

1



City of Petaluma, CA  
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

2

3

Minutes

4

Regular Meeting

October 14, 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](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.

11

12

13

14

Roll Call: Present: Teresa Barrett, Terry Kosewic, John Mills, Larry Reed  
Jack Rittenhouse\*

15

16

Historic: Corrine Farez-Demil

17

18

Absent: Michael Iritz

19

\*Chairperson

20

21

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development

22

Kim Gordon, Associate Planner

23

Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

24

25

26

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of September 23, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Mills, 5-0

27

Committee Members' Report: Larry Reed recused himself the first agenda item.

28

Correspondence: None.

29

Public Comment:

30

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

31

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

32

33

34

**HISTORIC & CULTURAL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

35

**OLD BUSINESS**

36

**I. RIVERTOWN APARTMENTS, 209-317 1<sup>st</sup> Street**

37

**APN: 008-121-007, 008, 009 and 010**

38

**File: 03-ZOA-0260-CR**

39

**Planner: Irene Borba**

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

The applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review and approval for modifications to approved plans for the Rivertown Apartments portion of the Theater District located at 209-317 1<sup>st</sup> Street.

George White introduced the project.

Matt White: Presented the project and asked the committee if the project is in conformance with the SPARC approval of July 24, 2003.

Chair Rittenhouse: Asked Matt White to cover the changes regarding the phasing and the parking garage that I think are relative to this discussion today..

Matt White: We will be building these 15 units here (referred to the drawing in front of the Committee) and the parking garage as a phase II to the project – very much similar to our other projects such as Redwood Business Park or Redwood Tech Center where we are not building all of the buildings at once. From a parking standpoint and what Jack is alluding to, is we are proposing on the warehouse building to use the front of the building and the rear of the building for commercial and use, on a short term basis, to create 16 parking stalls in the middle. We will design it in a way that we can go back and put glass storefronts in so we can turn this into commercial in the future. We are doing the improvements as if it is going to be entirely occupied now, but in the short term the middle part of the building will be used for 16 parking stalls.

Committee Member Barrett: Asked why the ground floor of the buildings has changed – there is no commercial look now and no stoops.

Matt White: Said the ground floor was the same in the new drawings.

Committee Member Barrett: So you were never proposing any stoops?

Matt White: The problem with the stoops is two fold; we cannot do it from an ADA standpoint and secondly the elevation of the site doesn't allow for it.

Committee Member Barrett: But, it was approved.

Matt White: I don't know the answer to that.

Committee Member Demil: Asked for clarification about stoops.

Matt White: Do not have the width for sidewalk, curb gutter, trees and stoops.

Public hearing opened:

Janet Gracyk, Prospect Street: I was a SPARC member when the project was approved. We worked long and hard on this project and it has lost a lot of the charm. There are no variations of materials and windows. The façade is very plain. It's a big project to set

1 this type of precedent. I am urging the committee to work with the applicant to get some  
2 of the charm back.

3  
4 Edwin Hamilton, 501 Keller Street: I echo Janet's comments, the detailing is really  
5 lacking. Want the committee to look at the project closely.

6  
7 Patricia Tuttle Brown, 513 Petaluma Blvd. South: Echo Janet Gracyk. I tried to appeal  
8 the demolition. I would call this a bait and switch by the applicant. Can you make a  
9 decision if Mr. White's does not know the answers to questions? This is an opportunity  
10 to take a closer look at this project when you get the information you need. You need to  
11 schedule when both historic SPARC members are available. We have a responsibility to  
12 make this a good project.

13  
14 Kit Schlich, 516 Prospect Street: There was a misunderstanding with drawings that went  
15 to Heritage Homes.

16  
17 Committee Member Demil: Clarified the misunderstanding regarding drawings that went  
18 to Heritage Homes.

19  
20 Tamara Norman: It is important to see things in context. The renderings do not show the  
21 proposed office building and the relationship to Rivertown Feed. Read 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>  
22 paragraphs of a letter submitted for the record.

23  
24 Jane Hamilton, G Street: Wanted to come and support the committee on holding to high  
25 standards for this project and urged the committee to please take the time to do this.

26  
27 **Public hearing closed:**

28  
29 **Committee Comments:**

30  
31 Chair Rittenhouse: Reiterated to the Committee that they were being asked if the  
32 submittal was in substantial conformance with the SPARC approval of July 2003.

