



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 May 8, 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, Hoppy Hopkins

*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Assistant Director Community Development
Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of March 27, 2003 and April 10, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Gracyk, 5-0.
Committee Members' Report: None
Correspondence: Correspondence from Horticultural Associates regarding oak seedling care and maintenance guidelines for Baker Ranch subdivision to satisfy a condition of approval for the subdivision. Correspondence from Chris Stevick and Heritage Homes regarding Town Center.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
PRELIMINARY REVIEW:

I. PETALUMA TOWN CENTER, Petaluma Blvd. South, First Street and

1 **Second Street at C and D Streets.**

2 **AP No(s): 008-065-002 & 003; 008-068-001, 002 & 003; 008-066-002, 003,**
3 **006, 007 & 009 and 008-121-001, 008-121-007, 008, 009, 010, 011 and 012.**

4 **File: 03PRE0129**

5
6 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee preliminary
7 review of plans for a 10-screen theater building (on the corner of Petaluma Blvd
8 South and C Street), a parking garage with ground floor retail (bounded by C, 1st
9 and 2nd Streets), a mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and 2nd and
10 3rd floor residential (bounded by Petaluma Blvd South, C, 2nd and D Streets), a 3-
11 story commercial/office building (on the corner of D and 1st Streets), and a 96-
12 unit residential complex and associated parking (on 1st Street).

13
14 Committee Member Lynch: Asked the applicant to outline responses to comments of the
15 last meeting.

16
17 Matt White: Addressed the site changes:

- 18
19 • Theater: created a secondary ticket kiosk, created pedestrian access to garage.
20 Mixed architectural styles so building does not look as though it was built all at
21 once. Traffic study is being completed – will have for the next meeting.
22
23 • On Rose property, simplified buildings responding to SPARC's comments.
24 Changed the elevation along Petaluma Blvd. South.
25
26 • Parking garage – took art deco out of architecture, attempted to simplify – made
27 solid concrete wall behind fire station.
28
29 • Presented the 1st Street town homes and apartments – changed since packet was
30 sent out. Proposing to move and reuse the livery stable.
31
32 • Discussed the office building at the corner of D and 1st Street – pedestrian access
33 all the way around.
34

35 Lynch: Asked about the process – will the Specific Plan be applied?

36
37 George White: Could do use permits administratively along with formal SPARC.

38
39 Committee Member Lynch: Will the project go to City Council first?

40
41 Matt White: Assuming specific plan will be adopted; we will go to SPARC with a formal
42 application.

43
44 Committee Member Barrett: Asked for explanation of phasing.

45
46 Matt White: Phase I: cinema, parking garage, commercial building and apartments on 1st

1 Street. Theatre Square will be the last phase.

2

3 Committee Member Lynch: A lot of development at one time – if it can be separated out
4 would be helpful.

5

6 Committee Members Barrett and Hurley concurred.

7

8 Committee Member Hurley: Asked for clarification on the livery stable.

9

10 Matt White: Will be moving to McNear Peninsula and rebuilding with same material as
11 much as possible.

12

13 Committee Member Hurley: Thought McNear Peninsula was stalled presently.

14

15 Committee Member Hopkins: Will you be moving western portion of the livery stable –
16 is not part of the original building.

17

18 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked if they have a landscape architect.

19

20 Matt White: Yes, Bill Smith is doing landscape for River Row Apartments.

21

22 Committee Member Gracyk: Did you consider parking under theater square?

23

24 Matt White: Yes, however, water table is an issue.

25

26 Committee Member Gracyk: Streetscape at the end of B street – is that part of this
27 application?

28

29 Matt White: No, is part of the commercial/residential building presently under
30 construction.

31

32 Committee Member Lynch: Potential commercial space on ground floor of River Row
33 Apartments – are we looking at living space or bedrooms on 2nd and 3rd floor.

34

35 Guy Ferris: Kitchens only on 2nd and 3rd floor.

36

37 Chair Rittenhouse arrived at 3:40 p.m.

38

39 Committee Member Lynch: If it was noted that it does not comply with specific plan,
40 would there be major design changes? Intent of code is to not have one large 20,000
41 square foot retail space. On cinema – do calculations include property lines.

