



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 August 14, 2003
City Council Chambers 3:00 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: Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic, Jack Rittenhouse*
Absent: Teresa Barrett, Chris Lynch

*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development Department
Phil Boyle, Associate Planner
Laura Lafler, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of July 24, 2003 will be reviewed August 28, 2003.
Committee Members' Report: None.
Correspondence: Cover memo regarding questions on Baker Ranch details and Traditions (Turnbridge) material change for windows
Public Comment: John Cheney, 55 Rocca Drive: Disappointed that the Outlet Expansion was not on the agenda. Concerned about flooding problems.
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:15 p.m.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

I. TRADITIONS SUBDIVISION, 909 Colabianchi Lane

1 **AP No: 137-440-001 to 084**
 2 **File: 03-SPC-0376-CR**
 3 **Planner: Phil Boyle**
 4

5 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review of a revised color
 6 scheme for the Traditions Subdivision located at the northeast corner of Sonoma
 7 Mountain Parkway and Maria Drive.
 8

9 Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

10
 11 David Bradley, Ryder Homes: Gave a history of the project, discussed the original colors
 12 approved by SPARC and presented the new colors to the committee.
 13

14 Chair Rittenhouse: Clarified that the models are painted in the proposed colors.
 15

16 Public hearing opened and closed.
 17

18 Committee Member Gracyk: Do not think light colors schemes are entirely successful
 19 (particularly scheme 3). Encouraged the applicant to use the bolder colors as the body
 20 colors – seems to fit the style of architecture.
 21

22 Committee Member Kosewic: It is to the applicant’s benefit to chose good colors –
 23 prefer the new color scheme.
 24

25 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicant and staff for bringing the project back to the
 26 committee. Agree that the new colors are superior – want it on the record that these type
 27 of material changes need to come back to the committee.
 28

29 M/S Rittenhouse/Kosewic to approve the new colors as presented. 3-0
 30

31 Public hearing closed at 3:30 p.m.
 32



33
 34 Public hearing resumed at 3:45 p.m.
 35

36 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
 37 **NEW BUSINESS:**
 38

39 **II. ROCKRIDGE POINTE, Windsor Drive & Western Avenue**
 40 **AP No: 020-030-037, 020, 030, & 039**
 41 **File: 03-SPC-0275-CR**
 42 **Planner: Laura Lafler**
 43

44 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review of 123 acre project
 45 with 93 acres dedicated to open space and 62 home sites.
 46

47 Laura Lafler presented the staff report.

1

2 Vin Smith: Introduced the project team.

3

4 Dan Hale, Architect: Presented the architecture for the project and the changes to the
5 project since coming to SPARC preliminarily in May 2001.

6

7 Gretchen Stranzl McCann, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plans.

8

9 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked the applicant to respond in detail to the issues identified on
10 pages 7 and 8 of the staff report.

11

12 Gretchen McCann: Presented the details of the fencing; open fencing on particular lots;
13 landscaping for the corner lots and the park.

14

15 SPARC Committee requested the applicant to provide an overlay of how the fencing will
16 work and include proposed fencing for corner lots..

17

18 Committee Member Kosewic: Would like to see a reduced height on fences where it is a
19 property line separation and not a privacy issue.

20

21 Committee Member Gracyk: Would like to see a little more variety in the landscaping. I
22 agree with the tree choices and layout. Some of the larger corner lots seem to have a lot
23 of certain plants – would like to see more variety on these type of lots.

24

25 Gretchen McCann: Tried to offer enough variety without creating a botanical garden.

26

27 Dan Hale: Presented in detail the elevations of lots 1-4 and 14-23.

28

29 Committee Member Kosewic: The Bungalow front porches show nice columns and then
30 landscaping. Would like a detail of the column support, like the back porch decks.
31 Asked what the material of stairs would be for elevation A3.6.

32

33 Dan Hale: Wood.

34

35 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested concrete for purpose of maintenance.

36

37 Public comment opened:

38

39 Dusty Resneck: PBAC – have questions and not comments. Lots 37-41 – how will
40 landscaping be handled on utility easements? The Bike Committee would like a
41 continuance of the public trail along the northern property line.

42

43 Margaret Deorsey, 270 Edinburg Way: Have security issues of having an access road
44 behind our home – want to know how wide the road is and who can drive on the road.

45

46 Would like to have the path screened. We were not aware how visible the homes would

1 be until the story poles went up – can see 1 and 2 stories of the homes.

2

3 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Mr. Smith to answer the questions regarding the path (road).

