

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

February 22, 2017
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Meredith Benz
Tom Leader
Mike Woldemar

Ray Welter, Vice Chair
Brant Fetter
Jonathan Livingston

Vice Chair Welter called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Vice Chair Ray Welter; Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Brant Fetter and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Chair Eileen Whitty, Boardmember Jonathan Livingston and Boardmember Leader

Staff Present: Hector Lopez, Jonathan Malagon and Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 13, 2016

Vice Chair Welter requested the following amendment:

- Page 6, above Public Comments; "The designer stated....."shabby chic-ish elements"

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the DRB Minutes of July 13, 2016; as amended, approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Welter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty).

July 27, 2016

Boardmembers Fetter and Welter requested the following amendments:

- Page 13, third paragraph, "Vice Chair Welter said....stucco ~~fit~~ sill"
- Page 8, second paragraph, "Boardmember Fetter said it is difficult to due to ~~is~~ the lack of data...."

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the DRB Minutes of July 27, 2016; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Welter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty).

August 24, 2016

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Fetter/Woldemar) to approve the DRB Minutes of August 24, 2016; approved by voice vote: 3-0-3-1 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty; Abstain: Welter)

September 14, 2016

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Welter/Woldemar) to approve the DRB Minutes of September 14, 2016; approved by voice vote: 3-0-3-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Welter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty; Abstain: Benz).

January 25, 2016

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Fetter/Welter) to approve the Minutes of January 25, 2016; as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter and Welter; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty; Abstain: Woldemar).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Welter/Woldemar) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Welter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty).

Public Forum – Brown Act – None

City Council Liaison Report – None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Vice Chair Welter announced that there were no Consent Calendar items and asked and confirmed members did not wish to place any items on the Consent Calendar.

He announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, March 6, 2017 by 5:00 p.m.

Public Hearing(s)

1. PLN17-033 GARCIA TWO-STORY ADDITION

Description: PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±850 TWO-STORY ADDITION IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL DUPLEX STRUCTURE.

Location: 524 22ND STREET

APN 514-220-019

Zoning RM-2, MEDIUM HIGH-DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

Applicant RANPEL DESIGN

Owner HUGO GARCIA

Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for a design review to construct an 850 square foot, two-story addition in the rear of an existing residential duplex structure. He noted that the lower level addition would be used as

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

a non-habitable space for recreational use and optional covered parking. Staff is recommending conditional approval subject to removal of a trellis and replacement with a roof over the area and secondly, to ensure windows are compatible to existing windows.

Boardmember Fetter questioned the lower area of non-occupied, yet recreational space, and he said it is either habitable or non-habitable and a garage is habitable space. Mr. Lopez stated it will be open on the sides, have one or two outlets and be used for things such as ping pong.

Boardmember Fetter referred to xeriscaping in the rear, and staff recommends no grass. He pointed out that the citywide efforts are to reduce the amounts of grass but not eliminating it entirely. He also referred to the side setback and said most jurisdictions require that if the building is within an existing setback which is non-conforming and it is added onto, the jurisdiction will require adherence to the setback code with new areas.

Mr. Lopez and Mr. Atencio confirmed that historically Richmond allows extension of the existing non-conforming setback provided new development does not extend further than the non-conforming structure.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the project was essentially a single family house on the second floor with a recreation room on the ground floor. Mr. Lopez clarified that the unit above will be extended and the ground addition is for parking and recreation, as well as a unit on the front lower level.

Vice Chair Welter asked and confirmed that the lower level has sheer walls. He then called upon the applicant to answer questions.

Roberto Pena, Designer with Ranpel Design, introduced himself.

Boardmember Fetter asked why the window is proposed to be removed on the north side and questioned whether it was due to the fire rating. Mr. Pena clarified that this is a mistake and it will remain.

Boardmember Fetter pointed to the lack of windows on the north elevation and confirmed with Mr. Lopez that there cannot be penetration to the new addition given it is so close to the property line. He asked if the applicant could move the wall back so it is 5 feet from the property line. He stated the wall is blank and while there is interaction with the code given the non-conforming setback, he briefly described design as being important, as well.

Mr. Pena proposed two windows for the bathroom and laundry area, given he would like privacy for the neighbors.

