



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 October 9, 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, Jack Rittenhouse*

*Chairperson

Staff: Irene Borba, Senior Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 25, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Gracyk, 4-0.
Committee Members' Report: Rittenhouse: Tried to contact neighbor at G Street, Tatum Project.
Correspondence: Letter from CPSP Committee members.
Public Comment: None
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
PRELIMINARY REVIEW:

- I. EAST PETALUMA BANKING CENTER, 181 North McDowell Blvd.**
AP No: 007-340-007
File: 03-PRE-0480

1 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
2 preliminary review of a proposed 5,400 square foot banking facility at Plaza
3 South.

4

5 Michael Way, Gensler Architects: Presented the project.

6

7 Public comment opened:

8

9 John McNellis, Developer: Introduced himself – is available for questions.

10

11 Public comment closed:

12

13 Committee Comments:

14

15 Committee Member Barrett: Like the lit tower, curious about how the red will look on
16 the metal. Too much red on northern elevation – this elevation is the weakest part of the
17 project. Will be important to see how the electrical area is enclosed. Want to see the
18 landscaping.

19

20 Committee Member Kosewic: Have a problem with the tower, like the brick. Unless the
21 electric room is the same construction will have a problem with expansion. Want
22 accurate drawings. Breezeway/alley needs to be studied further – do not make it an
23 abyss.

24

25 Committee Member Grayck: Many strong elevations, particularly the east elevation.
26 Tower is an important element. Metal canopies help tremendously. South elevation is
27 serviceable. Wish the tower could be seen from the inside of the building. North
28 elevation is problematic – is a heavily used right-of-way so will be seen – think about all
29 the red there. Need to comply with the landscaping requirements in the parking lot.
30 Drinking fountain and a bench with a back would be a nice amenity. Would like a
31 planting strip on the north elevation. Would like elevations to match the plans when it
32 comes for a formal hearing.

33

34 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the architect for coming to preliminary review. Agree with
35 other comments. Would like to see how the site plan and the landscaping develop, want
36 to see how you resolve the walkway. Suggested being more whimsical. Like the glass
37 tower – agree with Janet's comment about viewing from inside the building. Like the
38 metal canopies. Understand the branding colors. Look at more spandrel glass as opposed
39 to enamel panels on north elevation. Possibly changing the parapet height east of the
40 blue fin.

41

42 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested making the doors blue, transom height
43 windows along the top. If you were able to open the tower to the inside you can use as a
44 display.

45

46 John McNellis: Would you like the tower taller?

1
2 Chair Rittenhouse: Think the proportions are good.
3

4
5 **II. HAYSTACK SUBDIVISION, Units 1 & 2, Weller Street, East 'D' Street,**
6 **East Washington Street and Copeland Street**
7 **AP No: 007-143-003, 004, 014 and 015**
8 **File: 03-PRE-0482**
9

10 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
11 preliminary review of a proposed mixed-use commercial and 100 plus residential
12 unit project with underground parking garage and public open space.
13

14 Gina Pittler: Introduced the project and the changes since the last preliminary review.
15 Explained the process of an airspace condo map.
16

17 Wayne Miller: Provided some history on the project and presented the changes to the
18 proposal.
19

20 Mary Dooley: Spoke about the conformance of the project with the Central Petaluma
21 Specific Plan.
22

23 Mark Bowers, Resource Design: Presented the landscape plan.
24

25 Committee Member Barrett: Suggested a low brick wall on the East D Street elevation
26 that could be used as a bench for pedestrians.
27

28 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested making easement on the corner of East D
29 Street open space as a Community Garden.
30

31 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked if there was adequate turning radius at the property line of the
32 property that is not owned presently by Haystack.
33

34 Wayne Miller: Will look into this.
35

36 Mary Dooley: Worse case scenario we would lose a unit.
37

38 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested a path across Weller Street perpendicular to the
39 parking spaces – try to get pedestrians to the park and the restaurant.
40

41 Public comment opened:
42

43 Brian Rossen, 100 Mountain View: Excited about the project. Do not know what
44 changed the access to the park. Like the stoops on East D Street and the elevations
45 address the warehouse district. Would like to see some barrel vaults instead of arches on
46 the town homes. Would like more articulation or possibly a 6-story building with a tower
47 element to anchor this area. Would be nice to have a reflection pond area.

