

1



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

3

Minutes

4

Regular Meeting

December 11, 2003

5

City Council Chambers

3:00 p.m.

6

City Hall, 11 English Street

Petaluma, CA

7

Telephone: 707-778-4301

E-Mail: cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us

8

FAX: 707-778-4498

Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

9

10

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.

11

12

13

14

Roll Call: Present: Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic, Jack Rittenhouse*
Absent: Teresa Barrett

15

16

17

18

19

*Chairperson

20

21

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

22

23

24

25

26

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of November 11, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk, 2-0.

27

Committee Members' Report: None

28

Correspondence: Correspondence from Zak Matley regarding Sweed School, Katherine Rinehart and Marianne Hurley regarding Sweed School and the Martin Estate.

29

Public Comment: None

30

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

31

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

32

33

34

35

36

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
PRELIMINARY REVIEW:

37

38

39

I. SWEED SCHOOL, 331 Keller Street

40

1 **AP No.: 006-213-004**

2 **File: 03PRE0568**

3

4 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee preliminary
5 review of plans for 15 new dwelling units and associated on-site parking in two
6 separate buildings, existing and new, on the Philip Sweed School site at 331
7 Keller Street.

8

9 Maria Poncel: Introduced project team. The team has held neighborhood meetings and
10 is glad to be before the SPARC committee.

11

12 Doug Gawoski, Craiker Architects: Highlighted changes since the last preliminary
13 preview and reviewed the project.

14

15 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked what windows would be used.

16

17 Doug: We will use wood windows and doors for carriage units and Sweed School.

18

19 Committee Member Gracyk: What are materials and windows in the carriage house
20 units.

21

22 Doug: Wood widows, hardi plank siding and wood shingle siding.

23

24 Committee Member Gracyk: Are you replacing all windows or repairing some?

25

26 Doug: We are replacing all the windows due to cost of lead paint remediation.

27

28 Committee Member Gracyk: What are the materials for deck in front and how high are
29 they?

30

31 Doug: Wood or plank decking with wood column and iron railing. Decking is
32 approximately 18 inches high.

33

34 Chair Rittenhouse: The layout of unit T1 is problematic, two bedrooms on lower level,
35 with the bathroom in master suite.

36

37 Doug: Yes, I agree that we need a door so both bedrooms could share the bathroom.

38

39 Chair Rittenhouse: Are skylights existing as shown on sheet A1.2?

40

41 Doug: Yes.

42

43 Chair Rittenhouse: Are you cutting a whole through roof for courtyard?

44

45 Doug: Correct.

46

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Has fire approved?

2

3 Kim Gordon: Yes, ok with the exception of the driveway widths.

4

5 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about garbage pickup.

6

7 Doug: Would have a maintenance agreement for trash pickup.

8

9 Committee Member Gracyk: I have concerns about the access.

10

11 Committee Member Gracyk: In unit T10 and T11, the biggest bedroom will not
12 accommodate a queen size bed.

13

14 Doug: Some bedrooms are small – will need to work with the space.

15

16 Committee Member Gracyk: On back side of Sweed School – would like to gain space
17 on narrow planter? Currently there is 26' – is that necessary?

18

19 Kim Gordon: Yes – is required fore back-up distance.

20

21 Committee Member Kosewic: Have concerns of entering the building from back? How
22 will you market the units if you have enter in the rear? How does someone find the unit?

23

24 Doug: It will look better when completed and there is additional landscaping. Will need
25 way finding signs.

26

27 Committee Member Kosewic: I wouldn't know how to direct a guest if I'm in Unit T5.

28

29 Doug: There will be some signage.

30

31 Committee Member Kosewic: Why can't units T5 and T7 be accessed from the front of
32 the building – it would make the building fit in more with the neighborhood.

33

34 Doug: That's a good comment. Have concerns about minimizing the doors – with this
35 site plan, we would just be adding 2 gates and some landscaping.

36

37 Committee Member Kosewic: I agree with Jack about access to bathroom through a
38 bedroom. Use existing front door as access to units. The changes to outside are minimal.
39 Disagree with the comment about stripping lead paint. Suggest looking into preserving
40 what is already there – need to reuse existing windows. You can eliminate the lead paint
41 hazard and keep the integrity of the windows and the school. Would be a good marketing
42 tool. Will you be using hardy plank, smooth or wood grain?

43

44 Doug: Smooth.

45

46

1 Committee Member Gracyk: Why are there no windows on front porch of the carriage
2 units – there is a blank wall.

3
4 Doug: I agree that we should have a window there. There may be cabinets there.

