



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 28, 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: Teresa Barrett, Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic, Chris Lynch, Jack Rittenhouse*
Historic: Marianne Hurley, Petaluma Museum (absent)

*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of July 24, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Gracyk/Barrett 6-0 and Minutes of August 14, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Gracyk/Rittenhouse, 3-0, Barrett and Lynch abstained.
Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Hurley stated that she saw Hoppy Hopkins several times before his death and he had not lost his sense of humor. Marianne stated this was her last meeting and she met with Heritage Homes and suggested that there be a term for the historic position. She also suggested that Heritage Homes advertise for the position so that there is a pool of qualified applicants. Therefore, the position will not be filled immediately.
Committee Member Lynch announced that this is his last meeting.
Correspondence: 1) Memo from George White dated August 14, 2003 regarding Baker Ranch and Traditions Subdivisions. (Held over at the request of the chair.)
2) Memo and two attachments from Tiffany Robbe regarding the Washington Creek Subdivision sound wall.
3) Final Story Pole Policy

1 4) Memo from George White regarding vinyl windows at Traditions dated August 21, 2003.
2 Committee Member Gracyk: Commented that the sound wall at Washington Creek looks
3 horrible, do not want to make the same mistake again.

4 5) Letter from Linda Quinn dated August 5, 2003 regarding the Tatum project at 2nd & G.

5 Committee Member Gracyk asked the committee for some information and background on
6 the Tatum project at 2nd & G.

7 Chair Rittenhouse and Lynch: Gave some history of the project and its evolution through the
8 SPARC process. Committee Member Lynch attempted to talk with the neighbor about the
9 size of Mr. Tatum's project.

10 Committee Member Barrett: Mr. Tatum came to the SPARC committee twice – the
11 committee also had concerns about the size and the impact to the neighboring bungalows,
12 however, felt the committee did the best they could. Chair Rittenhouse will respond to the
13 neighbor's letter.

14 Public Comment: None

15 Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

16 Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda
17

18
19 Public hearing began at 3:15 p.m.
20

21 **HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

22 **OLD BUSINESS:**

23 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
24

25 **I. PETALUMA TOWN CENTER, Petaluma Blvd. South, First Street and Second
26 Street at C and D Streets.**

27 **AP No(s): 008-065-002 & 003; 008-068-001, 002 & 003; 008-066-002, 003, 006,
28 007 & 009 and 008-121-001, 008-121-007, 008, 009, 010, 011 and 012.**

29 **File: 03-ZOA-0260-CR**

30 **Planner: Irene Borba**
31

32 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and
33 approval of the Streetscape Master Plan for the "Petaluma Theater District" at
34 Petaluma Boulevard and "D" Street within the project area.
35

36 Continued from July 24, 2003.
37

38 Joyce Clark presented the proposal.
39

40 Sandy Reed presented the details of the Theater District streetscape.
41

42 Angela McDonald, Lighting Consultant: Presented the lighting for the Theater District.
43

44 Committee Questions:
45

1 Committee Member Barrett: The trees listed on the plans are not on the approved street tree
2 list – why hasn't this come to the Tree Advisory Committee? Trees selected have a lot of
3 debris.

4
5 Sandy Reed: Ed Anchordoguy approved these trees.

6
7 Committee Member Barrett: Have the same concerns about Water Street – trees on the plans
8 are not on the approved street tree list either.

9
10 Committee Member Gracyk: Is this streetscape consistent with River Enhancement Plan and
11 the Bike Plan? Is there a goal to construct a path under the D Street bridge?

12
13 Joyce Clark: The project is consistent with both plans. Cannot have a path due to fluctuation
14 of the tides – do not have the vertical clearance.

15
16 Public hearing opened:

17
18 Patricia Tuttle Brown, 513 Petaluma Boulevard South: PBAC wants pedestrian/bike access
19 from Water Street continuing in front of the Apple Box; would like recycling bins as well as
20 trash receptacles throughout downtown and the Theater District; asked if bike bollards are
21 the same density as in downtown; want highly visible crosswalk on D Street at 2nd Street;
22 want to revisit path under D Street bridge; want the docks at the end of C Street to then
23 connect to the path under D Street; would like the railroad trestle renovated.

