



---

DATE: February 25, 2020 AGENDA ITEM NO: 8.A

TO: **Planning Commission**

FROM: Tiffany Robbe, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Haystack Pacifica Mixed Use Project  
Site Plan and Architectural Review – Condition Compliance  
215 Weller Street, East Washington, Copeland, and East D Streets  
File# PLMA-16-0001

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve design refinements to satisfy Condition of Approval #17 as outlined in Planning Commission Resolution No. 2019-09 for the Haystack Pacifica Mixed Use Project.

### **BACKGROUND**

On May 28, 2019 the Planning Commission approved Resolution No. 2019-09 approving Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAR) and associated SmartCode Warrants for the Haystack Pacifica Project. The approved project includes construction of approximately 180 multi-family units, approximately 25,000 square feet of ground floor commercial and additional tenant amenity areas. Additionally, the approved project includes 15% onsite inclusionary housing. The site design is such that buildings are wrapped around the perimeter of the two blocks and the internal space of each block is occupied by a two-level parking garage capped by a residential courtyard at the third-floor level. The approved project includes construction of a new transverse street through the block (between Copeland and Weller Streets) and frontage improvements, including wide sidewalks and street trees, along all project frontages.





Figure 2: First Floor Building Plan



Copeland Street Elevation

East Washington Street Elevation

Figure 3



Weller Street Elevation

East D Street Elevation

Figure 4

As part of their review the Planning Commission identified several design details that warranted reconsideration and refinement before construction of the project. The Commission approved Site Plan and Architectural Review and the associated Warrants for the overall project, including Condition of Approval #17:

- 17. The following architectural details shall be brought back to the Planning Commission for final SPAR review and approval and shall subsequently be incorporated into plans submitted for building permit issuance:

- a. Simplification and consideration of roof lines, including proposed trusses
- b. Revisions to window design and variety
- c. Consideration of additional balconies
- d. Provide exhibits illustrating storefront details and including awnings and materials
- e. Appropriate replacement of stone veneer

## **DISCUSSION**

### *Condition of Approval #17*

The applicant has continued to refine the project to address the full list of conditions as approved by the Planning Commission. Pacifica has hired a full complement of consultants to see the project through the building permit and improvement plan process. DESS Architecture has replaced the previous project architect and has been involved in the refinement of the project. Consistent with Condition #17, the following considerations and revisions have been submitted for the Planning Commission's consideration of SPAR condition compliance review.

#### *a. Simplification and consideration of roof lines, including proposed trusses*

The architect considered the variety of roof lines approved with the overall project and found the trusses at the gable-end buildings to be out of character with the overall project architecture. As illustrated in Attachment C, Sheet A5.3.2, the trusses have been removed. No other changes to the rooflines from those approved by the Planning Commission are proposed.

#### *b. Revisions to window design and variety*

At the May 2019 hearing, commissioner comments included encouragement to utilize a "punched" window concept, where the windowpanes are inset from, rather than in the same plane with the exterior wall, consistent with architectural imagery in the Station Area Master Plan (Attachment B). Additional comments encouraged use of a more residential window pattern for the residential units on the upper floors.

Revised plans incorporate a "punched" window design with the window glass inset approximately three inches from the windowsill and two inches from the building wall (Attachment C, Sheet E-1). The window frame color remains dark bronze to match the proposed aluminum storefront system.

Window patterns have also been modified to respond to the Commission's comments. (Attachment C, Sheet A5.3.2). In the revised proposal, the various building types are coded as pink, turquoise, or blue<sup>1</sup>. Each color-coded building type utilizes its own window pattern to enhance the project's design approach, consistent with direction in the SmartCode for projects comprised of many building components abutting each other.

Many of the window openings that were originally proposed to be filled with a 6-paned window assembly are now proposed to be filled by a 3- to 4-paned assembly, particularly on floors two and three. The architect notes this change was made to address egress requirements

---

<sup>1</sup> There are two courtyard-fronting buildings color-coded yellow: buildings 8 and 16. For the purpose of exterior detailing, building 8 is treated as a turquoise building and building 16 is treated as a blue building.

as well as to provide more variety in the window patterns. The original architecture commonly utilized the same window pattern on floors two through four, whereas revised plans propose a different pattern on floors two and three than on floor four. A number of the revised window patterns have a more horizontal orientation than the original proposal, though the SAMP window imagery tends to be vertical in nature. It is not clear to staff whether the revised window patterns, specifically on floors two and three, satisfactorily address the Planning Commissioners' concern.

