

1



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

Minutes

3

4	Regular Meeting	March 11, 2004
5	City Council Chambers	3:00 p.m.
6	City Hall, 11 English Street	Petaluma, CA
7	Telephone: 707-778-4301	E-Mail: 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.

11

12

13

14

Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic, Jack Rittenhouse*

15

16

*Chairperson

17

18

Staff:

- Irene Borba, Senior Planner
- Phil Boyle, Associate Planner
- Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

19

20

21

22

23

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of February 26, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Gracyk 3-0, Kosewic abstained.
 Committee Members' Report: None
 Correspondence: Letter from ADR regarding the height of the proposed North Bay project; General Plan Alternatives were presented at places.
Public Comment: None.
Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.
Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

Public hearing began @ 3:00 p.m.

34

35

36

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
PUBLIC HEARING:

37

38

39

40

I. MARY ISAAK CENTER, 900 Hopper Street

1 **AP No: 007-170-008**
2 **File: 02-SPC-0087**
3 **Planner: Betsi Lewitter**

4
5 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
6 and approval of modifications to the approved elevations.
7

8 Betsi Lewitter presented the staff report.
9

10 John Sedlander, COTS: Functionality of the building is the same. Presented the changes
11 made to the building to reduce costs.

12
13 Committee Member Gracyk: Feel the balconies on the 2nd floor are the biggest loss.

14
15 Committee discussed the roof materials – composition shingles vs. standing seam metal.
16 At the time of the original approval the Committee’s preference was standing seam metal.
17 The Committee was aware at the time of the approval that the material could change to
18 composition shingles for a cost saving measure.

19
20 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked the Architect to provide details regarding the mesh
21 screening.

22
23 Ho-Man Wong, Architect: 2 x 4 horizontal and vertical posts with mesh screening to
24 provide shelter for the outside dining area.

25
26 John Morgan, Burbank Housing: Vines to be planted along the patio fence for privacy.
27 Gave some background of the project and Burbank’s involvement.

28
29 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about stucco colors.

30
31 John Morgan: Can match Kelly Moore colors.

32
33 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked about the water feature that is being eliminated.

34
35 John Sedlander: On the plans it shows as a circle, however, there will be no water feature
36 at this time. Could be part of a later fundraiser.

37
38 Public comment opened/closed:

39
40 Committee Comments:

41
42 Committee Kosewic: The building looked better before. Asked for a breakdown of costs
43 related to changes proposed. There are no changes in the cost with changes made to the
44 elevator towers – trelliswork and balconies made a huge difference for the visual
45 appearance. Do not see savings on the balcony – there are savings changing from a door
46 to a window. Referred to a Burbank Housing project on East side. Hate to see the metal

1 trellis for deciduous trees – can cut cost by attaching trellis to the building. Maybe the
2 committee can discuss all 11 items from the staff report one at a time.

3
4 Committee Member Gracyk: Difficult to have to take anything away from the building.
5 Glad metal planting screens were eliminated. Prefer the previous design of the elevator
6 tower. If there are enough funds possibly balconies can be added back in. The wood
7 horizontal and vertical posts for the patio fence are problematic to me – 2 x 4 are not big
8 enough. Doubling the verticals might be ok.

9
10 Committee Member Barrett: The financial information presented was helpful. Agree to
11 defer the water element until fund raising can be done. Exterior balconies and kickers on
12 the tower are the most visual losses. Do not know if 2x4 will provide stability and
13 sturdiness on the screening for outdoor patio. Agree with Janet to use trees instead of
14 metal trellises.

15
16 Committee Member Gracyk: My concern on the patio fence is visual rather than
17 structural – 2 x 4s will get lost.

18
19 Chair Rittenhouse: May two main concerns are: balcony at 2nd level and fence around
20 patio – would like that detail on the patio fence to come back with landscaping. Roof
21 was discussed and I think the metal roof looks better and would hold up longer, but
22 understand cost concerns. Regarding the sunshade eliminated on the south elevation –
23 we have nothing presented to see what this looks like.

24
25 John Morgan: Cost of the balconies is prohibitive – we would like to have them as well.

26
27 List of changes:

- 28
29 Stucco or wood on elevator tower – will leave up to the applicant.
30 Come back to committee with landscaping
31 Roof change ok to architectural composition shingles
32 Fountain/water feature – deferred until fund raising
33 Deciduous trees instead of metal trellis
34 Delete exterior balconies – will discuss later

35
36 Committee Member Kosewic: I believe the loss of the smaller balcony changes the
37 appearance of the building more than the larger one.