24
25 Public hearing closed:

26
27 Committee discussion:

28
29 Committee Member Gracyk: Committee member Barrett's concerns regarding the Tree
30 committee needs to be addressed. Would like the trees on 1st Street to be eclectic and not
31 formal. Like A and C light poles – was discussion about having one light at the theater and
32 another at 1st Street; pots are ok; sidewalk rail is fine – would like a variety of finials; like the
33 swirling pattern on the tree grates in this district; would like to see a path under the D Street
34 bridge even if it is under water part of the time. Agree that it is important to have recycling
35 bins throughout this district and downtown; want to condition the crosswalks to make sure it
36 happens. Like the square grate and the sand wash finish for the sidewalks.

37
38 Committee Member Barrett: Agree about the under bridge access; agree to continue bike
39 access from Water Street along the river in front of the Apple Box. Matt White mentioned
40 putting bike parking the garage – feel this is appropriate rather than in front of theater.

41 Visible crosswalks are essential – like the product shown – want a crosswalk on D Street at
42 1st and 2ND Streets. Did not like tree grate C, others are fine. Agree with the recycling.

43 Needs to address concerns about the tree selection – want to see projects going to the Tree
44 Advisory Committee. Redwood trees on 1st & C are in good condition and need to be
45 maintained – look healthy.

46

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Issues of an under crossing at the D Street bridge – what has been done
2 to achieve that goal.

3
4 Paul Marangella: Looked at two different types of paths under the D Street bridge: Arizona
5 which is hazardous and requires a lot of maintenance. Also looked at a floating dock –
6 would work ok except at high tide – liability of a pedestrian hitting their head on the bottom
7 of the bridge. Is worth doing a detailed study – am planning to pursue that.

8
9 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Mr. Marangella to address the access in front of Apple Box.

10
11 Paul Marangella: Trestle is unsound. We have asked Basin Street Properties to continue
12 path on top of bank and they are in agreement with that – just waiting for construction there
13 to be completed.

14
15 Committee Member Lynch: Is that temporary solution?

16
17 Paul Marangella: The trestle is not salvageable; therefore we are leaving the trestle for now
18 and putting the path along side of the trestle.

19
20 Committee Member Kosewic: L1 – concerns about the layout of lanes – need to be explored
21 further. L7 – like FJN grating; L71 – like Petaluma only and not Petaluma, CA on the
22 benches. L5 – older sidewalks has 6” score for a border. Like the sand wash finish. Need to
23 specify when referring to warm gray. Glad to see a signal at 1st and D Streets. On L7.3 need
24 to specify the bike parking. L7.3 – some inconsistencies. Powder coating ok only over
25 galvanized and not steel. Prefer lamppost, alternate A – best because it is lower – even lower
26 would be better (maybe 15’).

27
28 Committee Hurley: Agree with everything that has been said. Like A and C light fixtures.
29 Have concerns about maintenance with this much density of planting. Want conditions of
30 approval to come back to the committee in the minutes.

31
32 Committee Member Lynch: Agree with what has been said. Tree grates; exclude C, F, G,
33 and M – others ok. Like the curved railing and the artist finial; any of the light fixtures are
34 fine. Have heard of floating docks – sometimes have a gate that would close at high tide.
35 Would like to see a feasibility study. Like the terminus at C Street.

36
37 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with other comments from the Committee. Reiterate changing the
38 tree grates from downtown to theater district; like light standard A; like tree grates A and J;
39 feel the design team is good and will do a good job. Would like the tree selections to go to
40 the Tree Advisory Committee for approval.

41
42 Paul Marangella: We have spoken with Ed Anchordoguy and selection of trees will go to the
43 Tree Advisory Committee and only come back to SPARC for details if the Tree Committee
44 has a problem. Would like placement of furnishings to go to staff administratively.

45
46 Committee Member Gracyk: Want the crosswalks as a condition of approval.

1
2 Paul Marangella: Will work with Basin Street to resolve a continuation of the
3 bike/pedestrian access from Water Street along the river in front of the Apple Box.

