

1



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

3

Minutes

4

Regular Meeting

July 24, 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

15

Roll Call: Present: Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic, Chris Lynch, Jack Rittenhouse*,

16

Teresa Barrett

17

Historic: Hoppy Hopkins (absent), Marianne Hurley

18

19

20

*Chairperson

21

22

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development Department

23

Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner

24

Irene Borba, Senior Planner

25

Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

26

27

28

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of July 10, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S

29

Gracyk/Kosewic, 2-0. Rittenhouse and Barrett abstained.

30

Committee Members' Report: None.

31

Correspondence: None.

32

Public Comment: None

33

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

34

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

35

36

37

Public hearing began at 3:00 p.m.

38

39

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

40

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

**I. HANSEN HOUSE, 718 North McDowell Blvd.
AP Nos: 137-061-035 and 026
File: 03-SPC-0282-CR
Planner: Kim Gordon**

Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee determination regarding the potential historic significance of the subject property.

Kim Gordon: Presented the staff report.

Frank Denny, Cobblestone Homes: Reiterated that the applicant is requesting determination regarding historic significance of the property.

Committee Member Kosewic: The proposal to move house and lower to 1 story. Are we being asked to either approve or not approve moving the house?

George White: historic and Cultural Preservation Committee's purview is to determine if the house is a historic resource or not. Moving of the house would be up to council.

Committee Member Lynch: If we determine that the house is not historic, is there nothing to prevent demolition of the house.

George White: Nothing other than intent.

Thomas, 1401 Woodside: Would like to have the house preserved and moved.

Committee Member Hurley: This house has been under review since 1997. It was evaluated within the context of poultry farming. Discussed other contexts for the property. Applicant was aware of the potential of the property. Two areas neglected: Anna Hansen as a midwife and the Danish Community. Historian in Santa Rosa commented on the Danish population in Petaluma as largest in Sonoma County. Carey and Co. noted these two deficiencies in their report. The house has the potential to be a historic resource within the other contexts. The other context not considered is the evolution of water technology – had a water tower incorporated into design of house. Property still has potential to be locally historic property.

Committee Member Kosewic: Have looked at the house many times. Is a Craftsman and I do not know if the house was elevated. Need to know if the house was elevated.

Committee Member Hurley: The house is pre Craftsman – transitional. Was very common to have houses elevated at that time.

Committee Member Gracyk: I am fine if the house is moved – I do want to retain it and the trees with it. Makes me uneasy to say it has no historic significance in order to move it.

1

2 Committee Member Hurley: Once you move the structure it changes its historic
3 significance. We are only being asked to comment if it is historically important.

4

5 Committee Member Barrett: Would like the house moved and restored along with the
6 trees whether it is historic or not. I suggest that the two small palm trees in the back of
7 property be moved as well. Would like the Tree Committee to evaluate and would like
8 the trees designated as landmark trees.

9

10 Committee Member Lynch: Asked to have the process explained because it is counter
11 intuitive. Evaluations have said it is not eligible for National and California register.

12

13 George White: Could be considered a local resource.

14

15 Committee Member Lynch: Would Council be able to condition if the house was found
16 locally, historically significant.

17

18 Committee Member Hurley: Under CEQA if there is difference of opinion between
19 professionals, the lead agency will take into account that it is historically significant.

20

21 Chair Rittenhouse: So, we need to determine if it is a historic resource and make
22 findings. Contributes to the fabric of the community. Both reports and Heritage Homes
23 say it is not historic which makes it difficult to make the findings. Could we make a
24 recommendation to Council to relocate the house?

25

26 Committee Member Kosewic: Does not have to go to council except for appeal.
27 Applicant can demolish if we find it is not historically significant. If we find it
28 historically significant, can condition it. It is rare to find this type of house on the east
29 side of Petaluma. I have no problems with moving it, have difficulty with it going to
30 one-story. Committee Member Hurley feels its historically significant because of the
31 Danish community and the midwife, Anna Hansen.

