

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



City of Petaluma, CA
Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee

Minutes

Regular Meeting October 28, 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
FAX: 707-778-4498 Web Page: <http://www.ci.petaluma.ca.us>

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.

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

*Chairperson

Staff: George White, Assistant Director, Community Development
Kim Gordon, Associate Planner
Anne Windsor, Administrative Secretary

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of October 14, 2004 were approved as amended. M/S Barrett/Mills, 5-0.

Committee Members' Report: Committee Member Barrett asked about procedure regarding a committee member reviewing a project that was approved when the committee member was not on the SPARC Committee. Chair Rittenhouse met with Matt White, Pamela Torliatt, Mike Bierman and Basin Street staff regarding the Rivertown Apartments. Committee Member Mills announced that he had to leave the meeting early.

Correspondence: Planning Commissioner's Seminar flyer was put at places.

Public Comment: None.

Legal Resource Statement: Was noted on the agenda.

Appeal Statement: Was noted on the agenda

SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BUSINESS:
COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

I. ADOBE CREEK CENTER, South McDowell Blvd. and Lakeville Highway

1 **APN: 005-280-048**
2 **File: 03-SPC-0528-CR**
3 **Planner: Kim Gordon**

4
5 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee review
6 and approval of minor revisions to approved architectural plans.

7
8 Committee Member Mills recused himself because he was not on the committee when
9 the item was approved.

10
11 Committee Member Mills left the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

12
13 Public Hearing began at 3:20 p.m. & ended at 3:50 p.m.

14
15 Kim Gordon presented the staff report.

16
17 Scott Brasfield, Architect: Stated that the letter submitted to the Committee gave the
18 reasoning for the changes to the approved plans.

19
20 **Public hearing opened/closed:**

21
22 **Committee Comments:**

23
24 Committee Member Barrett: I have a problem with the request referred to in the letter
25 submitted by Mr. Brasfield. What is approved by SPARC is what we expect to be built.
26 This is a pattern that we are seeing with developers. The time to do the planning is
27 before the SPARC approval and not after. I see no reason to make changes in the
28 approval as it stands.

29
30 Committee Member Kosewic: I agree with Teresa. It's always an advantage to have
31 operable windows. Proposing operable windows and a natural ventilation system to
32 SPARC and then asking to remove them from the plans should not happen. I believe
33 operable windows will still serve a function to give you ventilation. It may not be as
34 adequate as you wanted, however, it will be functional.

35
36 Committee Member Reed: I concur with Terry and Teresa. Although, not totally
37 efficient, I believe it's an opportunity to have a more green design.

38
39 Chair Rittenhouse: The project is more of a retail center than an office building. Losing
40 the operable vents is not a burden to me because I never felt it would necessarily work.
41 Operable windows will be valuable for this type of a retail mix to not overload the AC
42 system. I could be split regarding the vents and the operable windows.

43
44 Committee Member Kosewic: I do not care about the vents. I am weighing in more on
45 the operable windows.

1 Committee Member Barrett: Operable windows should stay in the project. Believe the
2 applicant should have done homework regarding the vents before coming to SPARC.

3
4 Committee consensus: The project will retain the operable windows. The operable
5 vents can be eliminated.

6
7 M/S Rittenhouse/Kosewic to remove the operable vents and retain the operable windows.
8 4-0, Mills absent.

9
10
11 **PRELIMINARY REVIEW:**

12
13 **II. RIVER TRAIL ENHANCEMENT, Along Petaluma River from Lakeville to**
14 **Washington and around the Turning Basin**
15 **File: 04-PRE-0631**

16
17 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
18 preliminary review of plans for the Petaluma River Trail Enhancement project
19 design from Lakeville, around the turning basin and under the D Street Bridge.
20 The project entails construction of a pedestrian and bicycle path at top of bank
21 where possible and floating docks around the Turning Basin and under the D
22 Street Bridge.

23
24 Jeanne Miche: Introduced the project team.

25
26 Steve Arago, CSW Stuber-Stroeh: Presented an overview of the project.

