



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 February 27, 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, Chris Lynch, vacant, Jack Rittenhouse*
Historic: Marianne Hurley, Hoppy Hopkins

*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 February 13, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S–Rittenhouse/Lynch, 4-0.
Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: None
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:05 p.m.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
NEW BUSINESS:
PUBLIC HEARING:

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

I. DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS ON THE FEBRUARY 2003 FINAL DRAFT OF THE CENTRAL PETALUMA SPECIFIC PLAN

Mike Moore presented an overview of the plan.

Committee Member Lynch: Asked if SPARC has purview regarding the number of stories in each district.

Mike Moore: Yes

Committee Member Lynch: According to the SMART code will SPARC's purview be limited?

Mike Moore: No

Laura Hall: Yes

Committee Member Lynch: Let SPARC be an active partner in the learning curve of initiating the SMART code. Do not want to cut SPARC out of the process. Think the SMART code works well on a blanket spot of land. How does the smart code apply to an adaptive reuse of a building?

Mike Moore: Would probably come to SPARC under current zoning regulations – not much different than it is now.

Committee Member Hurley: Pg. 48 of SMART code – how is it different than the existing code?

George White: Not much different – mostly terminology.

Committee Member Barrett: Pg. 16, Section 4.60.040 A of SMART code – do not want to see us locked into a 30 ft. standard. Need to consult Tree Advisory Committee.

Public hearing opened:

Wayne Miller: Responded to what the purview of SPARC will be. SMART code will carry strength of regulation and will be a set of tools or a baseline. SPARC will be the bearer of quality the Committee wants to see in the specific plan.

Pete Gang: Affirm the idea that SPARC's purview is not clearly described at this stage. Plans need to address sustainability with specific language. Presented information on Green building and LEED, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design.

Public hearing closed:

1 Break @ 4:35

2

3 Resumed @ 4:45

4

5 Committee Comments:

6

7 Committee Member Hurley: Over 66 identified properties that are historic, however, the
8 Plan does not address preservation. Goals of the plan do not talk about preserving
9 historic buildings. Historic section, Chapter 9 – is very minimal. Study by Carey and
10 Co. is very broad – does not take the place of an intensive survey. Have specific rating
11 codes on properties – do not know how this was arrived at. Inconsistencies in narrative –
12 in the riverfront warehouse district – plan calls out specific properties – saying both
13 industrial and residential, however, only industrial are identified as potentially historic.
14 There is no discussion of boundaries for the historic district – is not made clear in any
15 narratives.

16

17 The SMART code has language that has a bearing on historic properties, however, it
18 does not really protect historic properties – is too gray. For protection there needs to be a
19 recognition of a historic district.

20

21 Committee Member Hopkins: Like what Marianne said – area named as Cedar Grove
22 Park (where first settlers landed) is being ignored.

23

24 Committee Member Gracyk: Have reservations about 6 stories – think we will lose view
25 corridors. Goals are worthwhile – concerned about the height. Have concerns about how
26 architectural standards will be used – want architectural guidelines to have same weight
27 as SMART code. Should be complementary to existing structures.

28

29 Committee Member Barrett: Referred to 4.60 on pg 16 in the SMART code – want this
30 to be consistent with what exists now. Use Oak Hill Park as an example of how to apply
31 SMART code to specific area. Think the SMART code could be used in a negative way.
32 Do not want to see SPARC's purview limited. Feel comfortable with height of Petaluma
33 hotel. Do think downtown needs to be denser, however, I share some of Committee
34 Member Gracyk's fear about the height of buildings. Like that there are references to the
35 River Enhancement Plan. Did not notice this regarding the Bike Plan – want to make
36 sure this is consistent with the Bike Plan.

37

38 Committee Member Rittenhouse: See some inherent conflicts – liked reading the section
39 on architecture, however, this falls down in the SMART code. SMART code works
40 better on a new community rather than a historic town. There is a danger in providing
41 renderings. Concern about the limitation of the SPARC Committee. Have problems with
42 statement on Pg. 1, Section 1.10.010 (H) of SMART code re: SPARC's purview. Like
43 the idea of public space – need to have willing applicants to make this happen – is this
44 policy required of applicants or a suggestion? Traffic model – agree with concepts,
45 however, when you look at proposed development, narrowing of streets and reducing
46 parking – what will actually happen? Do not think we can demand a public road in the

1 middle of private property. Need to address the funding mechanism for in lieu parking
2 fees. Sustainability is glazed over.

