



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
41

Minutes

Regular Meeting March 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, Jack Rittenhouse*
Historic: Marianne Hurley, Hopy Hopkins

*Chairperson

Staff: Mike Moore, Community Development Director
George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Irene Borba, Senior Planner

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of March 13, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S–
Rittenhouse/Barrett, 6-0.

Committee Members' Report: Katherine Rinehart submitted comments in writing.

Correspondence: None

Public Comment: None

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:10 p.m.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

OLD BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING:

- I. DRAFT CENTRAL PETALUMA SPECIFIC PLAN AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR).

1 **A. Review, comment and recommendation to City Council on DEIR.**
2 **B. Review, comment and recommendation to City Council on Draft Central**
3 **Petaluma Specific Plan.**

4
5 Mike Moore presented the DEIR and the draft CPSP and an overview of the process.

6
7 Public hearing opened:

8
9 Jane Hamilton: Co-chair of CPSP committee. Thanked the SPARC committee for the
10 time spent reading and discussing the plan.

11
12 Chris Stevick, 20 Liberty Street: Regarding resource issues – difficult having two
13 important issues discussed – would like clarity regarding the responsibility for changes to
14 plan. Still has questions about the role of CEQA.

15
16 Mike Moore: Final certification of EIR and adoption of the CPSP is the role of the
17 Council. The Planning Commission and SPARC are recommending bodies. If the
18 council adopts the Plan, resolutions and ordinances for the CPSP will be voted on by the
19 Council.

20
21 Katherine Rinehart: Submitted comments in writing.

22
23 Public hearing closed.

24
25 Committee comments on the DEIR:

26
27 Committee Member Hurley: Cultural and historic Chapter – need to decide whether a
28 structure is a historic resource under the laws of the State so it comes under the purview
29 of CEQA – if something is done that is negative, will it be a significant impact? CEQA
30 looks at alternatives; DEIR abdicates that responsibility by statement of overriding
31 considerations; EIR allows review of alternatives without EIR not enough detailed level
32 of review; threat of EIR helps protect property. Committee should not recommend SOC
33 for historic resources. Language reflects that a cultural survey has been done and it has
34 identified significant resources, however, that has not been done.

35
36 Chair Rittenhouse: Council is being asked to adopt a SOC on the historic resources
37 element – is only way around this to not certify the EIR?

38
39 George White: From a process standpoint the only way to go forward and do what
40 Marianne suggests is to reduce that impact to a less than significant level. One way to do
41 that is to say all issues relative to demolition or alteration of historic resources would not
42 be handled as part of this EIR but on a case by case basis which would lead to individual
43 EIRs.

44 Committee Member Gracyk: Can't accept 25% cap – needs to be higher. Regarding
45 traffic mitigations – 6-6, 6-7 not feasible. Resolve conflict regarding mitigations (visual
46 impacts) relative to SMART code. More flexibility needed in site planning – clarify
47 language

1

2 Committee Member Barrett: Regarding historical resources section – recommend
3 supporting no SOC adopted for historical resources. Support full EIR for demolition of
4 historic resources. If council does SOC – demolition or alteration of a historic resource
5 or potentially historic resource would require public hearing.

6

7 Committee Member Lynch: Historic resources – support Teresa’s proposal regarding
8 historic resources. Plan provides too many incentives to encourage demolition; threat of
9 EIR thwarted demolition of Victory Chevrolet; 25% cap seems to low – address densities
10 in plan to increase build out potential.

11

12 Chair Rittenhouse: Mitigations generally sufficient. Support public hearing on
13 demolition of historic resources.

14

15 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to recommend that the City Council certify the EIR and keep
16 public comment open until April 21, 2003. 6/0

17

18 Discussion of CPSP.

19

20 Committee Member Lynch: What does mixed use mean as far as land use?

21

22 Mike Moore: Definition on pg. 21.

23

24 Committee Member Lynch: Pg. 19, Section 4 – list of definitions – does every building
25 in mixed use district have to have a storefront?

