

1



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

Minutes

3

4 Regular Meeting
5 City Council Chambers
6 City Hall, 11 English Street
7 Telephone: 707-778-4301
8 FAX: 707-778-4498

February 12, 2004
3:00 p.m.
Petaluma, CA
E-Mail: cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us
Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

9

10

11 The Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee encourages applicants or their
12 representatives to be available at the meeting to answer questions so that no agenda item
13 need be deferred to a later date due to a lack of pertinent information.

14

15 Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic Jack Rittenhouse*
16 Historic: Corrine Farez, Michael Iritz

17

18

19 *Chairperson

20

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

24

25

26 Approval of Minutes: Minutes of January 22, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S
27 Barrett;/Rittenhouse 6-0.

28

29 Committee Members' Report: Chair Rittenhouse had a meeting with Gatti applicant and the
30 applicant will come to the next SPARC meeting to try and resolve issues. Met with Jim Carr
31 re: the bathrooms and the gazebo for Gatti Park. Will be on the next agenda also.

31

32 Janet Gracyk: Depot is not in SPARC's purview, however, Paul Marangella, Redevelopment
33 Director, asked some committee members to meet the architect and the landscape architect
34 and made suggestions. Comments were well received.

34

35 Correspondence: None.

35

36 Public Comment: Margaret Kullberg: Am opposed to the corrugated steel on the new
37 building on the waterfront. Do not believe this is appropriate north of "D" Street.

37

38 Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

38

39 Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

39

40 **2:00 P.M.**

1
2 **HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
3 **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

4
5 **I. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF**
6 **THE HISTORIC DISTRICT GUIDELINES**
7

8 Janet Gracyk: Believe there is an issue with windows and garage door replacement in
9 Historic Districts. Suggested a subcommittee to do some outreach and communicate with
10 residents who may not be aware of the historic district guidelines.

11
12 Also suggested a subcommittee to review the current guidelines for clarification and give
13 direction. There are discrepancies that need to be resolved. Make-up of the
14 subcommittee could be members of the community and members of SPARC.

15
16 George White: If a window opening size is not changed, no permit is required.

17
18 Terry Kosewic: Need a review in historic district even for windows. Time lines are an
19 issue – planning need not necessarily be involved.

20
21 Janet Gracyk: Administrative Review – what does the staff feel comfortable reviewing.
22 There are so many changes occurring in my neighborhood – too many vinyl windows.

23
24 Terry Kosewic: Since there are different code requirements should be able to have
25 different permit requirements.

26
27 Public comment opened:
28

29 Chris Lynch: Share the concern about the change of windows in historic districts.
30 Already there are too many vinyl windows – do not want to set this precedent that it is
31 ok. Need to educate homeowners, contractors and window replacement specialists, etc.
32 Want to discuss administrative SPARC versus SPARC Committee review. Suggested a
33 possible subcommittee to assist staff in looking at administrative applications.

34
35 George White: Regarding the windows – agree with Chris we can capture most people
36 with some education and outreach – would need to be ongoing. Regarding subcommittee
37 to assist staff with looking at administrative SPARC applications, we could do that and
38 would want to run it by the committee.

39
40 Janet Gracyk: Want to see that education and outreach takes place regarding window
41 replacement in historic districts. Would want to notify window suppliers and installers,
42 residents and owners, Sears, etc.

43
44 Committee consensus. To form two subcommittees: to review administrative vs. formal
45 SPARC applications; review and update the SPARC guidelines.
46

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

Teresa Barrett: I believe the committee would need to have at least one SPARC member and a historic member would make more sense.

Janet Gracyk: SPARC is a big commitment – could draw on other community members who are familiar with the process.

Terry Kosewic: Suggested possibly reviewing administrative SPARC applications every other week.

George White: Would need to be on an as needed basis.

Teresa Barrett: Suggested trying on a 90-day basis.

George White: Would only be projects that are not clear-cut. Committee would need to seek volunteers, advertise in the newspaper, etc. and then make a selection process at a regular SPARC meeting.

Janet Gracyk: Volunteered to spear head the subcommittee to review and update the SPARC Guidelines.

Jack Rittenhouse: Believe it should be a larger committee than SPARC and should include at least one historic member.

Michael Iritz: Suggested one historic member would assist reviewing administrative applications and one would serve on the subcommittee for reviewing the guidelines.

Public Hearing began at 3:15 p.m.

3:00 P.M.

HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

II. PETALUMA TOWN CENTER (THEATER DISTRICT), 200 C Street
AP No(s): 008-065-002 and 008-065-003
File: 03-ZOA-0260-CR
Planner: Irene Borba

Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and approval of conditions of approval for the cinema portion of the approved Theater District, located at 200 “C” Street.

