

1



City of Petaluma, CA  
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

3

Minutes

4

Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers  
City Hall, 11 English Street

June 10, 2004  
3:00 p.m.  
Petaluma, CA

7

Telephone: 707-778-4301

E-Mail: [cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us](mailto:cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us)

8

FAX: 707-778-4498

Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

9

10

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.

14

Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Janet Grayck Terry Kosewic, Mary Schearer, Jack Rittenhouse\*

17

\*Chairperson

18

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

21

22

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of May 27, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Shearer, 4-0, Rittenhouse arrived at 3:25 p.m.

25

Committee Members' Report: None

26

Correspondence: None.

27

Public Comment: None.

28

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

29

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

30

31

Public hearing began at 3:00

33

**SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

35

**NEW BUSINESS:**

36

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

37

I. PLAZA SOUTH FACADE - PHASE II, McDowell Boulevard North and East Washington Street

40

AP No: 007-340-007

41

File: 04-SPC-0157-CR

1           **Planner: Irene Borba**

2

3           Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
4           consideration and approval for facade modifications and addition to the Plaza  
5           South Shopping Center (Phase II) located on the corner of McDowell Boulevard  
6           North and East Washington Street.

7

8           Irene Borba presented the staff report.

9

10          Jay Baptista, Architect: Presented the project.

11

12          Jack Rittenhouse arrived at 3:25 p.m.

13

14          Committee Member Gracyk: I am disappointed in the design – was hoping for something  
15          more lively and some differentiation from building to building.

16

17          **Public hearing opened/closed:**

18

19          **Committee Comments:**

20

21          Committee Member Kosewic: Believe it is far better than what is there now. The utility  
22          space between Bank of America and the next pad needs an awning to make it part of the  
23          village feature of the shopping center. This would make the Bank of America really  
24          separate – closet would look out of place if it didn't complement one part or the other.  
25          Prefer colors on the board now. It will be a major improvement.

26

27          Committee Member Shearer: Like the elevation with the 5 colors because it provides  
28          variety. Like the outdoor patio spaces for the restaurant. Would like to see an employee  
29          break area. Would also like to see an area for a bus stop in the future.

30

31          Committee Member Barrett: Believe the applicant benefited from preliminary SPARC –  
32          think it looks good. Would like more trees on west side of building G. Want at least one  
33          more tree facing McDowell. Like the contrasting color at Silver Screen, especially on the  
34          east elevation. The PETCO sign dominates the architecture; however, the building looks  
35          fine. I am ok with deferring the Bike Committee recommendations until a later phase as  
36          long as they are implemented at the appropriate time. Regarding Raley's I like the  
37          windows and do not like the color. Believe the architecture is ok – it is not special,  
38          however, extending covered walkway is a good idea.

39

40          Committee Member Gracyk: In general, I just wish it were livelier. It is pretty simple  
41          and pretty plain. Transition from Bank of America to building G is disjunctive. Colors  
42          schemes will be curious next to one another. The site plan is fine in general. Addition of  
43          small trees at building G is appropriate. Glad to see outdoor seating area at the  
44          restaurants. Have the square tree wells in parking lot near Building G made into fingers.  
45          Along McDowell, the existing trees have a nice presence – am ok with the number of  
46          trees on McDowell if you make the above change. Regarding the trellis work on the east  
47          elevation of Bldg. A - would like the screen from the bottom of the building up to the

1 band – will make a difference on the stark wall. In favor of more various color scheme –  
2 punch up with some color. Transition area between Bank of America building needs  
3 some color to transition it. I am ok to defer additional PBAC items to next phase – want  
4 to look at the bike lane then. Regarding Raley’s – it is helped by having windows,  
5 arcades help, set back upper part of façade if possible – could look like three sections of  
6 building. Believe the bigger scale buildings are the best place to introduce liveliness.

7  
8 Chair Rittenhouse: Big 5 – canopy is not adding to the massing or layering – would like  
9 it more similar to the metal awnings. Think the green color could go around to silver  
10 screen to the other tower – would then tie in with Bldg. G. Trellis elements on the side  
11 need to be more substantial, actually adding an element, particularly on the east elevation.  
12 Feel there are a lot of plastered on elements, particularly on PETCO. Appreciate the  
13 colonnade, benches and bike racks will be good. Bldg. G – agree we need trees on the  
14 Pete’s coffee end. I have mixed feelings on the utility closet. Believe a clear break  
15 between Bank of America and the utility closet is the best way to go – prefer to drop it  
16 down and fade it into the background. Support Janet’s concept regarding trees in the  
17 square planters in parking lot near building G.