4

5 Vin Smith: In answer to the first question, the location of the lots at the northern property
6 line is consistent with the Vesting Tentative Map. There would not be a public trail along
7 this northern property line. In answer to the second question, Mr. Smith pointed out the
8 path and showed how far it was from the Deorsey's back fence. The road is a pedestrian
9 pathway and will only be used as road by emergency vehicles or water service vehicles.
10 If landscape screening is proposed, the City would maintain it because this area is
11 dedicated to the City.

12

13 Chair Rittenhouse: The landscaping has been approved and it is not in the City's budget
14 to increase maintenance obligations.

15

16 Margaret Deorsey: Would like to see more redwood trees in the landscaping.

17

18 Public comment closed.

19

20 Chair Rittenhouse: What are the windows you are proposing.

21

22 Dan Hale: Vinyl.

23

24 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked the architect to review the material board.

25

26 Committee Comments:

27

28 Committee Member Kosewic: Like the architecture – would the shingles be painted?

29

30 Dan Hale: Yes.

31

32 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked the other committee members to respond to the 5'
33 setback issue and the intent for rural character identified in the staff report.

34

35 Vin Smith: The overall size of the subdivision has been reduced to reduce the grading
36 and the lots are smaller as a result the houses are now closer together.

37

38 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not have a problem with the setback issue.

39

40 Committee Member Kosewic: The project cannot be considered rural if there are
41 sidewalks.

42

43 Committee Member Gracyk: Do not know how you get a rural feeling with the houses
44 this close together. Possibly the houses could be smaller, particularly 40 and 41. Most
45 lots are fine. Feel the rural fencing is being well thought out. Need fencing on the corner
46 lots as well, but pull it back where possible. There is a lot of strength in the architecture.

1 Need to pay attention to the details of the column base as pointed out by Committee
2 Member Kosewic – like the details on the railings. Would like to see an alternative
3 entrance on some floor plans that may become an office or a granny unit. Encourage the
4 applicant not to have blank windows on dormers. Residence 4A – side garage wall –
5 would like to see windows on the left and rear elevations. Appreciate the minimum
6 number of front entry garages. Residence 6 – has some very nice garage details.
7 Residence 6B – front elevation above door – is that a roofline?

8
9 Dan Hale: Yes.

10
11 Committee Member Gracyk: Like the signage for the park and the layout of the park.
12 Would like a recycle bin also. Referred to Sheet L2 – is that a requirement to have the
13 brick?

14
15 Vin Smith: Is a structural design.

16
17 George White: The material is subject to SPARC's purview.

18
19 Gretchen McCann: Material is a brick paver stone – will bring the material to the next
20 meeting.

21
22 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to have some discussion about the easement across
23 lots 41-45.

24
25 George White: The lot configuration has been set by the Vesting Tentative Map.

26
27 Committee Member Gracyk: Wanted to address the screening issues brought up by a
28 neighbor. Suggested putting in oak seedlings. Will take a long time, however, it is the
29 right thing to do.

30
31 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe the project has been improved over time. Like the four sided
32 elevations, the mixing and matching of materials and the building massing - an attempt to
33 vary the architectural style. Residence A6.1 – reduce the hips. Wanted to acknowledge
34 the Edinburgh neighbors, however, the map is set and do not believe we can do anything.
35 Suggested developing the color scheme further.

36
37 Committee Member Gracyk: Are there any retaining walls – if so, what is the material?

38
39 Dan Hale: Some small walls between lots.

40
41 Vin Smith: The material is tumbled keystone.

42
43 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked the applicant to bring back details of the porch lights
44 – down lighting. Reiterated exploring the colors.

45
46 The committee directed the applicant to bring back the following:

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

- Lighting detail on the homes
- Master fencing plan
- Column detail
- Revised color scheme

M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to continue to September 11, 2003. 3-0.

III. REPORTS:

Planning Staff Reports: None.
Liaison Reports: None.

IV. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- Water Street final details**
- Redwood Gateway**
- Library Expansion**
- Theater District Streetscape**

Gracyk: Would like to agendize the structure of the SPARC committee. Want to discuss how the SPARC process is used – do we need changes. Want to have a discussion about the CPSP.

Chair Rittenhouse: Would like to agendize election of officers and committee appointments.

Committee Member Kosewic: Does SPARC still do field trips?

George White: We may be able to arrange this. May also want to consider SPARC awards.

Committee Member Gracyk: Asked about the Airport Commission meetings and why that is encroaching on SPARC’s meeting times.

George White: Do you want the agenda items brought up today put on the next agenda?

Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested putting everything on the next agenda and some may be need to be continued.

Adjournment: 5 :33