Vin Smith: Introduced the team and reviewed the conditions for review and approval today.

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

Steve Ohlhaber, Strauss Architects: Presented the details on the torchiere lighting, corner marquee, columns and metal cornices and the ticket vending machines.

Committee Comments:

Terry Kosewic: Overall, I like the project. I like the boulevard sign and the art deco tile design. Do not like that the columns do not come to the ground. Foam and stucco makes it part of the building and not part of the light. Do not know how the concrete will work on the top of the column. Seems to have lost some of its tradition. Seems odd to have an automated ticket booth in an art Nuevo design.

Janet Gracyk: Like the colors and the canopies, want to know what the under side of the concrete will look like. Metal band is ok with shiny metal. Boulevard sign will look nice. I like the top of the columns. Believe the metal should replace the stucco on the lower portion of the small torchieres. Still do not like the Boulevard elevation – too plain. Want torchieres on all four pilasters on the Boulevard elevation.

Teresa Barrett: Automated ticketing is just a reality now. Want to know that the neon lighting is steady. I like the tile on the entrances and deco accent frieze and share the concerns about the Boulevard elevation – agree with extending torchieres to all four pilasters.

Corrine Demil: I like the overall project. Concerned about the lettering of the Boulevard at the entrance on “C” Street – suggest tracing in black. Agree with Terry about the turrets not going all the way to the ground. Would prefer brushed chrome as opposed to the shiny.

Michael Iritz: I echo concerns about the chrome and have concern about the torchiere lighting on the Boulevard – agree with Corrine about the Boulevard sign in front of glass block.

Jack Rittenhouse: Commend the applicant for bringing back details and continuing to develop the design. Want to discuss the bottom on the torchiere – believe it needs to be metal. Like the tile and the color selection, and the metal frieze. Asked applicant to address a vertical element near the exit doors.

Steve, Architect: Went over the details of the vertical element at the exit doors on the Boulevard and 2nd Street.

Janet Gracyk: Like the way the architect is thinking about things. Need to resolve some issues: Boulevard elevation – four torchieres.

Vin Smith: Base portion of torchiere to be metal – metal pole is ok. Adding two more torchieres to the Boulevard elevation is fine; neon lighting will be a steady light. Lettering on the main sign being too translucent – black background or tracing is fine.

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

Terry Kosewic: Change the style of the light and go to a rod, will lose what the light is portraying.

Jack Rittenhouse: Want clarification that bottom on lighting would be more of a box than a rod and consist of brushed metal.

Steve: If luster is the question can get the manufactured – polished on top and brushed on the bottom.

M/S to approve the Theater District conditions for the cinema regarding lighting, signage and the addition of two torchieres on the Petaluma Boulevard South elevation. M/S Barrett/Rittenhouse 6-0.

Public hearing ended at 4:15

Public hearing began at 4:15

PUBLIC HEARING:

**III. BASIN STREET TOWN CENTER (FORMER VICTORY CHEVROLET SITE), 5 Petaluma Boulevard South
AP No: 008-065-002
File: 04-SPC-0033-CR
Planner: Irene Borba**

Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and approval for modifications to approved plans for skylights and a trash enclosure for the Basin Street Town Center (former Victory Chevrolet site) located at 5 Petaluma Boulevard South.

Vin Smith: Stated the issues before the committee related to modifications to the approved Victory Chevrolet building, specifically for skylights, which were replaced, and for a trash enclosure along “B” Street. Vin addressed the issues of the windows on Petaluma Boulevard being replaced and not being true divided light. Mr. Smith assured the committee that the windows would be changed as agreed with a true divided light.

Corrine Demil: Had concerns about visibility for cars and possible collision due to lack of visibility around the trash enclosure.

Public hearing opened/closed

Michael Iritz: I don’t see any issues with the trash enclosure. Regarding the sky lights that have been installed – believe they do conflict with the Secretary of the Interior Standards specifically #6. Drawings show the use of flat skylights, think it in the

1 committee's best interest not to approve the new skylights.

2

3 Corrine Demil: Agree with Mr. Iritz about the skylights. Have concerns about visibility
4 for parking with the trash enclosure at this location.

5

6 Teresa Barrett: Agree regarding the skylights; the most reasonable response to the trash
7 enclosure is probably landscaping. Parking space next to the trash enclosure is hazardous
8 in terms of backing up.

9

10 Jack Rittenhouse: Do not have a problem with the location of trash enclosure. Can
11 possibly cover with fast growing ivy to shield it. Propose a compromise with
12 replacement of the skylights – replace only the ones that are visible when the theater is
13 complete rather than replacing all 19.

14

15 Janet Gracyk: This was clear from the beginning that the skylights need to be flat glass.
16 Believe we are stuck with the trash enclosure – needs to have some green all year around.

