



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 January 23, 2003
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, Janet Gracyk, Chris Lynch, Linda Mathies,
Jack Rittenhouse*
Historic: Hurley, Hopkins
*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Assistant Director of Community Development
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Tiffany Robbe, Associate Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of January 9, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S–
Gracyk/Rittenhouse, 7-0.
Committee Members' Report:
Correspondence: Neighborhood at Deer Creek requested a continuance to February 13,
2003.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:15 p.m.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**NEW BUSINESS:****PUBLIC HEARING:****I. CONCEPT PLAN FOR WATER STREET, Water Street Between Washington Street and Western Avenue
Staff: Paul Marangella, Director of Economic Development & Redevelopment**

Receive direction on overall design and concepts of two options for the development of Water Street between Washington Street and Western Avenue.

Paul Marangella, Director of Economic Development and Redevelopment: Introduced the team for Water Street Plan and the Downtown Streetscape Master plan.

Steve Arago, CSW Stuber-Stroeh: Gave a history of the project since the City Council's approval in September, 2002.

Sandy Reed, ZAK Landscape Architects: Presented the options to the committee as well as ideas for blending materials. such as cobblestone, asphalt, concrete and metal.

Public hearing opened:

Christopher Stevick, President of Heritage Homes: Trolley important part of Petaluma's heritage. Presented a copy of the history of the trolley. Plan does not show railroad tracks crossing the trestle. Like the blending of the historic materials and new.

Lauren Williams, 12 N. Napa Drive: Presented a copy of historic resources trolley. Railroad saved Petaluma from being bypassed – kept Petaluma economically viable. History is four-part Historical resource survey will help Petaluma become a historic place.

Dusty Resneck, PBAC: Pleased with the project – encourages pedestrians. Like that local crafts people will build the bike bollards. Do not want a cutesy look. Make sure bollards do not interfere with pedestrians and people getting in and out of cars. Need bike rack in high usage area.

Alison Marks, Petaluma Arts Council: Advocate for public art to become a part of the planning process. Project has come a long way – happy to see the vision and some of the ideas for environmental sculptures. Hope to see public art continue with future projects. Santa Rosa is a good model.

Nora Langan, Public Art Network of Northern Ca: Impressed that the public art is an important part of creating this proposed space. This type of project is a win-win situation. Want preservation policy for public art instituted. Would like to have a public artist involved with the project now rather than later in the process.

1

2 Judith Reniets, 1630 Annetta Drive: Asked if budget for the project has been published?
3 Where are funds coming from?

4

5 Paul Marangella: Preliminary figures for the river enhancement project was \$5 million.
6 All monies are redevelopment funds.

7

8 Judith: How much has the project cost to date?

9

10 Paul Marangella: \$400,000.

11

12 Chair Rittenhouse: SPARC is here to review the design of the project and not the
13 funding.

14

15 Samatha Freitas: Requested that the community have time to view the project before it
16 comes to the hearing body. Petaluma Downtown Associates support the project.

17

18 Sandy Reed: Presented the models and answered questions from the public.

19

20 Public hearing closed:

21

22 Committee comments:

23

24 Committee Member Mathies: Like different parts of both concepts – flexibility is very
25 important – like panels for decking, provides a distinct buffer. Like pedestrians having
26 connections with river. Since Western end is pedestrian makes sense to be focal point.
27 Like the idea of an environmental sculpture. Prefer soft up lighting on pathway next to
28 river – keep focus on reflections of buildings. Mount lighting on structures would be
29 easier if owners are willing. Like the mix of materials – it has an old world feel which is
30 the way Petaluma evolved.

