



# City of Petaluma, CA

## Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee *and* Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee

5

---

---

### Minutes

---

---

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  
48  
49

Regular Meeting Thursday, May 27, 2004  
City Council Chambers 3:00 p.m.  
City Hall, 11 English Street Petaluma, CA  
Telephone: 707-778-4301 E-Mail: [cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us](mailto:cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us)  
FAX: 707-778-4498 Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

---

---

The Site Plan and Architectural Review and the Historic and Cultural Preservation Committees encourage 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:** SPARC: Teresa Barrett, Janet Gracyk, Terry Kosewic, Jack Rittenhouse,\*  
Mary Shearer  
Historic: Corrine Farez-Demil  
Absent: Michael Iritz

**Staff:** Irene Borba, Senior Planner  
Kim Gordon, Assistant Planner

\* Chairperson

---

**Approval of Minutes:** Minutes of May 13, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Shearer, 6-0, Iritz absent.

**Committee Members' Report:** None

**Correspondence:** Staff noted late mail at places.

**Legal Recourse Statement:** Persons commenting orally or in writing are advised to raise all pertinent issues at this stage of review so that possible solutions may be implemented or adopted at the earliest opportunity. If you challenge the action taken by the City of Petaluma in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised during the public review process, or in written correspondence delivered to the City at or prior to the conclusion of the public review process.

**Appeal Statement:** Within fourteen (14) calendar days following the date of a decision of the Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee, the decision may be appealed to the City Council by the applicant or by any other interested party. If no appeal is made within that time, the decision shall be final. An appeal shall be addressed to the Council in writing and shall be filed with the City Clerk. The appeal shall state specifically the grounds for the appeal and the relief sought by the appellant. Said appeal shall be accompanied by the appeal fee as specified by Resolution 2002-114 N.C.S. as adopted by the City Council.

**Public Comment:** (15 minutes maximum). None.

1 The Committee will hear public comments only on matters over which they have  
2 jurisdiction. There will be no Committee discussion or action. The chairman will allot no  
3 more than five minutes to any individual. If more than three persons wish to speak their time  
4 will be allotted so that the total amount of time allocated to this agenda item will be 15  
5 minutes.

---

6  
7  
8 **HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**  
9 **OLD BUSINESS:**

10  
11 **I. BASIN STREET THEATER DISTRICT, 209, 219, 301, 311, AND 317 First**  
12 **Street**  
13 **AP No: 008-121-007, 009, 010, 011, and 012**  
14 **File: 03-ZOA-0260-CR**  
15 **Planner: Irene Borba**

16  
17 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review of  
18 conditions of approval for the Rivertown Apartments portion of the Basin Street  
19 Theater District project to be located at 209, 219, 301, 311, and 317 First Street.

20  
21 Irene Borba presented the staff report.

22  
23 Paul Andronico: Basin Street Properties presented the proposal for the “ghosting” and  
24 also requested that the condition regarding the windows be addressed, stating that the  
25 windows would be a milled aluminum with a mat finish.

26  
27 Committee member Barrett asked if the windows would be one color because the  
28 elevations show different colors.

29  
30 Mr. Andronico stated yes they would be one color.

31  
32 Committee Member Barrett asked what the “ghosting” material proposed is.

33  
34 Mr. Andronico explained that it is a 10” tubular steel material and that it is hollow.

35  
36 Committee Member Shearer asked if all of the frames for the windows would be a mat  
37 finish and that the glass would be clear, she was concerned about reflection.

38  
39 Mr. Andronico stated that the yes and that the glass would be clear.

40  
41 Committee Member Kosewic commented that originally when we talked about this, that  
42 you were worried about constructing something that could withstand earthquakes. Is  
43 making this earthquake proof a difficult thing? Did someone research doing a covered  
44 walkway to the river or something like that?

