



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 April 10, 2003
City Council Chambers 2:00 p.m.
City Hall, 11 English Street Petaluma, CA
Telephone: 707-778-4301 E-Mail: cdd@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, vacant,
Jack Rittenhouse*
Historic: Marianne Hurley, Hoppy Hopkins (arrived at 3:00 p.m.)

*Chairperson

Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director
George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of March 27, 2003 will be reviewed on April 24, 2003.
Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: Chris Stevick passed out written comments. Committee Member Hurley asked staff what is going on at 6th and C Street.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
OLD BUSINESS:

- I. **DRAFT CENTRAL PETALUMA SPECIFIC PLAN**
Review, comment and recommendation to City Council on the Draft Central

1 **Petaluma Specific Plan.**

2

3 Continued from March 27, 2003.

4

5 Items for discussion:

6

7 General Provisions page of Architectural Guidelines and LEED Program.

8

9 Committee Member Hurley: Support the LEED program.

10

11 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to take seriously – do not know how that would
12 happen – looking to staff for direction.

13

14 Committee Member Barrett: If we suggest LEED program – how is this implemented?

15

16 Mike Moore: There is basic language in the plan. Will hopefully have a program within
17 a year for Council and Commissions to review.

18

19 Committee Member Lynch: We have projects already on the board and now is the time
20 to require. Suggested hiring a consultant to implement LEED program now. Ask to
21 implement LEED certification now.

22

23 Committee Member Barrett: Until a formal plan is implemented?

24

25 Committee Member Lynch: If the implemented plan becomes more specific then it
26 would be all inclusive. Asked about a reference Paul Crawford made to sustainable. All
27 buildings shall be LEED certified.

28

29 Committee Member Barrett: New buildings as well.

30

31 Committee Member Lynch: LEED applies to adaptive reuse.

32

33 Wayne Miller: Could adopt minimum standards without requiring applicants to go
34 through a green building requirement certification. Level needs to be discussed as a City-
35 wide program. Establish a baseline.

36

37 Mike Moore: Will check with Paul Crawford to see if there is language that can be put in
38 the plan.

39

40 Chair Rittenhouse: Inclined to approach in a macro level for the entire city.

41

42 Committee Member Gracyk: Can ask applicants to meet a minimum threshold.

43

44 Committee Member Lynch: Prefer to take staff out of the process and that is
45 accomplished with the LEED certification. There are four levels – the minimum is
46 LEED certified. Suggest staff establish with a consultant how the threshold is met.

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 Member Barrett: Can put language in the specific plan that the City is in the process of adopting a LEED program and applications will be subject to LEED when adopted.

Committee Member Lynch: Will not be able to apply retroactively.

Mike Moore: Can pass on to Council that LEED is a program SPARC supports and want to see adopted as soon as possible.

General Provisions section of Architectural Guidelines:

Chair Rittenhouse: Problem is that it has been diluted – sometimes too general. Suggest deleting the General Provisions altogether.

Committee Member Barrett: Puts into writing some materials that we may want to be in the code.

Committee Member Lynch: Problem with the 1st sentence – which historic character? Downtown, RFW? Would be different for different districts. Not willing to throw the whole thing out. Can insert certain things. Keep Item 1.

Committee Member Gracyk: Sometimes vinyl windows will be allowed. If something historic – vinyl would not be appropriate.

Committee Member Lynch: Do not think there is a place for vinyl windows in this plan.

Committee Member Hurley: Need to have rationale that is understood and can be applied. The term historic character is very misleading.

Committee Member Lynch: Would like to use the page to prohibit some materials. Have a fear of vinyl windows downtown. Want to make a blanket statement “no vinyl windows.”

Mike Moore: Historic character is referred back to the previous narratives in the document in certain sub areas.

Committee Member Lynch: Vinyl windows and true divided light. Want storefront windows with true divided light – no phony grids in the middle of a window.

