



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 September 11, 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:** George White, Assistant Director, Community Development  
Irene Borba, Senior Planner  
Laura Lafler, Project Planner  
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner  
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner  
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

---

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of August 28, 2003 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Gracyk, 4-0  
Committee Members' Report: Chair Rittenhouse distributed pages from the Zoning Ordinance regarding SPARC rules and regulations for each committee member.  
Correspondence: None  
Public Comment:  
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.  
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

---

**SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
**COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

**I. DISCUSSION WITH CITY MANAGER OF THE GOALS, OBJECTIVES**

1           **AND ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE WITHIN THE CITY OF PETALUMA**  
2           **ORGANIZATION**

3           **City Manager: Michael Bierman**

4  
5           Committee Member Barrett: Ordinance stated that SPARC meets 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday.

6  
7           Chair Rittenhouse: Many municipalities start with the SPARC process.

8  
9           Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested that the process order be 1) land use issues  
10          through the Planning Commission, 2) site design from SPARC and 3) City Council.  
11          Planning Commission should have nothing to do with design.

12  
13          Committee Member Gracyk: Is a problem that SPARC is not being able to affect the site  
14          design. Suggested finding out what other jurisdictions are doing. Want to discuss the  
15          structure of SPARC – need a system for attracting professionals as committee members.  
16          Need to be careful about the appointments from Heritage Homes and the museum –  
17          would like that discussed.

18  
19          Committee Member Barrett: Received a notice regarding the historic SPARC vacancy  
20          from the museum. Historic SPARC needs specific terms – possibly 2 years. Do not  
21          know if we should limit appointments to design professionals only. Jack's suggestion  
22          regarding starting the entitlement process with SPARC makes sense, however, it's a lot  
23          of money up front for a developer if something is then voted against.

24  
25          Committee Member Kosewic: Inquired about staff changes to projects after SPARC  
26          approvals.

27  
28          Mike Bierman: Agree with the process and forum items. In other City's SPARC is up  
29          front. Council needs to be the final step. The Planning Commission is usually first for  
30          land use issues. Planning Commission needs to weigh in on this process also. Would  
31          like membership that is defined by category – need to have ordinance changes to make  
32          this occur. Possibly come back and have a joint meeting with the Planning Commission.

33  
34          Committee Member Barrett: Referred to the State commissions process – Heritage  
35          Homes and the museum would recommend appointments from the pool of applicants.  
36          Agree that council should have the last word. Feel there is a place for preliminary  
37          SPARC before the Planning Commission. Do not know if it is possible for a non-resident  
38          business owner to be a committee member or commissioner.

39  
40          Committee Member Gracyk: Would like the Planning Commission's opinion on whether  
41          they can comment on site plan.

42  
43          Mike Bierman: Process is very important – City Council needs to be the last body in the  
44          approval process.

45  
46          Committee Member Barrett: The purpose of these committees and commissions is to

1 have public input. Democracy is a good thing.  
2  
3

---

4 Public hearing began at 3:45 p.m.  
5

6 **OLD BUSINESS:**

7 **PUBLIC HEARING:**  
8

9 **II. ROCKRIDGE POINTE, Windsor Drive & Western Avenue**

10 **AP No: 020-030-037, 020, 030, & 039**

11 **File: 03-SPC-0275-CR**

12 **Planner: Laura Lafler**  
13

14 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review of 123 acre project  
15 with 93 acres dedicated to open space and 62 home sites.  
16

17 Continued from August 14, 2003.  
18

19 Laura Lafler presented the staff report.  
20

21 Committee Member Barrett: Stated that she was provided the information from the  
22 August 14, 2003 meeting and she has read it and is prepared to discuss and act on  
23 proposed project.  
24

25 Vin Smith: Site plan was approved by the City Council and that has not changed. Do not  
26 want to accept a condition of approval that includes irrigation of the oak seedlings.  
27