26

27 Mike Moore: Read definition – mixed use “shall comply” with following requirements.

28

29 Committee Member Lynch: Live/work complies as a mixed use – project would have to
30 show storefront?

31

32 Mike Moore: Yes.

33

34 Committee Member Lynch: Mixed use has to be defined better – if we allow six
35 buildings in a row along the river to be an apartment block – that is counter to the new
36 urbanist idea – will not be a pedestrian experience.

37

38 Mike Moore: If you look at the definition of shop front – it is not a use requirement, it a
39 form requirement in the relationship of the building to the street. The question to the
40 committee is do you want to be more specific than the plan is now and require that every
41 building be mixed use.

42

43 Committee Member Lynch: Needs to be something in the middle. Need to encourage
44 large projects to be a mixed-use project. Goal is to have high vitality area. Need to have
45 a language that strikes a balance.

46

47 Mike Moore: Referred the committee to look through the section which addresses mixed

1 use – look at B, pg. 19 of SMART Code. Tried to create flexibility and with that comes
2 uncertainty.

3
4 Public hearing opened:

5
6 Stephanie McAllister: Support for higher level of scrutiny for historic resources; SPARC
7 discretionary review – support as extensive as possible; support architectural guidelines;
8 support SMART code as tool – historic resources and architectural guidelines are
9 important supplements; need to upgrade guidelines in status. SMART
10 Code/Architectural Guidelines conflict in RFW – consider using LEED checklist for new
11 development in CPSP – p. 8 (area 4-last paragraph) – need to respect historic patterns if
12 demolition occurs. Area 11 – riverfront warehouse district - SMART Code needs to be
13 consistent with the recommendations contained in area 11 guideline description. On
14 Thoroughfare Map – did not like defining street light style.

15
16 Chris Stevick: Height of buildings – 2 sensitive areas – 1st Street tier development so at
17 later date buildings could be taller; the other area is downtown - how does downtown
18 limit height; avoid large buildings along the river.

19
20 Beth Meredith: Regarding historic buildings – as a citizen do not feel that EIRs are
21 helpful and not best solution for results – design better processes that work; looking for
22 certainty – need to put program together to determine value of historic resources and then
23 design a process such as a charrette that is solution oriented. Regarding density – key to
24 creating urban environment – economics will dictate that we do not get to full build out.
25 Want concentrated density inside. Need to buy the vision – committee worked hard – too
26 many loopholes will ruin vision; support fewer exceptions not more.

27
28 John Fitzgerald: CPSP Committee member. Here to answer questions on behalf of
29 Citizens Advisory Committee – plan is based on consensus of the committee.

30
31 Diana Painter: Have concerns regarding cultural resources area and transportation -
32 submitted comments in writing.

33
34 Wayne Miller: Comments on mixed use – p. 21 establishes overall guideline – need to
35 consider overall objectives of plan; more difficult threshold is how individual projects fit
36 in overall picture; SMART Code is there to serve goals of the CPSP not the other way
37 around – provide some clarity and simplicity; need body of knowledge that can relate
38 specific projects to overall goals; RFW design guidelines – adaptive reuse of existing
39 structures should be considered in development plan – if structurally or financially
40 infeasible, buildings of similar scale and proportion recommended and reuse of
41 weathered material considered – becomes a judgment call.. Suggest in RFW – not want
42 to make exception to T-5, downzone to a T-4 instead, particularly along the river.

43
44 Public hearing closed:

45
46 Committee questions:

47

1 Committee Member Lynch: If someone wants to do adaptive reuse – how do you apply
2 the code – response was to default to the existing Zoning Ordinance – is that correct?

3
4 Mike Moore: Would use the SMART Code where it is applicable and use other existing
5 regulations where they are applicable.

6
7 Committee Member Lynch: Used Haake building as example – don't have the 50%
8 exception, say 75 like all T5, how is that viewed? Can use parking requirements and uses
9 don't change, how is code applied?

10
11 Mike Moore: Apply current zoning regulations to the addition, if the existing building
12 does not change.

