

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

---

Draft  
Minutes

---

Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers  
City Hall, 11 English Street  
Telephone: 707-778-4301  
FAX: 707-778-4498

January 8, 2004  
3:00 p.m.  
Petaluma, CA  
E-Mail: [cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us](mailto:cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us)  
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, Jack Rittenhouse\*  
Absent: Terry Kosewic

\*Chairperson

**Staff:** Irene Borba, Senior Planner  
Jayni Allsep, Project Planner  
Tiffany Robbe, Associate Planner  
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

---

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of December 11, 2003 will be presented at the next meeting.  
Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Barrett presented information regarding the Planners Conference in March. Materials will be sent to all committee members with the next packet.  
Correspondence: Correspondence from Chris Lynch was presented at places for 3 of the projects on today's agenda.  
Public Comment: None  
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.  
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

Public hearing began at 3:00 p.m.

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

**I. REDWOOD GATEWAY RETAIL CENTER, 1363 North McDowell Blvd.**

**AP No: 007-411-020, 007-411-021**

**File: 03-ZOA-0271**

**Planner: Jayni Allsep**

Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee consideration of Kohl’s building elevations (Major Tenant A); and master landscape plan for the Redwood Gateway Retail Center, including trellis element and outdoor furniture.

Jayni Allsep presented the staff report.

Brian Wolfe, Architect: Presented the changes to the Kohl’s design, the trellis elements and the outdoor furniture since the December 11, 2003 meeting.

Vasilis Papadatos, Architect: Presented the detail of the cornices on the Kohl’s building.

Ken Andrew, Studio 5 Landscape Architects: Presented the changes to the landscape plan. Want to provide screening around the detention ponds with trees – sequoias, oaks and camphor trees that are evergreen as well as some deciduous tree. Do not want to plant Boston Ivy on the building itself due to long-term maintenance issues – want to use around the trash enclosures or on retaining wall. Suggested lavender trumpet vine for the trellis’ in the parking area. Increased tree counts in other areas of parking lot, since there cannot be trees on the easement.

Public comment opened/closed.

**Committee Discussion:**

Committee Member Gracyk: Will need to see a planting plan before approving the landscape plan. Want trees with a good canopy on North McDowell, Redwood Way and in the parking lot. Keep redwoods to a minimum. Believe it is a strong move to have redwoods near loading dock. The changes to the detention ponds are good – may want to be able to see in with the interesting changes you have presented. Stay away from photocarpus (will freeze). Vines you suggested will probably work.

Architecture: Is still a struggle – façade of Kohl’s has improved some since the last meeting, the rear is ok and practical, need improvements on the south elevation – need to have sufficient sidewalk for ADA compliance – would be nice to have some more green there – is very harsh. Design is still pretty staid – do not have many problems with the right side of the entry, however, left side is bleak. Will help to lose some of that band on the bottom and increase landscaping. Like the building on the previous plan marked tenant. The first plan we saw had liveliness to it. This is not as cohesive. Glad there are windows now on the north elevation. Need to hear from other committee members on the cohesiveness of the center.

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

Committee Member Barrett: Cannot comment on landscaping – want you to use the approved street tree list. Concur with Janet regarding canopy on street trees. Easement area does need more green.

Architecture: Agree about dead space between Kohl’s and the next retail sign – area looks dead – no windows from the front entry of Kohl’s to the next retail space. The midnight could work – not sure it is good with the tan color.

Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with Janet to make detention ponds an amenity that you can see into. Redwood trees block your view to the buildings. Do need a landscape plan.

Architecture: Is difficult to “dress up the box”. Agree with Janet - prefer the proportions and layering of the other building that says “tenant” on the original submittal. Want to ask to deal with the box to bring sophistication that Kohl’s is looking for and maybe some high tech elements. I like the white against the black. Could canopies be metal, the south elevation is what you will see driving from north to south – do not think that is good for Kohl’s or the town. Can add some additional canopies – possibly criss-cross panels (look at the outlet mall). The long constant rhythm of the horizontal band is problematic. Can south elevation have a change of elevation to break up the massing? Improvements are there – still think it can be pushed further. If we let a building like this with three plain sides go forward, it will set the standard for future retail in Petaluma.

Brian: Want to know if the front elevation is ok. Can come back and enhance south elevation.

Committee Member Barrett: Want to see the landscape plan.