Mr. Lopez stated the neighboring property is about 2 feet away and therefore, they would not be able to see the windows.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested adding a condition that indicates that the northerly side yard of the new addition be increased to the amount allowable by building code in order to provide windows along the wall by making it 3 to 5 feet.

Vice Chair Welter said there is a 21 foot master bedroom which is gigantic, so losing 1 to 3 feet will not impact it, as well as the family and dining room areas. He also suggested breaking up

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

the mass and suggested recessing the stairway a couple of feet and additionally installing a window there which would be seen when walking in the front door versus a blank wall.

Mr. Pena noted that half the door is wood and half the door is window, and he noted staff asked him to remove the trellis. Mr. Lopez explained that he asked that it be removed because it did not conform to the remainder of the building, it would bring in light, and also given maintenance issues.

Boardmember Fetter stated having a blank wall is a much bigger concern, and the functional use of the trellis lighting the stairway is reasonable.

Vice Chair Welter agreed the trellis will have waterproofing issues and he agrees with the concept of opening this area up and getting light into the windows. He recommended pulling back the stairway and installing windows.

Boardmember Fetter suggested installing windows above and below, as most of the homes in the neighborhood have windows, and Vice Chair Welter noted that most are one-story.

In response to Boardmembers, Mr. Pena said they can move the wall by 2 feet but it would require lessening the garage parking space.

Boardmember Fetter suggested a notch and Vice Chair Welter suggested not pulling the bottom level out and to pull out the top level and install a roof over the notch. Boardmember Fetter agreed this would work well, but structurally this is difficult.

Mr. Pena stated he could do this and confirmed with Vice Chair Welter that the Building Code requires 3 feet and he confirmed he can pull it back 14 or 15 inches and this would also address the parking space. The windows could be high clerestory, 2x4 foot windows to get light into the dining room, master bedroom and entry hall.

Boardmember Fetter questioned whether the Board could condition the project or whether it should be continued so the plans show design changes.

Vice Chair Welter opened the public comment period, and there were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Welter) to approve PLN17-033 based on staff's four design review findings and staff's 15 recommended conditions of approval, with the following additional conditions: 16) that there shall be a notch at the top and bottom of the door side of the stairway to create a 5 foot setback and shall have windows top and bottom, size to be determined; 17) that the north setback shall be revised to 3 feet or 5 feet depending on the Building Code allowable necessary to allow windows. If 5 feet is required and the parking spaces are short, there is no reason that holes on the ground floor north side couldn't be added so the noses of the vehicles stick out similar to a carport, and 18) that windows on the upper floor shall be a minimum of 4 x 2 foot deep clerestory type windows; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Welter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty).

2. PLN16-385 MAKING WAVES ACADEMY EXPANSION

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

Description	(HELD OVER FROM 02/08/2017) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO EXPAND THE MAKING WAVES ACADEMY CAMPUS. THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF RENOVATION OF EXISTING CLASSROOM FACILITIES; EXPANSION INTO ADJACENT PARCELS TO BE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THE MASTER PLAN; AND CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW CLASSROOM BUILDINGS, TWO GYMNASIUMS, OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL AREAS, ASSOCIATED PARKING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.	
Location	4075, 4123, 4131, 4175, AND 4301 LAKESIDE DRIVE, AND 2900, 2925, AND 2975 TECHNOLOGY COURT	
APNs	405-371-034, 405-371-035, 405-371-010, 405-371-032, 405-371-033, 405-371-025, 405-371-013, AND 405-371-014	
Zoning	IL, INDUSTRIAL, LIGHT	
Applicant	MAKING WAVES FOUNDATION, INC. (OWNER)	
Staff Contact	JONATHAN MALAGON	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonathan Malagon presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for recommendation to the Planning Commission for a design permit to expand the Making Waves Academy Campus. The DRB held a study session on November 9, 2016 where members provided feedback, including the following recommendations:

- Revise the landscape plans to increase the plant palette throughout the project site;
- Revise the landscape plans in the parking lots to provide better shading of paved sections;
- Provide more clarity on the entrance areas through arrows or wayfinding signs;
- Revising the parking area where buses will queue to increase the amount of back-out space when buses are parked;
- Adjusting the building colors to make buildings more attractive and colorful;
- Showing a variety of window treatments and color to the tilt-up buildings; and
- Development of a more creative fence along Richmond Parkway

Subsequently, the applicant made revisions which were also reviewed by two DRB members and acknowledged that recommendations were incorporated in the revised drawings; however, Boardmember Livingston voiced concerns with the lack of clarity in the campus design in articulating a main entry, arrival and drop-off spaces for both schools.