27
28 **Public Comment opened:**

29
30 Walt Haake, 625-2nd Street: Want to support the project and remind the committee of the
31 River Enhancement Plan. Also the CPSP calls for a continuation of this path down to the
32 Foundry Wharf. This portion of the River Trail is not part of the new Assessment
33 District. Urged the Committee for their support to ensure the continuation of the River
34 Trail from south of the D Street Bridge to the Foundry Wharf. Asked the Committee
35 what the next step was to make this happen.

36
37 **Public Comment closed:**

38
39 **Committee Comments:**

40
41 Chair Rittenhouse suggested commenting on the bullet points in the Memo from Project
42 Manager, Jeanne Miche.

- 43 ▪ Lighting
 - 44 ▪ Signage
 - 45 ▪ Pre-fabricated Bridge-Corten Steel
 - 46 ▪ Flood wall texture pattern-Weathered Plank Horizontal
- 47

1 **Bridge**

2

3 Chair Rittenhouse: I have always liked these bridges and think it is a nice continuation of
4 the trail.

5

6 Committee Member Barrett: I am ok with the bridge.

7

8 Committee Member Reed: I like the bridge. I like the wall texture, however, I have
9 some concerns about it being pre-cast versus a poured in place wall. I think the
10 horizontal banding is nice.

11

12 Committee Member Kosewic: Any bridge is ok. I don't have a problem with the
13 horizontal lines on the wall that is shown in the picture. It's the vertical breaks at 8 feet
14 that make it look like T111 that bother me.

15

16 **Flood wall texture pattern**

17

18 Chair Rittenhouse confirmed that it was a form liner and only comes in 8 foot increments.
19 It does have a little bit of that appearance, however, I didn't see it that way. I saw in
20 more of a textured, bulkhead look or a rough form. I think it's fine.

21

22 Committee Member Barrett: I'm ok with the wall. It is supposed to be functional so I'm
23 ok with that. To back up Terry, do not think the wall is ok everywhere, just here.

24

25 Committee Member Kosewic: It looks like an imitation of a rough form old style
26 retaining wall. What stands out though is that it looks like an imitation. It's trying to
27 achieve something that it is not. It looks like its trying to replicate that but not achieving
28 it. If it had just been flat and then someone came back and put grooves in it, it would
29 have looked better. If it had its own form it would be different.

30

31 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested that Redevelopment get Committee Member Mills
32 feedback since he had previously been on the Park & Recreation Commission.

33

34 **Signage**

35

36 Chair Rittenhouse: It is difficult to comment on because we do not have a sign program
37 here. I cannot really see the sign presented in the picture shown. Asked if it is the same
38 as the signs at Shollenberger. Agree with the simplest signage as possible.

39

40 Jeanne Miche: We just wanted to show you that we wanted to put something very simple
41 on the trail, possibly a peeler core with a sign posted on it. In many places we will say
42 things like begin trail, end trail, etc.

43

44 Committee Member Kosewic: How difficult would it be instead of a peeler core to go to
45 something like a grape stake. Over a period of time it will turn green by itself and it will

1 look like its been there for 100 years. The peeler core will just look like a peeler core all
2 the time.

3
4 Chair Rittenhouse: I agree with as simple a signage as possible. I think Terry has a good
5 point. It's a brand new trail in the urban part of town (to a great extent). Is the post
6 supposed to be a rustic trail or next to this bridge maybe look at this element as
7 something a little more updated.

8
9 Committee Member Barrett: Agree with Terry on this. Signs are always the weak link to
10 me. They are ugly and easily vandalized and often useless. Simple and small is better
11 and vandal proof. A good example would be signage that tells you which direction to go
12 to downtown. That would be better than something that shows you that you are on a bike
13 trail. I would be looking for few, simple and vandal proof.

14
15 Committee Member Kosewic: I think vandal proof would be difficult so if you go with a
16 simpler sign that would be easier to replace rather than trying to make one that cannot be
17 vandalized. I think more of a directional signage would make more sense. I agree with
18 Teresa when you come to an intersection, which way is downtown makes sense. I think a
19 directional/motivational signage program would probably be best for someone who is
20 from out of town.

21
22 Committee Member Barrett: Possibly put some distances to downtown, etc.