Vasilis: White on the entry is a must for the corporate look. Can create columns as on the right side – need a clear approval of the front façade.

Chair Rittenhouse: If entry was some sort of metallic – slightly more three dimensional – a little more attention to detail.

Brian: Will be a stretch to get detention rod cables. Points for the south elevation are well taken. Would like to leave with concurrence of the entry canopies.

Committee Member Barrett: Gray would complement the building instead of the tan.

Chair Rittenhouse: Midnight, white stucco, white mullions and aluminum canopy cable. Suggest light that will illuminate only part of the building. Return with lighting and landscape plan.

Committee Member Gracyk: Orientation of trellis’ in the parking area and detention pond are fine.

Tamara Thompson: Need to have a building pad by March 1, 2004.

It was the consensus of the committee for the application to return with:

- 1 • Landscape plan
- 2 • Lighting plan
- 3 • South elevation and west elevations
- 4 • Color analysis
- 5 • Change in trellis materials on south elevation
- 6 • Cornice variation on south elevation
- 7 • Integrate metal canopies around corners

8

9 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to continue to January 22, 2004, 3-0.

10

11

12

13 Public hearing began at 5:00

14

15 **OLD BUSINESS:**

16

17 **II. GATTI/STRATFORD PLACE SUBDIVISION, 710 Sonoma Mountain**

18

**Parkway**

19

**AP No: 137-070-079**

20

**File: 03-SPC-0516-CR**

21

**Planner: Tiffany Robbe**

22

23 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
24 consideration of site and architectural plans for a proposal to construct Stratford  
25 Place (Gatti Nursery) – a 46 unit single family and 46 unit townhouse subdivision  
26 on a 17-acre parcel at 710 Sonoma Mountain Parkway east of the future Gatti  
27 Park.

28

29 Continued from November 13, 2003.

30

31 Tiffany Robbe presented the staff report.

32

33 Al Barrell: Presented the changes to town homes, spacing between town homes – is a 6’  
34 minimum to allow operable windows. Pg. A-17 – clarifies what is happening between  
35 buildings. Presented changes to the roofline on the duplexes. Would use plan A and C  
36 for the corner units as they are more articulated/softer. Will eliminate any ‘fake’  
37 windows on the gables, which have already been removed from the SFD.

38

39 Committee Member Barrett: The A.C. prohibition on locating in the side yard shall be  
40 added to PUD Guidelines section 3.13 (not 3.12). The garbage pad shown between  
41 townhouse units is only big enough for garbage can, but not the yard waste container and  
42 recycling container as well.

43

44 Chair Rittenhouse: Need an easement for the end units – when leaving the garage door,  
45 you come to the common area. Need to know what the applicant wants – is not on the  
46 drawings.

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

RJ Wilson: Would prefer to have garage side doors on the end units and have an easement.

Committee Member Barrett: Units 81, 58 and 57 of the town homes and 39 on the single family homes abut 100-year FEMA flood line or have it in the front yard – would like disclosure for those units.

Al Barrell: Addressed changes to the single-family homes, lots 1-8. Added trellis to side entry garage 5A & a new roof gable to side entry garage 5B. Pg. 15 – porch would like it to be 6 feet instead of 5 if they can add the extra foot at toward the front (lots 1, 3, 5, 7).

R.J. Wilson: Can give more room to bay window side of plan 3, 5, & 7, if SPARC wants.

Al Barrell: Lots 9-46: All plans to have enhanced elevations from both sides & rear, instead of just street side but carrying windows, window trim, and material details around. All shutters removed on side unless there are shutters on the front. Then, specified added details for each plan.

Chair Rittenhouse: Where you changed the property line location between plans 3 & 4, does that change the fence & the need for easements? Have an approved tentative map – will the City allow change?

Dan Hughes, Engineer: Yes – City ok with have submitted changes for approval. Fence & easement won't change.

Rick Stover, Landscape Architect: Felt it would be prudent for homeowner to be involved in landscaping – possibly present 3 alternatives for the homeowner. Can use trees from street tree list, maybe Hornbeam. May use olive instead of podocarpus.

Committee Member Gracyk: Doesn't like columns like on 6B. Retaining wall with the fence – lots 1-8. How do I know where keystone retaining wall and where redwood.

Dan Hughes: Is not defined on a lot-by-lot basis. Retaining walls over 1 foot are keystone & redwood where less. Fence would be just behind (uphill) of keystone wall.