38
39 Consensus of committee:

- 40
41 Regarding the stucco color – the committee suggested samples be submitted for
42 staff approval prior to application to ensure conformity with the approved colors.
43 The details of the patio fence shall come back with final landscaping plan.
44 Shorten roof on east side – only covering the trash enclosure instead of covering
45 walkway as well – ok
46 Eliminate trellis on south elevation – will review with the landscaping

- 1 □ Delete exterior sunshade from south elevation.
- 2 □ Ok with smaller window on the first story adjacent to stair tower

3

4 Committee Member Barrett: What about the standard SPARC condition for covered bike
5 parking.

6

7 Ho Man-Wong:: Bike parking is indoors.

8

9 Committee Member Barrett: Can sunshade be added later?

10

11 Committee Member Kosewic: The sunshades will pay for themselves later in reduction
12 of energy costs.

13

14 Committee Member Gracyk: Would propose to put sunshades in at a later date.

15

16 Two outstanding issues:

17

- 18 □ Balcony over entry
- 19 □ Sunshades on south elevation.

20

21 Committee Member Barrett: I am willing to let sunshades be deferred.

22

23 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked if applicant could eliminate \$30,000 on the interior to save the
24 above two items.

25

26 Bonne Gaebler, Housing Administrator: We will save the balcony over the entry and
27 sunshades on the south elevation.

28

29 M/S Rittenhouse/Barrett approved building as amended with exception of the balcony
30 over entry, small balcony on the 2nd story and sunshades on south elevation. Colors will
31 be approved by staff prior to application to ensure conformity with the approved colors.
32 Details of the patio fence and final landscaping to return to SPARC for approval.

33

34 Public hearing ended @ 4:10 p.m.

35



36

37 Public hearing began @ 4:10 p.m.

38

39 **NEW BUSINESS:**

40 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

41

42 **II. NORTHBAY CONSTRUCTION MAINTENANCE BUILDING, 879**
43 **Lindberg Lane**
44 **AP No: 005-010-032**
45 **File: 03-SPC-0443-CR**
46 **Planner: Phil Boyle**

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

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee consideration for approval of site, architectural and landscaping plans to construct a 16,250 square foot industrial building at 879 Lindberg Lane.

Phil Boyle presented the staff report.

Rick Brereton, ADR: Condition 3 – would prefer bike racks inside or under an existing canopy. Do not think showers are appropriate for this use. Condition 8, – is this the purview of SPARC or a requirement from the City. Addressed the letter regarding raising the overall building height by 2 feet which was presented at places.

Phil Boyle: The Condition (#3) is that there be covered parking so inside or under an existing canopy is fine; any building over 10,000 square feet requires a shower; Condition 8: This is also part of the Bike Plan – just needs to be a simple document outlining incentives for employees who use alternative means of transportation.

Steven Lafranchi: Condition to pave first 20-foot driveway (under Engineering, #25) is required by the City Engineer and is not a problem for the applicant.

Committee Member Gracyk: Had hoped for larger canopy trees on the site.

Rick: Only other place to provide trees would be along the northwest where it abuts the landscape storage business, 891 and 895 Lindberg.

Chair Rittenhouse: There is 25 feet in the rear – this could be a possible opportunity for landscaping.

Public hearing opened:

Conny Gustafsson: Property owner of 891 and 895 Lindberg Lane. Mr. Gustafsson expressed concern as to how this project and the proposed lot line adjustments will affect his business. His particular concern is the access along the east side (freeway side) of the building via the driveway from Lindberg Lane.

Steve Lafranchi, engineer for the applicant, explained that the lot line adjustments must be approved by the city prior to approval of the building permit, Condition 23 under Engineering, pg. 8, referred to Sheet C2 for access. There will be a lot line adjustment -

Rick Brereton: Building does not affect the easement.

Craig Spaulding, City Engineer: Addressed the lot line adjustment and Condition 23. Concurred with Mr. Lafranchi regarding timing of lot line adjustments.

Committee Member Gracyk: Asked about concrete pad on northeast/freeway side of building – if the concrete was taken out there would be room for large canopy trees.

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

Public hearing closed.

Committee Comments:

Committee Member Barrett: Seems fine – would like a little more landscaping. Do not have a problem with the height change presented today.

Committee Member Kosewic: Do not have a problem with the addition of 2 feet on the roof. Have a concern about the showers – believe a shower is necessary and believe the employees would use it. Glad to see you are willing to give up concrete and put in some trees. Would like to see if the landscaping survives with this type of equipment and storage.

