



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 June 26, 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 (absent), Jack Rittenhouse*

*Chairperson

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

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of June 12, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S
Rittenhouse/Barrett – 3/0
Committee Members' Report: Correspondence: None
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:00 p.m.

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

I. RIDGEVIEW HEIGHTS - LOT No. 1, 3 Jerome Court

AP No: 019-201-025

File: 03-SPC-0147

Planner: Kim Gordon

Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural review of the site, architectural and landscaping plans for a new single-family residence at 3 Jerome Court.

Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

Craig Lawson, Pinnacle Homes: Introduced the project team. Asked for clarification of multilight versus divided light windows.

Brian Pruitt, Architect: Presented the architecture for Lot 1.

Susie Doud Markarian: Presented the landscape plan.

Public hearing opened and closed. No public comments.

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Kosewic: Clay vents at top out of scale – would like something more innovative. Decorative abutment on the dining room under eaves is just another place for dry rot. Do not like garage doors being dominant. Front door is recessed. Need to have a useable porch. On lot 2 front porch is a pleasing place to be. Do not like divided light on garage windows. True divided light is not much more expensive. In this caliber home, provide French doors as opposed to sliding doors. Like the curve in dining room. Need to enhance front porch so the garage is not so dominant. “Pull out” dining room.

Committee Member Gracyk: Always trying to avoid garage architecture. Agree with Terry’s comments on the front entrance. True divided lights in the window is important here. Guidelines say to consider surrounding area. Pyrus closer to the house would be more appropriate. Is it possible to have another street tree or 2 on Jerome Court? Recommend broad tree such as Pistache.

Bonnie Diefendorf: Pyrus trees were specified on the tentative map and cannot be changed.

Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Terry and Janet – have the same issues regarding the front entrance, porch and the garage domination. Front porch needs to be expanded. Agree about windows as well. Also agree with larger and more street trees, particularly on the Sunnyslope side. Refer to City’s Street Tree List. Agree with comments about sliding doors. Disappointed in design for a custom home – should have a “country feel”.

1
2 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with other committee members regarding garage, front entry
3 and windows. Not convinced the site plan works on this lot. Private spaces are located
4 closest to streets. No good private space due to siting of residence.

5
6 Craig Lawson: Have flexibility with the wing walls, stucco. Garage is in this location to
7 keep off Sunnyslope, had to meet off street parking requirements – were not able to do
8 tandem parking - and garage needed to be away from corner of Jerome and Sunnyslope.
9 Patio doors can be made into French sliders. Can add additional trees. Cannot get
10 divided light windows in vinyl – have checked.

11
12 Chair Rittenhouse: There are privacy and adjacency issues in the site plan. A two-story or
13 split-level design might be better here.

14
15 Committee Member Kosewic: Pull out the dining room roof and create a front railing.

16
17 Committee Member Barrett: Would like to see the porch revision especially since
18 architect is not here.

19
20 Committee Member Gracyk: Would like to see the porch revision come back.

21
22 Kim Gordon: Stated the parking requirements which is 3 off street spaces, 1 is required
23 to be covered.

24
25 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested offsetting the single car garage.

26
27 Chair Rittenhouse: Pushing back the single garage would improve the roofline.

28
29 Committee Member Barrett: Encourage looking at windows in the house and the garage
30 windows.

31
32 Chair Rittenhouse: Look at the light fixture so light is a soft wash on the building.

33
34 M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to approve the project with the applicant to return with a front
35 entry/porch design to include a useable porch, setback single-car garage, reconsider all
36 windows, especially garage doors. Exterior light to provide “soft wash” against the
37 building.

38
39
40 Public hearing began @ 4:00 p.m.

41
42 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

43
44 **II. RIDGEVIEW HEIGHTS - LOT No. 2, 685 Sunnyslope Road**

45 **AP No: 019-201-025**

46 **File: 03-SPC-0137**

47 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

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

Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural review of the site, architectural and landscaping plans for a new single-family residence at 685 Sunnyslope Road.

Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

Brian Pruitt: Presented the architecture.

Public hearing opened and closed. No comments.

Committee Discussion:

Committee Member Kosewic: Like tall double windows, impressed with stonework and and the different roof slopes, vents are good, condition the ridge vent to carry out to the edge of the roof. Problem with transom over dining room window – inconsistent with the style of house, like the porch and the size, eliminate grids on garage door windows. Suggest French doors rather than sliding glass doors.

Committee Member Gracyk: More compatible with existing houses, like proportions and the roofline. Need a window on right side elevation. Agree about the transom window – lose transom. Like the vertical boards on the garage. Stone on drawing is different than the finish schedule - prefer the stone on the drawing. Colors are fine. Driveway is a problem – need only two guests spaces.- take out compact space. Regarding landscaping, too much dietes – does not look good after a few years. A lot of society garlic – introduce some other different forms.

Committee Member Barrett: If you have to have that much driveway – use a different surface (something permeable). Think losing the compact space would work. Like rock as drawn rather than on finish schedule – do not like the way it stops around the corner. Need window on the garage on the right side elevation. Agree with the comment about transom window. Layout of house seems odd. Agree that sliding doors should be French doors instead. Appreciate the porch. Color would work better with a river stone.

Committee Member Gracyk: Reminder to the committee to review the stone corner.

