

**From:** Heidi Bauer <[heidibauer2000@gmail.com](mailto:heidibauer2000@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, May 27, 2019 3:14 AM

**To:** Hines, Heather

**Cc:** Barrett, Teresa

**Subject:** Comments on Haystack Project

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Heather, thank you for your response indicating that you would forward my comments on the Haystack project to my fellow commissioners prior to Tuesday's meeting. Please find my comments below:

Dear fellow Planning Commissioners,

My apologies for having to miss this milestone meeting regarding the Haystack project. I had no idea that when I sat on the Station Area Master Plan Advisory Committee that 7 years later I would be reviewing as a Planning Commissioner the first major development to fall under it.

You have a very important part to play in the development of this area. What you approve on Tuesday will set the tone for all future developments in the Station Area. In my opinion, this is the most important downtown project to come across the Commission since Theater Square.

The Station Area Plan took over 2 years to develop and approve. There were many public meetings, Plan reviews, public comments, and finally an approved plan that we all agreed on and are proud of. The Plan does ask for a lot, but knowing what a critical nexus this area is between our river, downtown and the train station, the development of this area can not be undervalued.

Based on the above, and knowing first-hand the intent behind what was approved for this area, I have the following comments on the Haystack project for your consideration:

1. The Transverse Street is the main thoroughfare for people to get from the downtown, across the river and up towards the train station. During the planning phase of this area it was discussed that this street may be better as a public concourse or a one way street. I like this idea, but don't recall why it wasn't included as an option in the original planning documents. I would support this area not being open to regular traffic, excluding emergency vehicles, or reducing the thoroughfare to one way traffic.
2. The SPAR drawings for the building facades and fenestrations on Transverse Street and Weller Street do not come close to what is shown in the Station Area Plan. The Plan calls for much more articulation and balconies. The Station Plan eludes to more of an old historic Townhouse type look like in Old Town Sacramento with a lot of balconies. This type of architecture fits in very well with our historic river town and I'd like to see this area follow what our original ideas were and set the look for future developments.
3. As we all know too well we are facing a housing crisis and people aren't able to live here anymore due to the lack of affordable housing. This development will serve to decrease demand and add more options to the market. At the same time we are constantly defending our few remaining open spaces and urban growth boundary from being developed. For this reason, we need to promote development in the right areas. The Station Area is the right area in downtown to allow for higher density living. Therefore, I would encourage and support and increase from 4 stories as currently proposed to 5 stories, as allowed in the Plan.
4. I saw that some of the ground level units are commercial but it would be smart to make sure that we plan for the possibility that we would want to add more ground level commercial. Can we have all of the ground level units designed so that they can accommodate commercial uses in the future; even if they aren't used like that now?

5. And lastly, I really like the rooftop garden areas, but is it possible to allow them to be open to the public?

Thank you for considering my input. I'm regretful I can't be there to weigh in, but know that you all love this City as much as I do and will do what is in the best interest of our community and future generations.

Kind Regards,

Heidi

**From:** Pete Gang <[pete@commonsensedesign.com](mailto:pete@commonsensedesign.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, May 27, 2019 2:00 PM

**To:** [alonsoplanningpet@gmail.com](mailto:alonsoplanningpet@gmail.com); [heidibauer2000@gmail.com](mailto:heidibauer2000@gmail.com); Bill Wolpert; [dianaagomez@gmail.com](mailto:dianaagomez@gmail.com); [richard@lacehouselinen.com](mailto:richard@lacehouselinen.com); [mcdonnell4council@gmail.com](mailto:mcdonnell4council@gmail.com); [patrickstreeter@gmail.com](mailto:patrickstreeter@gmail.com)

**Cc:** Hines, Heather

**Subject:** Lessons from a 34-unit residential project in Windsor

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Dear Planning Commissioners,

At the **Know Before You Grow** presentation of the Haystack project on Thursday, May 23rd, we heard the community implore the developer to increase its attention to energy and climate issues.

Toward that end, I wanted to bring to your attention a project in Windsor that has implications for this project and for other upcoming projects in Petauma.

In a public meeting in Windsor last month, Councilmember Deb Fudge related the story of a project that the Town Council had just approved. She said that she gave direction to the developer to come back in one month with a project that was **all-electric, as close to net zero (NZE) as possible, and to put solar PV on all the carports**. If the requested changes were made, Council would approve the project.

The developer complied and the project was approved. The developer reported that **eliminating natural gas resulted in financial savings**.

Here's a link to the documents about the project. Attachment 4 is the meatiest part of the package: [https://windsor-ca.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view\\_id=2&event\\_id=1412&meta\\_id=63297](https://windsor-ca.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=2&event_id=1412&meta_id=63297).

