

CITY OF PETALUMA, CALIFORNIA  
MEMORANDUM

---

*Community Development Department, 11 English Street, Petaluma, CA 94952  
(707) 778-4301 Fax (707) 778-4498 E-mail: cdd@ci.petaluma.ca.us*

---

DATE: August 19, 2008

TO: Development Code Advisory Committee

FROM: Tiffany Robbe, Senior Planner  
Irene Borba, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee Update

---

The following is a summary of the components of and the anticipated timing and completion of the Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee work relating to the Development Code:

- August 21, 2008 – Last meeting of the Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee (8:45 to 10:30am CM’s conference room)  
At this meeting the Subcommittee will look at details that need fleshing out. They will review and provide final direction to staff.
- November 2008 – The Subcommittee will review and provide direction on the drafted sections prepared by staff.
- February 17, 2009 (tentative) – The DCAC are scheduled to review and provide direction on the chapters that incorporate the Subcommittee’s direction.

The Roles and Responsibilities Subcommittee met twelve times to identify the role and responsibility of the Planning Commission, City Council, Site Plan and Architectural Review Committee, and Historic and Cultural Review Committee as they relate to development review decisions. The goal was to make the roles and responsibilities of each body both clear and distinct from each other, to make the ordering of hearings (for projects needing multiple types of review) most beneficial, and to make the process more understandable and - where possible - streamlined for the applicant. While the Subcommittee concluded that a perfect system does not exist, they proposed the following system as an improvement over the existing.

Draft of Consensus thus far:

1. In the case of a subdivision or similar project,
  - Neighborhood meeting shall be required prior to application submittal
  - Site plan review needs to occur first and
  - SPARC is best suited to this task.
  - Then, after map approval, such a project would return to SPARC for architectural (details, landscaping, etc) review.
2. Thus, SPARC agendas would be comprised of
  - Preliminary Reviews (optional)

- Site Plan Reviews, and
  - Detail Reviews
3. PC to have decision making authority for TSMs (appeal rights to CC) (*consensus, but concern of CM Barrett*)
  4. Projects needing Rezoning and/or General Plan amendment – including new or amended PUDs – go to PC for a recommendation and CC for approval (PC still decision making body for TSM).
  5. Subcommittee prefers City Engineer as approver of FSM (pursuant to Subdivision Map Act 66548(d)), but comfortable with Engineering’s recommendation to continue using Council consent calendar.
  6. Understand that major projects such as shopping centers, apartment and condominium complexes, may only be subject to SPARC review and approval (where no TSM, GPA, or Rezoning).
  7. Mixed use building(s)/projects: Placeholder: Depending on where the Development Standards subcommittee ends up with the task of “defining” mixed use (Lynch and Barrett to act as liaisons)
    - Any qualifying mixed use building/project (compliant with the established definition of mixed use) is simply subject to SPARC review or
    - If the mixture of uses falls below the threshold established by Dev Stnd (is token, minimal, or none existent), the mixture of uses (as reflected by the form/layout of the building/project) shall be subject to PC review and approval prior to SPARC approval.
  8. Environmental documents, including EIRs, to be certified by review body with decision making authority of the project. Exception: in the case of an EIR where the adoption of overriding considerations is necessary, the decision of the regular review body shall be advisory and the CC shall have the final approval.
  9. Residential Condo Conversions: Still to PC for recommendation and CC for approval
  10. CUPs and Variances as now, subject to PC review and approval, including:
    - Adult Entertainment CUP = PC 21-410.40
    - Cardroom CUP = PC 21-420.10
    - Alcoholic Beverage Establishment CUP = PC or Director 21-430.10
  11. The Historic review function will be done by a separate committee (as recommended by the CLG) – the Historic Preservation Committee which would be comprised of 5 Council appointed members having qualifications as specified by the CLG: 2 members from the professions listed and all others demonstrating an interest, knowledge, and competence in historic preservation (one means of demonstrating this could be attendance of the State Preservation Conference).

HPC would have Purview over:

- Design Review applications within a Residential (OakHill/Brewster & A Street) Historic District and those listed individually on a local, state, or national listing

(additions, exterior modifications, new structure); except in condition described under Joint review bullet 3.

- Façade modifications in Commercial Historic District
- Projects subject to the City’s demolition policy (Reso 2005-198)
- Exceptions (minor setback deviations) for projects before the HPC (rather than also going to the Planning Commission)
- Surveys, education, awards, etc.

HPC would meet Jointly with SPARC on the following items:

- New structures and major additions within the Commercial Historic District
- Subdivisions involving an eligible resource not yet listed or within a district (see *Subdivisions*, below)
- Multi-family (3 or more attached units) or non-residential principle building (new or major addition to existing) in Residential Historic Districts (rare)

Each board votes separately; a majority of each board is needed for approval

HPC would be a Recommending body to CC on:

- The listing of new Historic Districts or individual listings.

As is the case of SPARC, all HPC decisions would be appealable to the City Council

#### *Subdivision*

In the case of a larger entitlement/subdivision involving a historic resource:

Project 1<sup>st</sup> goes to HPC for decision regarding:

- Whether a resource exists and
- Whether to recommend to CC that the resource be listed.

If resource - then to Joint (SPARC and HPC) Review for:

- Recommendation to PC on the site plan and
- Decision whether Architectural (detail) Review will be done Jointly or whether to establish a resource “sphere” within which HPC will have Architectural Review purview and outside of which SPARC will have purview.

After map approval, Architectural (detail) Review done Jointly or separately (with HPC reviewing any modifications proposed to resource parcel and SPARC reviewing the remainder of project) - as determined at previous Joint hearing.

Note: Minor projects to be reviewed at the administrative level similar to current system, subject to recommendation of DCAC’s Historic Preservation Subcommittee

12. SPARC shall be comprised of 5 Council appointed members. These members shall be qualified (ex: 1 architect, 1 landscape architect, 1 contractor, civil engineer, or planner, and 2 showing an interest, knowledge, and competence in site planning and/or architecture.