

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

January 22, 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>

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: Irene Borba, Senior Planner  
22 Phil Boyle, Associate PLanner  
23 Jayni Allsep, Project Planner  
24 Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

25

26

---

27 Approval of Minutes: Minutes of December 11, 2003.were approved as amended. M/S  
28 Gracyk/Kosewic, 3-0, Barrett abstained. Minutes of January 8, 2004 were approved as  
29 amended. M/S Barrett/Gracyk, 3-0, Kosewic abstained.

30

31 Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Barrett asked about the status of the  
Livery Stable. Irene Borba gave the committee an update.

32

32 Correspondence: None.

33

33 Public Comment: None

34

34 Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

35

35 Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

36

37

**HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

38

**NEW BUSINESS:**

39

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

40

1 **I. KINSELLA ACCESSORY BUILDING, 532 Howard Street**  
2 **AP No: 006-141-018**  
3 **File: 03-SPC-0399-CR**  
4 **Planner: Phil Boyle**  
5

6 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and  
7 approval of an application for the demolition a small shed and construction of an  
8 accessory building in the side yard at 532 Howard Street within the Oakhill  
9 Brewster Historic District.

10  
11 Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

12  
13 Brent Russell, Architect, 202 Webster Street: Presented the project.

14  
15 **Public hearing opened/closed:**

16  
17 **Committee Comments:**

18  
19 Committee Member Iritz: All the requirements for the Oakhill Brewster Historic District  
20 have been met. Believe it is a good example for others who may do work in this area.

21  
22 Committee Member Farez-Demil: Agree with Committee Member Iritz. Would like  
23 clarification: will the steps be brick?

24  
25 Brent Russell: Yes, to be consistent with what is already there.

26  
27 Committee Member Barrett: Believe this is a good example in a historic district - looks  
28 very nice.

29  
30 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested the stained glass be dual glazed for protection  
31 from moisture and heat.

32  
33 Brent Russell: Will be putting in an extra pane for energy requirements.

34  
35 Committee Member Kosewic: Regarding the laundry room and drainage: a slope is  
36 required – would be an advantage to go to a pump if you go too high with fill.

37  
38 Committee Member Gracyk: Project is in keeping with historic guidelines – am glad to  
39 see the quality of windows used.

40  
41 Chair Rittenhouse: Happy to see the project is consistent with staff’s analysis as required  
42 and Heritage Homes has also approved.

43  
44 M/S Barrett/Gracyk, Motion carried 6-0.  
45  
46

---

1 Public hearing began @ 3:30

2  
3 **SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
4 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

5  
6 **II. REDWOOD GATEWAY RETAIL CENTER, 1363 North McDowell Blvd.**  
7 **AP No: 007-411-020, 007-411-021**  
8 **File: 03-ZOA-0271**  
9 **Planner: Jayni Allsep**

10  
11 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
12 consideration of Kohl's building elevations (Major Tenant A), for the Redwood  
13 Gateway Retail Center.

14  
15 Continued from January 8, 2004.

16  
17 Jayni Allsep presented the staff report. The landscape plan is deferred to a later date and  
18 is reflected in Condition of Approval #3.

19  
20 Tamara Thompson, Robertson Property Group: Addressed their plans for submitting  
21 SPARC applications for the remainder of the shopping center. Presented two additional  
22 color schemes from what was sent in the packet. Will return to the Committee with a site  
23 plan for the five additional buildings and the landscape plan.

24  
25 Vasilis Papadatos, Architect: Presented the changes to the West and South elevations  
26 with two additional options presented to the committee since the packet submittal. For  
27 discussion purposes, the various color schemes being reviewed and discussed were  
28 designated as scheme #1, #2, #3 and #4, and exhibits were labeled as such. Committee  
29 discussed various color schemes.

30  
31 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked for clarification on the mullions.

32  
33 Vasilis Papadatos: Mullions on storefront are white.

34  
35 Committee had a discussion regarding the south elevation, possible tree plantings,  
36 centering the Kohl's sign and fire exiting on that elevation.