18  
19 Commissioner Barrett: Agree to expand grid work on building A. Agree with Jack to  
20 bring the green around on the north elevation.

21  
22 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested integrating the tower element from the corner into the roof  
23 line of Big 5.

24  
25 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested consistency in the signs so that PETCO does  
26 not dominate the center. The columns at Big 5 give me the feeling of an iron work  
27 column which I like.

28  
29 Chair Rittenhouse: Clarified that there will be a master sign program.

30  
31 Committee Consensus:

- 32
- 33     ▪ Prefer the alternate colors presented and want green extended to tower element of
  - 34         Silver Screen
  - 35     ▪ Maintain minimal tree planting as shown on North McDowell
  - 36     ▪ Unnamed plant material brought back to SPARC
  - 37     ▪ Architecture ok except canopy at Big 5 –come back to SPARC for final details.
  - 38     ▪ More substantial trellis at the Big 5, east elevation – return to SPARC for final
  - 39         details
  - 40     ▪ Adding fingers instead of square tree wells in parking lot near building G
  - 41     ▪ Delay PBAC conditions until the next phase
- 42

43 John McNellis: Do not know how we can provide showers. This is problematic for a  
44 shopping center.

45  
46 Jay: I like the idea of mimicking the Trader Joe’s canopy at Big 5.

1

2 M/S Gracyk/Barrett to approve the alternative colors and extend the green tower element  
3 of Silver Screen; maintain the minimal tree planting on North McDowell; final  
4 landscaping plan to come back to SPARC; canopy at Big 5 to return to SPARC for  
5 details; add finger islands for trees to replace square wells in parking lot near building G;  
6 delay PBAC conditions until the next phase. 5-0

7

8 Public hearing ended at 4:30

9

10 Mark Marvelli, Architect: Presented the Raley's façade.

11

12 Committee Member Barrett: Prefer windows that are operable – want the windows  
13 functional. I would rather see this look like one building that stands on its own.

14

15 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested the applicant look at Whole Foods. Prefer more  
16 interaction with Trader Joes, like the brick. Spanish tile does not blend with the overall  
17 design of the shopping center. Agree with the single building concept also. Have fun  
18 with the colors. Not a fan of wood trellis'. Appreciate the 4-sided architecture approach.

19

20 Committee Member Kosewic: It is all one building, should look like one building. Do  
21 not agree with Committee Member Barrett re: windows that do not function – think that  
22 is ok to break up massing. Agree with Jack that the Spanish tile does not fit. Believe a  
23 metal roof would fit better here. Liked the look of a retrofit warehouse building.

24

25 Committee Member Shearer: I like the symmetry. Do not think metal roof is necessary.

26

27

## 28 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

29

### 30 **II. AGENCY SERVICE BUREAU, 696 Petaluma Boulevard North**

31

**AP No: 006-051-030**

32

**File: 04-PRE-0201**

33

34 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
35 preliminary review of plans to construct an 810 square foot, two-story addition to  
36 the front of an existing 1,295 square foot, one story building at 696 Petaluma  
37 Boulevard North.

38

39 Applicant has requested to be put on a future agenda.

40

41

### 42 **III. PETALUMA ECUMENICAL PROPERTIES, 400 Casa Grande Road**

43

**APN: 017-040-015**

44

**File: 04-PRE-0298**

45

46 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
47 preliminary review of plans to construct a 50 unit senior residential community at

1 400 Casa Grande Road.

2

3 Paula Cook, PEP Housing: Introduced the project team.

4

5 Tony Betalia: Presented the site plan.

6

7 Chair Rittenhouse and Committee Member Kosewic expressed concerns regarding the  
8 cost of the project due to the rounded and curved wall design.

9

10 Vera Ciammett, Executive Director, PEP: Addressed the financial aspects of the project.

11

12 Committee Member Shearer: Thought it would be good to have a pull out area that could  
13 be used for drop off on Casa Grande. Have concerns for the safety of the vehicles in the  
14 parking lot because it is away from the eye and ears of the tenants.

15

16 Committee Member Kosewic: Like the tower in the Community Room, would like to  
17 have access to the top. Think the project is different from anything I've seen – the curves  
18 would be great if you can do it. Believe the access and circulation are good – put  
19 emphasis on the entry and keep the driveway as wide as you can.