45  
46 Vin Smith, Basin Street Properties: Responded stating that we were reading the  
47 condition, and we looked at connecting this structure to the building itself. This solution  
48 is cost effective and we feel it meets the intent of the condition. We looked at a covered  
49 walkway but because of fire access concerns, that didn’t seem feasible. What we got out  
50 of this was that we were to follow the outline of the gables along the riverfront.

1 Committee Member Barrett provided some pictures and asked if any of the warehouses  
2 had already been taken down. The pictures showed six gables not five.

3

4 Mr. Smith noted that none of the warehouses have been removed and explained the  
5 pictures and the gables.

6

7 Committee Member Barrett stated that the “ghosting” as shown is not where the actual  
8 warehouses are now?

9

10 Mr. Smith noted that is not correct, the “ghosting” except for a portion of the first  
11 warehouse is where they are. Mr. Smith explained the diagram that was provided at the  
12 meeting.

13

14 Committee Member Barrett requested an explanation of how these structures interact  
15 with the path.

16

17 Mr. Smith noted that it’s not on the path at all because of security and fire access.

18

19 Committee Member Barrett asked if this kind of steel can be etched/engraved?

20

21 Mr. Smith responded that he believed it could be or a plaque could also be attached to the  
22 structure.

23

24 Committee Member Demil asked what the distance was from the structure to the  
25 apartments?

26

27 Mr. Smith responded, that it varies and that they are trying to keep close to the location of  
28 the original buildings.

29

30 Committee Member Demil asked what is going on in between the buildings?

31

32 Mr. Smith responded that it is a public park.

33

34 Committee Member Gracyk asked about attaching metal mesh to the structure.

35

36 Mr. Smith responded that the 10” steel structure is good given wind loads and then  
37 adding to that structure would make it more difficult from a structural standpoint to  
38 construct.

39

40 Committee Member Gracyk asked if metal structure could be attached to the apartments.

41

42 Mr. Andronico stated that they had explored attaching them to the building and it wasn’t  
43 feasible.

44

45 Committee Member Barrett asked that the applicant to respond to the letters from  
46 Katherine Rinehart and Marianne Hurley.

47

48 Shawn Montoya responded to the question stating that he was aware of their concerns  
49 and that he had been working with them to satisfy those concerns and they will put the  
50 required documentation together.

1  
2 Committee Member Shearer asked what Mr. Montoya was referring to when he spoke of  
3 the signs.

4  
5 Mr. Montoya was referring to the signs on the side of the existing warehouse structures.

6  
7 Chair Rittenhouse asked who designed the proposal.

8  
9 Mr. Smith responded that the architects that designed the apartments design the  
10 “ghosting”.

11  
12 Chair Rittenhouse asked if they pursued this with a landscape architect?

13  
14 Mr. Smith responded no, we thought the condition was specific and did what it said.

15  
16 Public Comment Opened:

17  
18 Stuart Hyde, 800 Middlefield Drive: Stated that the “ghosting” is unacceptable and that  
19 more historic buildings are being lost. Basin Street owes it to the community to do more,  
20 anything is possible if you have money. Mr. Hyde showed a picture from a book of what  
21 the warehouses should look like.

22  
23 Chris Stevick, 28 Liberty Street: Stated that the “ghosting” is an attempt to show the  
24 warehouses, but that as designed would have to be explained. It doesn’t capture what  
25 will be lost. People most affected by the arches will be those living in the apartments.  
26 Money could be better utilized for other things. Basin Street should put up some money  
27 for other things that would benefit the community. Maybe make a model, can’t see the  
28 merit in this.

29  
30 Patricia Tuttle Brown: Questioned if there is a fence between the path and the apartments  
31 and if the “ghosting” more or less is where the existing building are?

32  
33 Mr. Smith responded there is no fencing and yes they are in location of the existing  
34 warehouses.

35  
36 Ms. Brown continued and stated that the CPSP was not in print when this went through  
37 and referred and read language from the CPSP regarding the warehouse district. She  
38 stated that we have violated the CPSP and that the buildings should not be removed. She  
39 also stated that if removed, the front of the buildings should be removed and reused on  
40 the new buildings. The “ghosting” as proposed is pitiful. We can ask for something  
41 fabulous and we shouldn’t be afraid to ask for more.

