



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 9, 2003
City Council Chambers 2:00 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 (absent), 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 December 12, 2002 were approved as amended. M/S–
Rittenhouse/Barrett, 5-0.
Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Hurley asked about windows of Victory
Chevrolet building which is under restoration.
Committee Member Gracyk: Would like to agendize a discussion regarding processing
applications in historic districts
Correspondence: None
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:
PLEASE NOTE THIS ITEM WILL BE DISCUSSED FROM 2:00 – 3:00 P.M.

1 **I. DISCUSSION OF PETALUMA GENERAL PLAN 2004-2025.**
 2 **EXISTING CONDITIONS, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES**
 3 **REPORT.**

4
 5
 6 **Chapter 2 – Community Issues**

- 7
 8 ▶ Regarding housing variety and affordability, need to mandate a mix of house sizes within one
 9 development.

10
 11 **Chapter 3 – Growth and Evolution**

- 12
 13 ▶ On page 18, 5th paragraph, 2nd sentence, delete “detailing.” Encourage more protection for
 14 some of the historic areas.

15
 16 **Chapter 4 – Land Use and the Built Environment**

- 17
 18 ▶ Regarding residential density issue, when the General Plan process is complete, is the Zoning
 19 Ordinance going to happen as part of this process? Need more discretion either through
 20 SPARC or Planning Commission, not less discretion.

- 21
 22 ▶ Need better definition for “mixed-use.”

- 23
 24 ▶ Hillside ordinance needs to be looked at.

- 25
 26 ▶ On page 38, first bullet point, regarding minimum density standard of five or six units per
 27 acre for all developments within the UGB could be considered – this becomes a question of
 28 feathering that is described in the current General Plan and the factors of topography – a good
 29 portion of the western corridor of developmental area is questionable to get five or six units
 30 per acre. Suggested looking at San Rafael Hillside Guidelines.

- 31
 32 ▶ Is concerned the population between the ages of 25 and 34 has decreased five percent in the
 33 last study period. Believes this is a housing issue. Need to decide where and what we build
 34 and what type of densities to allow the younger and older population to live in Petaluma.

35
 36 Need to somehow deal with the issue of a cross-town connector.

37
 38 **Chapter 5 – Community Design and Character**

- 39
 40 ▶ Is concerned when we get close to the UGB and how we feather that development out - feels
 41 it is not possible to feather for commercial development. Discourages intense and
 42 uncharacteristic commercial development? Some language feels to be soft and needs to be
 43 better defined. “Limiting development” – what does this mean? Restrict development for
 44 low-impact areas and protect wild life corridors.

- 45
 46 ▶ Preserve views to the hills from key points in town.

- 1 ▶ Providing open space resources will be critical as we continue to get more intense growth
2 within town.
3
- 4 ▶ Need to require creek frontage dedication.
5
- 6 ▶ Regarding preserving peace and quiet in residential areas, need to retain historic business
7 uses, i.e., the Creamery, granaries, etc.
8
- 9 ▶ Need more restrictions for cutting down mature trees. There is a loss of mature trees through
10 bad pruning techniques.
11
- 12 ▶ Suggested looking at Wayne Miller's ideas in the CPSP.
13

14 **Chapter 7 - Transportation**

- 15
- 16 ▶ Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to parks, open space and to shopping areas.
17
- 18 ▶ Focus on improvements to the key arterial corridors and that none of the major arterials
19 displays a continuous public face representative of Petaluma.
20
- 21 ▶ Need to flag Petaluma Boulevard and Lakeville as problem areas for bike traffic.
22
- 23 ▶ Need public transit services for neighborhoods, downtown Petaluma and shopping centers.
24 Use incentives, i.e., shops and theater offer a discount if they have a bus ticket.
25
- 26 ▶ Need fewer barriers for pedestrians and bikes.
27

28 **Chapter 9 – Water Resources**

- 29
- 30 ▶ Is concerned with the hydrology of the floodplain and who has a handle on this? How are we
31 going to deal with proposals that we are seeing now within the floodplain area and how do
32 those affect downstream? What do we do with the General Plan that says that you can't go
33 out (with development) and you must come in (intensify development) and we have an entire
34 area of the City that we are saying that we can't build in?
35

36 **Chapter 10 – Recreation, Music and Parks**

- 37
- 38 ▶ Encourages joint uses with parks with schools and retaining basins. Emphasis on corridor
39 along the Petaluma River is critical. Would not encourage a fixed setback.
40

41 **Chapter 12 – The Natural Environment**

- 42
- 43 ▶ Is concerned with Riverfront greenway and habitat fragmentation. Challenge to get people to
44 the water and not break up the habitat too much. Regarding the Central Petaluma Specific
45 Plan, is concerned with hard edges on both sides of the River and losing our riparian
46 connection.
47
- 48 ▶ Need buffer zones.
49

1 ▶ Regarding possible creation of a storm water utility, could this also help fund street trees for
2 maintenance and planting? Need large crowning trees in some developments. Need
3 requirements for shade trees in parking lots.