42

43 Irene Borba: Number of things that may require design changes.

44

45 Committee Member Lynch: Seems some of the street design does not comply as well.

46

1 Irene Borba: True.

2

3 Public comment opened:

4

5 Wayne Miller: What is process from here out?

6

7 Committee Member Lynch: We recommend they come with separate projects.

8

9 Committee Member Barrett: Will give input today on everything that is before us.

10

11 Wayne Miller: Project is exciting overall – good intent. Want this project to meet the
12 spirit of the specific plan. Concerns: theater – is art deco appropriate for the City?
13 Character of details is important. Concerns about the parking garage – needs to read
14 more interestingly than long unbroken concrete building (do not want to repeat
15 downtown Santa Rosa parking garage). Housing on 1st Street – try to respect and work
16 with the buildings that exist. Want a sense of promenade on the street. Have a more
17 continuous line of buildings on the street – entrances to buildings be an extension of the
18 street. Needs to be considered in detail piece by piece.

19

20 Jane Hamilton: River Enhancement Plan called for pedestrian and bicycle access along
21 1st street.

22

23 Mitch Lind: Have an industrial operation with noise and dust directly across the river
24 from the proposed apartments. Operate 24 hours a day – want this disclosed to future
25 residents. Will there be a dock?

26

27 Matt White: Has not been determined.

28

29 Public comment closed:

30

31 Committee comments:

32

33 Committee Member Hurley: Happy to hear the livery stable will be moved. Still many
34 buildings assumed to be demolished. In the past warehouses on 1st Street have been
35 earmarked as historic — needs to be addressed. Other cities have adaptively reused
36 buildings successfully. The entire project is alot to digest at one time. Urged the 1st
37 Street housing portion be looked at again. Garage is problematic – not a very
38 complementary structure in the city. Garage will not be a graceful addition around the
39 fire station. Feel art deco design would be a nice addition to the city if it is done well,
40 like the marquee on the side. Relationship of theater to Theater Square is excellent.

41

42 Committee Member Hopkins: Concerned about the warehouses on the river. Agree with
43 comments about the firehouse.

44

45 Committee Member Gracyk: There is a provision in River Enhancement Plan for a
46 trail/bike path on 1st Street – don't know if that is different than sidewalk. Twenty-foot

1 setback will be difficult. Want to pull apartments out of the project. If we lose
2 warehouses we do not have a Riverfront Warehouse District. Will require an EIR.
3 Suggest thoroughfare from C Street to the Boulevard. Massing of garage too much with
4 the fire station. Potentially open an access on D Street and will break up massing. Ivy
5 will not necessarily be an option on the concrete wall – too hot. Make connection across
6 C Street and space between the firehouse and garage – provides relief on the massing.
7 Office building is a good design and successful. River Row Apartments are a suburban
8 type model – inner units look at asphalt and garages. Art deco is interesting, need a
9 modern element and the care taken with the details are critical. Horizontal banding on
10 garage is problematic.

11
12 Committee Member Barrett: Reiterate separating the submittal – addition of apartments
13 does not do you a service. Look at what is there now and try to mimic it. Concerns re:
14 parking structure around the firehouse – agree with Mr. Miller – avoid the Santa Rosa
15 downtown garage. Step back the top floor on the parking garage – being freer from large
16 square box – need to be creative with the parking structure.

17
18 Committee Member Lynch: Support separating the residential application. Commercial
19 office building was done well from the start. Cinema is busting at the seams so
20 circulation inside does not make sense. Number of spaces in parking garage is also
21 driven by theater. Parking structure is oppressive in it's massing. Passed out examples
22 of parking garages – all break up the massing – needs to happen here. Structure is 60' –
23 that's two Keller Street garages stacked on top of one another. Possibly less retail on the
24 1st floor – will free you up to break up the massing. Cinema is confusing – how do you
25 enter? Is a suburban solution in downtown. Residential is another suburban model – like
26 that it is clad in metal. Suggested reading a policy section from specific plan on mixed
27 use. The specific plan wants vitality on the street – will be a classic dead zone.
28 Encourage mixed use where the residential is. Need more consistent street frontage on 1st
29 Street, possibly stoops. E Street can be a terminus into the project. Interior of complex
30 has too much asphalt and garage – concur with Committee Member Gracyk. Use E
31 Street as a gateway to the river. Suggested story poles to designate the massing of the
32 garage.

33
34 Committee Member Gracyk: Specific plan says you can park on 1st layer if is hidden
35 from view. Can you move access route in the River Enhancement plan?

36
37 Irene Borba: Needs to come as close as possible.

38
39 Committee Member Barrett: When it comes as a formal application – will it go to City
40 Council?

41
42 Irene Borba: Just for the development agreement.