37  
38 **Public hearing opened/closed:**

39  
40 **Committee Comments:**

41  
42 Committee Member Gracyk: Like the black, believe it is more handsome than the red.  
43 Adding additional columns is a good step, also like color scheme in terms of placement  
44 on Scheme #4. Cornice details help alleviate some problems. Do not know if we can  
45 use trellis' or trees on south elevation – can discuss when we see the landscape plan. I  
46 like the resolution of two entrances on scheme 4.

1 Committee Member Kosewic: First drawings everyone liked and when the first and  
2 second were compared you could really see the difference colors can make. Committee  
3 is trying to express liveliness with the façade of the building. Cornice detail 2 helps to  
4 actually lower the height of the building. Agree that south elevation on #4 is better –  
5 definitely need the landscaping to break up mass.

6  
7 Committee Member Barrett: Agree regarding south elevation - #4 is best. Share Janet's  
8 concern regarding trees – would like trellis' if trees cannot be planted. Believe the choice  
9 of trees or trellis' is important on this elevation. Should be on both sections as shown on  
10 #4. Disappointed with colors, black and white is much better – will look even more drab  
11 when the rest of the center is built.

12  
13 Chair Rittenhouse: Scheme # 4 is the best for three reasons: wrapping the cornices gives  
14 the Kohl's sign some significance, spacing of columns helps to change the proportion of  
15 the long wall – cornice #2 is preferred – would like consistency; proportions of the  
16 banking in relation to trellis – more study of rhythm and proportion. Integration of  
17 landscaping will be crucial to performance. Possibly plant Italian cypress or columnar on  
18 the south elevation for screening. How will plants climb if trellises are used – think the  
19 crossed vine (like the outlet mall) work better. What is trellis color or materials? Is it  
20 sitting on pilaster – all these detail needs to be brought out to make the facade successful.  
21 Kohl's sign could be more symmetrical in its placement in relationship to the cornice  
22 elevation. If the trees are taken out of the rendering you have the same issue. Felt we  
23 had come a long way last meeting with black and white and metallic high tech facade.  
24 Concur that the Dunsmere crème and Huntington beige is very dull. Would like trellises  
25 to be metallic if Kohl's has to have the white mullions.

26  
27 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree that a trellis would need to go under the Kohl's sign.  
28 Would like to further resolve trellis and canopy with the landscape plan.

29  
30 Committee Member Barrett: Trellis on south side versus cypress trees – on section where  
31 Kohl's is written would need to have a trellis so you do not cover up Kohl's sign.

32  
33 Committee Member Kosewic: Need to keep in mind that this is a south wall and vines  
34 will grow fast.

35  
36 Committee Member Barrett: Can mimic trellis material in the handrail on the south  
37 elevation.

38  
39 Chair Rittenhouse: Put canopy on the landing to break up massing.

40  
41 Vasilis Papadatos: Understand the anguish about the colors. Regarding the corniced  
42 element – can incorporate Cornice #2, like the #4 scheme as well – gives a better balance  
43 with the pilaster. Metal canopy is supported by tension wires and is not supported on the  
44 pilasters. Can definitely have all metal trellis, awnings a metallic color and can look at  
45 exit doors and put a small metal eyebrow/awning to give definition. Can do a crossed  
46 trellis on the Kohl's elevation – am not clear if you want that or cypress trees in certain

1 areas.

2

3 Chair Rittenhouse: I would defer to the landscape architect. Suggest a diagonal pattern  
4 between the columns – strand wire, with some similar rhythm between higher cornices.  
5 Underneath Kohl’s sign something to break up the massing since you cannot have trees.

6

7 Vasilis Papadatos: Showed an example of trellis that could be used as eyebrow over exit.

8

9 Committee Member Kosewic: Go to a ½ inch pipe instead of wire – look at size of  
10 building. Make it all galvanized. Keep all the cornice detail where you have now – do  
11 not add additional.