13
14 Committee Member Lynch: Proscriptive things in the code are front setback, built to
15 lines, principal frontage percentage – so they are not applied to the building. Want to
16 make sure they will benefit by lower parking ratios. Civic buildings are not subject to
17 any categorization?

18
19 Mike Moore: Is the intention of SMART code principles.

20
21 Committee Member Lynch: If permitted in any area, will be in the urban standard
22 matrix.

23
24 Mike Moore: The use tables do address civic buildings – civic buildings are not
25 government buildings, they are museums, libraries, etc. and are in the use table.

26
27 Committee Member Lynch: Regarding parking – street frontage being used for parking
28 requirements – agree on a commercial basis, but if a building is all residential - not
29 appropriate since the threshold is being lowered. Pg. 42, Section 6-10B – should exclude
30 residential.

31
32 Chair Rittenhouse: Project on Lakeville – now is mixed use T-5, how do you rectify the
33 setbacks, etc. in a proposal to do an addition.

34
35 Mike Moore: Apply code where it makes sense – otherwise would be subject to
36 SPARC's discretion.

37
38 Chair Rittenhouse: Is it written somewhere in this code that unless this applies to the
39 project that we default to something else. Does this need to be addressed?

40
41 Mike Moore: Is not different from what exists now. Sometimes judgments have to be
42 made based on other considerations and policies that apply – when we can make
43 judgments on the current code we will do that. Will get the same type of analysis of
44 projects in a staff report once specific plan is adopted. Where there is question is when
45 SPARC's review will come in. From a procedural standpoint, this plan does not create a
46 different process than what exists now. We have a much wider range of permitted uses.

47

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Deviating from the code (such as variances) which is usually dealt
2 with at a Planning Commission level not SPARC, will it now be SPARC's discretion?
3

4 Mike Moore: If a project came in that was completely different from what the specific
5 plan anticipated, it would go through the same process of amending the General Plan or
6 change zoning which would go to the Planning Commission and ultimately to the
7 Council. The emphasis of a specific plan is on design review process – not dealing with
8 use or changes in policy.
9

10 Chair Rittenhouse: Would SPARC be required to any findings?
11

12 Mike Moore: If it were a project that necessitated that. From a procedural standpoint,
13 the plan does not create a different process than currently exists. We now have a wider
14 range of permitted uses, parking restrictions are more flexible and land use designations
15 are more flexible so fewer projects will be going to the Planning Commission and the
16 City Council.
17

18 Committee Member Gracyk: If an applicant comes in with an unusual property and the
19 SMART code does not make sense for it so the City will have some leeway, does the
20 applicant understand this?
21

22 Mike Moore: Is part of the process we now go through when a person inquires about a
23 property, we give them zoning information, general plan land use designation, etc.
24

25 Committee Member Gracyk: Am concerned about someone walking away with this
26 document and trying to figure out how the SMART code applies to their existing
27 building.
28

29 Committee Member Lynch: Need to provide a flow chart for applicants.
30

31 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked for definition of an edge yard in urban standards
32 table.
33

34 Mike Moore: On the building placement table, Section 4.3.0, pg. 13.
35

36 Committee Member Gracyk: Definition of a terrace or light court?
37

38 Mike Moore: Pg. 14, frontage types.
39

40 Committee Member Gracyk: Where is the description of the parking?
41

42 Mike Moore: It is in the layers.
43

44 Committee Member Hurley: This is overlay zoning and we already have in place overlay
45 zoning with the historic district. The downtown district is included in the specific plan, if
46 there is a conflict with the two does the specific plan with the SMART code prevail?
47

1 Mike Moore: The language is whatever the stricter requirement is would prevail.

2

3 Committee Member Hurley: In that case, the design guidelines already in place for the
4 historic districts would be the prevailing guidelines in most instances.

5

6 Mike Moore: Yes, these regulations, T4, T5 and T6 will become the new zoning for the
7 specific plan area and the historic district overlay will still be a historic district overlay.