3
4 Committee Member Lynch: A lot of good things that the SMART code will do.
5 Petaluma is unique and funky – new urbanism is very dogmatic. Fear that the densities
6 are so high and it will hurt the historic nature of Petaluma. SMART code is usually done
7 on new residential subdivision area. Depot area, Haystack area it can work well. Will
8 have a negative impact on river warehouse district and north river area. Possibly limit
9 and modify the code in the riverfront warehouse district. Will rely on Committee
10 Member Hurley for the historic preservation. Need to create incentives to keep historic
11 buildings. New urbanism can be carried to far – do not want to see this happen here.
12 Want the SPARC purview defined – do not want it limited. SPARC committee helps to
13 make better projects for the community. Suggested some revisions to pg. 19 of
14 Architectural Guidelines prepared by the subcommittee. Use as an opportunity to add a
15 section regarding vinyl windows – put into this type of document (General Provisions).
16 How do we review something like an adaptive reuse such as the Hay building? Agree
17 with Mr. Gang re: goals (pg. 34) regarding sustainability. Great sustainability concept
18 regarding reducing parking if surface is impervious. Work more of this type of concept
19 into the SMART code. Illustrations may be misleading for future applicants – need some
20 language on the drawings themselves stating “no regulatory or policy authority.”
21 Riverfront Warehouse District illustration shows all warehouse buildings being gone.
22 Like the idea of limited parking – don’t know how this will work.

23
24 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to support strong historic preservation language, want
25 adaptive reuse to be assured. Concerned we will lose the fabric of riverfront warehouse
26 district. There is language regarding habitat corridor – do not know if it is addressed
27 thoroughly – need stronger language. Can housing variations be assured in this plan.
28 LEED is very important here. Want SPARC to review each project and have some
29 leeway regarding the site plan. Want to protect some of the industrial uses – how do we
30 do this in the plan? Graphics can be useful – do not know if it is exactly what we want.
31 Language regarding open space needs to be included in the Specific Plan.

32
33 Committee Member Lynch: This could be an opportunity to protect some of the
34 riverfront warehouses or 2nd Street bungalows. Use the SMART code as an opportunity
35 to limit the number of stories on the riverfront. Tie the LEED concept to creating
36 incentives such as # of stories in each district..

37
38 Committee Member Gracyk: Concerned about quality and quantity of open space – most
39 of the open space is at the southern end. In the dense area (Washington St. and
40 Lakeville) there is very little or no green space.

41
42 Committee Member Hurley: Need to better delineate potential historic districts.

43
44
45
46 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
47 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

1
2 **II. POULTRY STREET MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, 300 Water Street and**
3 **294 Petaluma Blvd. North**
4 **AP No: 006-163-005, 025, 052, and 053**
5 **File: 03PRE0042**
6

7 Applicant is requesting a preliminary review of a proposed mixed-use 84-unit
8 development.
9

10 Ed Sohl, 5th Resource: Presented the revised project.
11

12 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Need to design the buildings respecting the easement.
13 Suggested doing a constraint map. Want to know what the true proposal is. Appreciate
14 the effort to bring it back with a streetscape. Bring back as formal proposal.
15

16 Committee Member Gracyk: Do not see as much landscaping and outdoor space as I
17 would like for a project this size. Middle units may be pretty dark as shown on the site
18 plan.
19

20 Committee Member Lynch: Push buildings more to west; use a 48 ft. street with
21 diagonal parking on one side. Suggested to use surface that is impervious for parking to
22 obtain a 20% reduction in parking – possibly get rid of parking in back and create public
23 open space on the site. Don't know if I agree with the road looping around. Do not like
24 the idea of having a car right next the river. Play off pattern of gables that are already
25 there. Carve out more open space on the site.
26

27 Committee Member Lynch left the meeting at 7:05.
28

29
30 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
31 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**
32

33 **III. PETALUMA LIBRARY EXPANSION, 100 Fairgrounds Drive**
34 **AP No: 007-031-004**
35 **File: 03PRE0060**
36

37 Applicant is requesting a preliminary review of proposed expansion of existing
38 meeting room by 1125 square feet.
39

40 Mary Dooley, Architect: Presented the project.
41

42 Dorothy Richards, Library Commission: Gave an overview of the countywide plan for
43 library expansion.
44

45 Committee comments:
46

1 Committee Member Barrett: Looks good.

2

3 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Sensitive attempt to break up the box. Like the
4 detailing of the exterior and the look of low windows once the function was explained.

5

6 Committee Member Gracyk: Agreed with Jack.

7

8

9

10
11 **IV. REPORTS:**

12

13 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

14 **Liaison Reports:** The Poultry Street project came before the Tree Advisory
15 Committee.

16

17

18

19 **Adjournment:** 7:32

20

21

22 C:\Documents and Settings\awindsor\Desktop\Minutes\SPARC\022703.doc

23

24