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

Public comment closed:

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Gracyk: Asked for an explanation of the linkage to the park.

Gina Pittler: The Copeland Street Transit Center dictated the linkage from the depot to the property.

Committee Member Kosewic: Site is in the center of town – suggested looking at the history of the property when naming the buildings. If required to have roof access it will provide the opportunity to change the roofline – will break up the monolithic style. Have never seen a curved roofline as in the town homes. Do not see any mansard roofs – want some variety to break it up. Suggested looking at a Burbank Housing project near Mountain Home estates regarding outside area – they have lovely small yards. Like the concept and the timing on condominiums is good. Do not know how the City will support all this commercial space. The pedestrian path is very important – commercial space on the path should be similar to what is at Putnam Plaza. Use color and texture in the path to direct people to Cavanaugh Park.

Committee Member Barrett: Discrepancy with the Specific Plan on the town homes regarding 600 versus 1,000 square feet for ground floor commercial – is it possible to accommodate 1,000 sq. ft. by eliminating the parking?

Wayne Miller: Is problematic – hope that we can amend or that there will be some flexibility.

Committee Member Barrett: Seems that the units meet the intent of the Specific Plan. Do not have comments on site plan – is similar to what we have seen previously. Town homes need to take into account the Jerico operation just across East D – is a 24/7 operation. Would like to see more barrel vaulted ceilings in the town homes. Would like more variation in the rooflines of the buildings on Copeland Street, especially the commercial side – pitch or gables, looks to monolithic. More window variation in size and shape, arched windows would be one suggestion. Copeland side of the project is the least successful. Like the Weller Street elevation for the town houses as an anchor – do not see that as much on the other entrances to the pedestrian concourse. Do not have as good a visual as you are heading east on Washington Street from downtown. Do not want white picket fences on East D Street. Do not want the corner landscaping to become abandoned or not maintained – something more urban and minimal.

Mary Dooley: Showed the delineation between the T5 and T6 zones in the Specific Plan with respect to the town homes.

1 Committee Member Gracyk: Many exciting things in this project. Will need to have the
2 discussion regarding the Specific Plan when we are looking at the formal application.
3 Can you make any of the commercial buildings taller?

4
5 Wayne Miller: If we go up we need to go down as well – cannot make the parking work.
6 May be able to get more parapet height.

7
8 Committee Member Kosewic: Building roof line will be seen as you are driving on
9 Washington Street toward downtown.

10
11 Committee Member Gracyk: Site plan is consistent with what we have seen before. The
12 diamond element in the concourse may be unnecessary – is not a big space. Go with the
13 flavor of the architecture, a bit playful instead of historic. Like that the buildings on
14 Copeland Street are simpler – has lost some liveliness – do not know exactly what is
15 missing, however, some of the buildings seem so alike. Building on Copeland that you
16 hope to acquire could perhaps be more of a commercial element – consider making it a
17 T6.

18
19 Gina Pittler: Are you suggesting that these buildings be commercial?

20
21 Committee Member Gracyk: Yes, however, with the look of the other town house
22 buildings – think it is worth exploring. Like the half barrel – makes the interior more
23 interesting. East D Street triangular piece of land is problematic – explore with the City
24 to make it a mini park with some benches. Will be a challenge to make these town
25 homes have a sense of ownership regarding the landscaping – like the small and large
26 gathering places. Character of East D and compliance with the Specific Plan – you are
27 transitioning to the theater district and the warehouse district. You are working in good
28 faith with the Specific Plan. You want to have flexibility because you may be faced with
29 a different SPARC committee.

30
31 Wayne Miller: We are trying to balance the Copeland Street buildings to have some
32 consistency – want to make it read as if it is not one large building.

33
34 Committee Member Kosewic: Change the roof pitch on the gable roof to get variety and
35 put on some arched windows. The continuous band on the building shows you it is all
36 one building.