The applicant then made additional revisions that would create a stronger sense of entries for both schools including paving the spine that goes to the front door to the street to help strengthen the sense of arrival, creating a stronger landscape announcement on the sidewalk and these can be discussed by the applicant.

Staff is recommending additional conditions in terms of the fence design along Richmond Parkway, adding more color to buildings, and there have been comments by Boardmember Woldemar, a copy of which he distributed to the Board.

Boardmember Woldemar posed the following questions and comments for staff:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

- He asked and confirmed that the project is a recommendation to the Planning Commission which was mistakenly identified on the agenda, given there is a use permit.
- He said if the environmental review identifies a number of traffic or parking impact problems that would change the site plan he asked what would occur. Mr. Malagon stated there was a traffic impact study prepared and staff will be publishing the Mitigated Negative Declaration. However, there were minor impacts that do not change the project, such as better signal timing along Lakeshore Drive. If impacts were too great, he would return this to the DRB.
- He referred to Condition No. 1 which references dated drawings of February 14th, and he noted that all drawings before the Board indicate February 22nd. He wanted to be sure to confirm which plans apply.
- He referred to Condition No. 5 regarding items being kept in good order. He asked if the City ever considered a Maintenance Bond for landscaping, given other cities mandate this for a period of time and said these should be considered in future projects as well.
- He referred to Condition No. 7 and asked for a sample of the aluminum decorative fence and that it be a bronze color. The sample he received was a typical picket fence which is located on another project by the Zeneca property and to the south of the field station which works well.
- He did not agree with Condition No. 8 about colors and he thinks there are more colors than staff is recommending.

Mr. Malagon pointed out an error on the last line of Condition No. 9 which should state “Making Waves Academy” and not “John Henry High School.”

Vice Chair Welter opened the public hearing and he called upon the applicant.

DOUG GIFFIN, Campus, LLC, stated they made one round of revisions which were reviewed by Boardmembers Leader and Livingston. Another round of revisions was made which are before the Board this evening and they are happy with where the project has gone based upon input. He introduced Thomas Lumikko regarding changes made.

THOMAS LUMIKKO, Studio Bondy Architecture, distributed a rendering package, stating these are the same renderings in the packet but are printed to reflect colors and they revised the color board. He described the following revisions made for the project and presented plans:

- A diagram regarding circulation for the two closed campus schools which are next to each other; a lower middle school and an upper high school with separate drop-off loops and areas for bus drop-offs.
- Maximization of the queue distance, stating the areas in red are only open during drop-off and pick-up times.
- Through signage, each school has its own visitor parking lot at the front of the schools which is associated to the main office for each school.
- In addressing the sense of entry and native California landscaping, John Martin, their landscape architect, will discuss this.
- Implementation at the front entry for glazed storefront type openings for light, with a skylight above, which have added a strong access coming to a plaza with a flagpole with raised paving from the entry.
- Emphasis on the 3 bus stop areas and their circulation to the school, fencing and elevation changes.
- The drop-off and pick-up experiences with triangular signage to depict a sense of entry

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

- Sheet 8-5.28 is an aerial plan and 8-5.20 is the new rendering showing the detailed front entry.
- The school drop-off area loops and entry down to the public parking, with significant queue distances.
- Creation of a special paved area which also slows vehicles and identifies it.
- Baked enamel based lights with a glowing top which are 8 feet tall, which also addresses security concerns.
- Middle school and high school drop-off loops.
- Visitor parking, wayfinding signs, plaza and flag pole area.
- Additional planting pockets in the plaza with a rendering of trees.
- Monument sign on the street, visitor sign at entrance directing people to visitor parking.

Boardmember Fetter stated after school, there will be sports field use, after-school programs and he asked how long the facilities will be used after the closing of school and how the campus interacts with the neighborhood.

Alton Nelson, Jr. CEO, Making Waves Academy, explained the school has after-school programs that operate until 6PM some of which include enrichment activities on the field. Afterwards, there are interscholastic soccer and baseball teams using the field space which will operate until dark. The campus gets full use until about 6:30 to 7:00 p.m. on most days.