4
5 M/S Gracyk/Lynch to approve the streetscape as per the findings and amended conditions
6 below. 6-0

- 7 ▪ Tree details will return to SPARC if Tree Committee has a problem
- 8 ▪ Crosswalk at 1st & D Streets

9
10 4. *Prior to issuance of a development permit, the applicant shall present the proposed*
11 *trees to the Tree Advisory Committee for review and approval.*

12
13 5. *Light fixture A or C can be installed. Plans for a development permit shall be*
14 *reviewed by the Planning staff.*

15
16 Public hearing closed at 4:45 p.m.
17
18

19 **OLD BUSINESS:**

20 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

21
22 **II. WATER STREET PLAN, Water Street Between Washington Street and**
23 **Western Avenue**

24 **Redevelopment Project Manager: Jeanne Miche**

25
26 Request for Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and approval of the
27 final details for the Redevelopment of Water Street.

28
29 Paul Marangella presented the staff report.

30
31 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked for explanation of intersection of Water Street and
32 East Washington regarding the mixture of trees.

33
34 Sandy Reed: Is used as a transition and a gateway.

35
36 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked about East Washington Street next to the Good Will
37 store – is a very harsh area.

38
39 Sandy Reed: Is not part of this project.

40
41 Public hearing opened:

42
43 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Pedestrian lighting on turning basin is not what we want anywhere
44 – is important to pay attention to lighting. Western Avenue access to the Balshaw Bridge –
45 needs to be access that is safe. Crossing Washington Street at Water Street is also
46 dangerous – would like an under bridge crossing there as well as the D Street bridge.
47

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Western at Water will be closed to traffic; the under the bridge
2 circulation at Washington Street is not under the purview of this Committee at this time.

3

4 Paul Marangella: The property owners on Water Street spoke with the City Manager and
5 we have agreed to allow parking and through traffic on a temporary basis until the new
6 parking garage is complete.

7

8 Committee Member Lynch: If this area is used as a bypass now it is just asking for trouble
9 – feel it needs to be closed now or a temporary situation will turn into a permanent
10 solution.

11

12 Committee Member Gracyk: What is timeline for garage?

13

14 Paul Marangella: Will be under grounding the utilities for Water Street by June 30, 2004.
15 Construction will begin July 2004. Completion will around the same time as the
16 completion of the garage – November 2004, therefore temporary parking is a moot point.

17

18 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Want a pathway that is visible from Western Avenue to Water
19 Street – do not have a problem with merchants parking on Water Street.

20

21 Committee Member Barrett: Are you asking for a temporary solution?

22

23 Chair Rittenhouse: I mistakenly thought this was going to be a pedestrian area.

24

25 Committee Member Gracyk: Can improvements be made only on the first portion of
26 Water Street?

27

28 Paul Marangella: Do not want to separate the project.

29

30 Committee Member Barrett: Can we make a condition of approval to stripe a bike lane in
31 the transition period between these improvements and the building of the garage?

32

33 Brian Rossen, Mountain View: Am as surprised about the change in the circulation – need
34 assurance that Water Street @ Western Avenue will be a pedestrian thoroughfare.

35

36 Public comment closed:

37

38 Committee Member Barrett: Wanted to comment on trees, however, if you are going to the
39 Tree Committee for approval, will forego comments. Trash enclosure – less is more. My
40 only concern is the use of Western for through traffic – asking for trouble. Condition a
41 bike lane during the time this is open to traffic.

42

43 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with Teresa's comments. Have concerns about the
44 number of trees at Water Street and East Washington – do agree with fast growing, riparian
45 trees, however, do not think this mix of big trees close to palms is particularly good. Like
46 the idea of using grass – would be a welcome counterpoint. Make sure the area along side

1 Good Will (on Washington Street) gets pulled into a project – is an important piece.
2 Materials are all good. Like the idea of seating near Balshaw Bridge. Have mixed feelings
3 regarding conditioning a temporary bike lane. Fear that we will lose the pedestrian plaza
4 on a permanent basis. Paving material will help to slow down the traffic. The Committee
5 previously discussed paving material to come to the property line and express the
6 irregularity in the property line.

7
8 Sandy Reed: Rather than change the material, it made sense to stop the brick and instead
9 changing the coursing on the brick rather than change the material.

