



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Minutes

Regular Meeting September 26, 2002
City Council Chambers 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 11 English Street Petaluma, CA
Telephone: 707-778-4301 E-Mail: planning@ci.petaluma.ca.us
FAX: 707-778-4498 Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee encourages applicants or their representatives to be available at the meeting to answer questions so that no agenda item need be deferred to a later date due to a lack of pertinent information.

Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Chris Lynch, Janet Gracyk, Linda Mathies, Jack Rittenhouse*

*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Planning Manager
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Laura Lafler, Project Planner
Betsi Lewitter, Project Planner
Phil Boyle, Assistant Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 12, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Lynch., 5-0.

Committee Members' Report: None

Correspondence: Committee Member Gracyk encouraged folks to attend CPSP meeting tonight.

Public Comment: None

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

OLD BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Public hearing began @ 3:15 p.m.

I. BAKER RANCH, 619 Ely Road
AP No: 137-070-09
File: ANX01001, TSM01001, PRZ01002, SPC01023
Planner: Laura Lafler

Applicant is requesting site plan and architectural approval for a proposal to construct ten new homes in an approved subdivision.

Note: This item is continued from September 12, 2002.

Laura Lafler presented the staff report.

Ben Smith, Waterford Associates: Introduced Doug Gawoski from Craiker Architects.

Doug Gawoski, Architect: Presented the architectural changes to the project.

Discussion regarding windows took place.

Bill Dick: Window preference is vinyl. Great deal of effort put into the redesign of the houses. Addressed the committee re: tree replacement ratio. Clarified that 300 seedlings will be planted and there will be a 3 to 1 replacement of oaks – the only issue is size.

Public hearing opened

Patricia Tuttle Brown: Went to the site – path will be very nice. Wanted to clarify if there would be a bench at the end of the path.

Public hearing closed.

Committee Member Mathies: Think plan is much improved. Would like to condition wood windows. OK with seedling program and 3 to 1 replacement with a little smaller tree.

Committee Member Lynch: 100% better – not traditional but rural. Like the simplicity of this vernacular. Some plans with 3-car garages – still essentially boxes. Get rid of 1 of the 3 garage doors and make a man door – better visual as you approach from the street. Think columns coming down to the porch with out details at the bottom – keep simple. Don't have a problem with proposal for trees. Want to see rear elevations.

Committee Member Barrett: Architecture is better – concur on conditioning wood windows. Have tree committee look at seedling plan that will be presented to the homeowners.

1 Committee Member Gracyk: Architecture tremendously improved. Enlarge the glass in
 2 the door. Asked applicant to clarify the porch – on certain plans it does not look
 3 accessible. Have concerns about panels above the bay windows. Agree with wood
 4 windows. Legitimate concern re: garage doors. Applicant’s arborist should do the
 5 seedling protection plan. Think should still have some big box trees and less seedlings –
 6 just one big box tree would be fine.

7
 8 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Project is more rural vernacular – thanked the
 9 applicant. Like the addition of the seedlings – don’t think a large specimen tree is
 10 necessary. Is brickwork necessary? The garage doors could be simplified or understated.
 11 Agree with wood windows and bench at end of bike path. Want porches to be useable,
 12 French doors would be preferable to a sliding glass door. Suggested committee member
 13 weigh in on large house.

14
 15 Committee Member Lynch: Large house is still too simple on the rear elevation – little
 16 more attention needs to be paid to all rear elevations. Work on the bay window on the
 17 house on corner – would rather see the plan with the wrap around porch at the corner.
 18 Agree with Committee Member Gracyk’s comment regarding the doors. Think you can
 19 lose the porte-couchere completely.

20
 21 Committee Member Gracyk: Outside lights too contemporary.

22
 23 Committee Member Mathies: Agree the rear elevation of large home needs some
 24 detailing.

25
 26 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Agree rear elevation of large home needs work.

27
 28 Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested project arborist chose the specimen of trees.

29
 30 Issues to be reviewed by staff:

- 31
 32 • All four exterior elevations
 33 • Rear of large home
 34 • Seedling protection plan to be presented to staff and the Tree Advisory
 35 Committee
 36 • Light fixtures
 37 • Front doors and garage doors
 38 • Wood windows (grids not inside the glass – both sides of exterior glass)
 39 • Bay window on corner lot
 40 • Bench at end of bike path

41
 42 M/S Barrett/Lynch to approve the project per the findings and amended conditions.

43
 44 All in favor:

45
 46 Committee Member Gracyk: Yes

- 1 Committee Member Barrett: Yes
- 2 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Yes
- 3 Committee Member Lynch: Yes
- 4 Committee member Mathies: Yes

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

**SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
DRAFT FINDINGS
Baker Ranch Subdivision
Southeast Corner of Corona Road and Ely Road
APN 137-070-09
Project File No(s). SPC01023**

1. The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee authorizes the proposed construction of a ten unit detached single family residential subdivision with associated roadways, paths, and utilities.
2. The project as conditioned, will conform to the intent, goals, and policies of the Petaluma General Plan and the Corona/Ely Specific Plan. The General Plan contains objectives and policies which encourages the orderly and harmonious development of Petaluma to insure a choice of housing types and locations to all persons regardless of sex, cultural origin, age, marital status, or physical handicaps.
3. The project as conditioned, will not constitute a nuisance or be detrimental to the public welfare of the community because it will be operated in conformance with Performance Standards specified in the Uniform Building Code, the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan.
4. The City Council adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration at its meeting of February 4, 2002 and all mitigation measures identified in the Initial Study are herein incorporated.
5. That the plan for the proposed development is compatible with the area.