5
6 **Public comment:**

7
8 Dennis Callahan, 342 Keller Street: Applicant did have neighborhood meetings – I
9 appreciate that. They took our comments into account particularly on Liberty Street. The
10 front of the building is a concern particularly about the patio decks and fences. With 30
11 parking spaces for 15 units, people will still park on the street. Asked the applicant to
12 consider diagonal parking to slow down traffic and provide guest parking. Have
13 concerns about the height of buildings on Liberty – will they tower above SFD next to
14 them? Again, appreciate the applicant taking input from the neighbors and want to speed
15 the project up because it is in such disrepair.

16
17 Committee Member Kosewic: Are you in favor of diagonal parking and the doors in
18 front?

19
20 Dennis Callahan: I am in favor of the diagonal parking. Want the decision makers to
21 consider design of front of Sweed School. Do not want a high fence – want the building
22 to be visible.

23
24 Rick Bereton, Hill Street: Glad to see something going on with the school. The front
25 Sweed School units need access from street or from existing main; carriage units seem
26 blocky – would like them to have more attention, disguise the parking and consider
27 height related to adjacent buildings.

28
29 **Public comment closed:**

30
31 **Committee Questions/Comments:**

32
33 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to follow-up with the neighbors. The school is a
34 treasure, thanked the applicant for taking on this project. Want to work with the
35 applicant to bring the project to fruition. Regarding the entrances: is compromising the
36 integrity the more openings you have in the building. I have problems with access into
37 the units – need to reconsider how units are arranged. People will want something
38 different – these spaces have a lot of potential. Use the main entry as the main entry to
39 the building, to new front units at least. Lose interior space to be able to access the units.
40 Make the spaces expansive and quirky. If you can't make that work, more entrances on
41 front is more difficult – will be working into the decking spaces. Would not want to see
42 wood decks there – is a more suburban design, create stoops. Want the owl to be saved.
43 Glad you want to do wood windows, make an effort to reuse the existing windows or
44 keep as many as possible. Happy to see the removal of covered parking – can now see
45 the back of the building. Agree with Mr. Bereton's comments – want to disguise that
46 there is parking underneath the carriage houses. Disguise parking to be sympathetic to

1 the neighborhood. No blank walls where the carriage house units front the street.
2 Architecture could use more attention. Regarding siding – I have reservations about
3 hardy plank in this district. Do not feel the size is problematic – have 2 story SFD and
4 apartment building adjacent. Discourage colored concrete – does not look old unless you
5 put black into it – try to match what would have been there. Plant palate is strong, old-
6 fashioned plants are good. Keep existing plants where possible. Want to see street trees.
7 Will want to see exactly what the plants are – is pretty broad now. Street parking is
8 worth exploring – do not know if that can be done, need to discuss with staff. Is a good
9 idea and will slow traffic down.

10
11 Committee Member Kosewic: There are 16 covered parking spaces – will that make a
12 difference in selling. If you do diagonal parking you can eliminate the covered parking
13 and will eliminate high elevation on that end. Carriage units seem to be lacking. It is
14 difficult to tell what you have.

15
16 Doug: Windows will be wood, shingles on one and smooth coat hardy plank.

17
18 Committee Member Kosewic: Need additional window information. Against hardy
19 plank – historic districts talk about redwood. You will have less contraction with
20 redwood and better joints. Overall costs would not be that much – would like you to
21 reconsider. Front elevation headed towards craftsman. Cannot tell on the side elevation
22 due to lack of detail. Side elevations are lacking – needs something.

23
24 Chair Rittenhouse: Excited that the building is being redone. I have concerns regarding
25 prominence of the front entrance and the street presence. Want the feeling of entering a
26 grand space. Where is front door to T5, T7, T8, why isn't there a presence to the street?
27 There should be stoops. The problems with site plan are the number of units being
28 proposed, tuck under parking and the size of the carriage units. Maybe loose 1 unit. T4
29 and T9 reconfigure to walk in through building. Storage units and trash – do not seem
30 functional. No provision for recycling. If car in 26 and 25, do I want to park there
31 because people walk through tight space. Carriage units need a lot of work. Don't see
32 how they fit the character of the site. They are part of a grand historic building. Floor
33 plans are not well thought out. Some bedrooms so small they are not functional - need
34 another look. Do not know if diagonal parking is possible, however, could be an asset to
35 the neighborhood. Where do guests park? Regarding windows – intention is to replicate
36 existing patterns; if windows can be repaired would go a long way – cost of stripping lead
37 is minimal. Do not use vinyl clad widows; use existing front door as main entry. Agree
38 with Janet Grayck's landscape comments. Believe it needs a lot more work before going
39 to the Planning Commission.