12

13 Committee Member Barrett: Asked for clarification on Scheme #4 - discrepancy  
14 regarding what color is where.

15

16 Vasilis Papadatos: Aware of the discrepancy – will make necessary adjustments.

17

18 Chair Rittenhouse: I am ok with cornices where they are, as long as they are the #2 type  
19 only, and the simplicity of the location of the Kohl’s sign.

20

21 Vasilis Papadatos: Believe the comments are acceptable and will enhance the building.

22

23 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with Terry regarding the cables – come back with detail when  
24 you bring landscape.

25

26 Committee Member Gracyk: Need to reach resolution on Huntington beige on Scheme  
27 #4.

28

29 Consensus of committee: Object to the color Huntington beige.

30

31 Chair Rittenhouse: What is shown on color board is not acceptable.

32

33 Vasilis Papadatos: For clarification purposes: the committee likes Exhibit 4  
34 architecturally, black and white at the entries; placement of colors on Exhibit 4 is ok,  
35 however Huntington beige needs to be replaced with a richer color.

36

37 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett approve the Kohl’s facade based on Scheme #4 and subject to  
38 the following conditions: Use cornice detail #2 as a consistent element, primary color at  
39 entry is midnight, color scheme will reflect brilliant white in locations shown on #4.  
40 Applicant to review Huntington beige, find complementary replacement color. Return to  
41 committee for details on: landscaping, lighting (site and building), final color scheme,  
42 trellis element, including pilaster diagonal at trellis’ and canopy on south side and details  
43 of entry canopy. Landscape architect will look at appropriate vines and/or tree for south  
44 elevation; add canopy on exit on south elevation. If trees can be planted on south  
45 elevation, use a columnar type tree. Motion carried: 4-0.

46

1 Public hearing ended at 4:30  
2  
3

---

4  
5 **III. GATTI PARK, Sonoma Mountain Parkway between G&G Shopping Center**  
6 **and Santa Rosa Junior College.**  
7 **AP No: 137-070-074**  
8 **Director of Parks and Recreation: Jim Carr**  
9

10 The Parks and Recreation Department is requesting review and approval of the  
11 restroom facilities and gazebo for Gatti Park.  
12

13 Jim Carr: Gave the background on the community park on Sonoma Mountain Parkway  
14 between the Junior College and G&G Shopping Center. Asking SPARC to weigh in on  
15 the bathrooms and the gazebo.  
16

17 Committee Member Barrett: Asked why the particular restroom was selected as opposed  
18 to the ones presented today at the meeting.  
19

20 Jim Carr: Durability and functionality predominately.  
21

22 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about the gazebo chosen.  
23

24 Gretchen Stanzel-McCan: We chose the product for it's flexibility – it holds up the best  
25 in a public setting. Also it has the most flexibility in terms of siting, colors and doors and  
26 is much more durable. Chose a 25' gazebo – wanted something classic and timeless.  
27 Want it to look streamlined and classic. Attempting to tie the whole park together.  
28

29 Chair Rittenhouse: Would like a broader idea of what kind of a park you are presenting  
30 today.  
31

32 Jim Carr: We are responding to the needs of the public and the neighbors – an example  
33 would be the McNear Park of the East Side. Do not know if it has a particular flavor and  
34 style – just trying to address the needs of the community.  
35

36 Committee Member Barrett: What is the material of the paths?  
37

38 Jim Carr: Concrete.  
39

40 Gretchen McCan: From our meetings with the community, we were asked that life be  
41 brought to this park with an innovative playground, bathrooms and a gazebo. We want  
42 good clean lines on each of the buildings that would have a lasting quality.  
43

44 Committee Member Barrett: What will the weather vane be?  
45

46 Gretchen McCan: A chicken.  
47

1 Committee Member Barrett: The blue on gazebo is meant to complement play area, what  
2 about the green on the restroom?  
3

4 Gretchen McCan: Trying to pick a neutral color – is actually a clay color – felt it would  
5 be neutral and the trim will be white to tie in with gazebo.  
6