33  
34 Committee Member Kosewic: It seemed as though there were substantial changes at first  
35 look. Differences noted: vents changed, number of windows changed and original had  
36 more double hung and less sliders, roof changed. There were a number of people who  
37 came and wanted to adaptively reuse the warehouses. Does this form still resemble the  
38 warehouses? Taking some of the windows out is more in keeping with the warehouse  
39 district. Do not agree with the slider windows with a bottom fixed sash. I would ask for  
40 a change there. Roof vents originally drawn were the same as on the ice house. Actual  
41 drawings show a different vent. It is unfortunate that Fire Department needs a 20 ft. wide  
42 driveway. I thought it was for the Fire Department to be approaching in one lane while  
43 the cars leaving are in the other lane. However, I do not know why they are requesting  
44 this because there will be no cars parked in the rear.

45  
46 Michael Ginn, Fire Marshal: Require 20 ft. width to operate articulating arms of the fire  
47 truck - whether straight or serpentine.

48

1 Committee Member Kosewic: All signage and lights are missing, details make the  
2 difference, however, the form is the same. Construction deadlines are not supposed to  
3 make a difference regarding our approval. From an economic standpoint, I do not have a  
4 problem with the details because the form is the same. I would question the roof vents  
5 and the windows and some of the roof cuts over the decks. The original drawings  
6 showed roof cutouts over the decks. Decks are more useable but roofline is more  
7 monotonous. Do tenants want a varied roofline or do they want to be able to stand on  
8 their decks in the rain? I have no problem with the project. It is the warehouse district  
9 and is supposed to be plain and simple and I think it achieves that fact

10  
11 Committee Member Barrett: There is a difference between plain and simple. The  
12 original project that we approved was plain and simple; however it has style and details  
13 that indicate some thought went into it. It was not thrown up as a faux warehouse  
14 because that is what this looks like. A letter referred to it as “boxes wrapped in tin”. I  
15 can understand the Fire Department wanting 20’ for their truck access. Since there was  
16 20’ originally why did that need to be doubled to provide landscaping which has had a  
17 ripple effect of bringing the rest of the building down in scale and quality. I do not  
18 understand the connection. The applicant is now adding 20’ to the original 20’ in order  
19 to provide landscaping and front yard space. Where was consideration given when the  
20 project was first approved? They were not going to have a 10’ front yard plus  
21 landscaping on the other side. Somehow that has become a priority instead of having a  
22 nice articulated building. For example Building C at the far end which was connected by  
23 a bridge has been reduced to a barn with no style. To say that this mimics what was  
24 approved, begs the imagination. The crossing from that building to existing warehouse  
25 has been downgraded to seem superfluous and why. It has nothing to do with the Fire  
26 Department needing additional access. Tower element on bldg C has also been  
27 downgraded from a very nice styled tower element to a block with a small hat on it. This  
28 also has nothing to do with the Fire Department’s demands. The reasons Mr. White has  
29 given us are all Fire Department driven. What he is showing us that has being degraded  
30 has nothing to do with the Fire Department. The fronts as shown may have the same  
31 number of articulations, but the kinds of articulations that are being suggested in the new  
32 drawings are little balconies – they are not obvious, useable balconies that someone could  
33 point to and say “that’s where I live”. Why are vents downgraded? Slider windows look  
34 like an afterthought. The street frontage on the ground floor is not the same as the  
35 original proposal – it does not have pedestrian friendly attractiveness that would make  
36 you want to stop. It will feel as though you are stuck on a long monotonous street. It is  
37 not what the CPSP had in mind, it is not what we approved and it is not the high quality  
38 that should be the opening building in this area. It is not what we tore down our  
39 warehouse district for either. I see no reason to approve this watered down version at all.

40  
41 Committee Member Mills: Agree with Terry more than Teresa although my thoughts lie  
42 somewhere in between. I spent about 2 hours with Matt White to go over the changes  
43 from the old and new plans since I was not on the Committee at the time it was approved.  
44 I got to see exactly where changes were made rather than see the pictures that are being  
45 proposed now. We went into more details in the office. In the drawings you can not see  
46 the articulations. When you really scrutinize (other than bldg C), there are not significant  
47 changes in the architecture, the materials, the design or the colors. Building C might be

1 something different. I am not sure why the scope of building C had to be brought down  
2 so much. Asked why roofline on Bldg C was changed?