1 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**
2 **DRAFT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**
3 **Baker Ranch Subdivision**
4 **Southeast Corner of Corona Road and Ely Road**
5 **APN 137-070-09**
6 **Project File No(s). SPC01023**
7
8

9 **Planning Department**
10

- 11 1. All mitigation measures and findings adopted in conjunction with approval of the
12 Mitigated Negative Declaration (Resolution 2002-020 N.C.S.) for the Baker
13 Ranch Subdivision project are herein incorporated by reference as conditions of
14 project approval.
15
- 16 2. All conditions/findings adopted in conjunction with Ordinance 2128 N.C.S.
17 prezoning the subject property to R1-6500, are herein incorporated by reference
18 as conditions of project approval.
19
- 20 3. All conditions/findings adopted in conjunction with Resolution 2002-021 N.C.S.
21 adopting a Tentative Map for the Baker Ranch Subdivision are herein
22 incorporated by reference, as conditions of approval.
23
- 24 4. Prior to issuance of 80% of the Certificates of Occupancy for the residential units,
25 the work approved for the public paths along Corona and Ely Roads shall be
26 completed and approved by the Community Development Department.
27
- 28 5. Oaks on Lot 4 identified as Tree #1 and Tree #2 shall be removed consistent with
29 recommendations of the City and applicant's arborists. The trees represent a
30 potential hazard with liability due to their deteriorating condition. Native
31 replacement trees shall be planted at a 3:1 ratio. The location of said trees, to be at
32 the discretion of the project landscape designer, shall be indicated on the final
33 landscape plan submitted prior to issuance of any building permit.
34
- 35 6. Prior to the issuance of building permits the applicant shall resolve the sight
36 distance issue on Hartman Lane by one or both of the following methods:
37
- 38 • Contact the owner of Lot 44 Graystone Creek to get permission to replace
39 with open fencing the last 10 feet of the rear yard fence to the point where
40 the privacy fencing begins and/or
 - 41
 - 42 • Flip the intended home on Lot 7 to move the driveway farther away from
43 the obstructing fence on Lot 44 of the Graystone Creek subdivision. With
44 this change the sight distance would be 55 feet for pedestrians, 125 feet for
45 bicycles, and 175 feet for vehicles.
46

- 1 7. *Prior to submitting applications for building permits, the applicant shall submit*
 2 *preliminary plans for design development that shall include the following for*
 3 *review and approval by Community Development staff:*
 4
- 5 • *Provide four exterior elevations for each proposed residential plan.*
 - 6 • *Revise plan for large residence on Lot 1 Plan to show more variation and*
 7 *interest in rear elevation.*
 - 8 • *Submit language regarding the seedling protection plan that shall be*
 9 *given to each homeowner who buys property with oak seedling mitigation*
 10 *plantings. Plan shall be reviewed by the Tree Advisory Committee.*
 - 11 • *Replace proposed exterior light fixtures with a design that is more in*
 12 *keeping with proposed architecture.*
 - 13 • *Redesign front doors to simplify and be in keeping with rural vernacular*
 14 *of other portions of the proposed homes.*
 - 15 • *Redesign side entry garage to offset or recess one of three parking spaces,*
 16 *so that appearance is not a “wall” of garage doors.*
 - 17 • *Redesign corner residence on Lot 11 to present a more inviting side*
 18 *elevation to the street, such as wrapping porch around the side.*
 - 19 • *Simplify design of bay windows on Plan 1.*
 - 20 • *Simplify design of proposed columns at front of homes.*
 - 21 • *Provide solar tubes as shown in previous plans.*
 - 22 • *Provide a bench at the eastern end of the path following Corona Road that*
 23 *will end at the school property.*
 - 24 • *Provide 24-inch box trees as shown in landscape plans, with trees to be*
 25 *selected by a certified arborist.*
 - 26 • *Provide specifications for wood windows on submitted plans.*

27
 28
 29 **Standard SPARC Conditions Of Approval:**

- 30
- 31 8. Construction activities shall comply with applicable Zoning Ordinance and
 32 Municipal Code Performance Standards (noise, dust, odor).
 33
- 34 9. The site shall be kept cleared at all times of all garbage and debris. No outdoor
 35 storage shall be permitted.
 36
- 37 10. At no time shall future business activities exceed Performance Standards specified
 38 in the Uniform Building Code, Section 22-301 of the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance,
 39 and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan.
 40
- 41 11. External downspouts shall be painted to match background-building colors.
 42 Scuppers without drainage pipes may not be installed because of probable staining
 43 of walls (overflow scuppers are excepted).
 44