32

33 Chair Rittenhouse: Do we have to make all 4 findings?

34

35 George White: You have discretion over which findings to make.

36

37 Committee Member Hurley: I consulted with a peer and had another professional look at
38 it and both could find this historic in different contexts. There are areas in the Clark
39 evaluation that could be taken further. I feel it has local significance and could have
40 California significance. A case can be made for local significance.

41

42 Committee Member Barrett: What about finding 3. Have no problem declaring this
43 locally historic. Don't want to burden the developer.

44

45 George White: Can make a finding in reverse – moving the house would not be
46 detrimental to the developer.

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

Frank Denny: Our application before you is to move the house.

Susan Clark: The house is lacking integrity and that is why all of the 4 historians said it was not significant. If you decide as Petaluma citizens it is significant – it does not meet the State standards. The water tower was not attached – was not incorporated in 1910. Four experts have said it is not historically significant.

Committee Member Hurley: I am applying state standards and want to reiterate it was not evaluated in a different context. I have questions about the discussion of integrity. I do not agree with the Carey & Company findings about the integrity. Looks as though the water tower was attached for many years. The four evaluations do need to be taken into account; however, I still stand with my evaluation that it is eligible for the CA register.

Committee Member Kosewick: I believe it is locally significant – historic for Petaluma. Ms. Clark states the water tower was not attached, however, when reading the report, it sounds as if it was one structure.

M/S Barrett/Hurley to find the building to be locally significant based on California Register criteria related to local midwifery and the local Danish agricultural community. Relocation not detrimental to the significance of this resource. All in favor 6-0.

II. PETALUMA TOWN CENTER, Petaluma Blvd. South, First Street and Second Street at C and D Streets.

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

File: 03-ZOA-0260-CR

Planner: Irene Borba

Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and approval of Certificate of Appropriateness and project site and architectural design for the “Petaluma Theater District” and the Streetscape Master Plan for Petaluma Boulevard and “D” Street within the project area.

Irene Borba: Presented the staff report.

Committee Member Hurley: Are we still within the 30 day appeal period?

George White: Yes.

Chair Rittenhouse: Asked for explanation of Certificate of Appropriateness.

George White: A way to provide permission to alter, demolish or relocate historic buildings.

1 Committee Member Hurley: Thought that the EIR for the CPSP stated that these
2 structures could potentially be considered as a historic district and therefore, could not be
3 demolished without the preparation of a subsequent EIR.

4
5 George White: The Council adopted a mitigated negative declaration that indicated that
6 the potential negative impacts to historic structure could be adequately migrated.

7
8 Matt White, Basin Street: Introduced the project team and responded to the previous
9 comments from SPARC.

10
11 Rick Strauss, Architect: Gave background and history of the site and presented the
12 architecture for the theater, Town Square Center between C & D Streets and the office
13 building on 1st and D Street.

14
15 Guy Ferris: Presented an overview of the River Town Apartments on 1st Street.

16
17 Brian Childs, 847 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco: Presented the architecture for the
18 parking garage.

19
20 Jill Pilaroscia, Eureka Street, San Francisco: Presented the project goals discussed the
21 colors and how they were chosen to make a pleasing and exiting area to blend with
22 historic downtown.

23
24 Matt White: Looking forward to SPARC's support.

25
26 Committee Member Kosewic: If parking garage will be used by office building at 1st
27 Street, how many people will be crossing D Street. Approximately 200 will work in the
28 building so probably between 200 and 300 people will cross D Street. Will be difficult
29 for pedestrians and motorists.

30
31 Break at 5:05

32
33 Resumed at 5:15.

34
35 Public hearing opened:

36
37 Beth Meredith, 223 Kentucky Street: Presented comments in writing. Issues are with the
38 architectural design. Like the Theater Square design, architecture reflects well the mix of
39 uses – strengthen gateway on the west elevation to read up and down on the street. Left
40 side of elevation needs to be more unified – has a somewhat monolithic look. Some
41 cornices are problematic. The design of the cinema is problematic on the Petaluma Blvd.
42 Elevation – long blank wall. Think the corner of Petaluma Boulevard and C Street is
43 important. Would like the cinema to have a mix of uses. Would like fewer displays. Pull
44 the parking back – build out the corner that is a gateway – horizontal orientation does not
45 fit with downtown. Distinguish that there is a retail element on the 1st floor. Would like
46 the garage redesigned. Office building does a good job reflecting the aesthetic of the