3  
4 Matt White: When we had to find 13 units, some of the 2-story lofts were removed.

5  
6 Committee Member Mills: My overall thought is that if the details of vents and windows  
7 were added to new drawings, I could get on board with the plan.

8  
9 Committee Member Demil: Agree with a lot of Teresa's comments. First floor has lost a  
10 lot of its excitement – the details need to come back. I appreciate color renderings  
11 although I would like more of the details. It's difficult to make a decision about being on  
12 the right track. Bldg. A has a void space where there were windows previously. It is  
13 space that is glaring. The connection from bldg C makes the remaining tower look  
14 comical – there is no relationship to the other buildings - want the connection added back.  
15 We are focusing on the exterior only, however, I would like to mention that the  
16 elevations from the interior courtyard lack style and interest – look like barracks. It will  
17 be very imposing when you are in the middle of it. Do not like fixed windows at the end  
18 – would like to see a larger window detail.

19  
20 Chair Rittenhouse: This is a very complex situation to comment on. I understand where  
21 the applicant is in the process of trying to move this forward. I also know that it has been  
22 over a year since it was approved and there was a substantial amount of time to bring  
23 changes back to the committee without the constraint of stopping construction this year  
24 and the pressure that is being put on the committee. This committee has a strong duty to  
25 hold a standard for future projects in this area and to set the standard for current buildings  
26 being built in the warehouse district. Comments particularly from Teresa, regarding  
27 proportions, rhythms, massing – all have been lost in its subtlety. You may need to be  
28 trained in architecture to see those differences. Everything from rooflines or the way the  
29 shadow lines carry on the overall project, the layering, the details, window proportions,  
30 massing, sliders vs. double hung windows are important details. I can envision the  
31 building with lighting and signage. I think the comment about the ground floor being  
32 modified significantly is true – has lost something. Pedestrian portholes into the project  
33 have lost a lot of detailing and seem to be downplayed. Bldg C has nothing to do with  
34 the fire department and has been dumbed down. The committee has to come to a  
35 resolution if the new building as proposed is an acceptable level of design for this  
36 particular area. I think potentially the site plan revisions that were done and being  
37 proposed due to additional constraints are real. I do not necessarily agree with the way  
38 that it was done. There are ways to bring this closer – detail wise- to what the committee  
39 was looking for without forcing the developer to halt construction and redo it.

40  
41 Matt White: We had no intention of eliminating details in the project. No one wants it to  
42 be more successful than me. There is a difference between construction drawings and  
43 hand renderings. All the bells and whistles will be on the project. The massing has not  
44 changed. We have worked for months to design a project that is consistent with our  
45 approval and have kept changes to a minimum.

46  
47 Chair Rittenhouse: I clearly said that I can envision the signage the lighting and I do  
48 understand the difference between a concept sketch and a working drawing. I clearly

1 disagree with you when you say that the massing has not changed. You have eliminated  
2 lofts and therefore 5<sup>th</sup> story roof elements. You have taken a corner of Bldg B that used  
3 to be 3 stories and made it 4 stories. The massing has changed and fairly dramatically.

4 .  
5 Committee Member Kosewic: The shadowing on the new drawing is much different than  
6 the shadowing on the old drawing – need to look at the square footage of the units to see  
7 if the decks sizes have changed.

8  
9 Matt White: The decks are not smaller.

10  
11 Committee Member Mills: It may be different from the old one, the question is, is it a  
12 project that we can move forward. Do not think the old project is feasible. What do we  
13 need to do with what is proposed now.

14  
15 Chair Rittenhouse: There are changes in footprint and the site plan that were made and  
16 there was good reason for it and I understood that. I have not gotten into the issues of  
17 what the interior of the buildings look like without the parking structure, etc. I am  
18 concerned with the rhythm, proportion and feel of it from the river and 1<sup>st</sup> street. End of  
19 bldg C, the rooflines and proportions are different. It's not the same project. Can we  
20 make changes yes, today probably not.