40
41 Committee Member Kosewic: Keep the doors at the school that have panic bars – speaks
42 to the history of the school. Do not agree that the small bedrooms are a bad thing.

43
44 Doug: Responded to comments: Re: trash had one can for each unit and had something
45 for recycling; there is enough space. We do intend to use wood windows. Will get a
46 price of replacing the wood windows – need to work on emergency egress.

1
2
3 **II. MARTIN ESTATE, 1197 East Washington Street**
4 **AP No.: 007-361-022**
5 **File: 03PRE0561**
6

7 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee preliminary
8 review of plans for 20 two-story single-family homes and the refurbishment of
9 the existing home that will be used for offices.

10
11 Rick Brereton: Have met with George White, the fire marshal and the City Engineer.
12 Want SPARC's feedback. The project is centered on the historic house and making it
13 have a vital presence. Fire Marshall liked the access on East Washington Street,
14 Engineering did not see an immediate problem. We like that entrance because it focuses
15 on the Martin Eestate. Presented the proposed project.

16
17 Nan White, landscape architect. Presented the landscape plan.

18
19 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about ADA compliance?
20

21 Rick Brereton: Not at this point, if not historical, we may have to comply.
22

23 Committee Member Kosewic: Did not see on the plans where the existing buildings are.
24

25 Rick: Gave committee an aerial photo and pointed out existing structures.
26

27 Committee Member Gracyk: What are side yard setbacks?
28

29 Rick: Four feet is the smallest – tried to balance out with a larger yard somewhere else.
30

31 Committee Member Gracyk: Did you consider the entry like the one where Kinko's is
32 located?
33

34 Rick: There is an easement that is owned by CalTrans.
35

36 Committee Member Gracyk: The present circulation sets up a lot of asphalt.
37

38 Rick: The easement behind the shopping center is our main entrance. East Washington
39 is just a convenience to get to the project.
40

41 Committee Member Gracyk: Road does not seem like a proper road.
42

43 Rick: It is a road; we have a civil engineer here if you want him to address this further.
44

45 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked what the goals of the project are?
46

47 Anton: Developer of the project. Attempted to make it a win-win situation. Primary

1 concern was keeping the Martin House where is. Site is difficult. Believe we have
2 accomplished this with the site plan we are proposing. The Planning Department was
3 concerned about the view corridor for the Martin House – believe we have accomplished
4 this. Maintained the architectural shape of the Martin House; you can see a relationship.

5
6 Committee Member Gracyk: Letters from historic preservationist feel the property is
7 compromised with the units as they are. Can you reduce by 1 or 2 units?

8
9 Anton: Twenty units are where we need to be. Believe we are accomplishing that.

10
11 **Public comment opened/closed:**

12
13 **Committee comments:**

14
15 Committee Member Gracyk: Exciting to know this house will be preserved. Believe it is
16 a great idea to make the water tower into a unit. Site plan is problematic – do not want to
17 surround the house with asphalt. Units in the middle with the Martin House are squeezed
18 – feels very tight because of the orientation – both are showing their sides to the main
19 street. Advocate for making a four-plex further down the property. Very little planting
20 and small trees and the street width – too harsh with so many hard surfaces – would like
21 it to be softer. You are in good hands with the landscape designer you are using – on the
22 right track. Consider plane trees further up on Washington Street. Explore the
23 vernacular of the outbuildings for the new units – that frees you up and is less expensive.
24 Does a disservice trying to replicate the Martin House. Use the form and structure of the
25 barn. Like the placement of the water tower – hope it does not need to move.

26
27 Committee Member Kosewic: Can understand moving the water tower – wish it wasn't
28 so far. Relocate the dormers or the skylights. On side with a utility room, add a window
29 to break up the wall. If you can't manage reuse of the barns – could have two designs
30 instead of one. Two units along side Martin House or behind – make it look more like an
31 adaptive reuse. Adaptive reuse looks like you are making an effort to reuse. Want to
32 make it look like you have preserved, maintained and added to. Moving the water tower
33 back to where it is gives you more flexibility.