10
11 Committee Member Gracyk: Now it looks like you are paving up to the property line.

12
13 Jeanne Miche: Yes.

14
15 Chair Rittenhouse: Previously there was a discussion about permission from the property
16 owners. Does this plans show which property owners agree and who does not?

17
18 Jeanne Miche: Yes.

19
20 Chair Rittenhouse: The property owners encroaching into public right of way is ok?

21
22 Sandy Reed: We are encouraging business to come out to the public right away for
23 outdoor seating, etc.

24
25 Committee Member Gracyk: Teresa's comment was interesting about trash receptacles,
26 would like to hear what other committee members say. Lighting – prefer B. Railing – do
27 not like guardrail B, like A.

28
29 Committee Member Hurley: Agree with Janet on railing A – like the vertical element,
30 provides a strong boundary. Concerns about the trees at East Washington and Water Street
31 – when you put smaller trees around the palm you cover the strength of the palm – not
32 necessary a good match. The maple trees selected are not very attractive in the fall.
33 Applicant needs to consider the lighting concerns expressed by Patricia Tuttle Brown.

34
35 Angela McDonald: All lamps are enclosed in a refractor – appearance is like an acorn –
36 nothing is exposed. There should not be a glare problem.

37
38 Committee Member Lynch: Also have concerns that temporary solution at Western will
39 become permanent. Strongly recommend that parking be allowed on a temporary basis,
40 however, no through traffic. Project itself is good, wheel stops are good – is a fun
41 solution, like the first rail – flip onto the pedestrian side, garbage enclosure – agree with
42 Teresa on one hand, however, a roof will be helpful and I like the design. Hope this
43 intersection will not stay open and this will be a moot point. Do not think we need a
44 painted bike lane unless the traffic stays. Historic lights cannot completely shield – lights
45 are fine. Possibly a feasibility study for an under crossing at Washington Street and the D
46 Street bridge. Are not seeing this in it full context – want to see the River Enhancement

1 Plan in full design detail.

2

3 Committee Member Kosewic: Against palm trees and eucalyptus. Do not feel bus drivers
4 will use bulb outs. Don't think there will be safety concerns after the pavement changes –
5 will change the way people drive.

6

7 Committee Member Gracyk: Look at the terminus at Steamer Gold – there is a trash
8 enclosure in front of a window. Can we have pedestrian activated crosswalk from Water
9 Street across East Washington, especially when Downtown River Apartments are built.

10

11 Chair Rittenhouse: Would have preferred the through traffic be brought up at the
12 beginning of the meeting. Design has come along way. Do hope this becomes a true
13 public plaza. Agree with Teresa about trees, like railing A – rotating hand rail toward
14 pedestrians. Historic fixture will not meet all recommendations of bike committee,
15 however, much has gone into this.

16

17 Committee Member Barrett: Want to condition that parking on Water Street is ok,
18 however, no through traffic to Western Avenue – the through traffic will go to the Golden
19 Concourse.

20

21 M/S Barrett/Lynch to approve the final details of Water Street as amended, 6-0

22

23 Committee Member Barrett left the meeting at 6:00

24

25 New Conditions:

26

27 *11. Prior to issuance of a development permit, the applicant shall present the proposed*
28 *trees to the Tree Advisory Committee for review and approval.*

29

30 *12. Plans submitted for a development permit shall include railing A, the handrail shall*
31 *be rotated.*

32

33 *13. Plans submitted for development permit shall include light fixture A.*

34

35 *14. Plans submitted for development permit shall allow for parking along Water Street*
36 *below the golden Concourse on a temporary basis until completion of the parking*
37 *structure at "C" and 2nd Street. Through traffic shall not be permitted, vehicles must*
38 *turn around and go out through the Golden Concourse.*

39

40

41 Public hearing began at 6:15 p.m. – Committee Member Barrett left the meeting.

42

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

44 **NEW BUSINESS:**

45 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

46

47 **III. LIBRARY EXPANSION, 100 Fairgrounds Drive**

1 **AP No.: 007-031-004**
2 **File: 03-SPC-0220-CR**
3 **Planner: Kim Gordon**
4

5 Request for Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee approval of a 1,125
6 square foot addition and a conceptual landscaping plan for the existing Sonoma
7 County Library building located at 100 Fairgrounds Drive.
8

9 Committee Member Lynch: Recused himself since his wife is the architect on the project.

10
11 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

12
13 Mary Dooley: Presented the project and the landscape plan.