8

9 Committee Member Hurley: Regarding the riverfront warehouses – the recommendation
10 from Carey & Co. was that these are a locally protected district, if that was designated
11 would they have design guidelines specific to that.

12

13 Mike Moore: That's correct.

14

15 Committee Member Hurley: If that is the case, then it could be less dense than the
16 prevailing code.

17

18 Mike Moore: That's correct and would be determined through a separate process of
19 creating that new district and whatever guidelines that would go along with that.

20

21 Committee Member Hurley: Regarding height – we typically have a maximum and here
22 it actually calls out minimum heights in the zoning. If we are trying to respect the
23 historic buildings as was brought up by the public, it seems there is a conflict. A lot of
24 the RFW is one story, however, it is T5.

25

26 Mike Moore: Earlier comments talked about changing the recommendation for the RFW
27 to T4 entirely.

28

29 Committee Member Hurley: It is now just the 2nd Street bungalows?

30

31 Mike Moore: Yes.

32

33 Committee Member Hurley: Am concerned about two-story minimum unless it is
34 changed to T4.

35

36 Committee Member Hopkins: I'm not in favor of smaller lots and greater density any
37 more than I'm in favor of 6-story buildings. My biggest concerns are traffic and water.
38 What are the answers?

39 Mike Moore: The EIR addresses both of those issues and it does say that traffic in some
40 areas could get worse than it is now. The water issue is also address and is not a
41 significant impact at this point. Regarding the traffic, the City is making a leap to
42 intensity development in the specific plan area. In order to respond to that the City would
43 not want to build it's way out of traffic situations for it to flow smoothly – would not
44 want to see E. Washington Street at 8 lanes or adding additional lanes to Petaluma Blvd.
45 We are accepting a lower level of traffic – the policy question is this a tradeoff you want
46 to make?

47

1 Committee Member Barrett: Pg. 6, Section 3 of SMART Code regarding conditional use
2 permits – use will not be allowed on a frontage where shop fronts are required – why not?
3

4 Mike Moore: It is not prohibited.
5

6 Committee Member Barrett: Is prohibited on the ground floor.
7

8 Mike Moore: Yes, in an area where you want some other kind of activity on the street –
9 could have on the 2nd floor.
10

11 Committee Member Barrett: Children’s things need to be on the ground floor and I
12 would make that recommendation. There is also prohibition of laundry and dry cleaning
13 in T4, T5 and T6. Now have environmentally friendly, why is this prohibited.
14

15 Mike Moore: Is not the local cleaner – it’s the industrial cleaner.
16

17 Committee Member Barrett: Where is this stated – is not clear to me. Need to make the
18 distinction.
19

20 George White: Is under services.
21

22 Committee Member Barrett: What about adult businesses?
23

24 Mike Moore: There are already existing regulations in the zoning ordinance that govern
25 adult businesses.
26

27 Committee Member Barrett: What are the chances of a complete historical survey being
28 conducted?
29

30 Mike Moore: As part of the specific plan? Is not feasible at this stage. It could go as a
31 recommendation as a priority for the council in implementing the plan to do a thorough
32 study, however, it would have to be budgeted.
33

34 Committee Member Barrett: How does that recommendation reach the City Council.
35

36 Mike Moore: You can make that recommendation.
37

38 John Fitzgerald: On concerns about where things don’t fit, on pg. 13 of the SMART
39 code, at the bottom there is a definition and example for “specialized” and it gives
40 examples. Possibly that language could be expanded to include visually what you
41 expressed concern about things not fitting in.
42

43 Committee comments:
44

45 Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested documenting what is working well, list what is
46 really close and what is needs to be changed.
47

1 Recommendations:

- 2 • Historic preservation protection.
- 3 • Expand specialized building placement to cover quirky sites
- 4 • Clarify SPARC's purview in SMART code – needs to be regulatory
- 5 • Architectural guidelines need as much strength as possible – default to existing
- 6 character and respect historic patterns – existing character rules, SMART code
- 7 follows
- 8 • Street light disclaimer regarding acorn types (thoroughfare standards)
- 9 • Make recommendation for historic survey for RFW
- 10 • Traffic circle is void and unsafe.
- 11 • Not enough open space in Lower Reach
- 12 • 4 story maximum – no T6