31

32 Marianne Hurley: Want to speak of the historic elements – the tracks, trestles and rear
33 façades of buildings. This is an important part of the area needs to be preserved. Rear
34 facades do not need a lot of trees. Like having trees away from buildings – trees
35 secondary to the buildings. Tracks and trestle – contribute to a historic district – possible
36 eligibility for national register. Retain tracks and trestle in place with utilities – moving
37 and replacing has to go through assessment – how much does it compromise historical
38 integrity. Trestle is a historic resource and needs to be treated as such. Will come under
39 section 106 review – integrity needs to be retained if repaired. Prefer recycled decking –
40 has boardwalk or riverfront feel. Fear that when streets are shut off it affects merchants
41 and downtown economics. Merchants need to be happy with arrangements. Would like
42 to see that this can be reversible if it does not work to discontinue a thoroughfare. Like
43 the river theatre idea. Clarify lighting on boardwalk area.

44

45 Committee Member Hopkins: Asked about cobblestones. Can historic tracks be
46 relocated and still be historic?

1

2 Committee Member Grayck: Like environmental art and river theatre. Express the
3 knuckle of the streets – I like pavilions. It is important to get enough light on the
4 buildings. Prefer concrete because the other material is not actual decking. Like the idea
5 of folding art into this now, however, it must be carefully chosen. Explore stepping down
6 at the Balshaw Bridge.

7

8

Sandy Reed: Would slow process down – possibly 5 years.

9

10 Committee Member Barrett: If the plan doesn't work for the merchants will not work for
11 the City. Agree with Marianne about the trees – no trees against buildings, possibly vines
12 on buildings instead. Trees on the opposite side of the river are a good idea. Lights on
13 buildings a good idea. No opinion on recycled decking vs. concrete. Would like focal
14 point at golden concourse.

15

16 Committee Member Lynch: Complemented design team. Think a combination of
17 options is best – feel the focus needs to be on the Western Street end. Like river theatre –
18 on option 2 put on the end of the golden concourse where cars will be turning. Tweak
19 river theatre – like the ripple effect and sculpture on the river – prefer it at Western
20 Avenue. Have issues with decking – if it is raised will limit the possibility for events.
21 Whole idea should be for pedestrians – don't know if concrete will solve issues. Put
22 energy into having a flush section – delivery trucks being able to pull up over curbs. At
23 the very least the track will remain – think that is important historically. Asphalt with
24 cobbles and concrete in between. Agree with Marianne about trees – the less the better
25 except for pockets in the merchants space. Wish we could do something at Western now,
26 do not want to slow the process down. Like the idea of pavilions or cafes. Don't care
27 about tower. Use a corten, weathered steel product – does not need maintenance –
28 temporary solutions – carry the guardrail theme to East Washington Street bridge.
29 Excited about the project.

30

31 Chair Rittenhouse: Progressed in a way that has evolved well in a positive way. Would
32 like to see the trolley preserved. Like the cobbles with the track and brick on sand – very
33 functional. Want a multi use level of space – ultimate goal is to be completely pedestrian
34 walkway. Suggested an overlay to set off the pedestrian area with a roll curb up to brick
35 walkway. River is focus – not landscaping. Quality of the street is the rear of the
36 buildings. Lighting if possible on the buildings or so close that it appears that way.
37 Agree with Chris on railing. Think the end of Western is the focus. Love the idea of
38 expanding across the river – river theatre. Like something emerging from the river.
39 Integrate for the trestle to be retained. Art incorporated is a good idea – do not know
40 exactly how to integrate. Consider palm trees on East Washington if not having an
41 archway. Like imagery, materials and pavers.

42

43 Steve Arago: Will come back with a plan incorporating comments from public and
44 committee. Will bring back to the committee for final approval.

45

46 Committee Member Barrett: Buildings are not the same so materials and lighting do not

1 have to be the same.

2

3 Paul Marangella: Goal is to come back in 30-45 days. May want to have something
4 focal at the end of the golden concourse in case the road is closed.

5

6 Committee Member Lynch: Biggest design challenge is where the focal point will be
7 and the river theatre.

8

9 Public hearing over at 5:30

10

11

12 **HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
13 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

14

15 **II. KING OFFICE BUILDING, 829 East Washington Street.**

16

AP No. 007-022-037

17

File: 02PRE0037

18

19 Applicant is requesting preliminary site plan and architectural review of a
20 remodel and addition to an existing commercial building.