4
5 ▶ Regarding energy standards, need higher standards for mega-houses.
6

7 **Miscellaneous Comments/Questions & Answers**
8

9 ▶ Look at Green building opportunities for redevelopment areas and infilling. Suggests looking
10 at Marin County green building issues to see if we can apply.
11

12 ▶ Encourages neighborhood groups.
13

14 ▶ Opportunities for economic growth and how we generate funds for the City to operate is a
15 key feature to how the City will grow.
16

17
18 **HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

19 **NEW BUSINESS:**

20 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**
21

22 **II. INCUBATOR LOFTS, 401-7th STREET.**

23 **AP No. 008-203-029**

24 **File: 02-PRE-0103**

25 **Planner: Kim Gordon**
26

27 Applicant is requesting site plan and architecture preliminary review of a
28 proposed 28 residential loft unit on 1.08 acres.
29

30 Ray Kaliski, Lofts Unlimited: Gave background of the project.
31

32 Colleen Mahoney, Architect: Presented the project.
33

34 Susan Clark, Clark Historic Resource: Building is significant under National Register A
35 and C – back only significant under A. Had someone from the state come to look at the
36 property. It was recommend that a study be done on the back portion to make sure it
37 could not be used.
38

39 George White: Explained the process of a preliminary review.
40

41 Committee Member Lynch: Explained the process of preliminary review regarding the
42 SPARC committee’s purview.
43

44 George White: Community Development Department received 21 letters in opposition to
45 the project.
46
47

1 Public hearing opened:

2

3 Patricia Loomis, 507-8th Street: Neighbor with a direct view and president of Pepper
4 School Board of Directors. Building too massive for the neighborhood. Concerned
5 about traffic, too tall. Takes up the middle of the lot, so there is no yard. Do not want to
6 set a precedent in the neighborhood. Would like the height reduced. Suggest
7 underground parking.

8

9 Michael Kennedy, F & 6th Street: Neighbor and parent of Pepper. City has obligation to
10 protect the school. Do not want building to shade the play yard. Do not want additional
11 apartment complex in the neighborhood. Already have 2 apartment buildings on the same
12 block.

13

14 Maureen Kosewic, 630 G Street: Main concern is the height and lighting and a 3-foot
15 easement on perimeter. Engineering problems with water drainage.

16

17 Carolyn Wasuleuski, Pepper Preschool, 627 F Street: Established by W.H. Pepper in
18 1894, at present location since 1959. Concerned about the density, traffic, height, mass
19 and intrusion to the school. Windows adjacent to the play yard, fire access, and noise
20 amplification are potential problems. Will take away sunlight. Want a shadow and sound
21 study, story poles along the properties at projected setback. Concerned about construction
22 and demolition impacts- noise, dust, and toxic waste.

23

24 David Rabbit, 428-11th Street: Development is out of scale and character with the
25 neighborhood, will rob neighboring properties of sunlight. Provided a shadow study.
26 Creates privacy concerns. Building too tall, massive and dense, 264 feet long. Does not
27 give the benefit of open space to the neighborhood. Would like to see this project closer
28 to downtown.

29

30 Gordon Preswell, Office Manager of Caliente apts. At G & 7th. Took a survey of 39
31 tenants – all are opposed. Will need to use easement of Caliente apartments for garage
32 egress–will increase traffic, noise, create hazards related to traffic.

33

34 Deborah Marin, 7th Street: Main concern is the easement – putting kids at risk because
35 this is where they play. Is too massive and tall for the site and traffic will be a problem.

36

37 Dale Higgins, 635 F Street: Concerns re: density. The driveway for the commercial
38 building is a problem as is. Am not totally against it. Problem with project size, suggest
39 reducing height, mass, size of building.

40

41 Chris Sparks, 636 F Street: Agree with comments regarding mass – is out of character
42 with the neighborhood. Traffic on F is a concern – is particularly narrow street. Parking
43 is a problem already due to existing apartments and Pepper Preschool.