28 George White: Spoke with Ed Anchordoguy, Parks Maintenance Supervisor and Ed did  
29 not want responsibility for maintenance of the oak seedlings unless there is irrigation for  
30 a specified amount of time.  
31

32 Dan Hale, Architect: Presented changes to the project since the last SPARC meeting.  
33

34 Gretchen McCann Will work with staff to address some issues of fencing and driveway  
35 access. Addressed the oak tree plantings – recommended they stay with tree pots.  
36

37 Public comment opened  
38

39 Dusty Resneck: Looked at circulation on Windsor Drive – recommended a loop trail  
40 around the detention basin as a pedestrian pathway. Want signs and direction or kiosk at  
41 Westhaven Drive.  
42

43 Public comment closed  
44

45 Committee Comments:  
46

1 Committee Member Kosewic: Like the overall concept. Did not like fencing on 2A –  
2 would like some variation in the fencing to highlight the architectural streetscape. Colors  
3 are fine – suggested more colors.  
4

5 Committee Member Gracyk: Have concerns about the blind windows – need access for  
6 cleaning. Colors are fine. Curious about some of the door choices - Bungalow and  
7 Cottage style homes, the doors do not seem to fit. Lights are fine. Will let staff work out  
8 the language of the PUD. Like the additional window on house Plan 4. Plan 5 would be  
9 a good option for a granny unit. Plan 5.1 looked like a thin column on the bottom. The  
10 quality of windows is not as high quality as the architecture. Agree with the idea for a  
11 loop trail. Agree to use tree pots and plant in the winter and just see what happens. Do  
12 not want to burden the Parks Maintenance Department. Would like corner lot plantings  
13 to come back to SPARC. Lots 7, 8, 25 and 26 – long stretches that are appropriate for  
14 more variety of landscaping.  
15

16 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with the pedestrian loop and corner lot landscaping  
17 to return to the committee. Not sure about the kiosk. Tree pots are a good idea. Agree  
18 with Janet about the blind windows – do need to have access for cleaning. Do not think  
19 doors are a great choice, however, may be limited by what is on the market.  
20

21 Chair Rittenhouse: Details are important in this project. Fencing plan needs some work  
22 – needs to be coordinated with the architect. Do not see the need for false dormers –  
23 would prefer they be deleted. Support the loop trail. Trust staff to work out the PUD  
24 guidelines. Support the oak seedlings without irrigation and maintenance by the City.  
25 Like the color choices.  
26

27 Committee Member Kosewic: False dormers create a variety in the architecture and  
28 should be allowed.  
29

30 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with keeping the dormers if they have a function.  
31

32 Additional Conditions:

- 33     ▪ Remove dormers with no function
- 34     ▪ Corner Lots 7 and 8 or 25 and 26 to return with the landscaping plan for review  
35         by Committee Member Gracyk.
- 36     ▪ Modify Condition 12 regarding planting of oak seedlings to be consistent with  
37         submitted plan.
- 38     ▪ Columns to have a foundation underneath/detail to be approved by City staff
- 39     ▪ Trail loop around detention basin if determined to be feasible by staff and not in  
40         conflict with previous approvals
- 41     ▪ Fencing plan to be reviewed by architect  
42

43 Dan Hale: Asked that the committee reconsider the condition to remove the false  
44 dormers.  
45

1 M/S Barrett/Gracyk to approve the project with the amended conditions. 3-1. Kosewic  
2 opposed.

3  
4 Public hearing ended at 4:50  
5

---

6  
7 Public hearing resumed at 5:00  
8

9 **NEW BUSINESS:**

10 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

11  
12 **III. REDWOOD TECHNOLOGY CENTER (Parcels A and B) North McDowell**  
13 **Blvd. Southeast of Old Redwood Highway**  
14 **AP NO: 007-411-07, -09, -18 AND -19**  
15 **File: 03-SPC-0204**  
16 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**  
17