20

21 Committee Member Gracyk: Initially I thought the entry was on Casa Grade, the drop  
22 off comment I believe was a good one. The curved architecture is interesting; however,  
23 I'm not sure that it would work for seniors. Covered spaces are good for sun and rain –  
24 would like to see more covered spaces as the landscape plan unfolds. Make sure the  
25 community garden is designed well and provide other landscape opportunities  
26 throughout. Encourage you to create lots of places to pause and be social. Need spigots  
27 for people growing plants in pots. Possibly pull the buildings toward Casa because that is  
28 not useable space and this would create more interior space for landscaping.

29

30 Committee Member Barrett: I like the site plan – would like the curved architecture if it  
31 can work. Like the idea of moving buildings toward Casa to have more interior space for  
32 landscaping. Have concerns about the units that are close to the existing house because  
33 residents are far away from the parking. This would make it difficult for carrying  
34 groceries, deliveries and emergency services. Suggest outdoor amenities such as benches  
35 and landscaping.

36

37 Chair Rittenhouse: If the budget cuts the curves the diagram still works. Possibly flip  
38 vehicular sight circulation into the turning circle to bring cars closer to the buildings and  
39 have eyes on the parking area.

40

41 **Areas of concern:**

42

- Hidden corners

43

- Too far to walk to parking

44

- How ambulances access the buildings

45

46

47

---

**IV. KEEGAN & COPPIN INDUSTRIAL BUILDING, 2231 Pineview Way**

1           **AP No: 005-090-074**

2           **File: 04-PRE-00296**

3

4           Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
5           preliminary review of plans to construct an approximately 29,530 square foot  
6           industrial flex building at 2231 Pineview Way.

7

8           Ben Sange: Looking for a direction from the committee if the original design of the  
9           building is still viable.

10

11          Committee Member Kosewic: Trash enclosure stuck in the corner; suggest putting in  
12          lines for a basketball court since it is over parked, one driveway is not wide enough.

13

14          Committee Member Gracyk: I'm not wild about it although it is serviceable. If it were a  
15          fresh application, the street elevation is weak.

16

17          Committee Member Shearer: Would like to see a better façade.

18

19          Chair Rittenhouse: Do not see this diagram as a problem, looking to the committee to see  
20          if they agree. Architecturally: don't particularly like the rendering shown here, would  
21          want to dress it up some. Would like it to come back as an application to SPARC and  
22          work through the issues. Suggested the applicant take a look at some buildings that have  
23          been approved recently. Look at how you want it to function for the tenants and the use  
24          of the building.

25

26          Committee Member Kosewic: Figure out what your minimal parking requirements are  
27          and then create some outdoor amenities.

28

29          Committee Member Gracyk: Building should look like the use – if it's industrial make it  
30          look like that.

31

32          Committee Member Shearer: Want the building to clearly have a front.

33

34          Committee Consensus:

35

- 36           ▪ In general site plan could work
- 37           ▪ Create more outdoor amenities
- 38           ▪ Dress up the front

39

40

41          **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

42

43          **V.       REPORTS:**

44

45           **Planning Staff Reports:** Irene Borba presented a sketch of trash enclosures for  
46           Water Street. The sketch presented was different from what was originally approved.  
47           The Committee agreed that it did not have to come back to SPARC.

1           **Liaison Reports:** Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation to the  
2 council to approve the Riverview Subdivision at McNear and Mission Streets. The  
3 Commission had concerns that SPARC's hands might be tied by the PUD guidelines.  
4 There will be at least two General Plan workshops, June 15th and June 22nd have been  
5 scheduled.

6  
7 Discussion about shower requirements and if the showers are being used. Mary asked for  
8 a survey of businesses that actually use the showers. Mary also asked what the thinking  
9 was for so much corrugated metal in town?

---

10  
11  
12 **VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

13           **Magnolia Place**  
14           **Jay Palm**  
15           **Petaluma Poultry Parking Lot**  
16           **Park Square**

---

17  
18  
19  
20 Committee Member Gracyk: Want to begin putting together a committee to update the  
21 Historic SPARC Guidelines; Hansen House is being appealed, flyer at the dias. Asked to  
22 have a tour of buildings that SPARC has approved.

23  
24 **Adjournment:**           7:00 p.m.

25  
26  
27 S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes04\061004.doc  
28  
29