42  
43 Teresa Barnard, 216 Keokuk Street: She asked who thought this design up and stated that  
44 this seemed bizarre.

45  
46 Public Comment Closed

47  
48 Committee Member Kosewic: “Ghosting” was the idea of Chris Lynch. The structures  
49 as proposed don’t really mean anything. The warehouse district is significant for  
50 Petaluma. Basin Street has to answer the question what was there if these structures are

1 demolished. There are things in this area that are unique such as the quell wall and the  
2 signs on the sides of the buildings, what is unique is the nostalgia. We can't keep  
3 everything the way it was, we need to be economically viable and also preserve our  
4 history. Don't agree with the color of the metal. It is Basin Streets responsibility to  
5 preserve the history in some way.

6  
7 Committee Member Gracyk asked Committee member Kosewic if he thought the design  
8 was suitable.

9  
10 Committee Member Kosewic responded that it is not what I'd like to see, but that he  
11 can't come up with anything else.

12  
13 Committee Member Gracyk: I was not an advocate for the buildings being demolished.  
14 You could have maintained the forms and made something wonderful. You could have  
15 created something more interesting. The proposal is weak. Work with a sculptor and/or  
16 landscape architect to make it more meaningful. A design that raises a question is fine  
17 and to answer it later is ok. Have something nearby with a historical marker. With  
18 regards to the windows, the milled aluminum is fine. Work with Marianne Hurley and  
19 Katherine Rinehart as well as Heritage Homes and the Museum to ensure that the  
20 documentation is appropriate. It is not our job to design it, but what we can say is that  
21 this is not acceptable.

22  
23 Committee Member Barrett: Do not think the "ghosting" meets the condition of approval.  
24 Ms. Barrett read the condition of approval. She stated that it is a challenge and that there  
25 has to be a 3 dimensional structure here. In general, I don't mind where it is, but it needs  
26 more. Concerned with how it interacts with the pedestrian path. Hunt and Beren's sign  
27 needs to be preserved and not moved to another site. There is a parallel we draw between  
28 this sign and the coke and chicken sign on Kentucky Street. This area will be seen more  
29 and more. Since not saving the buildings, we need more. Milled aluminum windows are  
30 fine.

31  
32 Committee Member Gracyk: Agreed that it would be ok to have historic information  
33 etched on the structures.

34  
35 Committee Member Kosewic agreed that the windows are fine.

36  
37 Committee Member Shearer: Glad to see some effort being made to maintain the area.  
38 Surprised to see the dilapidated condition of the existing buildings. Like that SPARC had  
39 wanted to see something preserved from the past. Our people are going to look at this  
40 and think this is some form of modern art and not know it is really is about a historical  
41 remembrance. Don't care for the metal mesh being added to it. Like the idea of letting it  
42 rust. A new development of this sort can recognize the past.

43  
44 Committee Member Demil: Demolition of the buildings is hard for me but I was not part  
45 of the committee at that time. Would like to see pictures/displays in the park area. As far  
46 as the materials, I don't think we are there yet. Would like to see the material be able to  
47 rust. Would like to see something in a 3 dimensional scale. Don't support the idea of a  
48 screen mesh. Fine with windows.

49  
50 Chair Rittenhouse: Was on Committee when the condition was imposed. This proposal

1 is not doing what I envisioned it would do. The new building as a backdrop has the  
2 gables as the warehouses. Needs to be integrated with landscaping and building so it  
3 becomes part of it. Go to 3 dimensional. Think a lot of what Terry said was right on. A  
4 certain level of designing would bring this to a different level. I'd rather take the money  
5 and use it for something else if this is what we are going to approve. Needs more  
6 exploration. There maybe other ways to integrate into the landscaping. Matt finish,  
7 aluminum windows ok.