18 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural review of an office/research  
19 and development campus that includes the construction of four (4) three-story  
20 buildings containing a total of 262,500 gross square feet, and a 7,500 square foot  
21 restaurant building.  
22

23 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report and a history of the entitlements on the project.  
24

25 Vin Smith: Water Quality Control Board will make recommendations for planting details  
26 on the landscape plan, it will not, however, change the site plan. Went over the  
27 constraints map presented.  
28

29 Discussion followed regarding paving versus landscaping affecting the Hydrology  
30 modeling.  
31

32 Vin Smith: Addressed the bullet points regarding the Preliminary SPARC review in the  
33 staff report.  
34

35 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked about the sunshades on the southwest elevations of  
36 the buildings.  
37

38 Vin Smith: Want to keep the design as it is.  
39

40 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Vin Smith to consider the reduction in parking presented by  
41 the Chair at the beginning of the meeting.  
42

43 Public comment opened:  
44

45 Dusty Resneck: Concerned about the pedestrian circulation. Submitted specific  
46 conditions from the Bike Committee.  
47

1 Public comment closed:

2

3 Committee Comments:

4

5 Committee Member Gracyk: Main concern is site B1 and B2 – this is such a hard space.  
6 Make a green space outside of the main entry by reducing parking in that area, as  
7 suggested by the Chair. Do not have a complete understanding about how the bike path  
8 will work on McDowell. Connections between this site and Redwood Gateway site is  
9 important – glad you are talking with the Redwood Gateway applicant. Want a path on  
10 the backside of these buildings along the wetland area, even if it is just a gravel path.  
11 Will reserve landscape comments until we have final details. Agree with the suggestion  
12 of hooks in the parking garage for bikes. Choose an approved bike rack. Want recycling  
13 bins available.

14

15 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested a circular ramp for the parking structure that  
16 would tie in with the curved design of the “B” buildings. Do not think ADA allows  
17 gravel paths that are public.

18

19 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with bike hooks in the parking garage. Landscape  
20 reserve along McDowell may soften the project. Like Chair Rittenhouse’s idea for the  
21 parking reserve. Agree with Janet to have a more landscaped drop off area. Want a  
22 condition that if construction of the buildings on Site B is not simultaneous – want the  
23 bridge to be built with the second building.

24

25 Chair Rittenhouse: My issues are with the site plan and the over parking by  
26 approximately 150 spaces according to my calculations. On Parcel A – reserve can go  
27 anywhere – 68 spaces in excess of what is necessary. Want to condition that the parking  
28 reserve and the landscaping details are shown on the plans. On Parcel B – propose a  
29 shorter ramp. No easy connection between this site and the Redwood Gateway site. Ask  
30 the committee to consider this change and the size of the parking structure. Agree with  
31 Teresa that during Phase II construction of the “B” buildings, the bridge needs to be built.

32

33 Dusty Resneck: Suggested a path behind the buildings that is decomposed granite – may  
34 meet ADA requirements.

35

36 Committee Member Kosewic: Disagree with the comments on the bridge.

37

38 Vin Smith: Do not want the bridge to be a requirement if the buildings are not built  
39 simultaneously, due to disruption of the tenants.

40

41 Conditions:

42

- 43 ■ Indicate the number of reserve parking spaces and the locations
- 44 ■ Reexamine the landscaping at the entryway
- 45 ■ Bring back landscape plan with pedestrian pathways and parking reserves on both
- 46 ■ Parcels A and B

- 1       ▪ Redesign the ramp and suggested shortening to create entry to Buildings B1 and  
2       B2.

3  
4       Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested approving the location of the buildings.

5  
6       Chair Rittenhouse: Can approve all the buildings except the parking garage.

7  
8       Committee Member Barrett left the meeting at 6:15.

9  
10      M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk approve buildings A1, A2, B1 and B2, with the condition that if  
11      buildings B1 and B2 are built simultaneously the bridge will be constructed, however, if  
12      they are not built simultaneously, it is up to the discretion of the applicant if the bridge is  
13      constructed. 3-0

14  
15      Public hearing ended @ 6:30.

