

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



City of Petaluma, CA  
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

---

---

Minutes

---

---

Regular Meeting October 23, 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](mailto: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, Jack Rittenhouse\*

\*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner  
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner  
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

---

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of October 9, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett, 4-0

Committee Members' Report: None

Correspondence: None

Public Comment: Jeff, Downtown Association, asked about decorative lighting for the downtown streetscape improvements. Presented a letter to the Committee asking for electricity brought up to the trees if merchants want to purchase lights at a later date.

Committee Member Gracyk: Asked what the decorative lighting would look like.

Jeff: Would just be small lights in the trees such as on the river from Dempsey's to J.M. Rosen's Grill.

Irene Borba suggested that they contact the Director of Redevelopment, Paul Marangella, who is overseeing the project.

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

---

1 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
2 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

3  
4 **I. MMM BUSINESS CONDO, 3820 Cypress Drive**

5 **AP No: 005-090-030**

6 **File: 03-PRE-0502**

7  
8 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
9 preliminary review of a 15-unit business condominium.

10  
11 Ed Soul, Architect, Fifth Resource: Presented the project.

12  
13 Willy McDevitt, McDevitt & McDevitt: Spoke about the landscaping plans and the  
14 individual entries.

15  
16 Committee Member Barrett: Asked about the demand for this type of space.

17  
18 Willy McDevitt: There is a demand for small business owners to own their own space,  
19 however, it is cost prohibitive to build a small building.

20  
21 Chair Rittenhouse: Why is parking maxed out?

22  
23 Ed Soul: Don't know the ultimate mix of business owners so we want to have enough  
24 spaces to accommodate this. As we go through sale of the spaces, we can adjust the  
25 parking at that time.

26  
27 Chair Rittenhouse: If the ratio changes for parking will that be deed restrictive?

28  
29 Willy McDevitt: Will be addressed in the CCR's.

30  
31 Committee Member Barrett: Can you cap the office space in the CC&Rs?

32  
33 Willy McDevitt: Yes.

34  
35 Committee Member Kosewic: Did square footage change on the plans we are looking at  
36 now? It looks as though the number of units was reduced from the set of plans we  
37 received in our packet.

38  
39 Ed Soul: We lost square footage on the building – took a unit out in the center and  
40 distributed the extra square footage between the other units.

41  
42 Committee Member Kosewic: West elevation looks good, would like some windows  
43 across the back of the building. When you have excess outside area, you will need to put  
44 a restriction for outside storage in the CC&Rs. Would be nice to have some amenities for  
45 employees, half court basketball or picnic tables.

46  
47 Committee Member Barrett: Have concerns about only two trash containers – will be

1 difficult for some owners to access. Agree with Terry's comments about some amenities  
2 for the employees. Suggested a landscape reserve in some of the additional parking  
3 spaces. One bench is not sufficient for the amount of employees. Am not sure about  
4 placement of bike racks. Asked about requirements for showers if these are individually  
5 owned. Am disappointed on the south elevation – does not take advantage of the area.  
6 Like the idea of matching the landscaping that is currently there. Also like the idea of  
7 skylights and windows on the east elevation.

8  
9 Committee Member Gracyk: Concept is interesting – I believe people will respond.  
10 North and south elevations are appealing. Configuration at the rear is problematic – have  
11 created two dark holes. Agree with Terry's comments about the windows on the east  
12 elevation and restricting storage in the CC&Rs. Difficult circulation of units out to the  
13 parking, units 2 and 13 only have 1 door – possibly have a loading dock that these units  
14 can share. Opportunity to pull landscaping up to east side, will add to that elevation.  
15 Agree with matching the landscaping that is already there. Need to develop amenities for  
16 employees. Can you provide a path to the wetlands and a bench for employees to use on  
17 a break.

18  
19 Chair Rittenhouse: There is a lot of hardscape pushed up against the structure – 40%  
20 over parked. Consider a parking reserve that is landscaping and amenities for employees.  
21 Assume all the mechanical will be on the roof and shielded, provide information as part  
22 of a formal submittal. East elevation – opportunities to landscape and soften rear of  
23 structure, also next to unit #4, could be landscaping where there is hardscape. Could lose  
24 some parking in the front and put more landscaping on Cypress. Exiting out of unit #2 –  
25 is there only one exit?

26  
27 Ed Soul: Is 2400 sq. ft. and only requires 1 exit.

28  
29 Chair Rittenhouse: Possibly change roof height in the back of the units to break up  
30 massing and the dark space. Coverage over the roll up doors is a good idea. On south  
31 elevation, units 12 and 13 – may have office space on 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, explore some additional  
32 windows. How the color, texture, and canopies are done will go along way.