43
44 Chair Rittenhouse: There was not a great deal of time spend on changes after the first
45 SPARC meeting. Is not taking into account the spirit of the Specific Plan, particularly
46 the housing. All the issues still exist at the Theater Row – project too complicated to

1 look at on a preliminary basis. Too many things in flux – rear setbacks, parking ratios,
2 etc.

3
4 Matt White: Have missed the mark – need to go back to the drawing board. Think the
5 positives outweigh the negatives.

6
7 Committee Member Lynch: The committee has to consider the impact to the downtown
8 – buildings may be here for 75 years – do not feel the applicant has responded to
9 comments from the first preliminary review.

10
11 Committee Member Barrett: Addition of the apartments muddles the project –
12 concentrate more on the first portion of the project. We do not want to compromise on
13 the first project as a result of the specific plan. Want the parking structure designed in
14 such a way that it works. If you present a good design it will work.

15
16 Committee Member Lynch: Massing is the issue on the parking garage.

17
18 Committee Member Gracyk: Use art deco materials in a modern way – am not opposed
19 to art deco design.

20
21 Jay McNab: Good job on the setback from the river – people will want to congregate on
22 the river as well.

23
24 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked how the 20’ setback will be addressed.

25
26 Rick Strauss: Asked for clarification of outstanding issues:

- 27 • Garage needs work
- 28 • Cinema – detailing is crucial
- 29 • Theater square ok.
- 30 • River Row Apartments need work.
- 31 • How necessary is it to separate pieces?

32
33 Matt White: Not trying to sidestep SPARC – want to work through this with the
34 Committee.

35
36
37 **II. DIERKHISING ADDITION, 520 Walnut Street**

38 **AP No.: 006-151-001**

39 **File: 03PRE0077**

40
41 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee preliminary
42 review of plans to develop more living area by utilizing crawl space, addition of
43 dormers, and porch renovation.

44
45 Brent Russell presented the architecture.

46

1 The applicant gave some history of the project.

2

3 Committee Member Hurley: Changes are dramatic – additions overwhelm the existing
4 structure – respecting the structure is primary in a historic district. Use the house as the
5 starting point. The main part of the house is a small portion now. Urge you to pull back.
6 Garage does not fit with the time period. Do not encourage putting a garage on a historic
7 residence. The dormers overwhelm the style of the original house. Suggest paring down
8 to keep with the original house.

9

10 Committee Member Hopkins: Seems excessive.

11

12 Committee Member Barrett: More modest in the design of the front dormer. Expanding
13 the lower floor makes the most sense – keep the garage separate.

14

15 Committee Member Gracyk: Need to be consistent with the historic guidelines.

16

17 Applicant: If dormers were smaller and peak less – would that be more in style with the
18 original house?

19

20 Committee Member Hurley: Yes

21

22 Committee Member Gracyk: Top is overpowering. Don't know what you can do about
23 parking – do not have room for a separate garage. Possibly use more downstairs space
24 for living and not parking.

25

26 Chair Rittenhouse: Concur with others. Cottage going to three stories is no longer a
27 cottage. Utilize more space below instead of adding dormers. Concern as to steepness of
28 driveway. Like the wrap around porch and the rear porch. Scale back.

29

30 Committee Member Lynch: Agree with other committee members. Roof seems to be
31 busting at seams. Have very little living space after the remodel – everything is bedroom
32 or extra bedroom. Make main floor be all living and put master bedroom downstairs –
33 would be nice to have a relationship with the yard. Take garage out and scale back. Left
34 elevation needs work – simplify to keep cottage feel.

35

36 Committee Member Barrett: In the future if there are any proposed changes to the roof –
37 bring photos of neighboring houses.

38

39 Committee Member Hurley: Concern about losing the original cottage.

40

41 Chair Rittenhouse: Looks like an entirely different house with the scale of the project.

42

43 Brent Russell: Is there a consensus to take the garage out.

44

45 Committee Member Lynch: Keep the same roofline and you can still have dormers and
46 will keep the character the original cottage.