---

16  
17  
18      **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

19  
20      **IV. JAY PALM SADDLE SHOP, 414 Petaluma Blvd. North**

21           **AP No.: 006-163-044**

22           **File: 03-SPC-0413**

23           **Planner: Kim Gordon**

24  
25           Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee preliminary review of an addition  
26           to the existing building located at 414 Petaluma Blvd. North.

27  
28      Wayne Miller: Gave a history of the project.

29  
30      Armando: Went over the parking issues and compared the requirements of the Central  
31      Petaluma Specific Plan with the Zoning Ordinance requirements. Provided parking  
32      reserve at the rear of the site. Presented the architecture.

33  
34      Committee Questions and Comments:

35  
36      Committee Member Gracyk: Asked about the requirements for trees in the parking area.

37  
38      Kim Gordon: SPARC ratio is planting for every 8 spaces; CPSP is planting for every 5  
39      spaces.

40  
41      Committee Member Kosewic: Looks like a 12' clearance. Make sure you have 14'  
42      clearance. Like the architecture, like the metal. The angled first floor helps the  
43      circulation.

44  
45      Committee Member Gracyk: Big improvement over the last design, is appropriate for the  
46      site and the use. Looks as though you can accommodate parking, can you accommodate  
47      the trees. Maybe you can provide some relief with plantings – need to follow the rules.

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

Chair Rittenhouse: Adjustments in the floor plan makes sense for the functional space. Look at net result for clearance to get vehicles through comfortably. Will deal with the landscaping when we have a formal application. Believe you are going in the right way. Do not know if the two bays are necessary. Would like to see a more fun and quirky design.

Armando: Need to consider the client’s desires – the client and his staff chose this design.

Chair Rittenhouse: Be sophisticatedly simple if you cannot be quirky. What is the real detailing? Are windows operable? If you cannot push the design further, keep it simple. Should introduce landscaping where reasonable.

Wayne Miller: Will take the comments into consideration.

Committee Member Gracyk: Need two trees. Do not see a way you can associate it with parking, so put trees somewhere else on the site. The use will possibly change in the distant future. Choose fast growing trees.

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

**V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CENTRAL PETALUMA SPECIFIC PLAN (CPSP)**

Committee Member Gracyk: Want to discuss how Basin Street project came through the process – the perception of the CPSP committee was that we did not consider the committee’s input. Want a report from staff on where projects are consistent or not consistent with the CPSP. CPSP Committee expressed an interest in coming to the SPARC committee – need to discuss this issue as a Committee and would like staff’s input. Want to tap into the resource of the CPSP Committee – maybe a presentation is appropriate.

Chair Rittenhouse: I Believe staff will provide that analysis. Would encourage the CPSP committee to come to SPARC – need to send them the minutes of the meeting discussions.

Committee Member Gracyk: Want the committee’s input about interpretation of the CPSP. Want the committee to feel as though they can participate. Would like to reestablish a rapport with the committee. Discussed a CPSP liaison group.

Chair Rittenhouse: During our review of the EIR, the CPSP and the Basin Street Theater project we welcomed comment from the CPSP committee and some committee members did comment.

---

**VI. DISCUSSION REGARDING SPARC STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION**

---

1  
2 Covered during the discussion with the City Manager.  
3  
4

---

5 **VII. REPORTS:**

6  
7 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

8 **Liaison Reports:** None  
9

---

10  
11 **VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

12 **Way Finding Sign Program**

13 **Tuttleman Accessory Building**

14 **Kinsella Accessory Building**

15 **McDowell Business Center**  
16

17 Committee Member Gracyk: Some residents in historic districts are putting in vinyl  
18 windows – asked about the possibility of a mailing to residents in the historic districts  
19 regarding appropriate materials.  
20

21 **Adjournment: 7 :00**  
22  
23