Boardmember Fetter confirmed the campus is closed during classes, and he asked if students can go off campus between school and practice, such as going to Walgreen's.

Mr. Nelson stated they discourage kids leaving the campus and returning. The school does not allow junk food on campus and at times students do go off campus to buy something, but can leave the school once recessed.

Boardmember Fetter asked who from the community is able to use the fields. Mr. Nelson stated they have a process to apply for community use of the various spaces, which they welcome. There is no fencing or gates to the Lakeside Drive part of the campus. Boardmember Fetter said he had discussed this at the last meeting and thinks there should be knowledge about access from various directions or at least controlled access, given the closed campus during school times and semi-closed campus after school which should be able to be controlled for use.

Boardmember Benz questioned whether this had to do with design review and did not understand why access was an issue.

Mr. Nelson added that in the last year they only had about three groups to use the space and they charge a nominal fee of \$100 and required insurance. When they use outside space, they must rent it and do not get use of it for free. There is not a lot of residential housing around the campus and there is a YMCA down the street, so rented use typically falls on weekends.

John Martin, Landscape Architect, presented the landscape diagram, green spaces and exterior spaces identified on A101-A and he said the goal is to create a school that has more of a park-like setting with organic flowing patterns that could be used by students so they are more immersed with the landscape. One comment was for a higher utilization of native plants and he noted they often use native plants.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

They identified areas with increased native plantings for a total of 38,000 square feet, identified south-facing sides for plant conditions, shady areas for specific plantings, switched out 23 large trees and have adapted the suggestion of Quercus Agrifolia evergreen trees for inside areas and bio-filtration pond areas.

Boardmember Woldemar asked a series of questions and provided comments on the project, as follows:

- He asked that the architect provided illustrations of plant materials or site furnishings in the plans to staff; however, they are not illustrated in the packet but are called out.

Mr. Martin discussed landscaping noting that there is a slight preference towards evergreen plantings, given the school year is during the winter months. They wanted to incorporate academic related plantings by leaf, root type, vegetation, color, and in trees they have fruitless mulberries, a Ginkgo tree, deer grasses and coffee berry, manzanita, and Ceanothus. He described a light bench-way system in open spaces, the amphitheater area and dedicated dining areas. They are trying to steer away from steel and concrete and they have a climbing wall, basketball courts, a vegetable garden located by the middle school gym on sheet L101, with orientation towards wood and an Alice Waters garden theme.

- He referred to the 8 ½ x 11 sheets which are numbered with circles around them. Above these are the original sheet numbers. He skipped to page 02 and commented on this sheet and his sheet 03, stating along the entire western side of the site is an old time pre-fabricated concrete block wall of pilasters which has fallen down. He suggested it be removed and replaced.

Mr. Giffin stated this is an old Caltrans wall and they have verified it was not on their property. He noted that place it looks better is where there is ivy and he agreed they could plant ivy to cover it if they cannot get Caltrans to remove it. He noted there is a large flat area which is owned by the City and they cannot do anything with the vertical part at the corner.

- He asked and confirmed that the 10 foot high fence is being removed, which should be included in the drawings. He said when coming around the corner at San Pablo Avenue and the Parkway, he said it appears as if the new fencing will follow that block wall, and he asked why it should not be uphill like other parts.
- He also noted that the western side of San Pablo Avenue is all residential, and he thinks there should be a pedestrian entrance into the campus from that corner, given there are many kids who could enter from this way.

Mr. Giffin stated there are 14 students and 1 uses their bike out of 800 that currently walk to school, so it is a very low pedestrian count and they are also trying to de-emphasize the ability to go to Walgreen's.