17

18 Terry Kosewic: Do not have a problem with the trash enclosure – is necessary. I do have
19 a problem with acrylic skylights on a historic building. Want them to be glass. Visible
20 skylights need to be glass.

21

22 Michael Iritz: I have an overriding concern about the visibility of the skylights when
23 driving.

24

25 Janet Gracyk: Think all skylights are visible from interior and should be glass.

26

27 Vin Smith: The record is clear that this is not on national register of historic buildings –
28 it does not contribute to the district. Do not know if a skylight is a distinctive feature of
29 this building. There was no discussion about the material if skylights were to be
30 replaced. Would be willing to replace the 6 skylights that are visible from B Street.

31

32 Janet Gracyk: That was a misunderstanding on my part about the national register. If
33 they were to be rehabilitated the intent was clear that they would be replaced in kind.

34

35 Teresa Barrett: Staff will evaluate if sky lights can be seen by pedestrians, if so they need
36 to be replaced with flat glass.

37

38 Terry Kosewic: Need to address the six that are visible from B Street.

39

40 Vin Smith: Would agree to change out the 6 on the B Street elevation and reexamine the
41 rest when the theatre is built.

42

43 Janet Gracyk: Do not like seeing the acrylic from the interior of the building.

44

45 Michael Iritz: There are conflicting statements from the Downtown Historic Guidelines
46 and what was presented today at the meeting.

1
 2 M/S Kosewic/Demil prior to Certificate of Occupancy, applicant will replace the 6
 3 skylights on the B Street elevation with flat glass. Upon completion of theater, other
 4 visible skylights shall be replaced with flat glass. when the theater is completed.
 5 Approve the trash enclosure with an evergreen vine. 4-2, Gracyk and Iritz opposed
 6 specifically regarding the replacement of the skylights.

7
 8 Public hearing ended at 5:05
 9

10
 11 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
 12 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

13
 14 **IV. McNEAR PENINSULA PHASE I, Shoreline Trail & Riverline Improvement**
 15 **Project**
 16 **Planner: Scott Duiven, General Plan Administration**

17
 18 Applicant is requesting preliminary review of improvements to the McNear
 19 Peninsula on lands adjacent to the McNear Channel.
 20

21 Scott Duiven: Presented the project.
 22

23 **Public comment opened:**

24
 25 Coleen Mace: North Bay Rowing Club: Want to be part of the Petaluma plans. Believe
 26 the North Bay Rowing Club is a valuable asset to the community. Would like a
 27 permanent structure for the future.
 28

29 Teresa Barrett: What kind of facility would you need?
 30

31 Coleen: Would need an acre that incorporated an administrative office, bathroom, and
 32 boat trailer storage.
 33

34 Mark Niemann: Currently the coach of the junior team – have great interest in the river.
 35 Want to educate the public on the benefits of the river. Rowers’ come from all over the
 36 county – is a valuable place for aquatic education.
 37

38 Terry Wedler: Rowing is a valuable experience for my son as a junior member. It serves
 39 the community in many ways – my son is blind.
 40

41 Brian Rossen: Want to have activity on the river – this project is very exciting and will
 42 be a great amenity to the city. Would like to see a display regarding the old steamer gold.
 43

44 **Committee Comments:**

45
 46 Janet Gracyk: This is a very exciting project, however, this will be a very urban place
 47 when there is development on the river. Do not want to design like Shollenberger Park –

1 is not that kind of a park. Develop now and know that it will be changing. Does not have
2 to always use raw materials – need to go in the direction of Crissie Fields in San
3 Francisco or Guadalupe River Park in San Jose. Art pieces should be integrated into the
4 site as much as possible. I suggest interpretive art that blends with the landscape and is
5 different every time you see it. Believe enamel signs instead of wood for an urban
6 design. Align the livery stable geographically with its original location. Keep
7 amphitheater small. Don't see that this is the appropriate place for the rowing club;
8 however, hope we can find something for the club. Agree with oyster shell paths. Wish
9 there could be different materials than the interlock pavers and keystone walls. Agree
10 with the woven wire fence for now. The trash cans seem at odds with whatever else was
11 going on out there.

12
13 Terry Kosewic: Do not think it would be difficult to match up the livery stable. Will
14 need to have some education inside the livery stable about its original location and
15 function. If you can use the pervious concrete that would be great. Do not know how
16 you cannot be ADA compliant with the paths.

17
18 Teresa Barrett: Am very excited to see the project and do think that Janet brought up
19 some great comments and hope you will take those into account.

20
21 Jack Rittenhouse: Agree with Teresa about Janet's comments. With all the comments so
22 far it seems as though this project will have an identity crisis. Do not know if the
23 materials are quite right yet.