8  
9 Committee Member Kosewic: What's missing is the sheet metal, the corrugated metal.  
10 If you were able to put a sheet metal ridge across that would give some sense to the  
11 shape. That's what's missing for me. Need a sense of the building that's there now.

12  
13 Committee Member Gracyk asked if this could come back.

14  
15 Chair Rittenhouse commented that it needed a thoughtful, artistic approach.

16  
17 Paul Andronico responded that they are willing to take another look at this. He talked  
18 about timing issues and the need to demo the existing warehouses in order to start the  
19 office building on the corner.

20  
21 Chair Rittenhouse said we can consider that provided that the appropriate documentation  
22 has been provided to the satisfaction of staff.

23  
24 Committee Member Demil stated that she was not comfortable with the demo of the  
25 buildings until the documentation is done and we have a sense of where this is going.

26  
27 Committee Member Kosewic stated that he was ok if the documentation was provided.

28  
29 Committee Member Shearer stated that the materials should be saved during the  
30 dismantling because it might be used for the "ghosting" and that the documentation  
31 should be provided before demo.

32  
33 Committee Member Barrett: Basin Street is asking for a whole lot of faith on our part.  
34 The attempt they made is incomplete and minimal. I want to hear more about what they  
35 want to do. Some guarantee that Petaluma gets what it deserves, this was a condition of  
36 approval.

37  
38 Paul Andronico: We had a different interpretation of the condition. We can commit to  
39 getting an architect that can do this very well and suggestions would be appreciated.

40  
41 Chair Rittenhouse: In order to continue with the demolition/dismantling of the buildings,  
42 the materials shall be retained for the design team to utilize in the design of the  
43 "ghosting" and the documentation shall be provided and the materials shall be retained.  
44 The "ghosting" should interact with the walkway.

45  
46 The item was continued to a date uncertain.

47  
48  
49 **NEW BUSINESS:**  
50 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

51

1 **II. VALENTE APPEAL, 531 Howard Street**  
2 **AP No: 006-065-007**  
3 **File: 04-APL-0209**  
4 **Planner: Kim Gordon**  
5

6 Applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee  
7 consideration of an appeal of a staff determination that the installation of vinyl  
8 windows and metal doors in the addition to the residence located at 531 Howard  
9 Street, in the Oakhill-Brewster Historic District, is inconsistent with the Oakhill-  
10 Brewster Historic District Guidelines and Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

11  
12 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

13  
14 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked if Kim was the planner that worked on the project and that  
15 reviewed the working drawings.

16  
17 Ms. Gordon: Yes and worked with the applicant for more than a year before a formal  
18 application was submitted.

19  
20 Committee Member Shearer: Asked about the windows in front which are vinyl, not  
21 wood.

22  
23 Ms. Gordon: Those windows were existing prior to the project being submitted and were  
24 not proposed to be replaced as part of the application.

25  
26 Dave Valente, 531 Howard Street, presented his appeal: He also provided a letter signed  
27 by neighbors in support of the windows and stated that he was familiar with Article 17 of  
28 the Zoning Ordinance. He stated that all of the doors are wood with the exception of two  
29 in the basement which are steel and are not visible from the street. Mr. Valente read from  
30 the Guidelines. He stated that he obtained the vinyl windows because they were easily  
31 available in the approved size, color and style and that due to losing his job he had a  
32 financial hardship. Only difference is the material. He explained that he will install wood  
33 molding around the windows, that they are encased in wood, and that only six of the 21  
34 windows are visible from the street. Wood windows require maintenance. He asked that  
35 the committee consider his points and that he be allowed to keep the doors and windows.

36  
37 Committee Member Barrett: Asked Mr. Valente when he had moved into the house.

38  
39 Mr. Valente: 1996.

40  
41 Committee Member Shearer: Wood trim is what gives the window the historic character.  
42 The front windows are setback deeper than the new windows. Can the new windows be  
43 set back further?