- He said the DRB has had numerous discussions regarding nodes and primary intersections; however, while this intersection is not identified, he thinks it ought to be, given the view inside of this facility.
- He then referred to Sheet 04 which is a series of civil cross sections and he asked that the various sections be marked of where things are located.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

Boardmember Woldemar then referred to Sheet 05 and had the following comments:

- Planting should occur outside of the wall;
- There appears to be big gaps in the overall landscaping theme;
- Along the inside of the wall to the west side of Buildings 2 and 3 there is no landscaping or just a strip of shrubbery, and he asked what happened with the trees in that area;
- There are also several locations where the pavement and/or sidewalks are cast right apart against the buildings and he asked for planting areas here. Mr. Giffin noted these are existing conditions and this is a drive aisle next to the existing campus buildings.
- On the north side of Building 3, there is existing sidewalk that comes right up against the building;
- On the northwestern side of the high school ball diamond open area, on the south side there are a row of trees that creates a nice sense of enclosure, but on the north side up towards the batting cage, there are no trees. Mr. Martin noted this is a C3 treatment area.
- On the south side, there is a mini warehouse and a space between the school, and he was not sure how much room there is for landscaping, but it is also unclear what the fence is along there and he asked whether it is a chain link fence and/or if it also has barbed wire. Mr. Lumikko stated it is a steep bank between that edge and the parking and it is heavily landscaped. They are not proposing a fence and he cannot remember whether the neighbor has barbed wire or not.
- He stated the landscaping in parking lots per the new zoning ordinance is 1 tree for every 5 cars and none of the parking lots achieve this. Mr. Martin stated they were working with the interim zoning ordinance which had 4 cars for every tree, and Mr. Giffin stated they did a shading study and as confirmed by Boardmember Livingston, trees are not required to be in the parking lot islands, and they proposed trees in the best possible place to provide shading for the lot and 28 are needed, but they provided 35 trees in better locations elsewhere for the project, which Mr. Martin briefly described.
- In the interim zoning ordinance, there was a percentage of the parking lot landscaping and then a number required for the number of spaces within the lot, and Mr. Lopez stated this still exists. Mr. Martin stated they believe what they have proposed meets this intent for perimeter and interior trees.
- The area in front of Building 1, to the east side is a sidewalk that appears to be right up against the wall. He asked if there were any benches to be provided.
- He noted there are a set of dimensions in one of the plans that has two layers of buses parked and pulling out and then there is angled parking. He did not believe there was enough dimension for all of this to work. The parking on the eastern side may need to move closer to the street to get the sidewalk away from the building, provide some benches and have proper dimensions. Mr. Lumikko stated both civil and traffic team members have verified that the dimensions work and they are here tonight.
- He asked why the angled parking was there. Mr. Lumikko stated it is visitor parking and part of an existing lot and loop and not proposed to be redone. Mr. Giffin stated there is no drop-off or pick-up there and staff parks in the back lots.

Boardmember Woldemar then referred to Sheet 06 and had the following comments:

- The planting is to occur on the slope bank along Richmond Parkway. He asked that it should be denser trees and shrubs to be more consistent with what is already there.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

Mr. Martin explained they have planted this rather heavily and it is masked through the entire space. Along San Pablo Avenue there are about 16 trees that exist and these are being retained and planting on the ground is augmented all the way through, as well as through the mid-section and Lakeside Drive.

- He has the same comment regarding percentages of trees and parking spaces.
- On the middle school entry-way, as he loops around the project there are a series of buses stacked up in front of the entrance to the school. There are 3 parallel parking spaces on that drive aisle and he asked and confirmed this was to provide extra visitor parking.
- Regarding the entryway, there are children arriving and leaving on foot that are crossing between buses, and others parking. It seems there may be a safety situation regarding arrivals and pedestrians.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 07 and had the following comments:

- He did not see anything in the package that talks about site furnishings or something to indicate what pavement materials are throughout the entire project. It makes reference to civil drawings which then make reference to landscape drawings, but it does not answer the question.
- He knows there was discussion at the subcommittee level with Boardmembers Leader and Livingston having to do with the use of live oaks versus London Plane trees. There was discussion regarding reducing London Plane trees and increasing live oak trees. This was to get the project away from looking like a business park and something more like a school and park. He would like to see where these are located and also would like to see what the 5 year renderings look like.

Mr. Lumikko stated he heard earlier that the London Plane trees where the street trees and kept there. Every London Plane tree was pulled from the interior of the campus and replaced. Mr. Martin said they also filled in missing gaps for the street trees. Boardmember Woldemar confirmed there were no London Plane trees at all on the interior.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 09 and had the following comments:

- While this is a landscape diagram, it does not represent an urban design diagram. He said he made note at the November study session of wanting to see this diagram and he asked what the dots and arrows point to. He thinks there is a north/south main street and another one running east/west, but the two never connect.