1 area, corner of 1st and D needs glass to see through. Need an entrance on the corner of D
2 & 1st Street – at the very least wrap the awning. Would like green building techniques.
3 Trash receptacles look like the location is a problem. Retail does not distinguish itself –
4 define 1st floor area. Showed pictures of facades in Monterey. Recommend simplifying
5 the façade on the front, creating interior courtyard as a backyard. Green roof – mental
6 carport seems to brutal. Confused by flow Bridge on F Street. Want path in front of
7 office building or under bridge. River walk should be a 12' path. Significant corners
8 identified. Landscape soils were not called out – trees in front of the firehouse seems
9 problematic – have concerns about durability of the planters. River access is important.

10
11 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Read into the record new conditions from the Bike committee.
12 Thanked the applicant. The livery stable is being moved, scales are gone. The Bike
13 Committee wants to retain the existing warehouses. From a pedestrian standpoint
14 removing all those buildings will be missed. Removing buildings does not fulfill some
15 CPSP policies. Class I connections – need a 6 ft. path to the river and 8 ft. path along the
16 river. Path on the river needs to be corrected to 14 feet. All pathways on river shall be
17 on land if warehouses are removed. Paths shall not prohibit bike traffic - 14 ft. path
18 should not butt up to Bar Ale site. Want path to continue to 1st street along the bridge –
19 needs to be public access next to D Street. Want mill trestle to be restored for pedestrian
20 and bicycle access. On 1st Street, need to be spaces between the buildings to see the river
21 and the Sonoma mountains. Do not want project to interfere with the Petaluma
22 Boulevard road diet. Needs more conditions regarding taking people out of their cars,
23 perhaps more bike parking. There is no bike parking in the garage. Twenty-five of the
24 parking needs to be for bikes and must be interior and safe. Project shall have a
25 transportation demand for incentives. Want windows to open in the office buildings.
26 Want water fountains and benches – preferably 2 per block. Entrance to parking garage
27 at 1st & D – need to benches and water fountain. All lighting needs to be down lighting.
28 Pesticides warning. Need showers. Bike parking and circulation. Need ground floor
29 safe parking for bicycles. Bar Ale office area needs to have interior bike parking.
30 Provide hooks in the parking garages for bikes. Difficult to cross D Street as a pedestrian
31 – need visible crosswalks.

32
33 Jane Hamilton, 110 G Street: Member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee for the
34 CPSP. Suggested sending notices to CPSP committee for important public hearings.
35 Hope SPARC is open to making changes. Reiterated the importance of bike parking in
36 the garage. The theater building needs the most thought – does not seem complete. The
37 blank façade on the Boulevard is a dead zone. Why not take up another story so there is
38 interaction with the street. CPSP wanted to create a pedestrian environment. Pedestrian
39 access across D Street is problematic – would like to see the River Enhancement Plan
40 path under the D Street bridge - under crossing is part of the River Enhancement Plan.

41
42 Patricia Tuttle Brown: In agreement that there be a bridge over Thompson Creek.

43
44 Robinson Brown, San Francisco: Am a developer and am interested in your town. Big
45 windows make good housing stock. On the apartment buildings and Town Center,
46 suggested doing something more with the windows.

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

Public comment closed.

Committee questions on the Theater:

Committee Member Gracyk: Can Basin Street address the 1-story building (the theater)?
It is in violation of CPSP.

Matt White: This is the best solution in terms of overwhelming Petaluma Boulevard.

Committee Member Gracyk: Want to have storefronts on the Boulevard side.

Matt White: There is a limited amount of land; was a balancing act to get the 12 theaters.

Committee Member Kosewic: Is there any bike parking for the theater?

Matt White: There will be bike parking in the office building on 1st street. Will design bike parking in the garage. Will be bike parking throughout the project.

Chair Rittenhouse: Asked the location of the screens for Theaters 1 and 2?

Rick Strauss: Showed the orientation of the seating.