21

22 George White: Bringing this item to the full committee because it is an undocumented
23 older building.

24

25 Church Hildreth, Architect, ADR: Presented the project.

26

27 Public comment opened.

28

29 Closed:

30

31 Committee Member Hurley: Do not think this has the potential to be designated a
32 historic building. However, it is a solid turn of the century house – probably not
33 available for state or national register. Can't review as under national register.

34

35 George White: Would need a historic evaluation to determine significance for which the
36 applicant would pay.

37

38 Committee Member Hurley: Would like to maintain residential character of the house.
39 A lot of assault to original design of the building – hard to see the original structure – the
40 form, massing, details are lost. Is it a good addition although according to preservation
41 standards, there are more subtle ways to go. Don't want to lose residential quality.
42 Think this can be done well – get rid of craftsman style entrance – takes away from
43 original design. Minimize the porch. Try to minimize and get what you need out of the
44 addition. Has too many columns. Don't use double door if not needed. Simplify.

45

46 Committee Member Hopkins: Marianne summed it up. Questions about height were

1 answered.

2

3 Chair Rittenhouse: The existing building is a very charming building – recreate the front
4 and maintain the charm – leave bay exposed. Think the minimalist approach is best –
5 simple and clean – put money into quality materials.

6

7 Committee Member Lynch: Think it is admirable what you are trying to do. Wrap
8 around porch not typical of this style of house. Needs to have front stoop. Breakdown
9 the massing in a different way – suggested a flat roof porch.

10

11 Committee Member Mathies: Simpler is better in this instance. You lose the existing
12 house when looking at front elevation.

13

14 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with what has been said by other Committee
15 members.

16

17 Committee Member Gracyk: Looks as though you are raising a house and repeating. Put
18 windows on back wall where stairs are. Suggested at least one tree in the back parking
19 zone to buffer other residences.

20

21 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested moving accessible parking space from #10 to #1.

22

23 Public review ended at 6:00 p.m.

24

25 Committee Member Mathies left the hearing @ 6:00 p.m.

26

27

28 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
29 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

30

31 **III. BOULEVARD APARTMENTS, 945 Petaluma Boulevard North.**
32 **AP No. 006-450-018**
33 **File: 03PRE0017**

34

35 Applicant and the Economic Development and Redevelopment Department are
36 requesting preliminary site plan and architectural review of a plan for an
37 affordable housing complex on 38,094 square foot City-owned site.

38

39 Katie Crecelius, Housing Consultant. The project represents the ultimate in public and
40 private projects. Two elements to the project: apartments in the back and mixed use in the
41 front. Presented the project and introduced the team: Jay Zlotnick, Executive Director,
42 Buckelew Programs; Alice Thomas, Project Director and Lara Spangler, Architect.

43

44 Paul Marangella, Director Economic Development and Redevelopment: The project is
45 consistent with some elements downtown regarding mixed use.

46

1 Laura Spangler: Presented the architecture and site plan.

2

3 Public comment opened:

4

5 Closed:

6

7 Committee comments:

8

9 Committee Member Lynch: Like the mixed use and the imagery. Understand that there
10 be constraints that the Committee is unaware of but the siting of the apartments seems
11 counter intuitive. If parking was on police dep't. side and common area on south side of
12 site, it would provide a buffer to houses on Hawthorne – would also alleviate view
13 corridor of asphalt. Take advantage of the green area in the form of garden apartment
14 living units – is mostly taken up with storage area. This is a good shared parking
15 opportunity. Have less parking so you can free up more green space. Have units take
16 advantage of solar access. Think the imagery is good on front building. Simplicity of
17 rear units is ok. Put the money into the siting and landscaping. Redevelopment concedes
18 that having a driveway on the south side is not necessary for future development.