- 1 12. Should any archeological/historical remains be encountered during grading, work
2 shall be halted temporarily and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to
3 evaluate the artifacts and to recommend further action.
4
- 5 13. All trees shall be a minimum fifteen-gallon size (i.e. trunk diameter of at least $\frac{3}{4}$
6 inch measured one foot above the ground) unless otherwise specified (e.g.: 24"
7 box or specimen size) and double staked; all shrubs shall be five-gallon size. All
8 landscaped areas not improved with lawn shall be protected with two-inch deep
9 bark mulch as a temporary measure until the ground cover is established.
10
- 11 14. All plant material shall be served by a City approved automatic underground
12 irrigation system.
13
- 14 15. All improvements and grading shall comply with the Sonoma County Water
15 Agency's Design Criteria.
16
- 17 16. All work within the public right-of-way requires an excavation permit from the
18 Division of Public Works.
19
- 20 17. All planting shall be maintained in good growing condition. Such maintenance
21 shall include, where appropriate, pruning, mowing, weeding, cleaning of debris
22 and trash, fertilizing and regular watering. Whenever necessary, planting shall be
23 replaced with other plant materials to insure continued compliance with
24 applicable landscaping requirements. Required irrigation systems shall be fully
25 maintained in sound operating condition with heads periodically cleaned and
26 replaced when missing to insure continued regular watering of landscape areas,
27 and health and vitality of landscape materials.
28
- 29 18. All street trees and other plant materials within the public right-of-way shall be
30 subject to inspection by the project landscape architect or designer prior to
31 installation and by City staff prior to acceptance by the City, for conformance
32 with the approved quality specifications.
33
- 34 19. All tree stakes and ties shall be removed within one year following installation or
35 as soon as trees are able to stand erect without support.
36
- 37 20. A master landscape plan of the street frontage areas shall be provided, to staff
38 approval, prior to issuance of a building permit. The landscape plan shall include
39 street trees with planting design and species to staff approval. Landscape shall be
40 installed to City standards prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.
- 41 21. Linear root barrier systems shall be utilized for trees near public streets or
42 walkways as needed, subject to staff review and approval.
- 43 22. Public utility access and easement locations and widths shall be subject to
44 approval by PG&E, Pacific Bell, SCWA, all other applicable utility and service

1 companies and the City Engineer and shall be shown on the plans submitted with
 2 the building permit.

3 23. Underground utilities such as water meters and sewer laterals shall be placed
 4 under paving or as close as possible to private driveways, to avoid conflict with
 5 street tree planting locations within the street right-of-way. Transformer vaults,
 6 fire hydrants and light standards shall be located in a manner which allows
 7 reasonable implementation of the approved street tree planting plan for the project
 8 without compromising public safety.
 9

10 24. A separate water meter shall be provided for landscape irrigation systems or as
 11 required by staff.

12 25. Any future color schemes that vary from those approved shall be subject to staff
 13 or SPARC review.

14 26. All exterior light fixtures shall be shown on plans subject to staff review and
 15 approval. All lights attached to buildings shall provide a soft “wash” of light
 16 against the wall. All lights shall conform to City Performance Standards (e.g., no
 17 direct glare, no poles in excess of 20 feet height) and shall compliment building
 18 architecture.

19 27. Temporary protective fencing shall be erected 5’ outside the drip line of all trees
 20 to be preserved/protected and all trees (on neighboring property) in proximity to
 21 construction activities. The fencing shall be a minimum of 5’ in height and shall
 22 be secured with in-ground posts subject to staff inspection prior to grading permit
 23 issuance and any grading/construction activity.
 24

25 28. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or any of its
 26 boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or
 27 proceeding against the City, its boards, commission, agents, officers, or
 28 employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, the approval of the project when
 29 such claim or action is brought within the time period provided for in applicable
 30 State and/or local statutes. The City shall promptly notify the applicants of any
 31 such claim, action, or proceeding. The City shall coordinate in the defense.
 32 Nothing contained in this condition shall prohibit the City from participating in a
 33 defense of any claim, action, or proceeding if the City bears its own attorney’s
 34 fees and costs, and the City defends the action in good faith.
 35

36
 37 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
 38 **NEW BUSINESS;**
 39 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
 40

41 **II. SALVATION ARMY PETALUMA CENTER, 721 South McDowell Blvd.**
 42 **AP No: 007-570-028**
 43 **File: SPC02034, CUP00014**

1 **Project Planner: Betsi Lewitter**

2

3 The applicant is requesting final approval of the architectural details, lighting
4 plans, parking lot layout, landscaping and fencing for a multi-use project on a 2-
5 acre site.

6

7 Betsi Lewitter presented the staff report.

8

9 Wayne Miller, Cogensis Design Group: Presented the project.

10

11 Lousie Leff: Presented the landscape plan.

12

13 Public hearing opened:

14

15 Susan Zanotti, 1420 Sarkesian Drive: Condition #10 re: master schedule of operations –
16 when will this be submitted? When does childcare get deleted? Will conditions be
17 deleted regarding childcare? Asked about condition #14 regarding landscaping and
18 construction.