7 **Committee Comments:**  
8

9 Chair Rittenhouse: Want to clarify that we are only looking at the two structures today. I  
10 like the park and the layout.  
11

12 Committee Member Kosewic: It is nice to see this happening. Prefer the drawings  
13 presented as opposed to the pictures – is much simpler. Presents a Victorian or New  
14 England picture, maybe lose the bracket work for the top if it is only for ornamentation.  
15 Slope on gazebo and equipment are similar, however, slope on restroom roof does not fit  
16 in – would be nice if you have a sloped roof there as well. All roofs are standing seam,  
17 believe all colors should be the same. No objection to the premanufactured buildings. I  
18 like a timeless design – that’s why I prefer the drawings. The nicer it looks, the less  
19 graffiti there will be. Believe the roofs could tie it all together.  
20

21 Committee Member Gracyk: The drawings are a very big improvement over the pictures.  
22 Did not want Victorian gazebo on the east side and the bathrooms are so plain. Would  
23 like structures with more character than out of a catalog – do not know if that is realistic.  
24 Possibly put money into the bathroom to make it nicer and build the gazebo later.  
25

26 Committee Member Barrett: Janet’s idea is interesting. I agree with Terry and Janet that  
27 the drawing is nicer than the pictures. Maybe the bathroom could be decorated in some  
28 way once it is placed.  
29

30 Gretchen McCan: Building will have some trees in front of it to provide some screening.  
31

32 Committee Member Barrett: I like the simpler gazebo.  
33

34 Chair Rittenhouse: I love the layout of the park. That part of town is new and is very  
35 different from the west side of town. You are bringing it to a modern level with the  
36 playground equipment. Do not think that the gazebo style is appropriate here, however.  
37 Hope the design team will find something that moves forward in time and can still meet  
38 the community’s needs. Think you made the worst choice – want it to be modern, classy  
39 and strong. Building choices do not work for me. The simplest is the concrete one.  
40

41 Committee Member Barrett: My initial impression was that it was the wrong gazebo for  
42 this place. Janet opened the door for spending money on the bathroom to provide for a  
43 nicer building. Believe it would be a mistake to put this gazebo here.  
44

1 Committee Member Gracyk: Would like to have the design team's opinion – would  
2 rather not pick one out of these choices. Can we get a local design that is in line  
3 financially?  
4

5 Chair Rittenhouse: The concrete choice is not my favorite.  
6

7 Jim Carr: When we built Prince Park, we did architectural drawings and it was very  
8 expensive. We waited for a gazebo at Luchessi and it is still not built. To design we  
9 would need architects and engineers and the gazebo may never be built. We wanted to  
10 try to meet the needs of the community, stay in budget and build the park all at once.  
11

12 Gretchen McCan: A manufactured rest room is what it is. We will have landscaping that  
13 will help to scale it down. A designed building would be great if cost was not an issue.  
14

15 Committee Member Kosewic: Gazebo drawing shows 4 sides open and 4 sides enclosed  
16 – is this design or structural?  
17

18 Gretchen McCan: Is a design feature – felt it gave some scale to the gazebo and helps to  
19 frame it in.  
20

21 Committee Member Kosewic: Reduce some features in the gazebo and put the money  
22 into the restroom. Looks like you are trying to back date something – is unsuccessful.  
23 Victorians do not belong on the east side.  
24

25 Committee Member Gracyk: Collective feeling of the committee is clear. Agree with  
26 Terry that the overhead lattice on the gazebo could be different. Encourage you to see  
27 what you can do with the bathroom. Colors are fine.  
28

29 Chair Rittenhouse: Buildings need to represent permanence and that this park is a big  
30 deal on the east side. Do not want to bring in prefab structures; something more modern  
31 would please me.  
32

33 Committee Member Barrett: This is different than Lucchesi – needs some civic buy in.  
34 Believe the gazebo could be built later. I have fewer problems with the bathroom than  
35 the gazebo.  
36

37 Chair Rittenhouse: What I am looking for is a modern gazebo – a metal roof would be  
38 going in the right direction.  
39