34
35 Chair Rittenhouse: Helpful to hear the goals. Site plan – water tower and proximity to
36 the Martin house is critical. The 3 units so close to the house are problematic. Water
37 tower should feel part of the historic section of the site – should be where the single
38 house is. Entrance from East Washington is a potential hazard. – need more length for
39 cars to slow down. Main entrance is not attractive but safer. There are curb cuts that I
40 don't believe engineers will agree with. Move the loop away from Martin House. Agree
41 with Janet. Mimicking the old house tends to loose the details. Go to another vernacular
42 such as the rural like the barn – possibly a shingled barn type of approach. Believe it is a
43 good start. Really need to preserve the view of the Martin House.

44
45 Rick: Regarding asphalt circling the house – fire marshal wants this for access. Entry
46 from East Washington we are not sure about. Engineering will need to look at this –

1 don't know if we can get a turning lane from East Washington. Understand what you are
2 saying about matching the house and details. I like the idea of picking up the vernacular
3 from the barns. You have given us a lot to think about.

4
5 Anton: Thanked the committee for their input.

6
7
8 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
9 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

10
11 **III. BJM BUILDING, 90 Sycamore Lane**
12 **AP No.: 006-450-002**
13 **File: SPC02014/03-CCM-0544-CR**
14 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

15
16 Applicant is returning for Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
17 and further discussion of conditions of compliance.

18
19 Kim Gordon: Presented the staff report.

20
21 Brian Miller: Went over the changes to the window and canopy modification and
22 lighting details, and presented a landscape plan.

23
24 Committee Member Gracyk: Why didn't you use sycamores?

25
26 Landscape architect: The site is a little small for a sycamore and they drop a lot of leaves
27 and are messy and a lot of people are allergic to sycamores. Maple seemed a better
28 alternative. Believe it will be a more desirable look.

29
30 **Committee comments:**

31
32 Committee Member Kosewic: Regarding the lighting sample, like stainless and
33 aluminum – do not put in 150-watt bulbs. The glass block looks good. Do you plan on
34 skylights? Might want operable skylights to cut down on AC.

35
36 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with Terry's comments regarding the skylight.
37 Light on drawings is not same as on cut sheet – prefer the one on the drawing.

38
39 Committee Member Gracyk: Awnings much better – has a stronger look. Appreciate the
40 landscaping plan, think your choice of trees is good, add dedicated bubbler. Adjust
41 landscaping at east elevation for trellis. Camilla's are good choice for trees on the
42 Petaluma Boulevard North elevation.

43
44 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe you have gotten it. Proportions on the windows and canopy
45 are more appropriate. Like the lighting. Agree with something on east elevation trellis.

46
47 M/S Rittenhouse/Kowewic to approve the conditions as presented including the lighting

1 that was presented today. 3-0
2
3

4 Public hearing began at 5:15
5

6 **NEW BUSINESS:**

7 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
8

9 **IV. REDWOOD GATEWAY RETAIL CENTER, 1363 North McDowell Blvd.**

10 **AP No.: 007-411-020, 007-411-021**

11 **File: 03ZOA0271**

12 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**
13

14 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
15 consideration of site and architectural plans for a proposal to allow the
16 development of a 166,713 foot retail center.
17

18 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report. Presented changes to Conditions of Approval, #9
19 on page 6 - are more restrictive than the zoning code. Wish to have wider construction
20 hours since there is no residential nearby. Condition #13, pg. 7: utility lines to be placed
21 underground. Add if required by the City Engineer.
22

23 Chair Rittenhouse: Regarding Stubb Road – has that been worked out?
24

25 Jayni Allsep: It is part of condition 12 requiring Stubb Road be reviewed with other
26 offsite improvements. It is premature to look at on the site improvements without
27 knowing what the off-site improvements to Stubb Road will be.
28

29 Chair Rittenhouse: It is very vague.
30

31 Tamara Thompson, Robertson Properties: Presented Kohl's building and site plan.
32

33 Chair Rittenhouse: Will you be back for the other buildings all at one time?
34

35 Tamara: We hope to be, may not have tenants for Shop F and E.
36

37 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not want to see Major C by itself.
38

39 Brian Wolf, Architect: Presented the architecture and the site plan. Showed the site
40 constraints regarding the power lines and hydrology of the site.
41

42 Committee Member Kosewic: Will pathways be designated with striping or
43 differentiation in material?
44

45 Brian: Pedestrian pathways through parking area would be integral color concrete.
46

47 **Committee questions:**

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

Chair Rittenhouse: How much interaction has taken place with Basin Street?