19

20 Staff addressed questions regarding condition 10 and the applicant addressed the
21 landscaping and fencing questions below.

22

23 Wayne Miller: Would like to landscape rear of project first and perimeter after
24 construction. Will work out a construction time for fence.

25

26 Susan Zanotti: Asked about the fencing on the perimeter of the trees.

27

28 Addressed by Louise Leff.

29

30 Janet Bush, 716 Park Lane: Asked how tall the replacement trees will get and if the wind
31 will drop the berries in the yard.

32

33 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Would like benches in the back open space area. Would like a
34 bench on south McDowell as well. Think there is another opportunity for a bench in the
35 parking lot near the landscaping. Would like old fashion bike rack (example in front of
36 Copperfields) and lockers near the showers. Lights look like they may shine in
37 pedestrian's eyes or neighbor's yards.

38

39 Susan Zanotti: Asked to be shown where the security lights are on the site plan and if
40 lights would be on all night.

41

42 Applicant addressed the above concerns.

43

44 Public hearing closed.

45

46 Committee Member Barrett: Would use permit have to be modified again if Salvation

1 Army decided to put the childcare center back into the project? Disappointed that the
2 childcare center has been removed after all the time and effort that was put into this
3 project to get the approval.

4
5 George White: Use permit would have to be modified again. Staff also had concerns
6 when the childcare center was removed.

7
8 Brian Hoover: There was a condition put on the use permit that the use of the facility
9 could never be changed. Salvation Army decided that if the use changed later there
10 would be nothing that could be done and therefore eliminated the childcare center.

11
12 Committee Member Barrett: Like PBAC committee's suggestions regarding benches.

13
14 Committee Member Lynch: Disappointed about childcare also. All the landscaping and
15 public amenity is in the rear of the project – would like to see more public space
16 throughout the project. The childcare building is gone, the chapel is being reduced and
17 parking needs are reduced, therefore, can some parking be eliminated and the landscaping
18 increased, possibly a little courtyard with some hardscape and landscaping. Regarding
19 the architecture – like south McDowell elevation - suggested screening the small house
20 so it does not detract from the chapel. OK with fiberglass windows.

21
22 Committee Member Mathies: Like the project – architecture is cohesive with the
23 neighborhood. Maybe too much detail on the social services building windows. Like
24 Committee Member Lynch's idea of the courtyard between the chapel and the social
25 services building.

26
27 Committee member Gracyk: Also sorry about the childcare. Agree with Committee
28 Member Lynch's comments regarding the courtyard and open space amenity. Like
29 architecture and colors. Hope you can keep the redwood in front of existing house.
30 Possibly larger canopy trees in the parking lot area for shade. Asked if there were
31 skylights. Think the choice of trees for the back area is a good one. Would like the
32 benches as suggested or a picnic table in the landscaped area. Look at the odd small
33 spaces in the parking area to see if there can be more plantings. Think the fence is ok –
34 do not understand the lattice on the top of the fence.

35
36 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Suggested moving the social services building back
37 next to the landscaping area and add more landscaping near the chapel. Fits into the
38 neighborhood, like the colors and the fencing. Like fiberglass windows. Think some
39 adjustments can be made to make the project better.

40
41 George White: Cannot move the social services building back without modifying the
42 Use Permit.

43
44 Wayne Miller: Very sensitive to the concerns of the neighbors. Like the idea of the
45 courtyard, however, it might change the circulation of the project and the noise may not
46 be able to be mitigated – do not want to create problems where we now have solutions.

1
2 Captain Hoover: Responded to the committee’s comments to have open space between
3 the chapel and social services building.

4
5 Conditions to be reviewed by staff:

- 6
- 7 • Trees in parking lot with larger canopies
- 8 • Expanded open space near chapel and consideration of 90 degree parking
- 9 • Benches added per bike committee
- 10 • Casting outside light down, yet meet safety standards necessary

11
12 M/S Lynch/ Gracyk to approve the project per the findings and amended conditions.

13
14 All in favor:

15		
16	Committee Member Gracyk:	Yes
17	Committee member Barrett:	Yes
18	Committee Member Rittenhouse:	Yes
19	Committee Member Lynch:	Yes
20	Committee Member Mathies:	Yes
21		
22		

23
24
25 **DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FINDINGS**
26 **Salvation Army Petaluma Center**
27 **721 South McDowell Boulevard**
28 **APN 007-570-028**
29 **File No. SPC02034**
30

- 31 1. The project as conditioned will conform to the intent, goals and policies of the
32 Petaluma General Plan. Specifically, the proposal implements General Plan
33 Chapter 7, Goal 6 and Chapter 3, Objectives (i) and (o), Chapter 7, Objective (u)
34 and Chapter 9, Objectives (d) and (g).
35
- 36 2. The construction of a new chapel and social services building and the remodel of
37 the existing chapel and single family home on the site will not constitute a
38 nuisance or be detrimental to the public welfare of the community because it will
39 be operated in conformance with the Conditional Use Permit Conditions of
40 Approval and the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance.
41
- 42 3. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) an Initial Study
43 was prepared and potential impacts resulting from the project have been
44 identified. Mitigation measures have been proposed and agreed to by the applicant
45 as a condition of project approval that will reduce potential impacts to a less than
46 significant level. In addition, there is no substantial evidence that supports a fair

1 argument that the project, as conditioned and mitigated, would have a significant
2 effect on the environment.