Committee Comments on Theater:

Committee Member Kosewic: Difficult to visualize from the drawing. Appreciate the materials. Applaud the art deco, it stands on its own merit. Like the historic display – is on the north side so it will not be destroyed by sun. Displays on the Boulevard elevation will need to change so they won't fade.

Committee Member Gracyk: Like the torchiere on top of columns on the entry, like the color choices, like the display of movie posters outside, appreciate the storefronts. Do not know about the financial viability if one theater is given up for retail on the Boulevard. Sign seems insufficient – may not be big enough, could be more playful. Not a consistent pattern for the torchier all the way around the building.

Committee Member Barrett: Like the theater – would like to see the sign on the corner of Petaluma Boulevard & C Street bigger and more significant. Torchiere – feel they should go all the way around the building. Like the materials and colors selected. Still have concerns about the interpretive display – want a Condition of Approval that the applicant will seek input from Heritage Homes and Petaluma Historic Museum, however, applicant will maintain. Want a automatic ticket kiosk on the Petaluma Boulevard side.

Committee Member Gracyk: Is it possible to add another story and put a few theaters upstairs and some offices or cafes. A historic display is not sufficient mitigation – maybe can do something at the warehouse site.

1

2 Committee Member Hurley: Like the idea of a multilevel in the center of theater
3 building – my main concern is the Petaluma Boulevard elevation. Displays don't animate
4 the street. The corner is problematic – competing with the entrance on C Street. Below
5 marquee on the corner is nothing – need more attention there. Under the marquee on C
6 Street looks pretty unexciting.

7

8 Committee Member Lynch: I have no problem with 50' in the center of the theater.
9 Think Janet's idea would be worth exploring. CPSP wants to avoid the dead space – that
10 is what the Boulevard elevation will be. Short of a 2nd story – need to fool with the
11 puzzle pieces. It is important to get life on the Petaluma Boulevard elevation. Torchiere
12 could be a problem – would like them simplified. Like the Art deco if not overdone.
13 Corner has been a problem since day one. Downplay the corner of C Street & Petaluma
14 Boulevard – have the letters turn the corner on C Street – would prefer less rather than
15 more. Like the materials and the colors. Want the bike parking in the garage. Like the
16 free popcorn idea for bike riders.

17

18 Chair Rittenhouse: Project has come a long way, materials and colors are quite strong.
19 Like the art deco if it is not overdone. Move theater 3 back, next to 9 and it would free
20 up retail space. Like the idea of making corner element bolder. Want Heritage Homes
21 and the museum to weigh in on the interpretive display. Like the idea of an automatic
22 ticket kiosk.

23

24 Committee Member Kosewic: Need a cross walk from Town Center to theater entrance
25 (same kind of lighting as on Petaluma Boulevard North at Putnam Plaza). Disagree with
26 50' height in the center of the building. How much retail can downtown support? Would
27 not condition the historic display. Need some neon with the art deco.

28

29 Committee Member Hurley: Both the Museum and Heritage Homes are volunteer
30 organizations – do not know if the support is realistic.

31

32 Committee Member Barrett: The responsibility is with Basin Street - would just like
33 input from the Museum and Heritage Homes.

34

35 Matt White: Torchiere might be too much all the way around. Ticket booth – ok.
36 Asphalt will be raised across C Street in front of the theater for crosswalk. Need
37 consensus on the corner sign. No problem with Basin Street taking responsibility for
38 display and input from Heritage Homes and the museum. Two-stories would mean two
39 more sets of stairs and elevators – just not enough room.

40

41 Committee Member Lynch: Is there a way to move puzzle pieces around and create
42 some retail on Petaluma Boulevard?

43

44 Matt White: Do not have a problem trying.

45

46 Committee Member Barrett: The building as it is 30' and more than the size of one-story

1 building.