Mr. Lumikko said no; they are separate campuses. They are connected for staff and administrators or in case someone goes to the wrong visitor parking lot. It is not like a college campus and does not have the need to navigate. Given they do not have large events on the campus this does not filter into the design.

Boardmember Woldemar said he thinks there should be some sort of logical connection there and believes the north/south plan implies that students are going to walk over to the bus stop.

- Near the bottom of the page, there is an north/south connection which is where the middle school drop-off is located. The applicant's illustration showed a view of this and as he looks through the corridor, he saw a car. He questioned why he would not see

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

some sort of tree, sculpture, or a sort of focus as one would see in any kind of campus plan or urban design plan. This was done for the entrance coming to the high school.

- When looking to the south, he sees a path fade off to the left and he thinks there are bleachers on the right, but he does not know what the bleachers look like visually. This should show up in the architecture and site furnishings.

Boardmember Woldemar then referred to Sheet 10 and had the following comments:

- On the fire diagram, it looks as though these are all compact spaces which he understands currently exist. He thinks it is narrow along there and something should be done.
- He would also note the 28 feet along the eastern side, which he did not think was enough room for bypass buses and auto back-up ability.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 11 and had the following comments:

- There is a red dotted line by the administrative area of the middle school, and he asked and confirmed this was the main office of each of the schools and they try to show how the main entry goes to the main office.
- He asked what would happen if the dotted line were on the north side of the space instead of the south side. Mr. Lumikko stated the kids coming from the corner would find the first opportunity to get to the school which would be walking up the drive aisle and this is why it is important to keep it on the other side.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 12:

- He drew a sketch showing keeping kids out of the bus and auto circulation, have it on the south side of the drive aisle, as it tries to make the entry more direct and obvious and he suggested flipping the spine.

Mr. Giffin stated they received different feedback from Boardmembers Leader and Livingston. They started with where Boardmember Woldemar wanted it and they asked that it be on the other side. He said they could switch it back, given they still have the design. However, to Mr. Lumikko's point, they like it where it is because there are not a lot of pedestrians and the bus stops kids from walking up the driveway.

- He said he was trying to determine how kids will stay on the path, noting that he did not understand the dog leg. He would also suggest near here out into the street, he asked there be an entry form that announces the front door. He believes in people first, cars second.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 13:

- The entry into the high school area has a funny jog or dog leg in, and in both cases the landscaping does not seem strong enough. He was looking to do his "cups" and focus people into this area through pavers or trees. He has the same conflict with people and buses and suggested a stronger entry here, as well.
- The connection that reads north/south from the middle school to the high school running along the east side of Building 4 is something he questions as its purpose. He asked what materials are used to make the walkway crossing across the driveway.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

Mr. Giffin stated because they are closing all of the drive aisles except for 30 minutes after drop-off and 30 minutes before pick-up, there is no vehicle traffic there during the day, and Boardmember Woldemar noted there will be visitor accessing the area.

- The elliptical shape shown at the drop-off at the high school and he asked what material this is.

Mr. Martin stated it is colored concrete or special paving. Mr. Lumikko said it is a contrast and noticeable. It is an integral colored concrete with a textured finish or uni-pavers. He believes on the itemized number list it shows what this is, and Boardmember Woldemar noted it states “see civil” and the civil plan states “see landscape.”

- He referred to a stronger connection between the two schools, and said between Buildings 2 and 3 which exist on the western side, it appears to be wall-to-wall concrete.

Mr. Martin stated there is some planting on the south side, and Mr. Lumikko referred to Photo 6 on A0.0-3 shows the top left corner. The area is interesting due to grades coming together, and the existing building has a 5' retaining wall to make the grades work.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 14:

- He appreciates the beginnings of a sign program but what is missing is that he believes there should be a sign on the corner of San Pablo Avenue and the Parkway, as well as another level of signage not included yet which includes doors, bus stops, wayfinding, etc. What will be very important in the plan is the coordination and compatibility of one sign to the next so it all hangs together.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 15:

- The color palette has too much blue and it needs other colors. He thought about colors at sunrise and sunset, which reflects kids coming to school and coming home, or Tuscany, rusts, oranges, which should be used more consistently throughout the palette. He thinks the colors might be chosen by way of building location and it might be more helpful to students.
- There is a lot of aluminum frame but no color indicated in the drawings. Mr. Giffin stated it is clear anodized aluminum throughout.
- The Board had conversation earlier about the tilt up panel pattern, and he noted there still seems to be too much of the same, with the same openings, and he asked that there be more variety.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet 16:

- He pointed to two existing buildings and said the whole western elevation is hidden behind the block wall and it needs some color to it.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the front page:

- He said missing in the design review submittal are that in the drawings it indicates a 42 inch high guard rail (Item #31) and a retaining wall below it, and there is nothing that talks about these details.
- There are 4 places with vehicular gates, and he asked what these are.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

- There are seat walls that he would like to know more about, as to whether the bumps are there to keep skateboarders off of them.
- They touched on site furnishings but he asked about site lights and important for both items are that their colors be consistent and that they work together with everything.
- He asked for discussion regarding new fences and pilasters, graphics, and he made reference to the site at Hilltop and panel fencing with cut-outs.
- A site materials and building materials board is needed.

Boardmember Fetter said he was not sure he could condition the project as a recommendation to the Planning Commission, and some of the items are and are not addressed. One issue is the sense of entry for the high school and middle school and what the majority of people will experience and Boardmembers discussed this as not what the majority of people coming to the facility will see.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the high school and connection from the street sidewalk into the raised bump area and he suggested adding a simple sidewalk along the north edge of the east/west parking area, eliminate the walkway in the front and possibly a Sader gate in between the buildings. For the middle school site, there is a walkway coming around on the west side of the drive aisle and he suggested moving the two handicapped spaces and bring a sidewalk out to the street which creates a secondary entrance.

Mr. Lumikko noted there are three bus stops which he pointed to, and some kids do walk and this is why they wanted it on the one side of the drive aisle, and Mr. Giffin said if this revision were made, the school would have to staff the kids coming in. Mr. Lumikko said in all cases, they were also trying to remove steps and the extra length assists with this.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested flipping the entrance and put it on the south side so it is by the sidewalk off of the street, asked to use some of the 3-4 foot high fence designs to prevent kids from cutting across, and he suggested using more creativity in the project.

Vice Chair Welter commented that his initial reaction is it is 6 or one half dozen and they are either forcing kids to cross the main entry into the parking lot or they have to cross the parking drive aisles twice; however, it is much more controllable via monitors on site and not someone out at the curb cut.

Regarding the high school entry, Vice Chair Welter said it might make more sense to be on the other side. Boardmember Fetter said if the applicant was forced to put a Sader gate somewhere, where would they put it. Mr. Lumikko said he thinks the sense of entry is already created between buildings in thinking about the amount of sidewalk and scale, and he thinks the proposed gate fits within the architecture for this site. Mr. Martin said they also have incorporated trees inside the space.

Vice Chair Welter said he agrees with Boardmember Woldemar that something is needed instead of a basketball court to bring people in. Mr. Lumikko stated they have a good budget for public art and they have identified more local artists and if the Board wanted to condition a location for the public art, they could here. There is a substantial grade change by the drop-off area of the high school, seat steps facing the drop-off and meandering paths going up 15 feet between the drop-off and the field. They have created this area into something great, and the back of it is for hanging out with steps kids can sit on during the day or have lunch.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

Boardmember Woldemar pointed to the parking, ballfield, and then the drop-off area. He suggested doing a stair step down for sitting, and then bleachers with a sail cloth cover over it as the focus. Therefore, he thinks the termination should be on the other side of the field.

Mr. Martin stated there are many trees here and the direct line of sight would be obstructed. He noted they are somewhat challenged because they must get a fire truck there and they are right at the allowable turning radius limits. Narrowing this would create a bigger sense of entry but they cannot do it, so they are designing the space for access while still creating a sense of entry and funneling in when walking.

Vice Chair Welter said this is all the more reason to have something like an object as the focus such as the art piece.

Boardmember Fetter stated its location and type should have been brought back during this submission, but it was not. He referred to the public edge and concurs with Boardmember Woldemar's comments about sidewalks along San Pablo Avenue, and he said if the applicant does not have access to the Caltrans portions of right-of-ways he asked how it would work.

Mr. Atencio stated he obtained input from the City's engineering staff and their recommendation is to have a sidewalk along San Pablo Avenue which is part of the Complete Streets Project which the City has already started.