1
2 Committee Member Hurley: Suggested rear is the only location for a dormer this size.
3
4

5 Public hearing began at 6:45.
6

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

10 **III. CITY OF PETALUMA TRANSIT MALL, Copeland Street between East**
11 **Washington Street and East “D” Street.**
12 **File No.: 03PRE0202**
13

14 Request for recommendation to City Council for new transit facility.
15

16 Jim Ryan: Presented the team.
17

18 Don McNair, Landscape Architect: Presented the changes to the project since the last
19 SPARC meeting of March 14, 2002.
20

21 Richard Thompson, Thompson Associates: No public restrooms will be provided – will
22 be new restrooms when the depot is renovated. Presented architecture.
23

24 Committee Member Lynch: Asked why fencing is necessary.
25

26 Tom Krackow: Needed a separation between depot property – drainage problems and
27 there is a change of grade.
28

29 Richard Thompson: Creating a layer between projects because of the noise and fumes
30 from the buses.
31

32 Committee Member Barrett: Cannot walk from one project to the other.
33

34 Richard Thompson: Correct – will be a difference of a two foot grade.
35

36 Chair Rittenhouse: Is this a temporary facility?
37

38 Richard Thompson: Was designed it as a moveable facility. May be temporary, depends
39 on what happens with SMART and the redevelopment project at the depot. See it as at
40 least a 10 year project.
41

42 Committee Member Lynch: Will this work for the buses to maneuver.
43

44 Tom Krackow: Will be redoing the intersection at Copeland and D to accommodate the
45 buses.
46

47 Committee Member Lynch: The reason for removing the art wall was graffiti, this could

1 happen with the new wall also. How crucial are the wind screens – design is not for
2 someone of my height.

3
4 Richard Thompson: Am flexible.

5
6 Committee Member Barrett: What about commuter parking?

7
8 Tom Krackow: Limitations of space – will be a transfer center and not a park and ride
9 lot.

10
11 Committee Member Barrett: Defeating the project if you do not provide parking.

12
13 Bryan Albee, Sonoma County Transit Manager: Explained Golden Gate commuter hours
14 and purpose of Petaluma’s transit facility will be a transfer center.

15
16 Committee Member Lynch: Asked about policy, what we are approving here.

17
18 George White: Making a recommendation to Council.

19
20 Committee Member Barrett: Will not be encouraging people to use this transit center.

21
22 Chair Rittenhouse: Have you been directed to do improvements on the opposite side of
23 Copeland.

24
25 Tom Krackow: Definitely curb and gutter and sidewalk improvements.

26
27 Chair Rittenhouse: How much coordination has gone on with the applicant of Haystack?

28
29 Committee Member Lynch: Would the Haystack project redo the improvements you will
30 be putting in?

31
32 Tom Krackow: No.

33
34 Committee Member Barrett: Can we put in conditions?

35
36 George White: Can make any suggestions you would like.

37
38 Committee Member Barrett: Like wind and rain screens – do not want them eliminated.

39
40 Committee Member Lynch: Liked the original idea – new portals are in keeping with
41 that. Don’t like the walls and fences. Simplify the fencing – can we just have hedge or
42 chain link that you cover with vines. Keep the backdrop simple – keep it low so you can
43 see the depot building. Will have same graffiti problems with the new walls. Bollards
44 seem problematic. Possibly a more permanent bollard that can be moved later. Change
45 the windscreen design. Larger letters on the portals.

46

1 Committee Member Gracyk: Like the idea of the chain link – evergreen vine would
2 grow very fast. Like the arched look of the previous design.

3
4 Richard Thompson: What about a steel fence that is plain.

5
6 Committee Member Lynch: Think a living type of fence would be best.

7
8 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Gracyk and Lynch - like the arched look.

9
10 Committee Member Gracyk: Recommend that we develop the depot as a transit center.
11 Glad you put in water fountains. Need more bike racks.

12
13 Jim Ryan: Would be willing to put more bike racks.

14
15 Committee Member Barrett: Need to have parking for users.

16
17 Chair Rittenhouse: First design was fun and whimsical – straight fence and straight wall
18 is too boring. Art wall encourages people do put art there. Like a low fence to protect
19 the vistas and arched fence design.

20
21 M/S Barrett/Lynch to forward the following recommendations to the City Council: 4-0.

- 22
- 23 • Pursue park and ride parking on depot site
 - 24 • Suggest deferring improvements on south of Copeland beyond the curb and
25 gutter. Coordinate with other applicant (Gina Pittler, Haystack Project).
 - 26 • Encourage discussion with Golden Gate to transfer riders/routes to this site.
 - 27 • Prefer original arched fence design
 - 28 • Ask that final design details return to SPARC
- 29

30 Public hearing closed 8:10.

31

32
33 **IV. REPORTS:**

34
35 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

36 **Liaison Reports:** None. Chair asked to place election of a vice-chair on the next
37 agenda.

38

39
40
41
42 **Adjournment:** 8 :10