Public comment opened/closed.

#### **Committee Comments Town homes:**

Committee Member Barrett: I still have problems with the garbage, yard waste, etc. – do not understand how 6 foot between units is setup. Need more definition for those spaces. Applicant needs to address the corner units that open to common area. No effort has been made to make the end units look any better, 82, 81, 58, 57 – a lot of visibility there. Does not like shallow Juliet balcony.

1 Chair Rittenhouse: Appreciate you have made some efforts. Project has functional  
2 difficulties; guest parking does not work for middle units 58-81. Alleyway will be full of  
3 garbage cans. Everything pointed out in previous meetings is still the same, cannot  
4 support the project as it is – do not think the plan works. I am sorry it is attached to the  
5 other part of the project.

6  
7 Committee Member Gracyk: Expressed the same concerns as Jack. Will be problems if  
8 you cannot loose units. Alleyways are awful, there is too long of an expanse of garage  
9 doors and asphalt, trash day will be awful. Corner units facing the creek are too plain.  
10 Do not know where to go from here. I'm ok with the Juliet balcony being shallow.  
11 Regarding the middle unit with the meter – possibly incorporate meter into fence. Add  
12 detail to door, as you can't hide it.

13 Landscape for town homes: You have shade lots and sun lots and the plant palate is the  
14 same – this will not work. There is not much choice in the shady areas. Specifically  
15 asked for lot specific landscaping at the last meeting. Proposed trees are too large for 6-  
16 foot wide area. In the 2-ft planting areas, plants selected (S-4) like rockrose will be too  
17 large. There are areas where S5 and S2 choices will not work. Needs a good going over.

18  
19 **Committee Comments on SFD, Units 1 through 8:**

20  
21 Committee Member Barrett: Has turned out to be best part. Move balconies to street to  
22 allow 6+ foot depth.

23  
24 Committee Member Gracyk: Columns to porches – want to see detail. Do not bother  
25 with cultured stone, it will cheapen project. You didn't bring stone sample as you said  
26 you would. If units can be moved down since 8 has large side yard to give more space to  
27 bay windows might be nice, but not sure it is necessary. Do line up windows at front per  
28 staff report (plan 5 side garage).

29 Landscape: Detail trellis in landscape plan. Eliminate fence piece on lot 8. Do not plant  
30 large shrubs outside windows. Landscape plan at houses needs to consider floor  
31 plan/location of windows.

32  
33 Committee Member Barrett: Agree to eliminate cultured stone from columns.

34  
35 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with comments so far. Roofline changes present more interest  
36 now. Agree with minimum of 5 feet to bay windows. Agree to eliminate piece of fence  
37 on lot 8. Agree with Janet regarding columns – need foundation and then column – do  
38 not use cultured stone.

39  
40 **Committee Comments on Two-packs, lots 9 through 46:**

41  
42 Committee Member Gracyk: Follow City arborist's direction on trees. Keep pear tree  
43 use to minimum (fire blight a problem), use just where space is narrow. Why is property  
44 line through driveway on plans 2 & 4 - is the 3 feet setback enough to get windows? Do  
45 not like shutters on side elevations even when there are shutters on the front (2A & 4A).

46

1 Committee Member Barrett: Wish you had switched the two-packs that face Norfolk.  
2 Side view of plan 1 houses need to be exceptional. Successful with Plan 1C, however A  
3 and D are weak, B is good however window enhancements need to be fully extended. A  
4 and D should not be plan 1 on the corners or need improving. Need disclosure on lot 39  
5 that they are within the 100-year flood line. Do not like the stone wrap around – need to  
6 continue to chimney (2B & 4B).

7  
8 Committee Member Gracyk: Fencing on lots 11 and 26 – looks as though it is coming  
9 into the middle of the porch, fix that. Like plan 1D best.

10  
11 Chair Rittenhouse: Applicant has addressed the concerns from last meeting. Plan 1s are  
12 ok. No shutters on side elevations (2A & 4A) – only on front elevations. Need good  
13 quality materials and windows, finish them well.

14  
15 Committee Member Gracyk: Landscape, sheet L3 is fine. Want to see lot specific  
16 (sunny vs. shady) landscape plan. Want to see exterior lighting fixtures.