Brian: We have taken the lead on improving the pedestrian access between the two projects.

Tamara: We are using the same consultants, which will help to coordinate the connections.

Jayni Allsep: There is a condition of approval for Redwood Technology Center to come back for final landscape plan, parking structure and other items at which time the pedestrian circulation could be reevaluated.

Chair Rittenhouse: Is there a reason for the 6' retaining wall on the smaller detention pond?

Tamara: Civil Engineer said it is the only detention pond that needs this. According to our PCD we can have 806 parking spaces, only have 766.

Chair Rittenhouse: What is the treatment for this wall.

Brain: Proposed a 42" high pipe rail.

Committee Member Kosewic: On detention ponds, can they be used for anything – can there be benches without a liability problem?

Tamara: There is a liability issue and the placement of benches would back up the flow of floodwaters.

Chair Rittenhouse: Did you have 3 majors at the preliminary review?

Tamara: Major C may be broken up into two smaller shops

Committee Member Gracyk: Can you manipulate the forms of the smaller detention pond so it is not so rectangular.

Brian: Can work with the civil engineer to try and do something.

Public comment opened/closed.

Committee comments:

Chair Rittenhouse: Clarified that the committee is looking at Kohl's building only and the site plan.

Tamara: Yes.

1

2 Committee Member Kosewic: Like that the pedestrian pathways will be a different
3 material. Like the trellis' you have added – it breaks up the length. You have managed
4 to break up Kohl's a little bit. Glad the parking is reduced. Overall everything is good.

5

6 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicant for listening to Planning Commission and
7 SPARC regarding detention basins and parking. Pedestrian amenities are a great
8 improvement. Trellis I believe is weak – emulating G&G's trellis. Try to do something
9 more interesting than a flat trellis – nothing interesting. Kohl's – do not have a problem
10 with the back side facing Redwood Technology Center. Front almost looks like two
11 different projects. Kohl's does not have as much interest as the other Majors, like the
12 color palate. Looks like the Kohl's building is separate from the rest of the center.

13

14 Committee Member Gracyk: Jack makes a good point – Kohl's is not nearly as dynamic
15 as the left side of the in line buildings.

16

17 Brian: Two different issues. The Kohl's plans are computer generated and the others are
18 hand drawn. Will have difficulty changing this. Am very constrained with what Kohl's
19 will let me do.

20

21 Chair Rittenhouse: What is length of the Kohl's building frontage?

22

23 Brian: 320 feet, is broken up pretty substantially.

24

25 Committee Member Gracyk: Is so symmetrical, the other buildings are less so.

26

27 Chair Rittenhouse: Did not see it this way in the preliminary review. Does Kohl's have
28 this façade?

29

30 Brian: Couple of elements that are critical – stepped entry, use of white, columns, dual
31 entry. Have never seen one that is asymmetrical. Is there something that could be
32 implemented away from the building? Believe the symmetry will be difficult to get away
33 from.

34

35 Chair Rittenhouse: Could there be something other than a box from which the canopy is
36 hanging.

37

38 Committee Member Kosewic: Would prefer something that is not so rectangular.

39

40 Brian: Can we do something with the steel frame and top it with something different.

41

42 Chair Rittenhouse: Referred to the building labeled retail – there is much more layering.

43

44 Brian: Kohl's wants the symmetrical look. Can work with the canopy elements with
45 Kohl's and maybe implement something on the corner of the building. If we go back to
46 Kohl's, it will still be symmetrical.

1

2 Committee Member Kosewic: Can you put a tower on one end with the Kohl's sign on it
3 that would be visible from the freeway.

4

5 Brian: Have seen 20 Kohl's stores – they are all quite symmetrical. It is a mindset of
6 Kohl's. The canopies are well crafted and detailed.

7

8 Chair Rittenhouse: Need to know where we are. What is anticipated ground breaking?

9

10 Tamara: Need to have a pad ready for Kohl's by March 1, 2004.

11

12 Committee Member Kosewic: We like everything to the left of Kohl's.

13

14 Chair Rittenhouse: Did not think that we would only see Kohl's. It is difficult to take it
15 piece by piece. Nothing has changed from the preliminary review.

16

17 Brian: Building footprint has changed. The other buildings have similar elements to
18 Kohl's. Am not saying everything will be symmetrical and corporate.

19

20 Committee Member Kosewic: There is a conformity that you have on the top that you
21 don't have on the bottom.. Prefer the top – is more vibrant.