23
24 Committee Member Reed: I'm beginning to see some sense of a vocabulary of materials
25 that we can expect to see throughout the entire river walk. The more remote pieces were
26 to lend themselves to the rougher corten steel or maybe a peeler post. When I first saw
27 the lighting I thought it didn't seem to be in the right vocabulary with the remote portions
28 of the path. Maybe you want to come up with two lighting fixtures, one that is related
29 more to the outer stretches of the path that are more remote and maybe a more urban
30 fixture that might be more appropriate downtown.

31
32 Chair Rittenhouse: That is a good point. Ultimately it comes down to the feeling of this
33 trail and what the vocabulary is from start to end and does it transition from a downtown
34 trail to an outskirts trail or is it fairly consistent in its materials and forms.

35
36 Steve Arago: You have made some good comments. I was sketching something for
37 Jeanne that may be exactly what you are looking for. I know there is a system of signage
38 in San Diego that is consistent and you know where you are going. It is simple and it is
39 low, probably no more than 36" off the ground so that it does not bring a lot of attention
40 to it.

41 42 **Lighting**

43
44 Chair Rittenhouse: I like the bollards – this is a typical style for a bollard light. I think
45 the finish is the question. Is it painted or is it aluminum or bronze. What is it? That
46 goes back to the vocabulary. It is the same thing with the wall mounted light. I think

1 these wall mounted lights look good in rough concrete. I believe it will come down to the
2 finish. I would like a little more description of where the wall ceiling mounted fixture
3 will go. Can you give an example of where you want to use that? Is it on a post?
4

5 Jeanne Miche: At this point one of the places that we have to think about lighting is
6 underneath the D Street bridge. The intention is not to have the whole trail lit.
7

8 Committee Member Barrett: Asked if the lights would be phovoltaic – that something
9 on a dark day would kick on?
10

11 Jeanne Miche: It could be, we have not gotten that far. You have given us good
12 direction so far.
13

14 Committee Member Reed: I would like to follow up on Teresa's comments about
15 photovoltaic. Is the City using photovoltaic lights in any remote areas that are
16 inexpensive and easily maintained?
17

18 Jeanne: We are always in consultation with Ed Anchordoguy, however, not that I am
19 aware of.
20

21 Ed Anchordoguy: We are just beginning in some of the subdivisions to use bollard
22 lighting. It is all on a photo cell. We would like to standardize it so we are looking
23 at using Kim as the brand name. We can go with different models of a Kim brand and then
24 the finish is different. We have been looking at black and a galvanized finish. There is
25 room to move there.
26

27 Chair Rittenhouse: Believe the project is exciting. Get the vocabulary together to make a
28 connection from one end of town to the other.
29

30 Committee Member Reed: I would offer to meet with you separately if you wish because
31 I see details that need a little work. Since Walt is here I would like to pick up the issue of
32 the D Street bridge. Because I am working with Basin Street on their office building, I
33 believe there is a bit of a disconnect when you try to make that on grade crossing
34 underneath D Street. Based on the plan Walt has, I think there may be an opportunity to
35 make a connection underneath the bridge over the water and the ability to push that path
36 away from the bank. I think is worth exploring to make that continuity down the river.
37

38 Committee Member Kosewic: If you are not able to go under the D Street bridge for
39 some reason, you can be directed over the street at a controlled intersection. I believe
40 there would be liability issues if the path under the D Street bridge was covered in mud.
41

42 Committee Member Barrett: I think it is important that Mr. Haake's comments do not get
43 lost and get integrated with this and becomes part of the assessment district too. I am not
44 sure how that gets pushed forward, possibly some letters to Mr. Bierman or phone calls to
45 Council members.
46

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

Chair Rittenhouse: As a follow up to that, when I was in a meeting yesterday with Basin Street and Mr. Bierman that issue came up.

Paul Marangella: What I would like to do so that we do not have to come back again to revisit the same subject, are we generally (with some additional advice from Larry) on the right path and can we move forward on this. If we can get your general direction, I am assuming that we would not be coming back and we would like to know if that is your intent today.

Chair Rittenhouse: It is my general feeling that you are on the right path. There may be some critical junctures that come up, such as handicap ramps that you may want some design input on especially if there are railing designs or switchback ramps. Typically if you kept the vocabulary of the concrete walls with the corten type railings so there is a consistency then I don't know if we would need to see them all.

Paul Marangella: I would feel good about working with Larry as a sounding board and a little guidance, I would like to move forward.