Mike Moore: Can add LEED language. Do you want to find another place where it fits – can find an appropriate place. Can add as part of the building standards table.

Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested in the SMART code itself. We list it as a general provision when it is very specific.

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

Committee Member Lynch: Under 4.7, mixed use, page 19. How do we ensure the street frontage with a group of apartment buildings? Possibly a ground floor use language. If commercial, provide shop fronts. If residential mixed-use, some other way to define the street – possibly live/work - needs stoops.

Mike Moore: Is guidance already in the frontage type. Referred to use tables – specify uses that should be on ground floor.

Committee Member Lynch: RFW does not have that. Committee’s goal is for this area to be walkable and have street frontage. Under mixed-use projects, you can refer to policies in the Specific Plan, pg. 22, Goal 4 which are more specific.

Committee Member Gracyk: Do not know if adaptive reuse is strengthened – want it to be a standard, not the exception.

Committee Member Barrett: Want to be incentives.

Committee Member Gracyk: Want removal of specific street light. If there is a conflict between SMART code and the Architectural Guidelines – Architectural Guidelines would be prevailing document. Suggested that Architectural Guidelines physically conform to the rest of the document format.

Committee Member Hurley: Clarify the number and identity in Chapter 9. Recommend the ratings not be included since they did not do a national survey.

M/S Barrett/Lynch to recommend forwarding CPSP to the City Council. 6-0

Public hearing began at 3:25

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

II. ST. VINCENT’S PLAYGROUND, Union and Howard Streets

AP No: 006-244-004

File: 03SPC0114

Planner: Irene Borba

Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee site plan review and approval for the reconstruction of the playground for Saint Vincent Elementary School.

Committee members Lynch and Gracyk recused themselves because they live within 500 feet of the project.

- 1 Irene Borba presented the staff report.
2
- 3 Chris Lucia: Introduced the project team and presented the project which included a
4 revision to the plan provided to the Committee as part of the packet.
5
- 6 Committee Member Barrett: Asked for detail of changes on Walnut Street from what
7 was received in the packet.
8
- 9 Committee Member Hurley: No elevations were submitted, so it is difficult to visualize.
10
- 11 Committee Member Barrett: No material were submitted?
12
- 13 Chris Lucia: No. Concrete will be earth tone.
14
- 15 Committee Member Barrett: When are you proposing to put in the trees, and sidewalk
16 improvements?
17
- 18 Chris Lucia: Next phase.
19
- 20 Public hearing opened:
21
- 22 June Haroun, 503 Prospect Street: Project is important to my family. Own a house next
23 to the project on Prospect Street. Saw a brochure with the house on Prospect Street
24 demolished. What are plans on Prospect Street? How far does the rod iron fence go
25 toward Howard and toward Walnut? Narrowing streets and widening sidewalks is a
26 detriment to an already congested area.
27
- 28 Chair Rittenhouse: As part of this application today, nothing will happen on Prospect
29 Street?
30
- 31 Irene Borba: Correct.
32
- 33 George White: All future phases will require public hearing.
34
- 35 Susan Roffman, Principal: Addressed initial comment regarding a brochure that
36 demolishes a house on Prospect – did not come from the school.
37
- 38 Janet Gracyk, 615 Prospect: Has the access been signed off by Fire? Evening events are
39 not an issue. Encourage SPARC to see fence detail, good time to see street trees on
40 Howard put in – concerned trees may be lost in the last phase. Do not understand
41 widening of sidewalk – do not see narrowing the street – will cause more problems.
42 Trees of any size against the retaining wall will compromise the wall, better off putting
43 trees on the sidewalk. Would be a kindness for St. Vincent's to mitigate the edge of the
44 house that just sold.
45
- 46 Committee Member Hurley: Support plan as I see it – disappointed that we do not have

1 elevations. Cannot tell where historic walls are – assuming they will be retained. Like
2 the tiered seating. Agree with Janet that street trees on Howard be included now. Don't
3 know what the hard surface is going to look like. Confused about what we're approving.
4