22

23 Brian: Could go back to modify the colors.

24

25 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not know where you are going now?

26

27 Tamara: We will see what we can come back with. If we can, will do something
28 freestanding that is asymmetrical.

29

30 Chair Rittenhouse: Kohl's is huge, there are only a few materials, long expanse of
31 building.

32

33 Committee Member Kosewic: Can we give you approval of the site plan and come back
34 with a new architectural design?

35

36 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not want the rest of the center to look like Kohl's – whole rhythm
37 of shopping center will be different.

38

39 Brian: Was not saying that we will eliminate the whimsy on the other pads. What about
40 a transition element from Kohl's to the other buildings?

41

42 Committee Member Gracyk: Is very much like what we saw originally – maybe we did
43 not call that out earlier. Make efforts to introduce dynamic elements where you can,
44 roofline in the first plan is better. Canopies are a handsome element. Façade that canopy
45 is attached to can be a little more whimsical. The suggestion to create something at the
46 end of building is a worthwhile approach. Color is a problem – could make it more

1 dynamic. The black stone could be a more vibrant color.

2

3 Committee Member Kosewic: Huge difference between top and bottom – top looks
4 consistent like it was done at the same time. On the top there are similarities that
5 complement one another.

6

7 Brian: Feel if I only develop the top of the building it will not be enough. Janet's
8 comments are well founded.

9

10 Chair Rittenhouse: What I would like to see is one integrated shopping center. I am
11 most disappointed that what you showed us before is the same this time with different
12 colors. The design needs to be brought further- rhythm of center is going to be different
13 than what you are showing to us. Do not think you can design just this 300' of the center.

14

15 Committee Member Gracyk: I am comfortable reviewing B, C and D at a later date.

16

17 Committee Member Kosewick: What you have done on the left is very good. The top
18 drawing does not look like one building to me. Maybe if you came back with black
19 where you have red, this would tie it together. If you understand what I am saying I will
20 let staff look at what you bring back. In the preliminary I liked what you brought to us.
21 Need to tie the two pieces together somehow.

22

23 Brian: I understand what you want – more of the whimsical from the left to the Kohl's
24 portion.

25

26 Committee Member Kosewic: Felt that the original design was good – far better than
27 what you brought to us today. Sides would look a lot better if they were lighter. Darker
28 color on top looks like it's floating. Do not want to see you lose the red.

29

30 Chair Rittenhouse: You do have three shops correct.

31

32 Tamara: Yes.

33

34 Committee Member Kosewic: Would be happy if they came back with just the colors.
35 Am willing to deal with just Kohl's.

36

37 Chair Rittenhouse: Can the committee agree that they are not happy with the Kohl's we
38 see here?

39

40 Committee Member Gracyk: Can we go forward with approving the site plan and have
41 the architecture come back.

42

43 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not have a problem with the pad of Kohl's, it is just the façade.

44

45 Tamara: We can come back on the 22nd of January.

46

1 Committee Gracyk: Garbage cans and benches are rather Victorian – look at something
2 to go with your modern design. Appreciate the landscape strips and appreciate the trellis’
3 – think you can do a better job. We asked to see something with more undulation on the
4 detention ponds – at least on the inside edges. Working the connection with Redwood
5 Technology is important. There are places where you have exceeded landscaping for
6 every 8 spaces – have 9. Want a lot more vines on the wall that faces the parking
7 structure. Recommend Boston Ivy. This looks like a southern California plant palate.
8 This is not in keeping with the character here – some plants do not work here, particularly
9 with the tree selection. Fairly small trees in the parking lot – want larger trees with a
10 better canopy. Would like to know what street trees you want to use. London plane tree
11 is good for North McDowell. Shop F has long continuous parking where you have
12 exceeded 1 tree per 8 spaces. Am fine with not under grounding distribution line when
13 you already have poles.

14

15 Chair Rittenhouse: I am ok with construction hours, want to see a better trellis that works
16 with the building.

17

18 Committee Member Gracyk: Would definitely want to review the landscaping. Will
19 meet with the applicant separately.

20

21 Brian: Will bring the landscape architect on the January 8, 2004.

22

23 M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to approve the site plan with landscaping, architectural façade
24 for Kohls and trellis element to come back. 3-0

25

26

27 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

28

29 **V. REPORTS:**

30

31 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

32

33 **Liaison Reports:** None

34

35 Committee requested a new SPARC member.

36

37

38 Adjournment: 7:30