Committee Member Reed: Regarding these pieces that relate to Poultry Street or the Water Street. It would be nice to see how this all connects for example to the Poultry Street project when it comes in.

Paul Marangella: We would be happy to bring all that to you when Poultry Street comes to you.

III. THE BIRCHES, 870 Wood Sorrel Drive
APN: 137-061-022 and 023
File: 04-PRE-0593

The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee preliminary review of plans to construct a 24 unit PUD at 870 Wood Sorrel Drive.

Steven Lafranchi: Presented background and an overview of the project and introduced the project team.

Tracy Anthony, Anthony Investments: Presented an overview of the density and architecture for the project.

Ralph Alexander, Landscape Architect: Presented the landscape plan.

Public comment opened/closed:

Committee Member Reed: I like the attention to a neotraditional kind of neighborhood and I like the architectural facades that you show. Regarding the parking on the roadway, it seems as though it is an opportunity with the scaled down drive that it could

1 be a neighborhood space. If you had to park there it would be unfortunate in terms of
2 kids playing. Looking at the elevations, it might be nice if there was a picket fence with a
3 semi public space behind the sidewalk. That way it feels as though it is a more pedestrian
4 scale. Then if you are going to have the picket fences do you really need the lawn in
5 there. I appreciate the attention to the lawn on the perimeter, but I thought on the interior
6 it might be an opportunity to take a lot of the lawn out of there and treat as cottage
7 gardens in front of the buildings. Then I began thinking if we really needed the street
8 trees in there. What if you scattered your birch trees all along that roadway kind of
9 informally so the whole road was a birch forest. I believe there are some things you can
10 do to refine the landscape and emphasize that as a pedestrian space for the houses there. I
11 am have difficulty with the triplex units at the end. You have that great space coming
12 down across Wood Sorrell but then the circulation does not come through the middle. It
13 wraps around the outside without the connection to McDowell which seems confusing to
14 me.

15

16 Tracy Anthony: We wanted the triplexes to have private attached parking so you could
17 have security at night. The only way to do that was with one driveway and that precluded
18 that the units would back up to one another. That's why the sides are really well
19 developed. In the bottom portion two corners spill out onto more lawn so I would
20 imagine all six of the families could use that edge as yard.

21

22 Committee Member Reed: The gesture to McDowell is simply a 6 foot high wood fence.

23

24 Committee Member Kosewic: I was quite impressed with the conceptual street scape,
25 especially the detail on the folk Victorian. On the farmhouse and the Victorian, there
26 seems to be a lot of roof. It seems like a huge waste of space. Look into some smaller
27 trusses and a useable attic spaces. Would like to see all the details on the conceptual
28 drawings come through on the final drawings. On the Victorian you see more garage
29 than front porch. Referred to Heritage Subdivision and the tandem garages and suggested
30 the applicant look at this subdivision. You need closed canopy trees to achieve what you
31 are trying to do.

32

33 Committee Member Barrett: Think it is generally ok. The homes on Allegheny Court
34 are isolated and might not work for the residents. Change the entrance to more of the
35 middle of Yarberry Street to break up the long section of homes. I am a little concerned
36 about backyards with large wooden fences backing up to Yarberry. Need to have design
37 attention on the back yard fences that are facing Yarberry. The other concern I have is
38 about the triplex. You will probably be putting in a sound wall on North McDowell,
39 however, design concerns are important here. Master bedroom seems to be overlooking
40 the garage instead of the landscape area.

41

42 Chair Rittenhouse: The Town Houses seems like its own little island. If you do not get
43 the access fingers to have the driveway on Yarberry Drive, consider bringing the
44 driveway back to the middle and then putting more town homes at the other end and sort
45 of book ending the project. You may actually get more units which would increase the
46 density and your market because you have more different products. It also reduces the

1 length of that street. I think it is a diagram that could be investigated.
2 Steve Lafranchi: Some of this is driven by access for emergency vehicles.