44

45 Cathy Thomson, 8 Shady Lane: Has a son attending Pepper preschool – does not want
46 the building blocking the sun.

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

Donna Pacheco: Has a child attending school – project is too tall, would take too much light from the school. Will also create more traffic and impact roads.

Public hearing closed:

Committee comments:

Marianne Hurley: Lot of issues – will address only two. 1. Building is one of Petaluma’s most significant – important to history of Petaluma. Entire property is historically significant and potentially eligible for the National Register – worried about the back building being demolished – will have an adverse affect under CEQA. Would hope the rear building could be adaptively reused. 2. South elevation is a primary concern because of configuration of windows – needs work.

Hoppy Hopkins: Gratifying that the corner building is being maintained. Too massive and dense – will cause too much traffic.

Committee Member Barrett: Have a number of concerns which the neighbors presented. Do think story poles would be helpful here. Unit sizes are too large – ripe for illegal conversions. There is already tremendous amount of on street parking – adding this much density would be a disservice to the neighborhood. Concerned also about the water and sewer problems addressed in some of the neighbor’s letters. Need to see more energy conservation as part of the project. Traffic is a major concern, especially deliveries to the existing office space. Am sympathetic to the school’s situation – gardens and light are an important part of preschool. Project will result in increased use of easement- was this intended when easement was granted?

Committee Member Mathies: Thanked the neighbors and the applicant. Thanked the applicant for wanting to preserve the historic nature of the building. The square footage of the apartments is very large – could be much smaller and still economically viable or reduce the number of units allowing reduction in height and mass of building. Should articulate the façade. Possibly use the historic corner building as an amenity for the units, such as a community room. Story poles a must. Should conduct formal sunlight study; look at traffic issues and increased use of easement.

Committee Member Gracyk: Too dense for the location – imposition on neighbors too profound. Noise will be an issue-will bounce off building; sunlight for the school and other neighbors. Architecture was disappointing –windows and design do not seem to relate to the existing buildings. Appreciate effort to make outdoor space for the residents – can’t grow much in “buffer” space. Want to see the historic office use maintained.

Committee Member Lynch: Regardless of density, project needs work. The impact on the neighborhood is way too much. Need to rethink the project – for formal application must have a shadow study. Size of units as one bedroom invites the use as more than a one bedroom – will have an affect on the parking. Puzzled why 2-story on the side that

1 impacts the school. Articulated the courtyard but not the exterior. Courtyard is not
2 neighborhood friendly. If the project is reversed so the outside area is neighborhood
3 friendly could step back the building, accordion building in – get rid of two-stories –
4 would not impact the school as much. The impact to the rear property of the apartments
5 would be devastating. Three-story rectangle needs to be looked at. Consider tandem
6 parking in garage.

7
8 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Thanked applicant for coming to preliminary SPARC.
9 Know the applicants and understand what they are trying to do. Lost context of the
10 project, might work Central Petaluma Specific Plan area or San Francisco. Trying to put
11 this many units here is out of character – a very urban project in suburban setting. Private
12 space is turning it’s back to the neighborhood. South elevation shows that everything is
13 inward and does not deal with the neighborhood. Building is one story taller than
14 existing apartment buildings. If density was reduced the bulk and mass would be reduced
15 – difficult to resolve in what you are trying to accomplish. Easement was placed for low
16 intensity – have serious traffic issues. If this number of units is all that will work here
17 financially – it will be difficult to make general plan findings for proposed density.

18
19 Ray Kaliski: Will try to address concerns of the committee and the neighbors – will not
20 go away, however, will not come back with the same project you are seeing today.

21
22
23 Public hearing began @ 5:20

24
25 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
26 **NEW BUSINESS:**
27 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

28
29 **III. PLAZA SOUTH FACADE MODIFICATION, North McDowell Boulevard**
30 **and East Washington Street.**
31 **AP No. 007-340-0007**
32 **File: 02SPC0034**
33 **Planner: Irene Borba**

34
35 Applicant is requesting architectural review and approval for facade modifications
36 to the Plaza South Shopping Center.

37
38 George White presented the project for Irene Borba, the project planner.

39
40 Jay Baptista, RHL Design: Presented the project.

41
42 John McNellis: Gave some history of the project and the ideas for the shopping center.