44  
45 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Mr. Valente if he was aware that the historic district required  
46 wood windows. He also asked if he was aware that when you changed drawings that  
47 approval was needed.

48  
49 Mr. Valente: 90% sure that wood windows and doors were desired and did not know that  
50 approval was required for changes to approved plans, but know now that approval is  
51 required from staff when plans are changed.

1  
2 Committee Member Barrett: Asked Mr. Valente if he was aware he was in a historic  
3 district.

4  
5 Mr. Valente: Yes, but did not realize the implications of that.

6  
7 Ms. Gordon: Was clear and direct with Mr. Valente that wood was required for doors  
8 and windows. Conditions of approval state that changes to the approved plans require  
9 staff approval and informed Mr. Valente of this.

10  
11 Public Hearing Opened:

12  
13 Susan Bonet, 218 Keller Street: Ms. Bonet noted she is also a member of Heritage  
14 Homes. Was surprised to get the notice and also to hear Mr. Valente's comments. Spoke  
15 with Mr. Valente as a member of Heritage Homes for 30 minutes and had told him to  
16 follow the guidelines. Discussed the need to repair, restore, replace in kind and that he  
17 would have to go through Historic SPARC approval.

18  
19 Scott Shelly, 22 6<sup>th</sup> Street: Am a general contractor, member of Heritage Homes, and live  
20 in a historic district. Stated he had spoken with Mr. Valente during the process regarding  
21 wood windows and thought that he was very clear on the process. Felt it was important  
22 the committee hold us all accountable to the guidelines.

23  
24 Public Hearing Closed.

25  
26 Committee Member Kosewic. Not against vinyl windows in new homes. Vinyl  
27 windows have some drawbacks- cannot paint so every house has the same color  
28 windows, cannot get true divided lights, only grids in glass. Whether you knew when  
29 you purchased the house or not that you were in a historic district, you were told as part  
30 of the process. No point in district if the guidelines are not followed. Only southern  
31 exposure with full sun would be better to have steel door than wood- not the case here.  
32 Windows and doors have to be wood. No reason not to have wood doors.

33  
34 Committee Member Demil: Agree with Terry. Staff and Heritage Homes told him of the  
35 guidelines, has to be viewed as a whole project and the guidelines are specific. Need to  
36 maintain the integrity of the residence and the district.

37  
38 Committee Member Shearer: Need to support the use of wood doors and windows.  
39 Others in the District would be required to use wood for replacement windows.

40  
41 Committee Member Barrett: Staff and 2 members of Heritage Homes informed of need  
42 to use wood and explained the Guidelines. Read Texture and Materials section of the  
43 Oakhill-Brewster Guidelines- "materials and textures which never existed in the pre-1930  
44 historical context of the district ..." Knew what was approved and what was to be done  
45 and changed without approval. Do not support the appeal. Letters from neighbors are not  
46 relevant since they do not fully disclose the issues: work done that was not consistent  
47 with approved plans, changes made to approved plans without staff approval, and work  
48 done that is not consistent with the guidelines.

1 Committee Member Gracyk: Agree with statements already made. Would vote to deny  
2 the appeal.

3  
4 Chair Rittenhouse: Agree with everything said. Modified the plans without permission  
5 and that's not acceptable. Simulated divided lights in windows are acceptable.

6  
7 M/S Demil/Rittenhouse: Deny the appeal and require wood doors and windows per the  
8 Oakhill-Brewster Historic District Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's  
9 Standards. Staff to review and approve the windows and doors to be used. Committee  
10 also noted that simulated divided lights in windows are fine. 6-0 to deny appeal. Iritz  
11 absent.

12  
13 Committee member Kosewic left the meeting at 5:15 P.M.