2

3 Beth Meredith: The 1-story building is not keeping in code with the CPSP. How does
4 SPARC respond to that?

5

6 Irene Borba: The 30' height meets the intent of a 2-story building.

7

8 Committee Member Kosewic: Do not think we are not keeping within the code.

9

10 M/S Barrett/Gracyk to approve the theater per the amended conditions below. 6-0

11

- 12 ▪ Input from Heritage Homes and the historic museum for the interpretive display.
- 13 ▪ Details of the torchiere lighting, corner detail of C & Petaluma Boulevard to
14 return to SPARC.
- 15 ▪ Up lights on the columns
- 16 ▪ Punched metal at cornices
- 17 ▪ Automatic ticketing kiosk on Petaluma Boulevard

18

19 **Committee questions/comments on the Parking Garage:**

20

21 Committee Member Kosewic: What is material of wall of the garage behind fire station.

22

23 Brian Childs: Raw concrete board.

24

25 Committee Member Gracyk: Concerns regarding elevation on 1st Street.

26

27 Brian Childs: Graphics are underdeveloped at this time.

28

29 Landscape architect:

30

31 Committee Member Gracyk: Plaza at entry – not part of streetscape – can be planted as
32 a shady area.

33

34 Committee Member Barrett: Water fountains or public bathroom in garage at the
35 intersection of 1st and D.

36

37 Brian Childs: Will put in water fountain and telephones.

38

39 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about elevator core.

40

41 Brian Childs: Serves the apartments and office building better – better for the massing as
42 well.

43

44 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked the architect to summarize the major changes.

45

46 Brian Childs: Graphic statement on 1st & D, "D" Street elevation had three slots gave it a

1 commercial feel and it not commercial except the 1st floor, moving the elevator core
2 which was just explained.

3

4 Committee Member Barrett: Would like to see roses on the scale saved.

5

6 Matt White: Will be saved – landscape architect will include in landscape plan.

7

8 Committee Member Lynch: Talked about breaking away the corner on the “D” Street
9 and firehouse side.

10

11 Brian Childs: Parking is tight – could not pull back and keep the parking count.

12

13 Committee Member Gracyk: Garage design received very favorable response from the
14 committee. Asked the landscape architect why poplars cannot be on both sides.

15

16 Landscape Architect: Because of the Fire Department.

17

18 Committee Member Gracyk: Can there be vines?

19

20 Landscape Architect: Yes

21

22 Committee Member Barrett: Will there be parking for bicycles?

23

24 Matt White: Yes.

25

26 Committee Member Hurley: I am happy that this architect is the designer of this
27 building, however, it still dwarfs and overshadows the existing historic fire station.
28 Don’t know what the answer is.

29

30 Committee Member Kosewic: Am opposed to design of the garage.

31

32 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to approve the parking garage per the conditions below. 4-2.
33 Kosewic and Hurley opposed.

34

- 35 ▪ Add graphic element on corner of 1st & “D” Street
- 36 ▪ Put in water fountain and phone
- 37 ▪ Retain roses
- 38 ▪ Grow vines on the fire station portion of the garage

39

40 **Committee Questions on Water front office building:**

41

42 Committee Member Lynch: Are there operable windows above the 1st floor.

43

44 Matt White: Yes – metal, operable windows.

45

46 Committee Member Barrett: Is the bridge approach 14’?

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

Matt White: It will be 14' behind the apartments and 8' between the buildings. Bridge is 8' and 20' between the office and the apartments.

Chair Rittenhouse: Will there be sun shading on 2nd and 3rd floors on south elevation.

Rick Strauss: Will be shaded by the apartments.

Chair Rittenhouse: Spandrel glass is more of a heat loss – can't see out of it.

Committee Member Lynch: Do not have problem with spandrel glass. Want the glass as clear as possible and operable windows.

Committee Member Gracyk: Like the idea of glass in the middle.

Committee Member Comments on the Waterfront Building:

Committee Member Kosewic: Only difference with this office and warehouse is the amount of glass, however, it's an office and you need the glass. The building fits in well. I have concerns about pedestrian traffic flow across D Street. Would be nice to have the river walk under the bridge – would be nice for residents, however, not necessarily good for office workers.

Committee Member Hurley: Like the building and the design. Want windows to be clear – cut down on square footage of windows that have tinted glass. It is a great complement to the river front warehouse district.

Matt White: Getting rid of spandrel is difficult – asked to eliminate.