43
44 Public hearing opened:

45
46 Public hearing closed:

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

Committee comments:

Committee Member Mathies: Think it's better than the last design. Is very typical of a lot of shopping centers though. Suggest trying to make it look like two spaces – delineate in some way. Would like extra outdoor space for Trader Joes. Would rather see corrugated metal. Seems too generic.

Committee Member Mathies left the hearing at 5:45 p.m.

Committee Member Gracyk: Is pleasant, however, it's very standard – thought you would have more fun. Would like to see some plants in the bump out area.

Committee Member Barrett: Nicer than the first rendition – is not too exciting - like colors better on the reproduction than the actual colors. Not objectionable, however not exciting.

Committee Member Lynch: Better because it's simpler and more straightforward. Take more freedom in the materials – do not agree to differentiate the two spaces. Work on compromise between the pedestrian and the vehicles on the road. Bring the arcade down a little to have a more human scale – possibly change the columns in the middle. Standing seam metal is a mistake. Look at corrugated with a weathered texture.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Layering of materials and colors provides a more interesting façade – would like the outside of the building more developed.

Committee Member Gracyk: Having roses growing up the brick walls would enhance the front of the building.

Committee Member Barrett: Like corrugated metal for the awning, change the support to metal, pairing entrances work, like the idea of plantings to soften the brick.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Would like to approve the project, yet have the applicant return to SPARC with the following details:

- Landscaping, preferably in ground plants if possible.
- Submit floor plan of outdoor space, incorporate existing or new metal supports for canopy feature
- Wire trellis to allow plants such as a climbing rose to grow on brick columns grow on brick wall – preferably with in ground plants.
- Lighting
- Consider reducing height of canopy/overhang to create a more human scale

M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to approve the project, however, to return to SPARC with the above details.

1 All in favor:

- 2
- 3 Committee Member Gracyk: Yes
- 4 Committee Member Barrett: Yes
- 5 Chair Rittenhouse: Yes
- 6 Committee Member Lynch: Yes
- 7 Committee Member Mathies: Yes

8
9
10 **“DRAFT” SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW FINDINGS**

11
12 **PLAZA SOUTH FACADE MODIFICATIONS**

13 **PHASE I (Trader Joe’s Building)**

14 **LOCATED AT THE CORNER OF MCDOWELL BOULEVARD NORTH AND**
15 **EAST WASHINGTON STREET IN THE PLAZA SOUTH SHOPPING CENTER**
16 **APN 007-340-007**
17

- 18
- 19 1. The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee (SPARC), authorizes the
- 20 construction for facade modifications (Phase 1) to the existing retail use Traders
- 21 Joes (formerly Apple Market/Albertsons Supermarket) located in the Plaza South
- 22 Shopping Center on the corner of McDowell Boulevard North and East
- 23 Washington Street, APN 007-340-007.
- 24
- 25 2. The project as conditioned, will conform to the intent, goals and policies of the
- 26 Petaluma General Plan. The General Plan contains objectives and policies which
- 27 encourage the use of commercial lands for economic activities that contribute to
- 28 local employment and income and which encourages small and locally owned
- 29 businesses.
- 30
- 31 3. The proposed modifications as conditioned, will not constitute a nuisance or be
- 32 detrimental to the public welfare of the community because it will be operated in
- 33 conformance with the Performance Standards specified in the Uniform Building
- 34 Code and the Petaluma Zoning Ordinance.
- 35
- 36 4. The project as conditioned, will conform to the purpose of site plan and
- 37 architectural approval, which is to promote orderly and harmonious development
- 38 of the City.
- 39
- 40 5. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the proposed
- 41 project is exempt from the requirements of CEQA pursuant to Section 15301,
- 42 Class 1, which allows for minor alterations of existing public or private structures.
- 43
- 44

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
47

“DRAFT” SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

**PLAZA SOUTH FACADE MODIFICATIONS
PHASE I (Trader Joe’s Building)
LOCATED AT THE CORNER OF MCDOWELL BOULEVARD NORTH AND
EAST WASHINGTON STREET IN THE PLAZA SOUTH SHOPPING CENTER
APN 007-340-007**