---

14  
15  
16 **SITE PLAN & ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

17 **OLD BUSINESS:**

18 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

19  
20 **III. ADOBE CREEK CENTER, South McDowell Blvd. and Lakeville Highway**

21 **APN: 005-280-048**

22 **File: 03-SPC-0528-CR**

23 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

24  
25 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee approval  
26 of a project to construct 3 commercial buildings with a net square footage totaling  
27 15,000 square feet; minor PCD amendment; and an amendment to the master sign  
28 program. The site is on 3.1 acres at the southeast corner of Lakeville Highway and  
29 South McDowell Boulevard.

30  
31 This item was continued from April 8, 2004.

32  
33 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

34  
35 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Kim to explain the sign program.

36  
37 Committee Member Gracyk: Asked if there was sufficient back-up space for garbage  
38 trucks.

39  
40 Kim: Yes.

41  
42 Committee Member Barrett: Asked about external lighting for signage.

43  
44 Ms. Gordon: The applicant is requesting approval of an amendment to the Lakeville  
45 Business Park Sign Program. Compared the proposed amendment to what the Zoning  
46 Ordinance would allow.

47  
48 A number of questions went back and forth regarding signs.

49  
50 Jamie Milliner of RNM Properties presented the project.

51

1 Scott Braesfield presented the project architecture.

2

3 Paul Reid presented the landscape architecture.

4

5 Committee Member Shearer: Need to balance the needs of the community with the wants  
6 of the applicant. This area doesn't seem to have a lot of trees.

7

8 Committee Member Gracyk noted that what you used for trees is not on the scale of a  
9 London Plane tree, you went with something smaller.

10

11 Paul Reid noted that they were trying to keep a visual corridor.

12

13 Committee Member Gracyk: At last meeting, the Committee requested that recycling be  
14 included with the trash containers in the project

15

16 The applicant agreed that they could be incorporated.

17

18 Committee Member Shearer: Asked about the drive through area.

19

20 Mr. Brasefield: Explained the clear story windows and the design of the structure.

21

22 Committee Member Gracyk Asked if the applicant could point out LEED elements of  
23 project.

24

25 Mr. Brasefield responded.

26

27 Committee Member Shearer: How long does landscaping take to grow to full size?

28

29 Mr. Reid: About two years.

30

31 Committee Member Gracyk: What kind of vines will be used for the trash enclosures?

32

33 Mr. Reid: Creeping fig and Boston ivy for the trash enclosure. Wisteria on the trellis.

34

35 Public Hearing Opened:

36

37 Judy Arntz, Tenant at 1670 Corporate Circle: Stated that the center would be a great  
38 addition to this area.

39

40 Public Hearing Closed.

41

42 Committee Member Barrett: Appreciate the model. Don't have as many issues about the  
43 architecture. Changes to building B are good and compliment buildings A and C. Still  
44 have an issue with height of tower at 40', but it seems to go well. Issues: the trees on  
45 Lakeville and McDowell. Lakeville- need more trees, more existing trees shown on the  
46 model than on the plans, keep the same number of trees as shown on the model would be  
47 okay. Save more Redwoods. South McDowell- take a long term view of choice of tree,  
48 larger tree with smaller canopy. Sign program acceptable but lighting for signs cannot  
49 exceed the 30 lambert limit stated in the zoning ordinance. Need a pedestrian crosswalk  
50 on South McDowell.

1  
2 Committee Member Shearer: Really liked the model and appreciate the changes. Need  
3 more trees on Lakeville. Echo the comments of Teresa. Lighting for signs to comply  
4 with the Zoning Ordinance regarding lambert limit. Model clarified the height of the  
5 tower and it works well.

6  
7 Committee Member Barrett: No up-lighting in the tower, applicant is proposing up-lit  
8 lighting for tower. Okay with internally lit signs as proposed.

9  
10 Committee Member Barrett left the meeting at 7:00P.M.