3
4 4. The proposed project, as conditioned, conforms to the requirements of Site Plan
5 and Architectural Review Standards for Review of Applications 26-406 (A) of the
6 Zoning Ordinance as:

7
8 a. Quality materials are used appropriately and the project is in harmony and
9 proportion to the surrounding structures.

10
11 b. The architectural style is appropriate for the structures and is compatible with
12 other structures in the immediate neighborhood.

13
14 c. The siting of the new structures are comparable to the siting of other
15 structures in the immediate neighborhood.

16
17 d. The bulk, height and color of the new structures is comparable to the bulk,
18 height and color of other structures in the immediate neighborhood.

19
20 e. The landscaping is in keeping with the character and design of the site.

21
22 f. Ingress, egress, internal traffic circulation, off-street parking facilities and
23 pedestrian ways have been designed to promote safety and convenience and
24 shall conform to the approved City standards and confirmed by the City's
25 traffic engineering consultant.

26
27
28
29
30
31 **DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**
32 **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**
33 **Salvation Army Petaluma Center**
34 **721 South McDowell Boulevard**
35 **APN 007-570-028**
36 **File No. SPC02034**
37

38 1. Approval is granted to allow construction of a social service and supplies
39 building, construction of a new chapel, remodel of an existing single-family
40 residence and remodel of the existing church building, which shall be
41 substantially as shown on the plans received in the Community Development
42 Department on August 12, 2002, except as modified by these conditions.

43
44 2. All conditions of approval and mitigation measures imposed with the approval of
45 the Conditional Use Permit, with the exception of those that relate to the childcare
46 center, are incorporated herein by reference as conditions of project approval.

- 1
- 2 3. A landscape plan for the upgrade of the existing landscape in front of the single-
- 3 family dwelling on the site shall be submitted for staff approval prior to issuance
- 4 of building permits.
- 5
- 6 4. A revised parking lot plan showing a 10-foot minimum width for end parking
- 7 spaces shall be submitted for Planning staff review and approval prior to issuance
- 8 of grading or building permits.
- 9
- 10 5. Signs shown on the plans are not approved as part of this project. The
- 11 identification/bulletin board sign shall be designed to conform to Zoning
- 12 Ordinance requirements and shall be submitted for Planning staff review and
- 13 approval prior to issuance of Certificates of Occupancy.
- 14
- 15 6. *The plans shall be revised to provide a larger courtyard space, which includes a*
- 16 *seating area, between the chapel entry and the social services building.*
- 17 *Additional seating (bench) shall be installed in the open space area at the rear of*
- 18 *the site. Courtyard details and bench locations and designs shall be shown on the*
- 19 *plans submitted for building permit and shall be subject to review and approval of*
- 20 *the Community Development staff.*
- 21
- 22 7. *A revised landscape plan, which includes large canopy trees within the parking*
- 23 *areas, shall be submitted prior to issuance of building permits and subject to*
- 24 *review and approval of the Community Development staff.*
- 25
- 26 8. *All exterior light fixtures shall be shown on the building permit plans subject to*
- 27 *staff review and approval. All lights shall conform to City Performance Standards*
- 28 *and be shielded to prevent glare.*
- 29
- 30 9. All trees shall be a minimum fifteen (15) gallon size, unless otherwise specified
- 31 smaller (5 gallon) may be considered in areas not subject to high pedestrian
- 32 access or based on site specific and design purposes and larger (24" box sized)
- 33 and installed to City planting and staking standards; trees may be required in
- 34 highly visible areas; all shrubs shall be five (5) gallon size. All planted areas not
- 35 improved with lawn or other groundcover material shall be protected with a two-
- 36 inch deep bark mulch as a temporary measure until the ground cover is
- 37 established.
- 38
- 39 10. All plant material shall be served by a City approved automatic underground
- 40 irrigation system.
- 41
- 42 11. All planting shall be maintained in good growing condition. Such maintenance
- 43 shall include, where appropriate, pruning, mowing, weeding, cleaning of debris
- 44 and trash, fertilizing and regular watering. Whenever necessary, planting shall be
- 45 replaced with other plant materials to insure continued compliance with
- 46 applicable landscaping requirements. Required irrigation systems shall be fully