A few highlights:

- It's a 34-unit project on a 2.9 acre site; 2 stories in 7 buildings.
- The approved project is **all-electric (no gas)** and is intended to be 45% to 75% solar. 140 kW for 34 units = 4.12 kW per unit, which is probably not enough to be 100% ZNE.
- All the units are metered separately ("**virtual net metering**"). Separate electric meters ensure that owners/tenants have a direct financial stake in their energy usage.
- There will be **(15) Level 2 EV chargers for 34 units!** That seems like a reasonable ratio.
- **Sonoma Clean Power (SCP) will make the EV chargers available for free!**
- Many of the measures noted in Guttman and Blaevoet's letter (Attachment 4) are basic code requirements that really shouldn't be highlighted, such as: "high performance windows," "cool roof," "100% LED lighting," "Energy Star appliances," etc. In my opinion, doing so is a wee bit duplicitous.
- There are numerous **incentives and rebates** available to the developer for the energy features, as listed in Guttman and Blaevoet's letter (Attachment 4).

This “next level” of attention to energy and climate issues **saves money for the developer, saves money for the owner/tenant, and has ongoing benefit to the inhabitants of a climate-constrained earth.** In a climate-constrained world, we would be foolish to ignore solutions that result in wins all around.

Many thanks for your tireless service to our community!

Pete Gang, Architect, LEED-AP, HERS, BPI

May 27, 2019

Re: Haystack Pacifica Mixed-Use Project

Members of the Planning Commission:

I have a physical therapy practice located in the River House opposite the proposed project. My office faces the proposed project and will be directly opposite the Transverse Road. Many of my clients are disabled; many use assistive devices for walking and are limited in their mobility. Many use the in office elevator and need parking in either handicap spaces or other places readily accessible to the office. My concerns re: the proposed project are as a business owner in the project vicinity and as a long time resident of the Petaluma community.

Parking/project traffic/infrastructure

The proposed parking of 197 interior spaces and 57 on boundary street for both apartments and commercial space is inadequate. By the developers own estimate, that is 0.93/residence with remainder allocated to the commercial square footage. I asked the architect/representative for the number of BR's in the plan to better gauge how realistic the number; they were unable to provide that information readily, but that is probably a better way to estimate parking needs, particularly with units larger than studio/one BR.

Currently, on most days, there are 50-80 vehicles parked on the proposed project site and on the adjacent project side of Weller Street and East "D" Street. Most is overflow from the Smart Train; some from adjacent businesses at peak class/work hours. Most of the businesses on Weller, ours included, don't have adequate parking in their private lots to accommodate both employees and clients. The River House, for example, has 14 offices and 9 spaces; one of which is disabled parking. There are times at present when it can be difficult for my clients to find parking that is close to the office given their physical limitations. Many of the currently available slots will become unavailable with the proposed project due to both increased demand (proposed project; as yet incomplete Float House/park/shower; Smart Train impact) and the Transverse Road and fire lanes which will effectively remove parking, particularly in close proximity to my office.

The project needs to provide additional on site parking for residents/visitors/customers of commercial enterprises. As dependence on vehicles diminish with time, the parking can be reallocated. Overall, there needs to be additional handicap parking. There also has to be independent discussion on how to better accommodate Smart Train parking and/or provide easier access to the train minus a vehicle.

The Transverse Road. I understand that it is part of a longer term plan to make it a road for vehicles. But, in the middle of high density housing/commercial and adjacent transit center it makes no sense from a safety perspective to have cars/bikes/pedestrians/buses all in such close proximity. I would urge you to reconsider the plan and instead encourage a wide pedestrian/bike route at this location with adequate width for emergency vehicles to access the interior of the site and to serve some of the community functions anticipated.

Weller Street. At present, there is a proposed stop sign and L turn lane from Weller Street to "D" Street. If there is to be a L turn a signal is needed. There will be more traffic than at present and it's a real hazard currently to attempt a L hand turn at this location at peak hours. Otherwise: R hand turn only.

## Views/Aesthetics

My view of the beautiful Sonoma Hills will largely be gone with completion of this project. The view from the Turning Basin will be markedly changed. As both a business owner and a long time community member, I will miss the extraordinary beauty and joy the view brings me daily. This is part of the fabric of Petaluma. And yet, there is not one rendering of what the proposed project will look like from the very public water front along the turning basin. I believe view corridors should be part of the project consideration and part of the planning process. The developer should provide renderings to show what the project will look like from vantage points along the water front and the design should better reflect the architectural heritage that is uniquely Petaluma. The buildings (especially #20 and two similar at the corners of the southern parcel) have an overall blocky appearance that is a hodgepodge of design elements that my eye finds grating. Each piece, on it's own may be okay but collectively they, don't work.

Renderings of the private roof top spaces needs to include any mechanicals. The drawings of Brewsters' roof top green space fronting Petaluma Blvd N proved to be very misleading as it did not include any of the restaurant mechanicals.