3
4 Chair Rittenhouse: Suggested looking at Adobe Creek for bulb parking on a circular
5 road. Bring driveway westerly and look at book ending the project. Look at the real
6 usability of the porches. Look at the two pack which Ryder built. The worse part of the
7 project is that almost the entire length of the buildings is garage door with a small entry
8 off to the side. I would like to see you access product type further. Largest footprint is
9 on the corners, pay some special attention to the four sided architecture. Would like to
10 see you get the extra property because it will help the site plan to make some
11 adjustments. My pet peeve in the triplex is that the middle unit has no back door. Would
12 like you to find that few extra feet to get the back door. In this project it is walking
13 around the back of the building to get to the front door. I will be brief on the architecture.
14 I am against out of the drawer architecture. Do not like fake farmhouse, craftsman and
15 Victorians. Believe it is Disneyland and cartoon like. It is unconsidered architecture.
16 Buildings built now do not need to replicate older houses of the west side and farm
17 houses.

18
19 Committee Member Kosewic: Was thinking about Twin Creeks subdivision which put
20 master bedroom upstairs and had a single car garage. It gave the project a lot more space.

21
22 Committee Member Barrett: Want to reiterate that there is a sticking point on your
23 architecture that has to do the garages, they are so up front. Terry suggested tandem and
24 Jack has suggested staggered site planning. It is important to listen to these comments.
25 Jacks' comments on the middle triplex is important as well just for quality of life. Also,
26 you may want to look at tandem parking on the town homes as well.

27
28

29 **IV. 1309 Dynamic Street**
30 **APN: 007-501-014**
31 **File: 04-PRE-0616**

32
33 The applicant is requesting Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee
34 preliminary review of plans to update existing 34,883 square foot structure and
35 construct two new buildings to house 9 light industrial condominiums of
36 approximately 2,000 square feet each.

37
38 Jason Sanger: Presented the project.

39
40 Committee Member Reed: I like the simplicity of the architecture. I see some
41 opportunities for landscaping. Why is there so much parking?

42
43 Jason: We are meeting parking requirements for office instead of light industrial.

44
45 Committee Member Reed: There is not much landscaping between the mobile home
46 park and the new building. Suggest more pervious paving particularly in the compact
47 spaces. The access road behind building A could be pervious surface. There is an also

1
2 an opportunity to put more trees here as well because it is a southern exposure. In
3 addition, putting trees in the front of building will provide a landscaped entry.
4

5 Chair Rittenhouse: Would it be possible to do a landscape reserve. You may be over
6 parked. The entire row at the rear of the building could be landscape reserve and the
7 benefit to the neighbors would be immeasurable. If it is truly fenced in you need to look
8 at the landscape on the edges, particularly a landscape element on the long drive isle. If
9 you had roll up delivery doors I could see the drive isle. Along the front doors of the
10 building would be an opportunity to work in a minimalist landscape plan to tie in the
11 industrial look, possibly a metal cables as a trellis. This will break up the long metal face
12 of the building. The existing structure needs help. Would love to have you look at
13 parapets and play up what you are doing on the new building on the existing structure.
14 Bring it down to a human scale at the entry.
15

16 Committee Member Reed: Would like to see landscaping that helps to structure the
17 building. Pervious pavement will be your landscape vocabulary. If you redo Dynamic
18 Street, encourage you to try something new there, get rid of lawn and keep the large
19 canopy trees.
20

21 Committee Member Barrett: This is an area that is ripe for redevelopment. You are
22 leading the way. You are getting really good direction here. The area of the front yard
23 with the palm tree could be an area where people could sit out to eat lunch. It is another
24 amenity that could make a difference.
25

26 Chair Rittenhouse: You have a unique challenge to bring in layering and colors to make
27 it fun and techy. I want to see you set the standard on the upgrade of the existing
28 building to match the standard for your new buildings.
29

30
31 **Planning Staff Reports :** Discussion regarding the conversation on the River Trail. If
32 there is an expectation that this should come back to SPARC, Community Development
33 needs to know that now. George White will relay to Redevelopment that they do not
34 need to come back to the committee for the items discussed today, however, the project
35 will need to come back to the Committee and be publically noticed.
36

37 Committee Member Kosewic: Discussed wanting to go to a PBAC meeting to understand
38 why they are asking for the type of access they are. Would be interested in meeting with
39 Basin Street as well regarding the Rivertown Apartments..
40

41 **Liaison Reports :** None
42

43 Adjournment : 6 :35
44

45
46 S:\Sparc\Minutes\Minutes04\102804.doc