5 Committee Member Hopkins: Concerned about narrowing Howard Street.
6

7 Committee Member Barrett: Do not have fence material or a design. Looks more like a
8 preliminary review.
9

10 Committee Member Barrett: Is it your intention to put in the fence in this phase?
11

12 Chris Lucia: Yes.
13

14 Committee Member Barrett: Assuming you will use black asphalt. Does not seem
15 complete. Agree with Janet to include street trees on Howard. Want to see example of
16 fence materials.
17

18 Chair Rittenhouse: Had the same concerns. Have difficulty approving a project that does
19 not provide drawings that match. Committee should see the fence. Concerns about
20 relationship of the playground to the building. Concerns about impact to the property on
21 Prospect Street.
22

23 Jerold Tierney: Would lose a year on the project if street trees were included due to the
24 amount of work involved in narrowing the street and widening the sidewalk.
25

26 Committee consensus to have following details returned to SPARC.
27

28 Rod iron fence

29 Detailed landscape

30 New grade to existing structure

31 Clarify what is staying on historic walls

32 Material on the perimeter

33 Elevation of south and west perimeter

34 Streetscape elevations

35 Delineation of what is included in this phase

36 Bike ramp on Walnut Street adjacent to steps shall be included
37

38 M/S Rittenhouse/Hurley to approve this phase, subject to final details and conditions
39 returning to the Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee.
40

41 Public hearing ended at 4:00 p.m.
42

43
44 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**
45

46 **III. PETALUMA TOWN CENTER, Petaluma Blvd. South, First Street and**
47 **Second Street at C and D Streets.**

1 **AP No(s): 008-065-002 & 003; 008-068-001, 002 & 003; 008-066-002, 003,**
2 **006, 007 & 009 and 008-121-001**
3 **File: 03PRE0129**

4
5 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee preliminary
6 review of plans for a 10-screen theater building, a parking garage, a mixed-use
7 building with ground floor commercial and 2nd and 3rd floor residential, and a 3-
8 story commercial building.

9

10 Matt White: Gave a history of the project.

11

12 Rick Strauss: Presented the architecture.

13

14 Committee Member Lynch: Asked about fate of fire house.

15

16 George White: Chief is looking into new location for fire house.

17

18 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked about circulation of the parking garage.

19

20 Matt White: Addressed access issues.

21

22 Committee Member Hopkins: Where will the old stable be relocated?

23

24 Matt White: Will not relocate. Previous project was entirely different. Structure of
25 building is completely unsound.

26

27 Chair Rittenhouse: Diagonal doors at the corner do not work. Traffic study will be
28 critical. Do you have control of exterior look?

29

30 Matt White: Yes, we own the building.

31

32 Committee Member Barrett: How many spaces in the parking garage will be private.

33

34 Matt White: Approximately 120.

35

36 Public hearing opened:

37

38 David Glass: City Council has a priority for this project. This is an ideal location and
39 will provide economic vitality for the community. Hold standards high and move
40 forward.

41

42 Pamela Torliatt: Thrilled that Basin Street is investing in our community and our
43 downtown. Give them good direction on the architecture and move forward.

44

45 Chris Stevick, 20 Liberty: Concerns regarding riverside of garage, ways to break up a
46 garage. Showed an example from a garage in Monterey. Garage looks as though it

1 dwarfs the fire house. Tracks are drawn out of the proposal. Specific Plan calls for the
2 tracks to remain. Trolley will be launching efforts for fundraising. Regarding the livery
3 stable – building can be disassembled and reassembled, possibly put on other side of
4 river. Inspired there is movement toward revitalization.

5
6 Public hearing closed:

7
8 Committee Member Barrett: Generally like it – suggested side of cinema be tile. Like
9 the colors and the concept of automatic ticket booth. Encourage green building to set a
10 trend – future operation will only be enhanced. Consider the bike committee's
11 recommendations.