17  
18 Chair Rittenhouse: Want to poll the committee regarding extra conditions or if there is  
19 anything you wish to see again as items to be brought back?

20  
21 Committee Member Gracyk: Landscape plan for the multi-family units. Problem with  
22 sidewalks/grates on Belgrave – will not have enough room for planting trees. Like the  
23 idea of letting townhouse-owners choose landscape plan, but we need to see these plans.  
24 Improve corner townhouse elevations. Want to see the porch lights.

25  
26 All: Agree the alley light fixture needs to be more consistent with architecture.

27  
28 Chair Rittenhouse: PUD Guidelines page 4, last sentence says the Community  
29 Development Director can revise plans & elevations to accommodate market conditions.  
30 Are you comfortable with this or should it be done through SPARC instead?

31  
32 Committee Member Gracyk & Barrett: It should come back to SPARC if it changes.

33  
34 Chair Rittenhouse: Do not want to continue project if the applicant is not willing to make  
35 further changes.

36  
37 Committee Member Barrett: Believe the committee has reached consensus that the  
38 single-family homes are ok, but the town homes are an issue and need substantial work.

39  
40 Chair Rittenhouse: There are so many deficiencies with the townhouse side - I cannot  
41 support the project. If the applicant is interested in revising it, would like to see it again,  
42 if not, then we should vote.

43  
44 Rick Rosenbaum, Delco Builders: Have been working with the committee to come up  
45 with a layout and a site plan that works well. This is a higher density project that will  
46 have issues that are not inherent with single-family homes. Looking for an action

1 tonight. Willing to refine the project details, but not interested in coming back with a site  
2 plan redesign.

3  
4 Chair Rittenhouse: Know the project changed at Planning Commission & C.C. Don't  
5 know if the P.C. is correct body to make comments about architecture & access. I find  
6 plan highly deficient. I would be happy to call for a vote.

7  
8 Committee Member Barrett: Planning Commission did not say this project was  
9 wonderful - wanted problems solved at SPARC. There has not been the give and take  
10 you indicate.

11  
12 Rick Rosenbaum: Tried to address your concerns. Here to fine-tune issues such as  
13 garbage collection, storage of garbage cans and access. Happy to redesign that and tweak  
14 it, but not here to redesign the townhouse layout or to reduce density. Happy to bring  
15 back the landscaping plan if it needs additional attention, but want the Committee to act  
16 tonight.

17  
18 Chair Rittenhouse: Not challenging the density of the project - challenging the way the  
19 site plan functions, how the circulation works, and the guest-parking layout. No attempt  
20 was made to improve corner units. Have no problem with single-family homes.

21  
22 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett to deny the project as presented. 3-0

23  
24 Public hearing ended at 7:00 p.m.

25  
26  
27  
28 Public hearing began at 7:00 p.m.

29  
30 **HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

31 **OLD BUSINESS:**

32 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

33  
34 **III. WAY FINDING SIGN PROGRAM, Central Petaluma Business District,**  
35 **Downtown Historic District and various other locations**

36 **Planner: Irene Borba**

37  
38 The City of Petaluma Economic Development and Redevelopment is requesting  
39 review and approval by the Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee of a  
40 Way Finding Sign Program to be within the Central Petaluma Business District,  
41 Downtown Historic District and other various locations outside the center of the  
42 city.

43  
44 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

45  
46 Jeanne Miche: Gave a history of the project, worked with a committee of diverse citizens  
47 and Pentagram Design. Asking the committee to choose 1 of the 3 concepts presented

1 today.

2

3 Paul Marangella: Introduced Pentagram Design and reviewed the project before the  
4 committee.

5

6 Kit, Pentagram Design: Introduced the project team, John Schlining, Project Manager;  
7 David Asair, Senior Designer; Nick, Environmental Designer. The team presented the  
8 changes to the project since the last meeting and the design charette.

9

10 **Public comment opened:**

11

12 Brent Russell, 202 Webster Street: Believe the applicant addressed all of SPARC's  
13 comments from the previous meeting. Like concept 1 as a first choice.

14

15 Sandy Reed, ZAK, Landscape Architects: Prefer concept 2B, is very elegant. Using  
16 many different types of metal on Water Street and the Theater District. Do not like  
17 concept 1, icons hanging off the poles – almost too much.