11  
12 Committee Member Gracyk: Don't mind the height of the tower. Half round column  
13 with piece above it – not attractive. Roofline is disappointing. Most of the LEED  
14 requirements that are met by the project are done by most applicants- not extraordinary.  
15 May be some vines on the building. West awnings are a good idea. I see you have  
16 worked out circulation air intakes. Large canopy trees are better for visibility than Pyrus.  
17 Have some lighting issues. Internally lit signs are fine or down lit. No up-lighting  
18 anywhere including the tower. Light pollution is an issue. Outdoor spaces a strong move.  
19 Monument signs are fine. Parking lot not heavily shaded due to crape myrtle. Not  
20 enough trees on Lakeville and South McDowell. Lakeville-retain some of the redwoods.  
21 Suggest large canopy deciduous trees in conjunction with existing redwoods.. Work in  
22 larger canopy trees closer to the road. Reduce lawn area further- could use ornamental  
23 grasses or ground cover. A crosswalk on McDowell is important. Provide recycling bins  
24 with the trash cans.

25  
26 Chair Rittenhouse: This is a difficult site. Issues I had not easily changed due to  
27 configuration of lot. I understand why the diagrammatic moves were made. Due to the  
28 configuration of the site, this may be the way it is going to have to be. Over and under  
29 parked. Unifying Building B and plaza space is better, more usable area. Understand that  
30 this is a retail center and the need for signage. Share concern with the number of trees  
31 being removed. On South McDowell a tremendous number of trees are being removed.  
32 Project will be visible and people will know that it is retail. Not necessary to expose all of  
33 Buildings A and C, especially at corners. Need more trees in this area. Understand “back  
34 of house issues” and need for screening. Still have reservations about the tower-  
35 understand reasoning of the architect. Problem with light reflecting and spilling out.  
36 Applicant needs to do a light study for uplighting- no upwash of lighting, maybe cross  
37 lighting. Appreciate further attempts with sidewalk area and sitting areas. Sign program-  
38 internally and externally signs are ok. Like gooseneck fixture. Like that we have one  
39 sign measurement.

40  
41 M/S Shearer/Rittenhouse to approve the project per the findings in the staff report and the  
42 following amended conditions: 1) photometric lighting plan for the tower to be provided  
43 to staff for review; 2) landscaping plan to include additional large canopy trees on  
44 Lakeville and more larger canopy trees on South McDowell subject to staff review and  
45 approval; 3) add tree and landscaping in the finger island on Lakeville; 4) lighting level  
46 for signs to comply with Zoning Ordinance (lighting, 30 Lamberts); 5) internally lit signs  
47 and externally, gooseneck signs are ok; 6) Tower signs shall be externally lit with  
48 gooseneck light fixture. Approved 3-0, Barrett and Kosewic left the meeting early.

49  
50  
51 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

1  
2 **IV. THE 101 CASINO, 5151 Montero Way**  
3 **AP No: 007-421-025**  
4 **File: 04-PRE-0177**  
5

6 Applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
7 preliminary review of plans for the remodel and expansion of the existing card  
8 room casino building at 5151 Montero Way.  
9

10 Mike Owens, the owner of 101 Casino presented the project. Mr. Owens explained that  
11 after the last preliminary SPARC review that they thought things through and decided to  
12 demolish the existing building and build a new structure to accommodate their needs.  
13

14 Shawn Montoya, architect: Presented the project architecture.  
15

16 Sandy Reed, landscape architect: Presented the site plan and landscaping portion of the  
17 project.  
18

19 Committee Member Shearer asked about the number of employees and the number of  
20 parking spaces.  
21

22 Mr. Owens explained the number of employees and where they would park.  
23

24 Committee Member Gracyk asked about signage and why the building was sited where it  
25 is.  
26

27 Mr. Owens explained that signage has not been thought through at this point. He also  
28 explained that the building was sited where it is in order to leave the existing building  
29 functional during construction and to be further away from the adjacent businesses.  
30

31 Committee Member Gracyk asked about the columns.  
32

33 Mr. Montoya explained the thought behind them and Sandy Reed elaborated on how the  
34 planter pots and vegetation would work together with the columns.  
35