12
13 Committee Member Gracyk: Amazing opportunity – like efforts to make it civic quality.
14 Have reservations about repeating art deco – would like to have something modern that
15 complements the past and moves forward. Have problems with the parking garage trying
16 to look old. Plan for the theater seems very constricted. Have reservations about one
17 entrance/exit to the parking garage.

18
19 Committee Member Lynch: Circulation issues in the theater building – entrance is
20 confusing. Logical place for the lobby is opposite the Rivertown Center. Provide real
21 storefront on Petaluma Blvd. Theater concessions in the other building is confusing as
22 well. If you can lose 1 screen would work better. Area where the concession is now
23 could be a café or a bookstore. Don't have a huge problem with art deco – Janet's point
24 is well taken. Hard time with stretching art deco theme to the garage. If there was some
25 way to exchange the garage and the Rivertown Center. If there is some way to wrap
26 around the firehouse to keep it museum like. Needs to be very thoughtfully carried out.
27 Garage can use references from downtown and the RFW but is a new building. Suggest
28 looking at a different design. Crucial how the garage looks from the river. Regarding the
29 Town Center, have similar concerns – detailing is troubling – get in trouble imitating
30 historical. Hotel Healdsburg is a good example. Like commercial office building on the
31 river – you are respecting the warehouse – like the base. Not sure why covered walkway
32 is in the Rivertown – faces the 7 Eleven. May be a higher priority to make C Street wider
33 – pick a spot – should be C Street. Re: livery stable – if there was a way to salvage
34 something and reuse in the courtyard area. Provide a view of garage with fire station.

35
36 Committee Member Hurley: Disappointed that buildings do not consider previous uses.
37 Happy with the movie theater – consider having a video store as retail space. Façade on
38 Pet. Boulevard is attractive – do not think it will be mistaken for an old building. Livery
39 stable is the most problematic. Proposed garage looks like 5th and Mission in San
40 Francisco. See the fire station completely dwarfed and unrelated to the new building. If
41 the livery stable is left and the garage is scaled back you have a historic corridor and step
42 back to the new modern buildings. Fire house is good candidate for adaptive reuse.
43 Livery stable has character of previous history – possible adaptive reuse. Garage might
44 benefit from a historic corridor in front. Would like the building that is the adult school
45 to be incorporated. Like the residential area. Courtyard – not keen on the covered
46 walkway – facade on Petaluma Boulevard is not broken up. Fire walls emphasize it

1 being too close to the fire house and the relationship of garage to fire house. Wonderful
2 job on the bar ale site and relationships to the buildings. Do not want to see the
3 warehouses demolished – incorporate empty lots in the housing.

4
5 Committee Member Hopkins: Parking garage looks too gaudy – does not blend. Traffic
6 will be a concern.

7
8 Chair Rittenhouse: Excited about overall project. Theater – consider doing a 2nd floor.
9 Need to have a feasible lobby. Don't have problems with art deco – difficult to recreate
10 – details are important. Break up the parapet to break up the massing. Suggest more of a
11 vertical element on C Street entrance. Look at back of Rivertown Center – break up
12 massing. Relocate a marquee at corner of C and 2nd. Parking garage – like the modern
13 adaptation and the glass block, like vertical park sign. Regarding adjacency to fire house
14 – open up as much as possible. Move access and elevators on parking garage – provide
15 more visual clues. Riverfront buildings – explore raising finished floor elevation to give
16 a feel of a loading dock. May minimize amount of arcade. Do not see amenities on the
17 river office building. Would like to see a more modern adaptation to the river town court.
18 Play vertically with parapets. Break down rigidity of the corner entrance to rivertown
19 court.

20
21 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked Committee's opinion on the livery stable.

22
23 Matt White: Cannot adaptively reuse the livery stable.

24
25 Committee Member Hurley: Think it can be done.