1. Plans submitted for building permit shall be in substantial conformance to the plans approved by the SPARC Committee on January 9, 2003 and date stamped December 17, 2002 by the City of Petaluma for review by the Planning Department.
2. Plans submitted for building permit shall include a plan sheet, which shall contain all conditions of approval for review by the Planning Department.
3. All outdoor mechanical equipment, satellite dishes, fire main and all rooftop equipment shall be shown on plans submitted for building permit and shall be fully visually screened to the satisfaction of the Planning Department.
4. Plans submitted for building permit shall provide a minimum of four covered bicycles stalls for review by the Planning Department. Said bicycle rack(s) shall be installed prior to a building permit final.
5. Plans submitted for building permit shall provide a minimum of two (2) benches along the front of the building. Said benches shall be installed prior to a building permit final.
6. Signs are not approved as part of this approval. The applicant shall apply for a separate sign permit. Sign permits must be obtained through the Building Division, and be designed to conform to Zoning Ordinance specifications.
7. The applicant shall be subject to the following Special development fees: Sewer and Water connection, Community Facilities, Storm Drain, School Facilities and Traffic Mitigation fees. Said fees are due at time of issuance of building permit at which time, other pertinent fees that may be applicable to the proposed project maybe required.
8. Any proposed exterior lighting fixtures shall be shown on building permit plans and shall be subject to staff review and approval at time of building permit. All lights to the building shall provide a “soft wash” of light against the wall and shall be directed downward and shall conform to City Performance Standards.
9. The applicant shall be required to utilize Best Management Practices regarding pesticide/herbicide use and fully commit to Integrated Pest Management

1 Techniques for the protection of pedestrians/bicyclists. The applicant shall be
 2 required, when pesticide/herbicide use occurs, to post appropriate signs warning
 3 pedestrians.
 4

5 *10. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall be required to submit*
 6 *plans to the Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee (SPARC) with details*
 7 *on the following: landscaping (preferably in ground plants) if possible; submit*
 8 *floor plan of outdoor space, incorporate existing or new metal supports for*
 9 *canopy feature; wire trellis to allow plants such as a climbing rose to grow on*
 10 *brick columns; lighting; consider reducing height of canopy/overhang to create a*
 11 *more human scale.*
 12
 13

14 **STANDARD SPARC CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

15
 16 ~~10.11.~~ The applicants/developers shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City
 17 or any of its boards, commissions, agents, officers, and employees from any
 18 claim, action, or proceeding against the City, its boards, commissions, agents,
 19 officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of the
 20 project when such claim, or action is brought within the time period provided for
 21 in applicable State and/or local statutes. The City shall promptly notify the
 22 applicants/developers of any such claim, action or proceeding. The City shall
 23 coordinate in the defense. Nothing contained in this condition shall prohibit the
 24 City from participating in a defense of any claim, action, or proceeding if the City
 25 bears its own attorney's fees and costs, and the City defends the action in good
 26 faith.
 27

28 ~~11.12.~~ Public utility access and easement locations and widths shall be subject to
 29 approval by PG&E, Pacific Bell, SCWA, all other applicable utility and service
 30 companies and the City Engineer and shall be shown on the plans.
 31

32 ~~12.13.~~ The site shall be kept cleared at all times of all garbage and debris. No outdoor
 33 storage shall be permitted.
 34

35 ~~13.14.~~ All improvements and grading shall comply with the Sonoma County Water
 36 Agency's Design Criteria.
 37

38 ~~14.15.~~ All work within the public right-of-way requires an excavation permit from the
 39 Engineering Division.
 40

41 ~~15.16.~~ All planting shall be maintained in good growing condition. Such maintenance
 42 shall include, where appropriate, pruning, mowing, weeding, cleaning of debris
 43 and trash, fertilizing and regular watering. Whenever necessary, planting shall be
 44 replaced with other plant materials to insure continued compliance with
 45 applicable landscaping requirements. Required irrigation systems shall be fully
 46 maintained in sound operating condition with heads periodically cleaned and

1 replaced when missing to insure continued regular watering of landscape areas,
2 and health and vitality of landscape materials.

3
4 ~~16.17.~~All conditions of the Building Division, Engineering Department and Fire
5 Marshal’s office shall be adhered to.

6
7 ~~17.18.~~Construction activities shall comply with applicable Zoning Ordinance and
8 Municipal Code Performance Standards (noise, dust, odor, etc.).

9
10 ~~18.19.~~At no time shall future business activities exceed Performance Standards
11 specified in the Uniform Building Code, Section 22-301 of the Petaluma Zoning
12 Ordinance, and the 1987 City of Petaluma General Plan.