21  
22 Committee Member Kosewic: Can we take one building at a time and look at them. The  
23 single biggest difference is an artist rendering versus a computer rendering. Siding alone  
24 is a huge difference. Not a lot of decks have been lost. Roofline has changed, however, I  
25 think we can continue if we look at one building at a time.

26  
27 Chair Rittenhouse: Asked the applicant if he had any interest in trying to get back the  
28 details of the original submittal or are you so far along with construction drawings that  
29 you are not willing to do that.

30  
31 Matt White: We spent months trying to keep in conformance with our original approval.  
32 If there are details that you want like vents and windows that is one thing, however, it  
33 would be very difficult to look at rooflines because that is structural. There is no intent to  
34 eliminate details. It depends on the level of changes you want. If you want great level of  
35 changes, I would ask you make a decision today if the project is in substantial  
36 conformance with the original approval.

37  
38 Chair Rittenhouse: So, you are willing to look at vents and that is all?

39  
40 Matt White: No, I heard vents, signage, the way windows slide, lighting and a lot of the  
41 details that we have not eliminated from the project. They are just not on these  
42 construction drawings.

43  
44 Committee Member Barrett: You are saying that the signs and the lights are really there,  
45 they are just not shown. What I see is a real degradation of what was approved in what is  
46 going to be the first residential development in this area. I would be more sympathetic if  
47 this had not happened before by this company. This happened at the Basin Street  
48 Landing project. It came back to us with downgraded materials because it was too

1 expensive. The kiosk was delayed and a bond was put up to make sure that it gets built at  
2 some future time. Now this project has been approved and it comes back to us and it is  
3 being watered down. You are asking a lot from the City of Petaluma and we are  
4 supposed to take everything on faith. Do not think that is the way the City should be  
5 working. Ross Parkerson was correct when he said the economics of the project are the  
6 developer's problem because it is outside our purview. It is not the design review board's  
7 problem. This has been approved for quite a while. We were asked to give speedy  
8 approval of demolition of the warehouses because of the developer's financial needs and  
9 are now being held hostage because of the developer's financial needs.

10  
11 Committee Member Kosewic: Still feel there are no differences except the renderings  
12 from an artist and the computer drawings. Asked where there is downgrading on the  
13 existing building. I am trying to find out what has been downgraded on the existing  
14 building.

15  
16 Committee Member Demil: Believe we have been making concessions: on the ghosting  
17 and there was no landscaping presented today. These are things that we needed to see.  
18 Mr. White's statements trouble me because we are not getting the details. This s a project  
19 that all of Petaluma is looking at and we need to give it our utmost consideration.

20  
21 Committee Member Mills: Am going to defend Basin Street here. Yes it is a huge  
22 project and I don't think there is another developer who would have taken it on. We need  
23 to look at what the developer given and what concessions he asked for on our end. It has  
24 been a mutual relationship and they have been up front about what they want to do. The  
25 developer is willing to do what we are asking – I want to work with the developer.

26  
27 Matt White: Windows in the existing warehouse are not different.

28  
29 M/S Kosewic/Mills to approve the project as submitted.

30  
31 Discussion among committee member regarding what developer is willing to change.

32  
33 Chair Rittenhouse: I am asking for a level of details re: materials, pedestrian friendly  
34 street frontage, port hole next to existing warehouse, tower element – can you agree to  
35 this. I am not asking you to move the footprint or shear walls. Am asking you to look at  
36 some of the detail, for example the relief that Terry was talking about over the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor  
37 deck. If you are willing to look at some of those things and if that is something you can  
38 agree to then I can move with the motion today. If you want 100% agreement today on  
39 what you see is what you get, then I cannot support it today. I

40  
41 Matt White: Do you want to do this now?

42  
43 Chair Rittenhouse: I believe a list of concerns that we can agree on today needs to be  
44 done. Concerns as in sliders vs. double hung windows and those type of issues. If we  
45 can agree on that and get some of the flavor back then I would be in agreement.

46  
47 Committee Member Demil: Asked for clarification – if we provide a list would they  
48 come back to the Committee with the details?

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  
48

Chair Rittenhouse: I would think that we want to see it again with the flavor back into the project.

Committee Member Demil: I would agree to that.

Committee Member Mills: I also agree.

Chair Rittenhouse: As an overall statement we are not going to change footprints.