33  
34 Committee Member Kosewic: Unit 2 only a single door – this will limit your ability to  
35 sell this unit.

36  
37 Willy McDevitt: The units may be subdivided into 20 spaces so the configuration may  
38 be different when we come for our formal application.

---

39  
40  
41 **II. IN-N-OUT BURGER, 1010 Lakeville Highway**  
42 **AP NO: 005-060-015 AND 005-060-038**  
43 **File: 03-PRE-0495**  
44 **Planner: Phil Boyle**  
45

1 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
2 preliminary review of plans for a drive-thru hamburger restaurant.

3

4 Ken Keller, In and Out Burger: Presented the project.

5

6 Committee Member Kosewic: Entrance of 15 feet is not wide enough because you have  
7 a change in grade. Have a problem with west elevation where there is a huge blank wall,  
8 suggested adding a few windows. Have difficult time with translucent plastic used on an  
9 awning – hope that is not what you will be using.

10

11 Ken: Will go back and look at something that is not so glossy.

12

13 Public comment open.

14

15 Public comment closed.

16

17 Committee Member Barrett: Traffic will be very problematic – do not think this is the  
18 right location. What about showers and bike racks for employees?

19

20 Ken: We provide bike racks, however, not typically showers.

21

22 Committee Member Barrett: Will need left turn impediments on Lakeville. Landscaping  
23 in the eating area needs to have protection. Too much hardscape since there is no  
24 landscaping on the front of the building. Pedestrian access seems to be in an unusual  
25 location – make it more organic to the site. Suggested trellis in the outdoor seating area  
26 to screen from Lakeville for noise and sun protection.

27

28 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with Teresa on the access – will be problematic.  
29 Need to provide some screening for the seating area – visual permeability, possibly trees  
30 to shade the area. Area across from front door needs more trees. Would like a little  
31 planting on the Lakeville elevation and the front door elevation. Is the lawn in back for a  
32 visual?

33

34 Ken: Yes.

35

36 Committee Member Gracyk: Think the lawn is unnecessary. Avoid lawn on Lakeville  
37 and put in street trees. I like the tree choices for the lot itself. Use windows and glass  
38 block wherever possible. Want to know for certain that Caufield access will be available  
39 when this is built. Appreciate the goal of contiguous access with other parcels.

40

41 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe there is an internal traffic circulation problem – eliminate the  
42 sign at the drive-through exit and broaden curb cut to the right. See a huge problem with  
43 people coming into the site at the northwest entrance. Look at the possibility of parking  
44 reserve – at a minimum 14 spaces on piece of property you are purchasing could be  
45 landscaped. Over parked by 50 spaces. Would like some landscaping in the outside  
46 seating area, the front of the store and near the changing area. Possibly add some glass

1 block. Not sold on the brick you added – do not know if it makes good sense, does not  
2 add anything. Agree with Janet about street trees on Lakeville and the lawn at Lakeville  
3 – do something more drought tolerant.

4  
5 Committee Member Gracyk: Do not have a strong feeling about the brick on the façade.  
6 Appreciate the trellis in the drive through area – circulation and access issues not  
7 resolved. Possibly lose the parking on the western edge. If you have cuing on the edge  
8 where you are staging cars for drive through, would be a problem. Maybe have a lawn in  
9 an area where people could actually sit to eat.

10  
11 Committee Member Kosewic: Windows in the dressing rooms can be glass block just to  
12 add light. Like the brick – balances the north elevation. Make the wainscoting look a  
13 little more functional.

14  
15 Committee Member Barrett: Traffic and circulation on the site are the main problem  
16 areas. Getting rid of parking on the Caufield extension, need to have a bike lane.  
17 Regarding the brick – tough to tie in with neon and plastic.

18  
19 Chair Rittenhouse: Circulation loops will be problematic. Extend cuing to solve some  
20 problems and have landscaping near the cue. Will have the same situation as you do in  
21 Rohnert Park.

---

22  
23  
24 **III. LAKEVILLE CHEVRON, 1000 Lakeville Street**

25 **AP No.: 005-060-031**

26 **File: 03-PRE-0496**

27 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

28  
29 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
30 preliminary review of plans for a service station.

31  
32 Rick Norman, Project Manager, Chevron: Presented the project. Revised traffic study is  
33 currently being done. Suggested reducing the 12' sidewalk width and add landscaping.

34  
35 Committee Member Kosewic: Can understand 12' sidewalk on Lakeville but not on  
36 Caufield.