19

20 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with Chris on the siting - the north – south orientation.
21 Landscaping shielding commercial building. Shift commercial building down – create
22 more of a street front – breaks the massing up. Have some fun with the front building.
23 Could reciprocal easements be worked out to share parking of commercial space and
24 reduce parking requirements?

25

26 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Chris' idea – restructure so asphalt is not a
27 straight shot from Petaluma Boulevard. Would like fewer parking spaces if possible.

28

29 Committee Member Gracyk: Don't have anything to add that has not already been said.

30

31 Architect: Parking drove the site plan. If parking can be reduced – there are more
32 possibilities for the design.

33

34 Review ended at 6:30.

35

36 Anne Windsor left the meeting @ 6:35.

37

38

39

40 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

41 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

42

43 **IV. NEIGHBORHOOD AT DEER CREEK, North McDowell Boulevard at**
44 **Rainier Avenue.**

45

46 **AP No. 007-380-027 and 007-380-005**

File: 03PRE0014

1
2 Applicant is requesting preliminary site plan and architectural review of a
3 proposal for a mixed-use neighborhood. The 215,000 square foot project will
4 include retail, commercial and approximately 300 residential units.
5

6 The applicant requested a continuance to February 13, 2003.
7

8
9 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
10 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

11
12 **V. HAYSTACK LANDING, 215 Weller Street.**
13 **AP No. 007-143-003, 007-143-004, 007-143-014 and 007-143-015**
14 **File: 03PRE0016**
15

16 Applicant is requesting preliminary site plan and architectural review of a
17 proposal for a commercial and residential mixed-use project.
18

19 Committee Member Lynch recused himself.
20

21 Wayne Miller presented the project including a discussion of the previous preliminary
22 review meeting and the current development of the site plan. A central street is designed
23 for pedestrians but could accommodate cars in future if desired.
24

25 Chair Rittenhouse asked how this related to the latest version of the Central Petaluma
26 Specific Plan (CPSP).
27

28 Wayne Miller indicated that this “recommended” street grid was the current “drift” of the
29 CPSP Committee.
30

31 Mary Dooley presented the townhome architecture.
32

33 Committee Comments:
34

35 Committee Member Barrett: Asked for an explanation of the new street circulation.
36 Understood and agreed with the plan for a clockwise one-way circulation. Generally likes
37 the plan.
38

39 Committee Member Gracyk: Liked central tower element. Some of the modern elements
40 are good. Some other elements seem unfinished. Though that mix of use would be
41 interesting. Some study should take place regarding the interface of commercial and
42 residential in the northern courtyard area. Could be a problem or could be very dynamic.
43

44 Chair Rittenhouse: Plan has come a long way. Four story elements make sense. Doesn't
45 like clubhouse design. Doesn't feel that the central street needs to be vehicular, not being
46 vehicular will encourage walking, biking and use of public transit. Need better

1 coordination between two parts of the project. Still need to develop architecture for the
2 streetscapes. Single tower element would be best. Some of the façade is still too boxy.
3 Need to define whether this is collection of smaller buildings or one or more larger
4 buildings. Decide between the various styles shown. May want to concentrate on unit
5 layout and final massing before designing the façade.

6
7 Mary Dooley: Does parcel need to be one unified plan or could it have separate
8 components?

9
10 Chair Rittenhouse: Likes 3-story townhome area. May want to offset from “D” St.

11
12 Wayne Miller: Washington St. edge not fully designed due to uncertainty about the
13 roundabout.

14
15 Committee Member Barrett: Likes one-way traffic circulation on Weller St. and no left
16 turn on “D” St.

17
18 Chair Rittenhouse: Headed in right direction. Encourage another preliminary review if
19 possible. Get a handle on the cost so that the plan won’t have to change later.

20
21
22
23
24 **VI. REPORTS:**

25
26 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

27 **Liaison Reports:** Committee Member Baret indicated that the Planning
28 Commission continued to review the Petaluma Village Outlet proposal.

29
30
31
32 **Adjournment:** @ 7 :42

33
34
35 S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes03\012303.doc