Matt White: I can't change more than just footprints. I can do the things Terry was talking about regarding how things can be cut back, the roof vents, how windows open one way as opposed to the other. We can change those type of things. When we start to add a half of a floor or do those type of things that's where I have problems because I have shear walls, I have load calculations, etc.

Chair Rittenhouse: That is not what I am asking. I'm talking about Bldg A in the center had a roof covering over a window. It is a little detail that seems to turn into a vent. I want that level of detail back. Another example is the port hole on Building A – it has some windows, some different siding on it and if you look at the top drawing it is just a door, an opening cut into a metal shed. Those are the subtleties at the pedestrian eye level. You do not see the feeling of the live/work space on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

Committee Member Barrett: On original approval, there are 5 sets of what look like double doors, on new submittal there is only 1 set on the existing warehouse. It had a lot of eye appeal and that is gone completely.

Matt White: You are correct, however, having to move units made this necessary. We tried to make up for it by adding double doors in areas where we had single doors before.

Items to return for approval:

- Ghosting
- Final Landscape plan

Chair Rittenhouse: Asked for assurance from the developer that in the Development Agreement they have to build the parking garage.

Matt White: Yes, it is in the development agreement.

The footprints are fine, unit counts and location are fine, the overall massing of the building is acceptable, however, the detailing is not what we are looking for.

Committee Member Barrett: If your intention is to approve these changes, that whatever you are approving should be specific in the minutes because Mr. White several times mentioned that something was not in the minutes. You need to know that you are not just approving this drawing. What you are approving is the packet that came with us today and that is a very different thing from what has already been approved. For someone to fall back on that in a defense for a change after approval does not instill my confidence.

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  
48

Committee Member Mills: Asked about the timeframe. Jack is proposing that we could agree to the changes that affect the footprint, the existing warehouse being used as a garage temporarily, the parking structure being built at a later date, the basic massing being the same but a lot of the details having to be worked on. Can you come back to the committee with the details discussed today, the final ghosting plan and the final landscaping while you do footprint and piling work?

Matt White: Yes.

Chair Rittenhouse: Would be happy to meet with you to go over the details.

Matt White: I am more than happy to come back with the details. Will do test piles in about 10 days. Coming back with details works for us and meanwhile we will continue with the construction. I will meet with Jack to deal with these details.

Chair Rittenhouse: Can we have the ghosting and landscaping details at the same time?

Committee Member Kosewic: Straw vote:

- Sliders need to go
- Cutout of roofline over the decks
- Go back to original vents
- Tower at end of walkway next to existing building – would like to see that back.
- Roof changed on other tower went from hip to gable roof – needs to go back to the original design.

Chair Rittenhouse: To summarize there is a feeling that everyone has been discussing. Believe you can get that feeling back. I appreciate the straw vote.

Matt White: Believe we will accomplish 90% and come back to tweak this.

Kosewic withdrew the first motion.

M/S Mills/Kosewic to approve project in scope such that the building size, mass, structure and footprint as changed by the applicant will be modified to meet the architectural detailing provided by the Committee and will return to the Committee with the final landscaping and ghosting plans.

George White: Suggested that the committee establish a deadline and set a date for the applicant to return.

Committee Member Mills: Amended the motion to continue to December 9, 2004, 4-1, Barrett, no.

Hearing began at 3:15 and ended at 4:45.

---

1 4:50 Public hearing began

2  
3 **NEW BUSINESS:**

4  
5 **II. SWEED SCHOOL ADAPTIVE REUSE AND TOWNHOUSE PROJECT,**  
6 **331 Keller Street**  
7 **APN: 006-213-004**  
8 **File: 04-SPC-0571-CR**  
9

10 The applicant is requesting Historic and Cultural Preservation Committee review  
11 of site, architectural and landscaping plans and Draft PUD Guidelines for the  
12 Phillip Sweed School Adaptive Reuse and Townhouse Project, 331 Keller Street  
13 in the Oakhill-Brewster Historic District.

14  
15 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

16  
17 Maria Poncel, West Bay Builders: Gave some background and history of the project.  
18 Presented to the committee some alternatives to the Liberty Street units which was not  
19 available at the time the packet went out.

20  
21 Chris Craiker, Craiker Architects: Reduced the number of units from 15 to 14, opened  
22 the site up a little bit and went over design changes to the Liberty Street units.