- 1 maintained in sound operating condition with heads periodically cleaned and
2 replaced when missing to insure continued regular watering of landscape areas,
3 and health and vitality of landscape materials.
4
- 5 12. All turf, groundcovers and shrubs shall be kept a minimum of 2' away from the
6 base of all newly planted trees. Construction plans shall contain specifications to
7 this effect.
8
- 9 13. All tree stakes and ties shall be removed within one year following installation or
10 as soon as trees are able to stand erect without support.
11
- 12 14. A separate water meter shall be provided for landscape irrigation systems or as
13 required by staff.
14
- 15 15. Any future color schemes that vary from those approved shall be subject to staff
16 or SPARC review.
17
- 18 16. There shall be no outdoor storage of materials or equipment unless screened from
19 view to staff satisfaction.
20
- 21 17. Driveway and parking surface areas shall be improved with a City approved
22 surface of asphaltic-concrete pavement. All parking surface areas shall be
23 bordered with concrete curbing which is designed to meet at least the minimum
24 specifications of the City Parking Design Standards.
25
- 26 18. Temporary protective fencing shall be erected 5 feet outside the drip line of all
27 trees to be preserved/protected and all trees (on neighboring properties) in
28 proximity to construction activities. The fencing shall be a minimum of 5 feet in
29 height and shall be secured with in ground posts subject to staff inspection prior to
30 grading permit issuance and any grading/construction activity.
31

32
33
34 **III. LEGACY MARKETING GROUP PARKING LOT AND BIKE PATH, 2090**
35 **Marina Avenue**
36 **AP No. 005-060-066**
37 **File: SPC01050**
38 **Assistant Planner: Phil Boyle**
39

40 Applicant is requesting review and approval to construct a 50-space parking lot
41 with a one-way access driveway; a 10-foot wide bicycle path and associated
42 landscaping. The site is south of the existing Legacy Marketing Building on
43 Marina Drive.
44

45 Phil Boyle presented the staff report.
46

1 Margaret Henderson, Quest Engineering: Introduced herself and the project.

2

3 Public hearing opened:

4

5 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Think it is a win win situation all the way around – would like the
6 no glare lighting to be conditioned. Suggested curb cut out of the parking lot. Would
7 like a cut out in the fence and benches to view the marsh.

8

9 Public hearing closed:

10

11 Committee Member Lynch: Suggested using cable on the top of the fence. Would prefer
12 to see the tara pave instead of asphalt.

13

14 Additional conditions from the committee:

15

- 16 • curb cut from the parking lot
- 17 • low glare lighting
- 18 • cable on top of fence
- 19 • road oyle or tara pave material for path
- 20 • 3 additional benches in the middle portion of the path

21

22 M/S Gracyk/Lynch to approve the project with the amended conditions.

23

24 All in favor:

25

26	Committee Member Gracyk:	Yes
27	Committee member Barrett:	Yes
28	Committee member Rittenhouse:	Yes
29	Committee Member Lynch:	Yes
30	Committee Member Mathies:	Yes

31

32 Public hearing items ended @ 6:30 p.m.

33

34

**DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FINDINGS
FOR A 50-SPACE PARKING LOT, ONE-WAY ACCESS DRIVEWAY,
MULTI-USE PATH AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING
ADJACENT TO 2090 MARINA AVENUE
APN 005-060-066; FILE SPC01050**

39

40

41

- 42 1. The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee (SPARC), authorizes the
- 43 construction of a 50-space parking lot, one-way access driveway, multi-use path
- 44 and associated landscaping located adjacent to 2090 Marina Ave. APN 005-060-
- 45 066

46

- 1 2. The project as conditioned will conform to the intent, goals and policies of the
- 2 Petaluma General Plan. The General Plan contains numerous objectives and
- 3 policies, which encourages the development of trails and pathways.
- 4
- 5 3. The construction of the project, as conditioned, will not constitute a nuisance or
- 6 be detrimental to the public welfare of the community in that it will be operated in
- 7 conformance with the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance and the conditional use permit
- 8 for the facility.
- 9
- 10 4. Planning Division Staff has concluded that this project is categorically exempt
- 11 from the provisions of CEQA per section 15311 Accessory Structures, which
- 12 allows for construction or replacement of minor structures accessory to existing
- 13 commercial, industrial or institutional facilities.
- 14
- 15 5. The proposed project, as conditioned, conforms to the requirements of Site Plan
- 16 and Architecture Review Standards for Review of Applications 26-406 (A) of the
- 17 Zoning Ordinance as:
- 18
- 19 a. Quality materials are used appropriately and the project is in harmony and
- 20 proportion to the surrounding structures and uses,
- 21
- 22 b. The architectural design is appropriate for the project and is compatible
- 23 with other structures in the immediate neighborhood,
- 24
- 25 c. The siting of the new facility is comparable to the siting of other structures
- 26 and parking lots in the immediate neighborhood, and
- 27
- 28 d. The landscaping is in keeping with the character and design of the site and
- 29 the majority of existing trees are to be preserved.
- 30
- 31 e. Ingress, egress, internal traffic circulation, off-street parking facilities, and
- 32 pedestrian ways have been designed to promote safety and convenience
- 33 and shall conform to the approved City standards as confirmed by the
- 34 City’s traffic engineering consultant.
- 35
- 36