13
14 Committee Member Hurley: Page 8 – very little discussion regarding historic. Added
15 the following: “the Central Specific Area is notable for its large numbers of diverse
16 properties that contribute to the City's historic core. The preservation of these properties
17 by encouraging their continued use or by rehabilitation and adaptive reuse enhances the
18 City as a whole and retains its historic character.”

- 19
20 • Chapter 9 is misleading – not a survey – information will be used as basis for
- 21 preservation planning – need disclaimer. Make it very clear this is a windshield
- 22 survey, a type of resonance survey (which is very limited level of effort).
- 23 Checked with the office of historic preservation – results of this kind of limited
- 24 survey “cannot be used for any definitive identification and evaluation of historic
- 25 properties and therefore it cannot be used as a comprehensive reference to identify
- 26 historical resources for the purposes of CEQA.” It is a broad overview and gives
- 27 parameters. Cannot be used in the way that is stated in Chapter 9.
- 28 • Clarify number (66) in Chapter 9.
- 29 • Chapter 9, page 109, Objective 3 – states to preserve the industrial, however, does
- 30 not discuss the residential. Narrative below discusses that there is a mix – it is the
- 31 mix that contributes to the historic significance.
- 32 • Remove all codes from the matrix – no documentation or historic research to
- 33 support these codes.
- 34 • Expand historic downtown district
- 35 • Need more detailed survey of riverfront warehouse district.
- 36 • SMART Code Section 7 (pg. 48-54) – adding another layer of review is too much
- 37 – defer to existing regulations related to historic preservation.
- 38 • Concur with building height reduction and general reduction of T-6 to T-5 and T-
- 39 5 to T-4.

40
41 Hoppy: Agreed with Marianne's recommendations.

42
43 Committee Member Barrett:

- 44 • 1-H gets changed regarding SPARC's purview;
- 45 • need flow chart for developers;
- 46 • architectural guidelines need to reinforce local character;

- 1 • concur on historic comments; eliminate Section 7;
 2 • historic survey should be priority – need public hearing for demolition of historic
 3 resources.
 4 • Densities – T-5, T-6 – maximum should be 4 stories; RWF should not be T-5.
 5 Establish height limit of 3 stories facing river from turning bridge to Foundry
 6 Wharf.

7
 8 Committee Member Lynch: SMART Code needs more time – code doesn't respect
 9 uniqueness of Petaluma. Architectural guidelines will be useful.

- 10 • Support reducing T-6 to T-5. RFW – T-4 much more appropriate; will encourage
 11 more mixed use; mixed use is still big concern.
 12 • Increase density in T-4 to 30 du/acre. More opening for view corridor – will
 13 encourage adaptive reuse, more sustainable design.
 14 • Need more designations of open space.
 15 • Architectural guidelines – definitions will dilute effect - delete p. 20; delete some
 16 General Provisions; need category for prohibited materials – vinyl or plastic
 17 gutter, windows; no phony grids. Guidelines should be an appendix – can be
 18 given to applicants.
 19 • Illustrations (pg. 31 of the Plan) – need a disclaimer.
 20 • “Specialized” needs to be in the Urban Standards matrix
 21 • Opportunities regarding incentives for sustainability – LEED should be applied;
 22 incentives are easy. LEED checklist should be requirement.
 23 • Support road diet and parking recommendations.
 24 • Agree re: acorn lighting
 25 • Flowchart for all overlays
 26 • Change language re: SPARC's purview

27
 28 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Concur with the majority of other committee
 29 member's recommendations.
 30

31
 32 **IV. REPORTS:**

33
 34 **Planning Staff Reports:** None
 35 **Liaison Reports:** None

36
 37 Adjournment: 9 :00

38
 39 S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes03\032703.doc