23  
24 The applicant asked for comments on the Keller Street stone wall that is failing. We are  
25 asking to cut that wall down to 3 ft. high and then repile stones behind it. From the street  
26 you cannot see the lawn. We want to create a series of banks with the stones that are  
27 removed.

28  
29 Mr. Craiker presented the proposed alternatives to the Liberty Street elevation.

30  
31 Committee Member Barrett: Regarding changing the retaining wall – bringing down to 3  
32 ft? How will modified wall relate to the stairs to the building?

33  
34 Chris Craiker: Will not change.

35  
36 George White: Carey & Co. is doing an evaluation of the wall. The committee may  
37 want to wait until the evaluation to weigh in on the retaining wall.

38  
39 **Public hearing opened:**

40  
41 Corrine Farez-Demil, 329 Liberty Street: Am supportive of the project. Believe the  
42 alternatives presented today are a big improvement. For the single family, I like  
43 Alternative #2 and for the town homes, I like Alternative #1. Regarding the landscaping  
44 plan, there are lots of textures and elements – may need to be streamlined - too many  
45 finishes. Like the iron fences and I would like to see fences consistent with the gates. I  
46 am not thrilled with stucco on 1<sup>st</sup> floor. I am happy to see how far it has come.

47  
48 **Public hearing closed:**

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  
48

**Committee Comments:**

Committee Member Kosewic: Nice to have a choice. For me less roof is better. On C1/C2, I prefer alternative 1, on C3, I like alternative 2. Believe it will work a lot better. Disagree with the City Council about Liberty Street fencing. People like picket fences. I believe Queen Anne pickets are typical of the era. Can understand wanting to cut down the wall – will leave it up to the historical results from Carey and Co. Believe project is moving in the right direction.

Committee Member Reed: Commend the applicant for the work so far, appreciate that you have met with the public. I want to address Keller Street elevation. I take issue with wall because it has significance to the building and has a scale that matches the building. Stepping the wall is out of character with the street. If you end up rebuilding, I suggest you look at some other historic walls in town. Want to wait and see Carey & Co. report. Glad you have an arborist involved. Regarding the Junipers in front of building – they may be part of the original planting. They are stressed and possibly could be relocated somewhere else. Agree with Corrine regarding too many materials. Concrete may be the main material. Look for different finishes. Maybe look at texturing asphalt to reduce or change the scale. Trees in courtyard need to be moved a little bit. Will defer to our architect regarding the alternatives – both are better than what was previously submitted. Believe pickets are more sensitive on Liberty Street. Vary picket design for each unit. Suggest finishing wall on Liberty with something other than stucco. Maybe finish with plaster to give a concrete look.

Chris Craiker: Will put a mortar finish on it.

Committee Member Reed: Landscape plan feels a little fussy – can be simplified. Metal fencing around units are nice – back it with simple hedge, discourage lawn.

Chair Rittenhouse: Applaud the changes proposed, both alternatives are better. C3, I prefer Alternative #1, do not think hip is consistent with style of building and there is still a reduction in height. On the C1/C2, Alternative #1 is the preferred design as it fits better with the neighborhood. It is more successful overall. On Sweed School, I am glad front door is main entry. One component is the importance of the wall and its relationship historically and the lawn and its formal street frontage. There is something grand about the wall and lawn. Your proposal to cut down the wall may be too fussy. Patios have wood post with metal details. Need metal post and metal rail for consistency. I am not a fan of pickets, however, I think if you look at the street scape, it is the appropriate response.

Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Terry that picket fence looks better on Liberty Street. Fence and gate should be same material. I prefer Alternative 1 on C3; and on C1/C2, Alternative 1 as well. Do not think hardy plank is ok – is not an approved material for the district. I would rather see shingle or stucco. Copy of what was on plaque in front of Sweed School. Agree about saving the junipers and relocating them. Commend the applicant. I will wait to comment on the wall.

1 Committee Member Mills: Agree with the comments on the school. On C3, prefer  
2 Alternate 1; C1/C2, prefer Alternate 1. Would prefer shingle at ridge rather than board  
3 and batten. Do not think hardi plank is appropriate. There is a redwood board that comes  
4 in a form similar to hardiplank.. I like picket fences – are appropriate for the site.  
5 Believe pickets should be different design for each unit. Don't like stucco on the lower  
6 portion – would have been wood. Mortar finish on wall would be easy to match with  
7 homes in the area.