14
15 Public hearing opened:

16
17 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Discussed bike parking – the library has always had a large number
18 of bike parking spaces (covered and uncovered) – want this to continue with the new
19 addition.

20
21 Public hearing closed:

22
23 Committee comments:

24
25 Committee Member Kosewic: No comments.

26
27 Committee Member Gracyk: Evolution of the design is appropriate and has gotten better
28 with time, like the materials. Landscape is a good design – do not think it is necessary to
29 come back to SPARC. Bench near the pay phone would be nice addition.

30
31 Chair Rittenhouse: Good project, complementary features added to the original design – it
32 works. Believe the bench is a good idea.

33
34 Mary Dooley: Want to know if the bus shelter could suffice as a seat. The library has had a
35 problem with the homeless using the area; feel the bench would contribute to that situation.

36
37 Committee Member Gracyk: Deferred to Mary Dooley and Dorothy regarding the bench.

38
39 M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to approve the project per the findings and conditions as amended.
40 3-0

41
42 Public hearing closed @ 6:30.

43
44 Amended condition:
45

- 1 5. ~~The final details for the conceptual landscaping plan shall return to SPARC for~~
2 ~~review and approval.~~ Phase I of the project may be completed and occupied prior to
3 installation of the Phase II conceptual landscaping plan.
4
-

5
6 **IV. REDWOOD TECHNOLOGY CENTER/REDWOOD GATEWAY, North**
7 **McDowell Blvd southeast of Old Redwood Highway**
8 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**
9

10 **A. Redwood Technology Center (Parcels A and B; Basin Street Properties)**
11 **AP No: 007-411-07, -09, -18 and -19**
12 **File: 03-SPC-0204**
13

14 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural preliminary review of an
15 office/research and development campus that includes the construction of four
16 (4) three-story buildings containing a total of 262,500 gross square feet, and a
17 7,500 square foot restaurant building.
18

19 **B. Redwood Gateway; (Parcel C; Robertson Properties Group)**
20 **AP No: 007-411-20 and -21 (Pacific Theaters property)**
21 **File: 03-SPC-0271**
22

23 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural preliminary review of a
24 166,713 gross square foot retail center with three major tenant spaces, including
25 96,853 square foot Kohl's Department Store, additional retail, and one pad with
26 drive-through facilities. The existing theater building is proposed to be
27 demolished to make way for the proposed retail center.
28

29 Jayni Allsep: Introduced herself to the Committee.
30

31 Vin Smith, Basin Street: Introduced his project team, Rick Strauss, Architect and gave a
32 history of the project.
33

34 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Mr. Smith to go over the high points of the project at the formal
35 hearing on September 11th.
36

37 Committee Member Gracyk: Is there any opportunity to change the parking for Redwood
38 Technology Center?
39

40 Jayni Allep: Gave a history of the project. Redwood Technology Center has already
41 received all their entitlements so there is little room for changes except to the architecture
42 and landscaping.
43

44 Tamara Thompson, Robertson Properties Group: Introduced the Redwood Gateway project
45 team.
46

47 Brian, Architect: Presented the architecture.

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

Tamara Thompson: Presented the site plan as it related to the hydrology report that was done for the entire site.

Discussion took place regarding utility easements near parking garage.

Committee Member Lynch: Is there enough room between the garage and the property line to plant trees?

Vin Smith: Yes.

Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested bringing a site constraint map when returning on September 11, 2003.

There was a discussion regarding parking reserve.

Public hearing opened:

Dusty Resneck: Each building should have bike parking, not each parcel. Concerned about pedestrian needs throughout the sites; too much parking, the Bike Committee has given specifications for benches and water fountains. Want the detention area to have some amenities. Did not see Class II bike lanes on North McDowell – want Class II path on both sides of North McDowell all the way to Old Redwood Highway. Want Class II paths on both sides of redwood Way also. Suggested color treatments in the parking area so bicycles can maneuver through the site plan – want to see a circulation plan for pedestrians, bikes, and cars for both projects.