*c. Consideration of additional balconies*

Revised plans have increased the number of balconies by approximately 10%. Generally, the additional balconies have been added in situations like that depicted on Attachment C, Sheet A5.3.2 at Building 19 where the original elevation included balconies on floors three and four, and the revised plan adds a balcony on floor two.

*d. Provide exhibits illustrating storefront details and including awnings and materials*

Attachment C, Sheet E-2 provides visual imaging of the proposed storefront system and Sheet E-3 illustrates the three proposed awning types. Similar to the window patterns, each store-front awning is associated with a building type represented by pink, turquoise, or blue color-coding. The middle image depicts a cloth awning, the top and bottom images are metal awnings.



*e. Appropriate replacement of stone veneer*

The plan set reviewed at the May Planning Commission meeting proposed one stone veneer product for the whole project. The Planning Commission directed that the architect study whether a stone veneer base was the preferred approach, and if so, to further consider the product proposed.

Revised plans incorporate three types of stone veneer, as illustrated in Attachment C, Sheet A5.3.1. All three stone products are similar in tone and orientation but also provide subtle variety that builds on the project's overall concept of a series of distinct building components abutting each other. Like the window patterns and awnings, each stone is associated with a building type represented by pink, turquoise, or blue color-coding. Detail 11 provides an installation detail and illustrates that each stone base extends to the grade/sidewalk.

The applicant has provided a written response to each of the design modifications conditioned for the project (Attachment A). With the possible exception of the window patterns, staff believes that each of the items identified in Condition #17 has been studied and modified to address the concerns previously expressed by the Commission and recommends that the Planning Commission authorize the final design refinements proposed to comply with Condition #17. Should the Commission find that further window or other modification is necessary, they may provide specific direction regarding that modification subject to staff review and approval prior to building permit issuance.

*Unit Count*

The project was approved as 178 residential units. During plan refinement work, the new architect identified four additional units that were visually represented on plans reviewed by the Planning

Commission but not identified in the numeric summary of the project units on Sheet A0.00 of the original plan set. More specifically, unit type A4 was not included in the statistics chart but was shown in the approved floor plans on each of the four floors within the south block facing the traverse street at the courtyard. The corrected unit count is 182 multi-family units. This is in substantial conformance with the approved project and the project remains compliant with minimum parking, density, and all other code requirements.

#### *Public Art Proposal*

Subsequent to the Planning Commission hearing, the applicant contracted with local artists Catherine Alden and David Duskin to design the onsite public art to meet the city's requirements of IZO Chapter 18. The public art proposal consists of a metal sculpture in the East D Street pocket plaza and multiple tile mosaics embedded into the concrete paving in and abutting the three pocket plazas as well as the transverse street's mid-block crosswalk, all thematically related to kayaking/being on the river. The artists' proposal strives "to draw people into and through the space, inviting them to stop and rest, explore, drift, or stay". The landscape architect and the two artists have been working collaboratively on the site design, and the pocket plazas and public areas have been designed with these themes in mind. For example, along East D Street the planting areas are not precisely parallel to the street, but ebb and flow as a river would, water-washed stones or stone-like seating plinths provide alternative seating options and natural texture into the overall palette, and the enhanced pavement is proposed to mimic piers extending toward East D Street. The final public art proposal is subject to approval by the Public Art Committee.

#### *Inclusionary Housing*

On October 21, 2019 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2019-171 N.C.S approving alternative compliance with inclusionary housing requirements for the project. At the request of the applicant and consistent with IZO Section 3.040.D., the Council approved an alternative mix of units by income level to allow all 15% of onsite inclusionary units to be provided to low income households.

#### *Next Steps*

In addition to the Planning Commission consideration of final SPAR, the Haystack Pacifica Mixed Use Project is scheduled for the following public meetings to satisfy conditions of approval prior to building permit application. On February 19, 2020 the Recreation, Music and Parks Commission will provide feedback to staff regarding the design and amenities proposed in the three small pocket plazas approved with the overall project. Also on February 19, 2020 the Tree Advisory Committee will provide feedback to staff regarding the street tree species proposed on each of the street frontages. Finally, on February 27, 2020 the Public Art Committee will consider the onsite public art proposal for consistency with IZO Section 18.120.

At the conclusion of these remaining public meetings the project is anticipated to submit for building permit and improvement plans in summer 2020.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- A: Applicant's Narrative regarding Condition #17 modifications
- B: SAMP Excerpt: Relevant Concept Imagery
- C: Condition #17 Compliance Review Plan Set

The Planning Commission Staff Report and all of its Attachments are viewable on the City's webpage at <https://cityofpetaluma.org/meetings/> via the May 28th Planning Commission Agenda link.