8  
9 Kim Gordon: Looking for guidance on the fence between this project and the apartment  
10 building to the north. The City Council wanted the Committee to consider open fencing  
11 for graffiti and security purposes.

12  
13 Committee Member Mills: Disagree – do not see how an open fence can address  
14 security. Fence can be six feet with 2 feet of lattice.

15  
16 Committee Member Kosewic: Believe it should be a solid wood fence.

17  
18 Chair Rittenhouse: Due to the historic nature of the building – solid wood subdivision  
19 fence is out of character. Wrought iron detail similar to front patios would be more  
20 consistent with historic nature of building. Could grow something on the fence.

21  
22 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Jack about the fence. Can see what the council  
23 meant. Will also keep site more open. Believe wood fence is more suburban.

24  
25 Committee Member Reed: Is the fence inside concrete wall or attached to it.

26  
27 Chris Craiker: Attached to it on our side. We cannot remove chain link since it is not on  
28 our site. Property next door is not attractive – we would like to design a nice wood fence  
29 that looks appropriate and gives some privacy and security. Stucco is consistent in the  
30 craftsman design and trying to tie in with the material for the storage. Want low  
31 maintenance with stucco. Board and batten originally proposed will fall part. Could use  
32 stucco on storage and board and batten on Liberty street side. Want to tie in subtly with  
33 the Sweed building.

34  
35 Rittenhouse and Kosewic: Don't have a problem with stucco.

36  
37 Committee Member Reed: There is a Craftsman home in the 200 block which is stucco  
38 with a coarse finish.

39  
40 Committee Member Barrett: Back to fence. Believe vines could take care of problems  
41 with privacy. Prefer this to wood fence.

42  
43 Chair Rittenhouse: That particular fence design does not fit.

44  
45 Maria Poncel: Regarding the retaining wall on Keller Street – our Geotechnical report  
46 said wall is in very poor condition, either replace or take it down. We wanted to cut it  
47 down to help preserve as much of the original wall as possible. I need clarification on  
48 Hardi plank. Is it not a preferred material or not for historic district?

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  
48

Committee: It is not allowed in the historic district.

Committee Member Barrett: Read page 10 from the Historic District Guidelines regarding materials.

Maria: Re: stucco, a coarse finish is acceptable.

Committee Member Mills: Just a personal opinion – will not tell you not to use stucco.

Committee Member Reed: Wanted clarification from the Geotechnical report.

Chris Craiker: At the next meeting, we will have a discussion about the wall, would like that as a condition of approval and not have to come back again.

It was previously noted that the applicant would return to the Committee on November 18, 2004.

Public Hearing ended 5:45.

Committee Member Kosewic left the meeting at 5:55.

---

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

**III. RALEYS AT PLAZA SOUTH (PHASE II), 157 North McDowell Boulevard**  
**APN: 007-340-007**  
**File: 04-PRE-0549**

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee preliminary review of plans to convert the existing JC Penney's store located at 157 North McDowell Boulevard to a Raley's Supermarket of approximately 65,000 square feet.

Mark Marvelli: Presented the project.

Rittenhouse: Is very nice – you heard what we were looking for at the last hearing. Very pleased with what you did to the rear of the building. Would almost want to see a little more gold and match up with RHL colors. You are headed in right direction.

Committee Member Barrett: It is really nice to see something like this come back. When the project moves into specifics – need cart retrieval areas to be sufficient.

Committee Member Mills: Was not hear to see the original proposal – glad I was not. I like the newly proposed building.

1 Committee Member Reed: I also was not here. Like the colors. Can we get some  
2 Boston Ivy vines to soften some of the walls.

3  
4 Marvelli: Is a little tenacious – would consider on the back of the building.

5  
6 Committee Member Mills: Vines are being put on the back of other buildings as well.

7  
8 Marvelli: Will get together with RHL about what they are doing.