18

19 Corrine Farez-Demil, Liberty Street: Prefer 2B best.

20

21 **Public comment closed:**

22

23 **Committee comments:**

24

25 Committee Member Gracyk: Icons are puzzling and not necessary. Do not think concept  
26 3 will wear well. Think concept 2B is handsome. Do not have a strong feeling about  
27 background colors in districts. Plain metal back is my least favorite except in the  
28 warehouse district. Believe the yellow is very attractive. Like the direction on the back  
29 of signs and the connections to the poles. Graphics look good. Will leave it to  
30 Redevelopment regarding banners.

31

32 Chair Rittenhouse: Concept 2B is the best design. Black and metal is a good look and is  
33 classy, can be used anywhere in town. Like the latitude and longitude sign. Am not sure  
34 if the colors in background will denote districts. Graphics are nice. Cut out arrow on a  
35 smaller scale. Warehouse steel pulls in the warehouse district. Can bend punched metal  
36 too.

37

38 Committee Member Barrett: Do not get the idea of the signs. Will these replace current  
39 signs?

40

41 Paul Marangella: The idea is to eliminate the clutter and have some consistency.

42

43 Committee Member Barrett: Districts in Petaluma are so small – do not think we need  
44 signs from district to district. Do not think the icons work. Do not like the banners – is  
45 Disneyland, Stratford on Avon, want to condition no banners. Like the hardware  
46 attaching to poles. I like the universal icons. Do not feel it is a good use of public funds

1 to point to private business.

2 Put the longitude and latitude sign where it actually is. On concept 2B, do not like the  
3 colors. Like signs for the pedestrian walkway. Like back and white – has high visibility  
4 so that you can see. Believe less is more. Want one uniform kind of sign.

5  
6 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked Committee member Barrett if she could support  
7 concept 2B?

8  
9 Committee Member Barrett: Can support except for colors.

10  
11 Committee Member Gracyk: Can we get rid of Factory Outlet Signs?

12  
13 Paul Marangella: Do not know if we can, will try.

14  
15 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked the designer what they think of the colors. Colors  
16 just bring a little bit of life to the signs – may not be understood, however, it does not  
17 matter.

18  
19 John: Wanted to broaden the idea of what downtown is.

20  
21 Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested keeping the number of signs minimal.

22  
23 Paul Marangella: If there is a power source near by, can illuminate the gateway signs.

24  
25 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe it's worth exploring, will leave to your discretion.

26  
27 M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to approve concept 2B as presented with inclusion of latitude  
28 and longitude sign, attachment to poles as seen on plans, graphics finished by design  
29 team, minimal number of signs and replace other signs where possible, no icons. 3-0

30  
31 Public hearing ended 8:00 p.m.

---

32  
33  
34 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

35  
36 **IV. NOMINATION OF LANDMARK TREE, 680 Paula Lane**

37 **AP No.: 006-412-001**

38 **File: 03-TRE-0529**

39 **Planner: Phil Boyle**

40  
41 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and  
42 approval of an application to designate a landmark tree at 680 Paula Lane.

43  
44 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

45  
46 M/S Barrett/Rittenhouse to approve the landmark tree designation. 3-0

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

**PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

**V. DIERKHISING ADDITION, 520 Walnut Street**  
**AP No.: 006-151-001**  
**File: 03-PRE-0540**

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

Brent Russell: Presented the changes to the project since the last preliminary review.

Justin Dierkhising: Want to hear a direction from SPARC before applying for a formal SPARC application.

**Committee comments:**

Committee Member Gracyk: Is a much stronger project. Roofline is more in scale with the house, good decision to omit the garage. Is working with the goals in this historic district. Glad to see the simplification. Glad you are doing wood windows with true divided light.

Committee Member Barrett: Believe there is much improvement – do not have any problems.

Chair Rittenhouse: Project is very much improved. Massing is eclectic.

Justin: Do you want to see lighting plan and palate board?

Committee: Yes.

Justin: Shutters on the dormers?

Committee: Will leave up to the applicant.

Justin: Transom above the doors.

Committee: Is ok.

---

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

**VI. REPORTS:**

**Planning Staff Reports:** None.

1           **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission or Tree Committee have not met since  
2           the last SPARC meeting.

3

4           Committee Member Gracyk: Want to clarify a procedure for replacing windows in a  
5           historic district – would like this item on the next agenda.

6

7           Adjournment : 8 :20