24
25 Pamela Tuft: Asked if the committee had any suggestions for another surface for the
26 paving.

27
28 Terry Kosewic: You can phase something in – use pervious concrete now and phase in
29 cobble curbs. Like Janet said do not try to accomplish everything at once.

30
31 Jack Rittenhouse: The goal is to get people out here. Want effort to go into bank
32 restoration instead of paving stone.

33

34

35 **V. THE 101 CASINO, 5151 Montero Way**

36 **AP No: 007-421-025**

37 **File: 04-PRE-0005**

38
39 Applicant is requesting preliminary review of plans for the remodel and
40 expansion of the existing building at 5151 Montero Way.

41
42 Mike Owen, Calpac: Gave a history of the project and explained the type of casino
43 operation.

44
45 Roger Robison, I-B Design: Presented the design of the project.

46

47 Shawn Montoya: This is a façade design that will be put over the existing buildings.

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

Public comment: None.

Committee Comments:

Jack Rittenhouse: Appreciate that you want to upgrade the building. Floor plan is fun and looks like a card room. Entry in the corner does not really address the flow of the customers from the parking area. Project is very convoluted, loud and way over the top.

Terry Kosewic: The colors are gaudy – understand that you need statements. Columns are holding up nothing. Have the impression that this does not have that much lighting. Do not see how you can incorporate a wavy band that implies motion where there isn’t any. The bright colors with an overlay of diamonds make it too busy. Can achieve what you discussed in the presentation – do not believe that you have done it here.

Janet Gracyk: Is quite at odds with what the community would look for. You have a building with clay tiles on it – be sympathetic to those. You need a total redesign. It is garish – will not ultimately do what you want it to. Is in your own best interest to redesign. Think carefully about the site plan; want to see trees on the freeway elevation.

Teresa Barrett: Agree with everything that has been said. Eliminate up lighting; meet the requirement for landscaping at every eight parking spaces. You also need landscaping around the building. Question the vinyl material being used. Petaluma does not want architecture like Rohnert Park. I understand a casino is not subtle, however, you need to be much more subtle than this design.

**VI. CLOVER STORNETTA FARMS TRUCK PARKING, 529 Madison Street
AP No: 007-041-005
File: 03-PRE-0617**

Applicant is requesting preliminary review of plans for expansion of the existing yard area and construction of a single-story structure to provide space for parking of 60 bobtail delivery trucks.

Gary Imm, Clover: Gave a history of the business and the need for expansion to meet the customers’ needs.

Edwin Wilson, Architect: Presented the architecture.

Steve Arago, CSW Stueber-Stroh: Presented the landscaping – 80 foot wide landscaping band along Edith Street.

Public comment: None.

Committee Comments:

1 Terry Kosewic: Am really disappointed that you had to move your offices and cannot
2 put a second floor on the building to house your offices. Madison Village (across Edith
3 Street) is two-story as well. Two-story office building would be in keeping with the
4 neighborhood. If building a structure just for truck parking, could achieve the screening
5 with landscaping instead of constructing a building just to please the neighbors and
6 mitigate the noise. At least leave the roof off and treat it as a fence. Landscaping plan is
7 good.

8
9 Teresa Barrett: I think it looks good and I commend you for working with the neighbors.
10 May not be a bad idea to keep the roof off.

11
12 Janet Gracyk: Suggest a clinging vine for the screening wall. It shows good will on your
13 part for working with the neighborhood as you have. The overall arrangement for the
14 landscaping is ok, however, want the opportunity for canopy trees on the street. Believe
15 the Victorian box might be tender here. Even if the neighbors don't want shrubs, you
16 may want some groundcover too. Mitigation area offers an opportunity. Tall trees will
17 be critical in this area – consider oaks in the mitigation area. Flowering tree against a
18 dark green is nice. Crepe Myrtle and flowering crab apples could substitute for dog wood
19 trees would work well here.

20
21 Jack Rittenhouse: You have gone to great extent to work with the neighbors. Am sorry
22 you could not keep your staff here. If you really don't need the trucks under a roof why
23 build it? Change to a screening wall with landscaping, sculpting the landscape to create
24 more of a park like area which would change the massing of the building – will
25 eventually disappear altogether. Support the project – just do what you need to do. If
26 you do prefer to keep the trucks out of the rain, the wall that is over 100 feet long could
27 has the façade all in one plane – create some undulations to break up massing.

28
29
30
31 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

32
33 **VII. REPORTS:**

34
35 **Planning Staff Reports:** None

36 **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission : Paula Lane was continued to February
37 24, 2004.

38
39 Janet : Asked about project on Howard Street & Prospect ; drainage at the Baker Ranch
40 subdivision.

41
42 Adjournment : 8 :00