9

---

10  
11 **IV. MARIA COMMONS/GREENBRIAR APARTMENTS, Maria Drive at Park**  
12 **Lane**  
13 **APN: 007-280-077 and 078, 007-610-001, 029, and 031**  
14 **File: 04-PRE-0523**

15

16 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee  
17 preliminary review of project on 23 acre site on Maria Drive. Plans are to  
18 improve existing units, re-landscape, add 124 unit townhomes. Plans for 6 acre  
19 parcel across the street include two-story row housing units and three-story  
20 work/live units.

21

22 David Moyer, Hedgpeth Architects: Introduced the development team and the project.

23

24 Committee Member Barrett: Asked how the applicant was addressing the creek.

25

26 David: There is currently a walkway, we may enhance that. You can possibly give us  
27 some direction. It can at least be improved with landscaping.

28

29 Committee Member Mills: Can you put units along the creek and make it an amenity  
30 rather than put carports on the creek.

31

32 Warren Hedgpeth: This being very preliminary. We will have a landscape architect look  
33 at the entire project and the relationship with pedestrians, tree canopies, etc. Wanted  
34 your feedback before we present to the landscape architecture.

35

36 Bejan Madjlessi: I like the idea of having parking and a unit above the parking to face  
37 the creek. Currently the project is fenced off from the creek.

38

39 Committee Member Mills: The history of the creek has had problems, anything to up to  
40 upgrade it and make it useable will be beneficial.

41

42 Warren Hedgpeth: The living area of the town homes will face the creek.

43

44 Committee Member Mills: The Bike Committee comments will be important early in the  
45 project.

46

47 Warren Hedgpeth: Would like to receive any reports and input. Want to diversify the  
48 neighborhood. Want pedestrians to use the street and walk back and forth.

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  
48

**Public comment opened/closed:**

**Committee Comments:**

Committee Member Reed: What an opportunity to relieve that open space. Believe this would be an improvement. A landscape architect could work wonders there. Most of the trees are unhealthy, but a few healthy ones are worth saving. Get an arborist to evaluate trees. Begin to differentiate the courtyard and direct circulation. The path along the creek is being graded now. The mixed use site is an improvement - seems dense in the center. Would look for a reconfiguration of the center of the project to get more open space. There are a few trees on the property line with Mervyns, a few eucalyptus worth saving. Consider a good buffer between this and Mervyns.

Committee Member Mills: I believe you have a winner. Am not sure someone will want to buy a Town House next to apartments. Believe the direction is right with a good landscape person you can achieve what you set out to do.

Committee Member Barrett: There are a lot of possibilities. The creek is an amenity - suggest orienting any new development to the creek. Get rid of carports that line the creek - that is the direction I would like to see. This is a good area for density, you can walk to shopping center and groceries. You also have a park and schools - lends itself to a good development, especially if this is going to be affordable. Would like you to see this development oriented to families. The smaller site is underutilized. Like the mix of businesses there.

Chair Rittenhouse: It is an Interesting and unique situation there. It will be a challenge to put Town Houses with the apartments. Good comments re: carports going and the creek as an amenity. Have reservations on the live/work units on Maria - what type of business will utilize? Is the market here in Petaluma? Can see some possible congestion issues. Use open space for the buffer between here and Mervyns. I see two different halves - unifying is tricky. Challenge will be the have marketable town home interspersed with apartments.

Committee Member Mills: Would like to see places for kids to play within the complex itself, half basketball court or tennis court. There is a possible 4-plex with a rental opportunity.

Chair Rittenhouse: Suggest not having a continual band of carports.

Bijan: Responded to committee comments regarding renters and buyers.

Committee Member Barrett: Suggested talking to the Bike committee early.

Committee Member Reed: Would diagonal parking or parallel parking be good out front?

Committee Member Mills: Maximize the parking out front for the businesses.

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

Chair Rittenhouse: People like convenience.

Committee Member Reed: Encourage you to find a landscape architect that is sensitive to sustainable materials and lawns.

Hedgpeth: Would like to do diagonal parking on Maria and have open space. We will showcase with the landscape effort.

---

**V. REPORTS:**

**Planning Staff Reports:** None.

**Liaison Reports: Planning Commission reviewed Woodridge Subdivision and General Plan.**

---

**VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:Confidential Page 16 02/12/2004**

- Southgate**
- Riverview**
- River Trail – Preliminary**
- Sequoia/Wood Sorrel - Preliminary**
- 609-617 East Washington - Preliminary**

---

**Adjournment: 6:41**

---