DRAFT SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
FOR A 50-SPACE PARKING LOT, ONE-WAY ACCESS DRIVEWAY,
MULTI-USE PATH AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING
ADJACENT TO 2090 MARINA AVENUE
APN 005-060-066; FILE SPC01050

From the Planning Division

- 1
- 2 1. On plans submitted for building permit, conditions of approval shall be included
- 3 on the first plan sheet.
- 4
- 5 2. Approval is granted for the design of a proposed a 50-space parking lot, one-way
- 6 access driveway, multi-use path and associated landscaping located adjacent to
- 7 2090 Marina Ave. which shall be in substantially compliance with the plans
- 8 received in the Planning Division and date stamped June 5, 2002, except as
- 9 modified by these conditions.
- 10
- 11 3. The applicant shall be required to utilize Best Management Practices regarding
- 12 pesticide/herbicide use and fully commit to Integrated Pest Management
- 13 techniques for the protection of pedestrian/bicyclists. The applicant shall be
- 14 required to post signs when pesticide/herbicide use occurs to warn pedestrians and
- 15 bicyclists.
- 16
- 17 4. *Prior to submitting an application for a building permit, the applicant shall*
- 18 *submit plans to include the following:*
- 19
- 20
 - *Three additional benches along the path for a total of 5 benches.*
 - 21
 - 22 • *A revised fence elevation with a steel cable across the top of the fence*
 - 23 *instead of the cap board and upper rail.*
 - 24 • **
 - 25 • *The surface of the multi-use path is Roadoil or tara pave, not asphalt.*
 - 26
 - 27 • *A curb cut at the eastern edge of the Legacy Property allow access to the*
 - 28 *path and parking lot.*
 - 29
 - 30 • *Lighting which does case glare in bicycle/pedestrian eyes.*
 - 31

From the Engineering Division

- 32
- 33
- 34 5. Complete and detailed topographic mapping shall be submitted as part of the
- 35 improvement plans and shall include Casa Grande Rd., the new Yardbirds
- 36 turnaround, the new trail bridge near Marina Ave. and any information beyond the
- 37 limits of this project to indicate conditions for design purposes.
- 38
- 39 6. All existing surface drainage directed to this site shall be addressed and resolved
- 40 with no adverse effect to existing properties. The existing storm drain junction
- 41 near Marina Ave. shall be replaced with a drainage structure. The existing
- 42 drainage situation at the end of Casa Grande Road shall be evaluated and
- 43 resolved. Existing drainage ditches that are to be filled shall be replaced with a
- 44 storm drain system to replace their function. The Sonoma County Water Agency
- 45 shall review and approve all hydrology; hydraulics and storm drain system design.
- 46

- 1 7. Frontage improvements shall be provided at Marina Ave. and Casa Grande Rd.
2 Improvements on Casa Grande shall include but not be limited to one half of a
3 cul-de-sac, sidewalk, streetlights, drainage improvements, signing and striping.
4 Improvements on Marina Ave. shall include but not be limited to connecting curb,
5 gutter and paving to the existing Marina parking lot, sidewalk, drainage
6 improvements, signing and striping. Provide an analysis by a Traffic Engineer
7 indicating that the proposed entrance configuration on Marina Ave. is satisfactory
8 for site distance and safety.
9
- 10 8. The proposed property adjustments at each end of the project shall be executed
11 with dedications.
12
- 13 9. A public access easement shall be dedicated over the entire site.
14

15 Parks and Recreation Department
16

- 17 10. Prior to issuance of a building or grading permit the applicant shall enter into a
18 long-term maintenance agreement with the City of Petaluma to maintain, per City
19 standards, the bike path surface, parking lot surface, all lighting and all
20 landscaping. This agreement shall be approved by the Department of Parks and
21 Recreation.
22

23 **Standard SPARC Conditions**
24

- 25 11. The site shall be kept cleared at all times of all garbage and debris. No outdoor
26 storage shall be permitted.
27
- 28 12. Construction activities shall comply with applicable Zoning Ordinance and
29 Municipal Code Performance Standards (noise, dust, odor, etc.).
30
- 31 13. At no time shall future business activities exceed Performance Standards specified
32 in the Uniform Building Code, Section 22-301 of the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance,
33 and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan.
34
- 35 14. All trees shall be a minimum fifteen-gallon size (i.e. trunk diameter of at least $\frac{3}{4}$
36 inch measured one foot above the ground) unless otherwise specified (e.g.: 24”
37 box or specimen size) and double staked; all shrubs shall be five-gallon size. All
38 landscaped areas not improved with lawn shall be protected with two-inch deep
39 bark mulch as a temporary measure until the ground cover is established.
40
- 41 15. All plant material shall be served by a City approved automatic underground
42 irrigation system.
43
- 44 16. All improvements and grading shall comply with the Sonoma County Water
45 Agency’s Design Criteria.
46