## Energy

The developers representative alluded to the fact that the developer is “exploring solar power”. Solar power should be a Condition of Approval.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments in the Planning Process.

Sincerely,

Barbara Haushalter  
222 Weller Street #208  
Petaluma, CA 94952

**From:** Lynch Chris <[chris@madarc.com](mailto:chris@madarc.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2019 1:38 PM

**To:** Richard Marzo <[richard@lacehouselinen.com](mailto:richard@lacehouselinen.com)>; [alonsoplanningpet@gmail.com](mailto:alonsoplanningpet@gmail.com);  
[heidibauer2000@gmail.com](mailto:heidibauer2000@gmail.com); [mcdonnell4council@gmail.com](mailto:mcdonnell4council@gmail.com); [dianaegomez@gmail.com](mailto:dianaegomez@gmail.com);  
[patrickstreeter@gmail.com](mailto:patrickstreeter@gmail.com)

**Cc:** Robbe, Tiffany <[trobbe@cityofpetaluma.org](mailto:trobbe@cityofpetaluma.org)>

**Subject:** Haystack

---Warning: Use caution before clicking any attachments. THIS EMAIL IS FROM OUTSIDE OUR EMAIL SYSTEM.---

Hello Planning Commissioners,

We wanted to drop a brief note regarding the Haystack project. WAs architects and residents for 30 years, we have been involved with this site all the way back into the 90's when it was owned by Gina Pittler and she was considering different proposals. Chris was on SPARC (design review) 2000-2004 when some of those proposals came to him in what was called at the time 'Preliminary review'. Mary was a member of the CPSP committee, 1996-2003, as well as the Station Area Master Plan committee which created the guiding documents. We, along with architect Wayne Miller who sadly passed away, worked on designs for this Site prior to these recent renditions.

Recently, Chris attended the KBYG public meeting last week and heard the developer / architect's presentations. We have gone online and reviewed the plans and documents.

We think from a Planning standpoint the design is sufficient to meet the CPSP intent. We like that they are providing a ratio of 1 car per unit. This gets them closer to the density that this TOD site demands.

However, we have issues with the architecture.

Chris heard the architect declare at the public meeting that the current design is the result of he and his firm studying Petaluma and ALL its diverse architecture. He said they grabbed references from throughout the town including the single family houses (Gable roofs, Lap siding, vinyl windows and asphalt roofing) on the East side, the river warehouses (metal siding and trusses) and the traditional architecture (stone) from downtown.

First of all, some of these references (East side houses?) are not appropriate for a urban core project. Secondly, they LITERALLY added these parts and pieces as appliqué, like decorating a cake or as Mary likes to say, an architectural version of the Mr. Potato Head game... The result is there is WAY too much going on resulting in a visually chaotic jumble of mixed metaphors.

Architecture should be about the sense of place itself which in this case is the river, transit, the train, the looming grain silo, the extension of the downtown pedestrian experience. This is the context which should inform the design...the plan as well as the architecture. Granted, this is not an easy task.

I general, we recommend asking the architect to go back and simplify the project in both massing and materials. By doing so, they will free up money better spent on higher quality materials more appropriate for an urban core project, as well as maximizing sustainable systems and components such as additional car chargers, PV arrays, etc.

Massing: Remove the 'hats and trusses' from the buildings. The renderings show the trusses literally floating in the air doing no honest work in most places. The heavy timber arcades and balconies also seem imposed onto the buildings. It all creates a 'Swiss Chalet' connotation which I doubt is the intent. Provide flat roofs which are urban and more conducive to maximizing the PV.

Materials: Use higher quality and provide far less variety. The 'Suburban Residential' palette of asphalt roofing, vinyl windows and fiber cement lap siding is not appropriate just because they 'occur' here in our subdivisions. Replace with metal roofing where sloped roofs occur. Use metal or even fiberglass windows rather than plastic ones. Use mostly plaster and metal siding in lieu of lap siding.

The 'stone' should also be struck completely from the project. It is not appropriate and cannot be duplicated authentically anyway. It will look like a cheap veneer, not a stone wall or pedestal.

Thanks for listening and for all your hard work. Feel free to call if you have further questions.

481-7410

Chris Lynch  
145 Keller Street  
Petaluma, CA 94952  
(707) 765-9222  
[www.madarc.com](http://www.madarc.com)







FIBER CEMENT TONGUE AND GROOVE VERTICAL SIDING 6



CORRUGATED STEEL - PAINTED 3



30 YEAR COMP SHINGLE W/ COLOR VARIATION 8



FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING - PAINTED 5



ADHERED STONE VENEER - COLOR MATCH LOCAL SAMPLES 7



FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING - EXAMPLE 4



CORRUGATED STEEL EXAMPLES 2