Public hearing closed:

Committee Member Kosewic: Want Kohl's to lower parking count – keep parking at a minimum. Agree with Dusty's comments regarding amenities for the site. Want to see some outside seating for employees to have lunch. Suggested applicants come prepared with hydrology constraints map at the formal hearing. Kohl's architecture has a 1950's feel to it which is interesting – like the sides and the front. The rear seems lacking – dress up a little more. Like the architecture for Redwood Technology site – will stand on its own.

Committee Member Lynch: Redwood Technology Center: Site A, over parked by 66 spaces, Site B over parked by 87 spaces. Area surrounding the parking structure does not need parking. Would like to see hard scape limited. Want a parking reserve or open space/wetlands as an amenity to the site. Projects are distinctly different – would prefer it looks like a campus. In order to provide a pedestrian connection between Building B-1 and the Redwood Gateway site, the applicant should consider putting a well landscaped tunnel/pedestrian passageway through the ramp of the parking structure. Architecture is fine. Kohl's Site: Is 300 spaces over parked – too much asphalt especially in an area that floods. Take the distant perimeter parking spaces and have a link to Kohl's. Develop a green

1 detention space that is an amenity for the site. Architecture is interesting – it can be
2 developed pretty well.

3
4 Committee Member Gracyk: Concerns are mostly about the site. Kohl’s shopping center
5 looks like fun – details will be crucial. McDowell elevation is lacking – needs some
6 development. Don’t have concerns about the backside. Explore reducing some parking in
7 the rear of Kohl’s – trees will help the site by holding water. Regarding tree plantings and
8 proposed landscaping, would like to see the landscape plan match the elevation – there are
9 some inconsistencies in the plans for Redwood Technology. Can there be any shared
10 parking? Would like to see that explored. Insist on using City standards for parking – do not
11 want either site to be over parked. Want safe circulation through the parking lot and between
12 buildings. Create pathways in the wetland mitigation area – can expand that if some parking
13 is given up. Introduce trees on Redwood Way. Suggested using the detention ponds in a
14 strong way – will make the experience of going to the shopping center better. Work out
15 some landscaping along the parking garage because it will be very harsh. Like the tree
16 selections.

17
18 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicants for coming on a preliminary basis. Also thanked
19 Committee Member Lynch for his time on the Committee – his input will be missed. Have
20 site concerns for both projects. Redwood Technology Center: Consider parking reserve.
21 Like the bridge element, like the materials and the forms, suggest some sunshades on the
22 southwest elevation - Buildings A1 and A2 look good. Weakest link is design of parking
23 garage – long monotonous wall, possibly some vines to break up monotony. Want a link
24 from the Redwood Technology site directly to Kohl’s. Suggest a perpendicular cross through
25 as well. Junior pad space on McDowell identified as Major C, suggest moving back into
26 parking area and have a better frontage on McDowell. McDowell elevation on Parcel C is
27 critical – needs more development. Not too concerned about the rear elevation. Architecture
28 is an interesting start – push the tech elements, canopies are fun, a lot of plaster still. Issues
29 to be resolved: site is over parked – consider parking reserve.

30
31 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested putting a tension canopy over the loading dock in
32 rear to give it some interest.

33
34 Committee Member Gracyk: Would like to see outdoor amenities for employees in the
35 Redwood Technology Center.

36
37
38 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

39 **V. ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

40
41 Committee Member Kosewic nominated Jack Rittenhouse as Chair and Janet Gracyk as
42 Vice-chair. 4-0

43
44
45 **VI. DISCUSSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CENTRAL PETALUMA**
46 **SPECIFIC PLAN (CPSP) – continued to September 11, 2003.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

VII. DISCUSSION REGARDING SPARC STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION –
continued to September 11, 2003.

VIII. REPORTS:

Planning Staff Reports: None.
Liaison Reports: None

IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Discussion with City Manager of Goals, Objectives and Role of SPARC
Rockridge Pointe Subdivision
Jay Palm Saddle Shop Addition

Adjournment: 8:15