37  
38 Mehrdad Haji-Sharifi, RHL: Presented the architecture.

39  
40 Public comment opened.

41  
42 Public comment closed:

43  
44 Committee Member Barrett: Need to have the 12' wide sidewalk as protection for  
45 pedestrians and bicyclist. Need a shower for employees per City standard. Plane tree is  
46 ok – City has an approved street tree list. Why isn't the blue on the canopy all the way  
47 around?

1  
2 Committee Member Kosewic: Is similar to the station on Petaluma Blvd. North.  
3 Disappointed with the blue band on the canopy but not on the store. Do not think you  
4 will have the same circulation problems as In and Out Burger. Impressed with the  
5 architecture – it speaks to where it is. On Caulfield, make the sidewalk 4' with 8' of  
6 landscaping reserve. Good use of windows. Blank wall due to location of refrigerator.  
7 On Caulfield, need median, 4" bumper won't be adequate to prevent people from turning.

8  
9 Committee Member Gracyk: My personal preference would be to see the architecture be  
10 something modern – may be the only voice on that. Could you incorporate blue into the  
11 color pallet? Applicant said Chevron will not allow the use of the blue. Would  
12 encourage landscaping and places to sit outside – will improve the experience for market  
13 patrons. Circulation will be ok. The 12' foot sidewalk needs to stay – am not willing to  
14 go against the CPSP on this. Add another tree across from the middle of the east  
15 elevation and add more where the tanks are. Want the trees on Caufield to have  
16 sufficient canopy. May need box trees to provide adequate clearance for trucks. Prefer  
17 to eliminate turf, introduce some color that is drought tolerant.

18  
19 Rick: You are correct so the face of the building is 25' from the property line so we can  
20 do what you are suggesting.

21  
22 Committee Member Gracyk: Avoid using turf, use drought tolerant plants instead.

23  
24 Committee Member Barrett: On the architecture, like the idea of moving the blue into  
25 the building. Am ok with modern. Need to see City staff about requirement for bike  
26 lanes.

27  
28 Chair Rittenhouse: Do need to honor the 12' sidewalk, agree with other landscaping  
29 comments. There are too many competing geometric elements. Like the connection  
30 between the canopies and the front of the store – is very strong and the East elevation  
31 works pretty well. Sloped roof on the back of the project does not do much for the  
32 project – believe there are other ways to articulate. Integrate the trellis vertically from the  
33 ground up, suggest a parapet height change on the South elevation. Circle vents too  
34 much; X trusses too much; good beginning on color palate. Integrate the entry a little  
35 better – too much going on.

---

36  
37  
38 **IV. PETALUMA QUARRY (DUTRA), 1500 & 1600 Petaluma Blvd. South**  
39 **AP Nos.: 019-210-010, 011, 038, & 039 and 019-220-012 & 027**  
40 **File: 03-PRE-0513**  
41 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**

42  
43 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
44 preliminary review of plans for a proposed subdivision, which would include 179  
45 single-family units, 80 condominiums and 64 live-work units, on approximately  
46 44 acres.

- 1 Larry Lazar, Lomas Development, Fulerton, CA: Gave some background on Lomas  
2 Development, introduced the project team and presented the project.  
3
- 4 Tom Grebial: Presented the circulation and site access for the project.  
5
- 6 Packowskki Heinritz Associates: Presented the architectural elements of the project.  
7
- 8 Committee Member Barrett: How do you see this project with regard to the Urban  
9 Growth Boundary?  
10
- 11 Larry Lazar: Would need to go through the annexation process.  
12
- 13 Committee Member Barrett: Project on the urban growth boundary is supposed to be  
14 feathered – do not think it is what the City wants on its urban growth boundary.  
15
- 16 Larry Lazar: We will continue to work with staff.  
17
- 18 Committee Member Gracyk: The site is very unique, with lots of promontories, will you  
19 be preserving that?  
20
- 21 Tom: We think we will be restoring it better than it is now and taking advantage of the  
22 promontories.  
23
- 24 Chair Rittenhouse: You will be creating flat pad lots on this site?  
25
- 26 Tom: Yes.  
27
- 28 Chair Rittenhouse: The county has jurisdiction over the reclamation plan, who has  
29 approval for the grading plan?  
30
- 31 Tom: The county has final approval on the reclamation plan. We will sit down with the  
32 City and the County to see who will go through which entitlements.  
33
- 34 Chair Rittenhouse: How close does the property line get to the freeway?  
35
- 36 Tom: Forty feet vertically and horizontally at its closest point.  
37
- 38 Chair Rittenhouse: Just want clarification of what you want from the committee today.  
39
- 40 Tom: Just want your vision of what you would like to see here.  
41
- 42 Committee Member Barrett: Do not think this is in compliance with the urban growth  
43 boundary. What you are proposing looks nice, is just not in compliance.  
44
- 45 Committee Member Kosewic: What kind of timeline are you looking at from the grading  
46 to the time you build your first house? Disagree with Teresa on the feathering and the