13
14 ~~19.20.~~External downspouts shall be painted to match background-building colors.
15 Scuppers without drainage pipes may not be installed because of probable
16 staining of walls (overflow scuppers are excepted)

17
18 Public hearing closed @ 6:00



19
20
21
22 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
23 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW**

24
25 **IV. GATTI SUBDIVISION, Casella Way & Yorkshire Road.**
26 **AP No. 137-070-079**
27 **File: 02PRE**
28 **Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

29
30 Applicant is requesting preliminary site plan and architectural review for the
31 subdivision of the Gatti nursery site, a proposed 100-lot subdivision of town
32 homes and detached single-family homes.

33
34 Tiffany Robbe presented the project.

35
36 Doyle Heaton, presented the project and introduced the team.

37
38 Alan Burrell, Dahlin Group: Presented the architecture and the building materials.
39 Stated that townhouse balcony would be 2 feet deep, mainly for elevation interest and
40 that stucco would be 3-coat

41
42 Public hearing opened:

43
44 Dusty Resneck, PBAC: Submitted written comments regarding the project. The issues
45 are through travel, benches, transit stop, greenway next to creek, Class I bikeways, 3
46 bridges on the site to link to the Junior college and pedestrian needs.

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

John Sharer: Answered question regarding bridges built at Turtle Creek.

Don Weisenflum, 903 Kensington Place: Referred to a document submitted to the clerk's office. Spoke regarding density of the project and the general plan.

Public hearing closed.

Committee comments:

Committee Member Lynch: Biggest concern is the townhouses – need to be redesigned. Common areas are asphalt and designed for cars. Appreciate efforts to put garages in the rear, however, alley system can work well, but doesn't here. Amount of public space per unit is about 100 square feet, no useable balconies – really no useable private open space. Open space required for RMG zoning for 3-bedroom home is 600 square feet. Ideas include using a different unit prototype that may be 2-bedroom with large balcony and better connection from yard to garage and/or removing some units. Take advantage of green, open space. Need private open space amenities. Regarding the single-family dwellings – Consider turning houses 40-43 & 21-24 toward creek and losing two units from northern block. Make architecture simpler – use fewer materials, fewer layers, lose the English tudor/stucco house. Pushing for wood clad windows. Two bridges are enough. Continue path to Sonoma Mt Parkway. Consider removing public streets along creek and open units to a green common area.

Committee Member Gracyk: Concern about blank walls toward the creek – hope they will be turned. Some side elevations need windows in bedrooms. Plan 3 should have access to kitchen from garage without going through the living room; bedrooms have opportunity to have windows. Suggest operable windows whenever possible. Do not rely on oleander for screening unless using shrub & mixing with other species. Some plantings/trees were not identified. Plantings in front should be more gardenesque – more detail on planting plans in front yards. Would want to see lighting pole detail – this is not Victorian architecture. Bridges need more discussion, one maybe, but not more. Like the mixing of styles of homes & the English Tudor/stucco. Dislikes cultured stone. Simplifying materials would be good. Provide more useable private open space.

Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Committee Member Lynch about townhouses – sections 21 through 46 is too much a.c./concrete. Hope you will rethink the town homes – too dense and not enough green space. Reconsider road D – lose it in this section. Extend path to Sonoma Mountain Parkway now. Repositioning the houses so they face the creek and open space. Think there is a density issue with SFD as well, not as bad as town homes. Think the stucco houses look better because they are less busy. Two-foot balcony is not enough, make usable or loss it.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Adjacent neighborhoods seem less dense. Center town homes have no open space. Alley with all garage doors is overbearing. Redesign prototype of town homes. Six ft. strip between town homes has no purpose - with tall

1 buildings will get no light. Suggest a public road around the perimeter and private road
2 in the middle. Rotate units on the end toward the creek. Homes right on creek would be
3 nice. Parking at UGB would be an amenity. Path to Sonoma Mt Parkway now. Can
4 even move driveway and access corner garages from the side. Kitchens will be dark.
5 Architecturally – in the town homes – need window in bathroom instead of laundry room.
6 Like the stucco – think it helps to simplify buildings. Do not like the faux rock. Would
7 rather see simple, clean designs. Do not want to see designs based on a historical
8 reference which end up looking like Disney Land. Articulate roof form better. Town
9 homes are too cute – try simple & clean & moving forward in time.

10
11
12 **V. REPORTS:**

13
14 **Planning Staff Reports:** Date for window appeals is February 3, 2003 in the
15 afternoon (3:00 p.m.).

16 **Liaison Reports:** None.

17
18 **Adjournment: 7:30**

19
20