26
27 Committee Member Lynch: Almost more valuable to preserve a piece of history –
28 preserve as a museum piece. Do not think adaptive reuse is viable.

29
30 Committee Member Hurley: Older buildings are what give our town character – other
31 wise we lose remnants to the past. In the long run you get a richer project by
32 incorporating historic buildings.

33
34 Committee Member Lynch: The garage is too monolithic – is there anything else that
35 can be done on corner of the building.

36
37 Committee Member Hurley: Do not need to save only the high end historic resources of
38 our history – livery stable is a unique building.

39
40 Committee Member Gracyk: The frieze on the garage could be the modern element on
41 the garage.

42
43 Committee Member Hopkins: Suggested livery stable be used as a car barn for trolley.
44
45
46
47

1 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
2

3 **IV. DISCUSSION OF SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**
4 **SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS, SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL**
5 **REVIEW GUIDELINES AND SPARC STANDARD CONDITIONS OF**
6 **APPROVAL.**

7
8 Comments on application and submittal requirements:
9

10 Committee Member Lynch: Pg. 3 of the application, under SPARC, preliminary grading
11 plans provided, street sections and site contour. Add site section in the context plan.
12

13 George White: Suggested new box on the matrix.
14

15 Chair Rittenhouse: Concur.
16

17 Committee Member Lynch: Suggested outreach in historic districts to let residents know
18 they are in a historic district.
19

20 Chair Rittenhouse: Would like shadow studies, perspectives, renderings, story poles.
21

22 Comments on SPARC Guidelines:
23

24 Committee Member Barrett: Figure 2 – 2ft overhand for landscaping only.
25

26 Committee Member Lynch: Suggest 50% canopy in a parking lot. Comfortable with
27 parking standards in zoning ordinance.
28

29 Committee Member Barrett: Building Restoration Standards: 3.1; 3.5.
30

31 George White: Can have a new Resolution to adopt Secretary of Interior Standards.
32

33 Chair Rittenhouse: Submittal requirements for Landscape design, H.
34

35 George White: Change to landscape and irrigation plan.
36

37 Committee Member Lynch: Too detailed. Issue is the landscaping, not the irrigation.
38 No point to see irrigation in design review.
39

40 Chair Rittenhouse: Architectural Design Plan, a minimum
41

42 Committee Member Lynch: Have a list of what is in a contextual site plan.
43

44 Committee Member Hurley: Having the recommendations up front would be helpful for
45 applicants.
46

47 Landscape Design Standards.

1
2 Cream of the crop and rotten eggs award.

3
4 Committee Member Barrett: Pg. 26-11, #4 – did not think we had purview over signs.

5
6 George White: If there is a sign on the building. Think commercial signs should come to
7 you.

8
9 Committee Member Lynch: Take #15, 16 and 18 out.

10
11 Chair Rittenhouse: Roof plans, like 11 x 17 sets in addition to full size plans, lighting
12 (exterior lighting locations on plans), photometric plans.

13
14 George White: Look at lighting standards in development code.

15
16 Chair Rittenhouse: More interested in the fixtures themselves. Lighting detail.

17
18 Was the consensus of the Committee and staff to research guidelines from other cities
19 and draft new guidelines and a checklist to bring back to the Committee.
20
21

22
23 **V. DISCUSSION OF POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE**
24 **INSTALLATION OF STORY POLES.**

25
26 Committee Member Barrett: Policy II A List Community Dev. 1st, then Planning
27 Commission and SPARC. III, J - 4 feet by 6 feet – take out square.

28
29 Committee Member Lynch: III, C and D are redundant. G – instead of site plan handout
30 – use story pole plan.
31

32
33 **VI. REPORTS:**

34
35 **Planning Staff Reports:**

36 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission reviewed Gatti Subdivision, presented a
37 revised site plan for the townhomes, was continued to May 13, 2003.
38

39 **Adjournment:** 7:55
40