M/S Lynch/ Kosewic to approve the Waterfront building with operable windows. 6-0

Committee questions on the River Row Apartments:

Committee Member Kosewic: Asked why the frame of the buildings were retained?

Matt White: To help soften the project.

Committee Member Gracyk: Not clear where the trash pickup is on this project.

Guy Ferris: Pointed them out – will be tucked in the auto court and will be pulled out to the street for pickup.

Committee Member Lynch: Re: findings necessary for the COA. Feel the Economic hardship is more appropriate.

1 Comments on the Certificate of Appropriateness:

2
3 Committee Member Hurley: We have not been asked to comment on the Mitigated
4 Negative Declaration. Do not think the City is in compliance with CEQA. Demolition
5 cannot be mitigated. If you demolish a building you are adversely changing it and
6 significantly impacting the environment. I feel as a Historic Preservation Committee
7 member that a mitigated negative declaration is not appropriate. My letter to the Council
8 and other letters from historians were not included here in the packet. Am not supportive
9 of this finding – since demolition cannot be mitigated, there should have been a project
10 focused EIR. I am focusing simply on the warehouse buildings not other buildings
11 throughout the project, which will be demolished. These warehouses have been
12 identified as potential contributors to a historic district. When you get rid of the buildings
13 you lose the integrity of the “river front warehouse district.” Once they are gone, there is
14 nothing to identify a historic district. This particular portion of the project would be
15 better on an empty site. Great opportunity to have light industrial uses here in the
16 existing warehouses. As a City we are not taking responsibility for the loss of the
17 warehouses – each of the buildings separately is not historic, however, as a district it is
18 historic.

19
20 Committee Member Kosewic: Have spent my life rehabilitating residential buildings.
21 Warehouses (even now are inexpensive to build). The warehouses individually are not
22 historically significant. Petaluma is moving away from industrial uses. Warehouse
23 districts are built cheaply and not maintained. Foundry Wharf does not contribute to a
24 historic district. The history will always be there, however, keeping the warehouses is
25 not necessary to keep the district. Having residential here is in keeping with the CPSP by
26 having an office next to residential and hopefully people will be able to walk from place
27 to place.

28
29 Committee Member Lynch: Referred to Section 7.10.060, Section E – Effect of
30 demolition. Attempts have been made by the applicant and this does not have to be a
31 black and white issue – may be able to find something in the middle. Can apply
32 conditions. The applicant is saving one warehouse and part of a structure on the river.

33
34 Committee Member Barrett: Referred to Katherine Rinehart’s letter which is to have a
35 photo display. Provide materials for the public to have from the demolition – would like
36 as a condition of approval.

37
38 Committee Member Kosewic: Find a name that would keep the warehouse district
39 theme.

40
41 Committee Member Barrett: Can we see if there is consensus to support COA.

42
43 The committee did a straw vote to pass the COA.

44
45 Committee Member Barrett: Tenants must understand that there is 24-hour river
46 industry. Need to determine the decibel level for the interior of the apartments.

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 Lynch: On the warehouse that is being saved – looks like the back is being taken off – will be rest be salvaged.

Matt White: Yes.

Chair Rittenhouse: Can you actually rehab once you have to make it structurally sound?

Matt White: Yes.

Committee Comments on the Riverfront Apartments:

Committee Member Lynch: Don't agree with the first finding of the COA – can be adaptively reused, however, not the way Basin Street is proposing. Agree no one building is historically significant, it is as district that the buildings are significant. Saving one building is meaningless, however, saving more is not feasible. Suggested a portle on E Street which morphed into saving a skeleton on the river side. Pictured a series of gables running down the river – don't believe saving two will do it. Possibly carry down the river and save 3 more gable ends. Have a series of gable ends and have a ghosting of much more of a district. Tone down the colors – would like something in the raw metal. Do not like white windows – too stark on the colors. Massing is successful on it's own – do not reiterate on the color. Would prefer the path all the way to D Street. Don't know about flat panel on ground floor – would simplify. Suggest doing less on the building being saved and do more with the other buildings along the river.