37
38 Chair Rittenhouse: The border between the commercial and the town homes is more
39 blurred in this site plan. Suggest a more commercial use in the property you are trying to
40 acquire. Delineate the podium buildings from across the pathway. Look at project as a
41 whole and exclude the property you do not own – design it accordingly. Do a similar yet
42 different architectural style. Design a back-up to include this property. I like the town
43 homes, suggest making rooflines different heights. The plans and layout are fine.
44 Suggest a metal canopy over large windows on the East D Street elevation. Town homes
45 are well laid out – would like the City to grant an easement on the triangular piece.

1 The podium buildings seemed to stay with the original site plan and landscaping design.
2 This will provide a great opportunity for homebuyers. On the previous submission we
3 saw an at designing South of Market buildings in San Francisco – what has evolved is a
4 new urbanist homogenous – it has lost the edge. Number 8 on Copeland Street is more
5 successful. Bring the exterior experience to the podium buildings with common decks
6 and private space..

7
8 Committee Member Kosewic: The more diverse a building is the easier it will be for you
9 to sell. Suggested a roof deck if feasible.

10
11 Anne Windsor left the meeting at 6:45.

12
13
14 **III. TECHNOLOGY LANE COMMERCIAL CENTER, Technology Lane**
15 **AP No.: 005-280-050**
16 **File: 03-PRE-0489**

17
18 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
19 preliminary review of plans for a light industrial project consisting of two new
20 concrete tilt-up buildings with associated site improvements on a currently vacant
21 parcel.

22
23 Greg LeDoux, Architect: Presented the project.

24
25 Chair Rittenhouse: Two-ways of ingress and egress is confusing.

26
27 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested leaving the arrows out.

28
29 Committee Member Barrett: Redesign the landscaping in median so you can enter into
30 the left driveway – remove bike parking from there and put closer to the building than
31 reshape the landscape area.

32
33 Committee Member Kosewic: Asked for elevation drawings.

34
35 Greg LeDoux: You have the perspective drawings – the design will wrap around.

36
37 Committee Member Kosewic: Difficult for me to speak on this without having the
38 information.

39
40 Chair Rittenhouse: Are you at maximum lot coverage? You have 3 dead ends.

41
42 Greg LeDoux: No.

43
44 Chair Rittenhouse: Is it 2-story space inside?

45
46 Greg LeDoux: Yes.

47

1 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Chair Rittenhouse on the 3 dead ends. Leave
2 the bike path as open as possible – make it softer.

3
4 Committee Member Gracyk: Buildings are pulled up against Adobe Creek side which I
5 like. Pull parking and plants up against the building where possible. Need buffer along
6 bike path – don't necessarily want parking against it.

7
8 Committee Member Rittenhouse: Building B, Unit 8 is a limited unit. Allow more of a
9 drive around concept. Loop through site or all around the buildings – is a brutal
10 environment with the roll-up doors.

11
12 Greg LeDoux: Explained the building layout and why the units are where they are.
13 Units will probably be combined occupying more than one unit.

14
15 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested relooking at the site plan.

16
17 Committee Member Kosewic: I need elevations for all sides.

18
19 Greg LeDoux: Is the architectural style headed in the right direction?

20
21 Chair Rittenhouse: Is a tilt up building – fine for a utilitarian building. I have more
22 issues with the site, would like more of a campus feeling, a little softer. Find a better way
23 to solve parking and circulation.

24
25 Greg LeDoux: There are some tradeoffs we have to make.

26
27 Committee Member Barrett: Something needs to be softened – bring the landscaping in,
28 preferably landscaping against the buildings.

29
30 Greg LeDoux: Will see what we can do about landscaping against the buildings.

31
32 Committee Member Gracyk: Regular parking in front of loading doors is ok.

33
34 Chair Rittenhouse: Agreed with Janet.

35
36 Committee Member Gracyk: Like the amenities along the creek. Suggested canopies on
37 the south or west sides. Would be nice to have a little more going on with the
38 architecture. Want bike parking at each building and drinking fountain near benches.

39
40
41 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

42
43 **IV. REPORTS:**

44
45 **Planning Staff Reports:**

46 **Liaison Reports:**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

V. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- Gatti Subdivision – public hearing**
- Mishi Building – preliminary review**
- Lomas Development/Quarry – preliminary review**
- SPARC Submittal requirements**

Adjournment: 7 :17