1 urban growth boundary. Feathering was discussed going from an urban area to a rural  
2 area – is not the case here. Am mixed on the flat pads – should have some sloped. Think  
3 the roof height in Petaluma is 25' – I don't have a problem with 35' roofline, couldn't be  
4 all of them though. Do design guidelines for custom homes.

5  
6 Committee Member Gracyk: Do not know if you will be allowed to develop housing  
7 here. Do not think the feathering is so important here. You have a wonderful  
8 opportunity here with the topography. The flat pad architecture is a mistake here – need  
9 to work with the topography – build into the hillside. Do something interesting and use  
10 the site to your advantage. Would like to maintain some of the wildlife corridors by not  
11 developing on the steep edges, want the oaks protected. Appreciate the circulation for the  
12 public and the river walk access. Architecturally, I would like to see you do something  
13 contemporary.

14  
15 Note: Anne Windsor left meeting at 7:00 PM.

16  
17 John, Architect: Interested in getting SPARC opinions regarding flat pad architecture one  
18 vs. another or some of both.

19  
20 Committee Member Gracyk: Rockridge worked with topography. Would like to see  
21 some of both. F

22  
23 lat pads do not play out too well. Is it reasonable to do as Terry suggested and have  
24 some custom home sites?

25  
26 John: A large group of people who like traditional/historic housing. Use of attic space,  
27 atypical, requires more expensive roof.

28  
29 Committee Member Gracyk: Is it absolutely your business model that you do not design  
30 and build the homes?

31  
32 Tom Grebiel: Yes that is our business plan. We take a long time finding the right builder.  
33 We are very discriminate on who we bring in.

34  
35 Chair Rittenhouse: Last statement clarifies what your firm is doing – it will be a long  
36 hard road.

37  
38 Tom Grebiel: May know who the builder is before the project entitlements are in place.  
39 It is difficult to get a builder comfortable with committing.

40  
41 Chair Rittenhouse: Strongly recommend doing studies on the large pads. Pad concept  
42 went out a long time ago on hillsides. If you place 189 homes on 1, 2 or 3 pads on a very  
43 prominent knoll at the southern end of town, I have a problem with that. The site is a  
44 stunning geologic form – may be missing the sculptural quality for the sake of density.  
45 Don't mind density along the river. But the big flat pads are a problem. They would look  
46 like big benches from off site. Work with the topography by cutting in and stepping up -

1 Rockridge is a good example, a lot of split-level homes. Architecturally, really tired of  
2 Disneyesque style. The concepts, proportions and ideas of historic architecture  
3 incorporated into something contemporary can be very exciting.

4  
5 John: Will community support the contemporary architectural style advocated by the  
6 Committee?

7  
8 Chair Rittenhouse: We have been preaching this for the last couple of years.

9  
10 Committee Member Kosewic: Three of the four committee members have been  
11 preaching this.

12  
13 Chair Rittenhouse: In this case, the site is not near the downtown where you have to  
14 blend in with what is already there. You are blending into the City as a whole.

15  
16 Committee Member Gracyk: I think the community can potentially support it. I believe  
17 there are enough sophisticated folks here in Petaluma. Not having to blend in with  
18 surrounding architectural styles is a real strength and opportunity for the site – this is a  
19 unique site which you can run with.

20  
21 Committee Member Kosewic: Did not like the streetscape. Put in some stucco or  
22 Spanish style homes. Would like to see some custom sites and some variation in the  
23 building pads.

24  
25 Chair Rittenhouse: The beauty of preliminary review is that there are no conditions of  
26 approval to be constrained by. We hope this is beneficial – hope on a project this  
27 complex you will come back again. Many projects have come back four or five times.

---

28  
29  
30 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

31  
32 **V. REPORTS:**

33  
34 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

35 **Liaison Reports:** City Manager met with the Planning Commission to discuss  
36 their role. He will be meeting with the Council on October 27, 2003 to discuss the  
37 outcome. Tree Committee planted a PEACE tree at Wickersham Park ; reviewed  
38 downtown area tree planting ; considered looking at various City's regulations on  
39 construction near existing trees.

40  
41  
42 Adjournment: 7 :20 p.m.