Committee Member Grayck: This is the best group of warehouses in the area. Interested in keeping the gable ends and carrying the rhythm down the river. Think the color is effective.

Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Janet – keeping just the outlines of the gable ends. I like the colors.

Committee Member Kosewic: Agree with Chris and keep the corners where they are and incorporate into the river walk.

Chair Rittenhouse: Project has come a long way. Disappointed that it is not more whimsical – does mimic the warehouses. Think it is a functional project and would like to move forward.

Matt White: Like the committee's idea – don't know how to pay for it. Agree it would be a good idea, however, I don't know how to make it happen.

Committee Member Grayck: PBAC asked for a bridge across the creek at F Street – do not think that is necessary.

Committee Member Kosewic: Can we move on with the project and give Matt some

1 time to research.

2

3 Matt White: Can we limit the buildings we do it on?

4

5 Committee Member Lynch: Am trying to facilitate a compromise.

6

7 Matt White: Do roofline along the river and attach to the apartment buildings – could use
8 wood and mimic what is there. It's the response to this district as a warehouse district.

9

10 Chair Rittenhouse: Concur with Chris Lynch re: white windows.

11

12 Will return to the committee as a condition of approval.

13

14 M/S Lynch/ Barrett to approve the COA based on Section C and E, 5 to memorialize the
15 resource applicant will come back with responses. 4-2. Hurley and Gracyk – No.

16

17 M/S Kosewic/Barrett to approve the project as conditioned. 4 in favor, Hurley opposed,
18 Gracyk abstained.

19

- Design of gable elements to contribute to warehouse district

20

- Interior decibel level to code

21

- Recycling materials from historic demolitions and photographic element to the
22 library.

22

23

- Recreate Bar Ale sign

24

25 M/S Barrett/Rittenhouse to move livery stable. 6-0

26

27 **Theater Square:**

28

29 Mat White: Introduced the landscape architect.

30

31 Larry Reed: Presented the landscape architecture for the Theater Square portion of the
32 project.

33

34 **Committee Comments on Theater Square:**

35

36 Committee Member Hurley: Petaluma Blvd façade is the weakest – still reads as a
37 monolithic building – want the design to relate to the urban downtown since it is in a
38 significant location on Petaluma Boulevard.

39

40 Committee Member Kosewic: Agree with Marianne on the Petaluma Blvd. Façade – mix
41 up with texture and not just color. Looks too massive – has to be a way to break it up.
42 Whole concept is very well put together.

43

44 Committee Member Gracyk: Appreciate efforts that have been made. Like what the
45 colorist is doing here. Bumped out windows on the Petaluma Boulevard elevation are
46 successful. Have reservations about panels below the windows – is a lot of stucco, so

1 detailing is critical here. Crossover piece seems incongruous – want the architects to
2 weigh in.

3
4 Committee Member Barrett: Courtyard is the strongest element to this building, like the
5 attention to detail. Agree with Marianne about the outside of the building. Is such a
6 large building and so prominent – needs to provide a good visual impact when driving by.
7 Agree with Janet about the entrance from Petaluma Blvd – have doubts about it. Love
8 the colors and the awnings, like a working clock tower. “D” Street and Petaluma
9 Boulevard elevations need work.

10
11 Committee Member Lynch: Agree with everything said so far. This is probably my least
12 favorite of the buildings. Applicant is using color to break up massing instead of building
13 articulations – need to simplify the historicism. Want more distinct articulations. Is
14 really nice from a site plan perspective. Wanted to complement the applicant for all they
15 have done. Hope it gets tweaked to get 3-dimensional articulations.

16
17 Chair Rittenhouse: Appreciate the applicants willingness to respond to the committee’s
18 comments. This building is boring compared to the others. Agree with Terry that the
19 composition could use some texture.

20
21 Matt White: Open to mixing up the textures.

22
23 M/S Kosewic/Lynch to approve the Theater Square building with the landscaping plan as
24 presented this evening. 6-0

25
26
27 **III. REPORTS:**

28
29 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

30 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission reviewed Outlet Mall. Asked the
31 applicant to submit alternatives and go to SPARC on 8/14.

32
33
34
35 **Adjournment:** 9:40