Committee Member Gracyk: On the northeast/freeway side where there is concrete, recommend stopping the aprons and plant some large canopy trees and native shrubs – green will be very important on the site. Crepe Myrtle is ok on the Lindberg side of the building. On Lindberg Lane planting strip, oaks will be ok. Wants more plants along Lindberg Lane frontage than what we are seeing – more groundcover planting. Want one large canopy tree, could be something like Tilia or Celtis tree on the northwest side of parcel to provide some screening between this project and Mr. Gustafsson’s property, 891 Lindberg Lane. Can we have a condition of approval to make sure trees survive for 3 years?

Committee Member Barrett: Concur with Terry there should be a shower.

Committee Member Rittenhouse: Agree about the shower. Also agree with Janet on the landscaping on Lindberg Lane – possibly add landscaping at northwest façade. The 2 ft. height adjustment is fine. Suggested the neighbor protect himself regarding easements and access

Committee Member Gracyk: Suggested columnar trees on northwest elevation, suggested 24” boxes to have some height.

M/S Gracyk/Barrett to approve Mitigated Negative Declaration and the proposed 16,250 square foot industrial building with an amended condition of approval to have a landscape bond for 3 years to ensure survival of the trees and details of landscape plan can come to staff with consultation from Janet Gracyk.

Public hearing ended at 5:00

**III. PETALUMA POULTRY PARKING LOT, 2700 Lakeville Highway
AP No: 005-040-048**

1 **File: 03-SPC-0521-CR**
2 **Planner: Irene Borba**

3
4 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
5 approval to allow for the reconstruction of the driveway entry and parking lot for
6 Petaluma Poultry, located at 2700 Lakeville Highway.

7
8 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

9
10 The applicant requested a continuance to a date uncertain. Barrett/Rittenhouse, 4-0

11
12
13 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

14
15 **IV. NORTHBAY SUNSPACE, 420 Lakeville Street**
16 **AP No: 007-163-018**
17 **File: 04-PRE-0040**

18
19 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
20 preliminary review of a proposal for replacements and upgrades to the existing
21 building at 420 Lakeville Street.

22
23 Mike, Northbay Sunspace: Presented the proposed changes to the existing building –
24 new storage area, new fence. Presented proposed additions to the building: a porch over
25 the showroom entrance and a white vinyl English conservatory.

26
27 **Committee Comments:**

28
29 Committee Member Kosewic: It looks as though you are trying to sell your product more
30 than embellish your building. I may not agree with this style and it will look like an add
31 on because it does not lend itself to the architecture of the building. The additions are
32 better than the building – would upgrade the building so that it looks like part of the
33 original building.

34
35 Committee Member Gracyk: Believe Terry’s comments are correct. Would sell the
36 product better if the building were upgraded to match your product. Would like the
37 planting to be clear if it is proposed. Do not like site plan with plants shown that are not
38 being proposed. Would want a planting plan with the formal application. Tuff shed
39 should not be visible from Lakeville – screen with landscaping. Glad there was a metal
40 as well as vinyl conservatory.

41
42 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Terry and Janet – it makes sense. Tuff shed
43 needs to be obstructed from view.

44
45 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with other comments. Understand the need to display your
46 product. Need to look at clearance, ADA, etc. when you come in for formal application.
47 There are a number of things that do not meet standards. Want heavy landscaping if you

1 are using a tuff shed.
2

3 Committee Member Kosewic: Suggested possibly using one of their own products for a
4 storage building instead of the tuff shed.
5

6
7 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**
8

9 **V. REPORTS:**
10

11 **Planning Staff Reports:** None.

12 **Liaison Reports:** No Planning Commission Meeting or Tree Committee
13 Meeting.
14

15 Janet Gracyk : Suggested a CPSP presentation at a SPARC meeting in July after
16 new members are elected. Would want it to be historic SPARC.
17

18 Ross Parkerson is in town and will be speaking about his paintings at the museum
19 on Saturday afternoon. There will be a reception at 433 Black Oak at 4:00 in his honor –
20 everyone is welcome.
21

22 Committee was presented with General Plan alternatives. The committee will
23 either submit comments to Pamela Tuft directly or come to Planning Commission and
24 make comments on March 23, 2004.
25

26
27 **VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**
28

29 **611 Baker Street Preliminary**

30 **Novato Narrows Preliminary**
31

32 **Adjournment:** 5:40