Chair Rittenhouse: This design is more compatible with the neighborhood. Window on dining room – not sure about. Like the articulation from the street – problem with 80 lineal feet of wall to rear. Reduce the great room by 4 feet to reduce the lineal feet of the rear of the building. Offset the interior walls by 4 feet to break up the rear elevation. Stone should be a structural element. Do not like the stone finish on garage and wrapping around the corner. Do not need the compact guest space – would rather see landscaping. Need a couple of windows on the garage wall. Concur re: French doors as opposed to sliders. River rock would be preferred over the Eldorado stone, however, no stone is preferable.

Dick Dowd, Pinnacle Homes: Would like to have to reduce the parking.

1 M/S Barrett/Gracyk to approve the project as per the conditions below:

- 2 • Lose compact space, make remaining space a minimum of six feet from the
- 3 sidewalk
- 4 • Use turf block for remaining space and turnaround
- 5 • Add window on right side elevation (repetition of windows on other garages)
- 6 • Remove the stone from the garage.
- 7 • Remove grids from garage windows
- 8 • Remove transom window
- 9 • In order to meet guest parking and turnaround/back out requirement, garage
- 10 cannot be converted to living space.

11
12 Public hearing ended at 4:45

13
14
15 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

16
17 **III. BOULEVARD APARTMENTS, 945 Petaluma Blvd. North**
18 **AP No: 006-450-018**
19 **File: 03-PRE-9256**

20
21 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural preliminary review of a
22 project for three, one and two-story buildings. The two-story building fronting on
23 the boulevard includes a community room, office, and laundry room on the first
24 floor with apartments on the second floor. The fifteen units will provide housing
25 for 14 individuals with a mental illness as well as one unit for an on-site manager.

26
27 Lara Spangler, Architect: Presented the architecture.

28
29 Alice Thomas: Program Director: Answered questions regarding tenants and caregivers.

30
31 Discussion regarding the reduction in units and the lose of the mixed-use component.
32 Project needed to be scaled back due to funding issues.

33
34 Chair Rittenhouse: Sorry to see mixed use taken out. Nice site plan, good buffer to
35 neighbors, provides green space for the residents. Concerned about look of the X braces.
36 Sun shades are a good idea on south elevation – would like to see the detail. Like the
37 massing and asymmetry of the boulevard building. Problems with staircase blocking
38 windows on particular units.

39
40 Committee Member Barrett: Appreciate the buffer from the neighbors, like the site plan.

41
42 Committee Member Gracyk: Like the site plan – particularly east and south elevations.
43 Appreciate the thoughtfulness regarding the awnings. Hesitation about the X's on the
44 building. Maybe keep for the back buildings – don't take the chance on the boulevard
45 elevation.

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Maybe push the front (boulevard) elevation to look more like the rear
2 units.

3
4 Committee Member Kosewic: The X on the west elevation fit because it's on the first
5 floor. Front building lost its simplicity – lack of consistency. Site plan is good – exterior
6 finishes need work.

7
8 Chair Barrett: Like the detail on the corner of the front building – may look good on the
9 other buildings. Asked about signage on front building.

10
11 Katie Crecelius: Would have signage out front on the office.
12

13
14 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

15
16 **IV. JAY PALM SADDLE SHOP, 414 Petaluma Blvd. North**
17 **AP No.: 006-163-044**
18 **File: SPC02045**
19 **Planner: Kim Gordon**
20

21 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural preliminary review of an
22 addition to the existing building located at 414 Petaluma Blvd. North.
23

24 Wayne Miller, Architect: Gave background for the project.
25

26 Armando Franco: Presented the architecture for the project.
27

28 Committee comments:
29

30 Committee Member Barrett: Issue is the easement and parking for Silvas. CPSP has
31 been adopted so we need to know the parking requirements. How many additional
32 spaces are needed?
33

34 Kim Gordon: Need 1-2 additional spaces (for the addition only) than was shown on the
35 proposed site plan.
36

37 Committee Member Kosewic: The project is not changing anything that requires
38 additional parking spaces.
39

40 Kim Gordon: There is not flexibility in the Specific Plan to reduce the parking
41 requirement. Parking requirement is 1 space per 300 square feet in the Specific Plan.
42

43 Committee Member Kosewic: An employee could park in the back of the lot so there
44 would be adequate parking for customers.
45

46 Chair Rittenhouse: Want a diagram showing that parking can be accomplished. Can
47 create parking space next to the vacuum at the car wash.

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

Committee Member Barrett: Addition looks like the current building. Would be ok with metal.

Committee Member Gracyk: South elevation is ok, not so happy about the west elevation – is non descript. Would be ok with metal – would like something playful, different and innovative.

Wayne Miller: Tried to decide whether to make the addition stand out or blend with the existing building – went with the latter.

Chair Rittenhouse: Take away fancy metal roof. Make a statement with the block or combine block and stucco. Play with the circulation.

Wayne Miller : Suggested a metal addition like a grain elevator so it fits in the context with the agricultural theme.

Chair Rittenhouse: Recommend something that fits into the vernacular with some innovation and asymmetry. Could do metal, would be less expensive.

V. **REPORTS:**

Planning Staff Reports: None.

Liaison Reports: No planning commission meeting. Tree Committee would like to be included more in the planning for the downtown streetscape.

Adjournment: 6 :35