40 Committee Member Kosewic: Believe there are other options to make the gazebo more  
41 modern. Can we give them a direction?  
42

43 Chair Rittenhouse: Is difficult to design based on a shop drawing. The clearest direction  
44 I can give is a modern gazebo for a modern park.  
45

1 Jim Carr: Is there a consensus on the restroom so we can move forward and come back  
2 with the gazebo.

3

4 Committee Member Kosewic: I would rather see a restroom that I am not happy with  
5 than to not see a park.

6

7 Committee Consensus: Would like to see the park move forward, however, prefer  
8 permanent structures with a better design.

9

10 Jim Carr: I understand what you are saying, however, I want to move forward.

11

12 M/S Rittenhouse/Gracyk to continue to a date uncertain.

13

14

---

15 **IV. LAKEVILLE HIGHWAY WATER RECYCLING FACILITY,**  
16 **4104 Lakeville Highway**  
17 **File: 04-PRE-0020**

18

19 The Water Resources and Conservation Department is requesting a preliminary  
20 Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review of plans to construct a new  
21 wastewater treatment facility.

22

23 Margaret Orr: Gave a brief overview of the project and presented the team.

24

25 Doug Wayne: Gave an overview of the site plan.

26

27 Sandy Reed, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.

28

29 Karen Burks, Architect: Presented the architecture for the maintenance and operations  
30 buildings, approximately 15,000 square feet. The City's goal is to make it a LEED  
31 certified building.

32

33 **Committee Comments:**

34

35 Committee Member Barrett: This is a very exciting project – glad to have a LEED  
36 certified building in town. Looks as though it is going in the right direction.

37

38 Committee Member Gracyk: I was able to have a tour of the site today. The tone of the  
39 team is very evident – they are reaching high. Agree it is good to have a LEED certified  
40 building. I like the architecture – am happy to see the buildings are designed for the uses.  
41 The project may want to incorporate a bike bath on Lakeville even if it does not go  
42 anywhere now, it may in the future. Hedgerow is a good choice for landscaping. Hope  
43 there will be options to provide other kinds of paths – is nice to have some choices when  
44 walking as opposed retracing your steps. I am excited about the agricultural component.  
45 The team has thought about every aspect of the project.

46

1 Committee Member Kosewic: I like the architecture – nice to see a green roof, however,  
2 one big building with no eve looks incomplete to me. This would be a perfect place to  
3 have a lush park – make it a destination for people. Don't agree with a bike path on  
4 Lakeville – is too dangerous.

5  
6 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the project team for coming to a preliminary review,  
7 particularly on a project of this size. Am familiar with Patricia Johanson – her work is  
8 very good. Commend the architects for the thought put into the buildings. The style and  
9 adjacency of the buildings work. Appreciate the attention to detail, solar screens, and  
10 orientation of building components. Think it will be exceptional when it is done. LEED  
11 certification will be an amazing extra to that. Want to see the same level of attention into  
12 the processing plant. The whole integration of the site may be one of the best field trips  
13 for our school children.

---

14  
15  
16 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

17  
18 **IV. REPORTS:**

19  
20 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

21  
22 **Liaison Reports:**

23 **Planning Commission:** Paula Lane finished public comment

24 **Tree Committee;** The committee met, however, Teresa Barrett did not attend.

25  
26 Committee Member Gracyk : Asked if the Committee would be discussing the historic  
27 guidelines.

28  
29 Irene Borba : Asked if the committee wanted to meet earlier and what specifically they  
30 would like to discuss in addition to window replacement in historic districts.

31  
32 Committee Member Gracyk: Need to deal with window replacement immediately.  
33 Possibly establish a committee to work on the guidelines. Initial discussion would be  
34 committee business. Also, Committee Member Barrett had suggested a joint meeting  
35 with the Planning Commission since the adoption of the Central Petaluma Specific Plan.

36  
37 Irene Borba: Will not schedule a joint meeting until there is a change in policy.

38  
39 Adjournment : 6 :53