36 Committee Member Shearer asked about the south elevation and if these were emergency  
37 entrances/exits.  
38

39 Mr. Montoya explained that these are employee entrances. For security purposes, the  
40 employees have an entrance and security has an entrance.  
41

42 Committee Member Gracyk asked about the smoking patio and whether or not it was  
43 enclosed.  
44

45 Mr. Montoya explained that it is enclosed for security purposes, there is no entrance/exit  
46 door. He explained that it would be ventilated and possibly have windows for the smoke  
47 to go out.  
48

49 Committee Member Shearer asked about the shower requirement.  
50

1 Staff stated that if the new structure meets the requirements in the bike plan for a shower,  
2 it would be required.

3  
4 **Committee Comments:**

5  
6 Committee Member Gracyk: Grateful you are looking at this with a fresh eye. General  
7 direction of architecture I believe is the way to go with simple materials. Go a step  
8 further from where you are now through the use of forms. Manipulate the forms. This is  
9 going to be an entertainment center. Site plan bolder. Study landscaping further, pots not  
10 necessarily enough, don't just rely on pots, not the strongest move. Use of trees to define  
11 the edges is strong. Look at opportunity to create a bioswale at corner. Fencing a good  
12 idea and what it looks like will be interesting. Glad to see corner at end being addressed.

13  
14 Committee Member Shearer: Use more colors to make it more interesting.

15  
16 Chair Rittenhouse read some comments from Committee Member Barrett: Much better,  
17 showers missing, had a question regarding building back to freeway. Colors.

18  
19 Chair Rittenhouse: Thanked the applicant. The existing building is unsalvageable for  
20 what you want. Glad you came to the conclusion to demolish it and construct a new one.  
21 This has begun to become a building that begins to relate to the use. Push it into the  
22 corner, allow more space for employees. Concur with Janet-maybe another built-up layer  
23 of planters. Re-look at the south and west elevations, use more of a layering at the base  
24 of the building. On the area closest to freeway, bring landscaping up above the building.  
25 Shawn has done a good job. Metal structure doesn't bother me. Façade-still trying to  
26 figure out if your bringing rustic, home grown elements with the cornices, go one way or  
27 the other. Think more about concept of what the building is. Outside seems subdued  
28 compared to what is going on inside, have some fun with it. Colors need to be bright, but  
29 not bright red. How you make it fun is critical.

30  
31 Committee Member Shearer asked about site circulation with regards to people going to  
32 the motel.

33  
34 Chair Rittenhouse also pointed out the landscaping strip and how the project does not  
35 meet the SPARC guidelines of a landscaping strip every 8 parking spaces.

36  
37 Committee Member Gracyk: Willing to consider less landscaping in the parking lot if we  
38 get more trees

39  
40 Committee Member Shearer also asked about outdoor spaces/patios.

41  
42 Mr. Owens stated that is not the nature of the business.

43  
44 Discussion ended at 8:05 P.M.

45  
46  
47 **V. AGENCY SERVICE BUREAU, 696 Petaluma Boulevard North**  
48 **AP No: 006-051-030**  
49 **File: 04-PRE-0201**  
50

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

5  
6 Due to the late hour of the meeting, the applicant requested to be on the next  
7 SPARC agenda 6/10/04 for preliminary review.

8  
9

---

10 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

11

12 **VI. REPORTS:**

13

14 **Planning Staff Reports:** Staff responded to a message from Committee member  
15 Gracyk regarding the yellow railing in the sidewalk in front of the Basin Street  
16 Town Center. Staff stated that the railing was required for handicap access/safety  
17 because of the slope of the sidewalk at the entrance to the business. Staff also  
18 stated that it would be temporary until the sidewalk has been replaced.

19 **Liaison Reports:** None

20

---

21  
22 **VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:**

23

24 **Jay Palm**  
25 **IN-N-Out Burger**  
26 **Plaza South Facade remodel and addition**

27

---

28  
29 **Adjournment: 8:10 P.M.**

30

31 S:\Sparc\Agenda\Agenda04\052704.doc