- 1 17. All work within the public right-of-way requires an excavation permit from the
2 Engineering Division.
3
- 4 18. All planting shall be maintained in good growing condition. Such maintenance
5 shall include, where appropriate, pruning, mowing, weeding, cleaning of debris
6 and trash, fertilizing and regular watering. Whenever necessary, planting shall be
7 replaced with other plant materials to insure continued compliance with
8 applicable landscaping requirements. Required irrigation systems shall be fully
9 maintained in sound operating condition with heads periodically cleaned and
10 replaced when missing to insure continued regular watering of landscape areas,
11 and health and vitality of landscape materials.
12
- 13 19. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City or any of its
14 boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or
15 proceeding against the City, its boards, commission, agents, officers, or
16 employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul, the approval of the project when
17 such claim or action is brought within the time period provided for in applicable
18 State and/or local statutes. The City shall promptly notify the applicants of any
19 such claim, action, or proceeding. The City shall coordinate in the defense.
20 Nothing contained in this condition shall prohibit the City from participating in a
21 defense of any claim, action, or proceeding if the City bears its own attorney's
22 fees and costs, and the City defends the action in good faith.
23
24

25
26 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
27 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**
28

29 **IV. PLAZA SOUTH FACADE UPGRADE, North McDowell Blvd. and East**
30 **Washington Street**
31 **AP No: 007-340-007**
32 **File: PRE02020**
33

34 Applicant is requesting a preliminary review of Plaza South facade upgrade.
35

36 Mike Powers, McNellis Partners: Introduced the project.
37

38 Jay Baptista, RHL Design: Presented the design façade.
39

40 Public hearing opened:
41

42 Patricia Tuttle Brown: PBAC had a proposed Class I path behind the shopping center –
43 would like to open up the back of the shopping center to a path.
44

45 Public hearing closed:
46

1 Committee Member Lynch: Think that if it is phased – it will be a strange looking
 2 shopping center. Think finding a design that is more suited to stand alone architecture is
 3 appropriate. Do not need single monotonous design that will be carried throughout the
 4 shopping center. Design looks tired – do you want to look like all the other malls? Come
 5 up with something more suited to this town. Think the outlet project is a good one and
 6 more suitable. Think large canopy trees in the parking lot are necessary.

7
 8 Committee Member Mathies: Glad to see the shopping center is getting some help.
 9 Consider designing according to the use of the buildings. Do not like plain, redundant
 10 style. Parking lot needs to be more pedestrian friendly. Great opportunity to turn this
 11 eyesore into something special. Don't think the band aide approach is the best.

12
 13 Committee Member Barrett: This design could be anywhere – does not look like
 14 Petaluma. Needs something that invites you to come. May be worth doing some
 15 plantings that could later be moved. Reiterate to have something more pedestrian
 16 friendly. Look at other places in Petaluma for ideas.

17
 18 Committee Member Gracyk: Disappointed with design. This is in your own best interest
 19 to make this inviting with some outdoor space. There are opportunities to open up that
 20 corner where Ross is now. Increase pedestrian space in front of the stores. The rear
 21 elevations on Washington Street are important. Architecture that is more eclectic that can
 22 be phased in is very important. Landscaping will be an important part of this redesign.
 23 Mature trees are important and providing rooting space is important. Would like more
 24 specific information on the site plan in the second phase.

25
 26 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Difficult situation without future tenants. Choosing a
 27 style now that will work it's way around is a mistake. Something about this building
 28 could be up to date and modern without a lot of effort. Code Stone is a good example of
 29 a stand alone pad building. Just put some trees in front of this particular store to make it
 30 inviting. Difficult to start with this and plan for the rest of the center.

31
 32
 33 Committee Member Lynch left the meeting @ 7:00 p.m.

34
 35 **V. WATER FIELD OFFICE, 202 North McDowell Blvd.**
 36 **AP No: 136-111-022**
 37 **File No: PRE02021**

38
 39 Water Resources is requesting a preliminary review for the construction of a new
 40 field office.

41
 42 Steve Simmons, Utility Manager: Introduced the project.

43
 44 Karen Burks, Burks Toma Architects: Presented the project.

45
 46 Public hearing opened:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

Patricia Tuttle Brown: If there was some way to shelter the area of the equipment and yet open up to the park to have more open space for the employees.

Public hearing closed:

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Read comments of Committee Member Lynch: Like the project – is simple and straightforward, consider some sun shading.

Committee Member Barrett: Like the project, need bike racks. Would like landscaping every 8 spaces in parking lot.

Committee Member Mathies: Think you are going in the right direction. Glad to see the corner being cleaned up. Like the materials and the simple lines.

Committee Member Gracyk: Like the architecture, is appropriate. Talk with Ed Anchordoguy regarding landscaping against the wall. Suggested more landscaping in front and trees in the parking area.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Like the architecture - it's honest. Push for what you need in terms of height. Day lighting and sun shading is good. Let it be playful and honest. Would like to see the security integrated into the project.

George White: Suggested outreach to the neighbors before the project begins.

VI. REPORTS:

Planning Staff Reports: None

Liaison Reports: Planning Commission: Rockridge Pointe is a more favorable project and is continued to October 22, 2002.

Adjournment: 7:30