Mr. Lumikko explained that if this area is cut, it will undermine the walk and the person walking will be put on the curb of a very fast street. On the flip side, they pointed out how at the housing complex across the street, they pulled the sidewalk back from the street to make it safe. Therefore, they think they would be putting in a sidewalk to nowhere because EBMUD and Public Storage are never going to do it, and whoever is walking there will be 3 feet from very fast cars, as opposed to taking them onto what is a very nice sidewalk on the other side of the street which is set back and safe.

Boardmember Woldemar disagreed and said sidewalks should be added whenever they are able to be added, and if the applicant elects not to install the sidewalk, staff should make note of that in the report to the Planning Commission which will end up being a Commissioner and/or City Council decision.

Vice Chair Welter said personally he thinks the sidewalk will be a huge waste of money because people will not use it.

The Board then briefly discussed the existing sidewalk and potential planters and/or tree wells cut in the concrete, trees along San Pablo Avenue and the Parkway which Mr. Martin presented a diagram of showing existing trees and an obvious gap. There is a pre-existing fence and Mr. Martin stated they can plant this area with trees.

Boardmember Fetter referred to colors and likened them to IKEA's colors. Mr. Lumikko pointed to the actual colors which are different than those presented at the last meeting and he presented the color board. He noted the school has some identity colors which are blue and they want to make both schools seem different but similar a bit using different accent colors.

Boardmembers indicated they feel like the blue is a bit institutional-looking, suggested using a bold color for taller elements of a non-blue color, and Mr. Lumikko noted the blue was a gesture for Making Waves theme or branding, and Boardmembers discussed the use of bold colors and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

accent colors. Boardmember Woldemar suggested the use of more consistency throughout the project by purchasing powder coated street furniture, aluminum awnings, light fixtures, etc., and Mr. Lumikko stated this would be extremely expensive and they were looking to achieve this through paint as the colors are hard to match between different manufacturers.

Vice Chair Welter suggested making certain items like all benches be powder coated red that sticks out and he thinks there is enough color in the project that if they start getting into a different color for the storefront and doors, it will look too busy. He suggested changing some of the blues out to different colors and he thinks they should definitely keep the branding but it just does not need to be everywhere.

The applicant discussed fencing, stating their goal was to make it disappear in the landscaping. Boardmember Livingston suggested switching to a picket fence which they are open to, and he presented their fencing plan.

Vice Chair Welter noted the time and asked what the Board would like to do as far as continuing to discuss the item. Boardmember Woldemar suggested continuing discussion until 9:30 p.m. Boardmember Fetter asked if the Board has resolve the larger items so that if it comes back, these items can be conditioned.

Boardmember Woldemar asked that the applicant number each item to be resolved, and when they return describe how they have addressed them. Regarding the fencing, he asked to look for ways to move the fence around, landscape it properly to fit the pattern and plant things that grow around the fence.

Boardmembers referred to the sidewalk and access from the Parkway to the schools. Mr. Lumikko said access should be achieved closer to Lakeside just because of the retaining wall and sound wall blocking access. He noted there is too much of a grade change for ADA requirements until one gets mid-block and they would have to punch through the sound wall and retaining wall.

Eric with BKF Engineers, Civil Engineer, introduced himself and referred to the corner and location of the property line. He noted the Caltrans wall acts as a retaining wall there and it falls quickly on the other side of the wall. Cities sometime have maintenance agreements and it may be that the City maintains the wall even though it is a Caltrans right-of-way, so its ownership should be confirmed.

In addressing the concept for a node, Vice Chair Welter said the corner could be planted, but he did not believe anything else could be done given future expansion plans for the Parkway and San Pablo Avenue. Boardmembers discussed landscaping the meandering fence and the applicant team indicated they more supported the landscaping concept. Mr. Martin stated they can probably introduce an element that traverses the hillside perpendicular to allow a fence to stagger.

The applicant agreed to return and address comments of the Board. He confirmed the items to address include: colors, fencing, mechanical screening, circulation, traffic and pedestrian access, site details and photos so what the Board is able to see what items look like, focal points, art and landscaping details.

Mr. Lumikko summarized the items, stating they will focus on access points for the drop-off and that they need a focal point which they will address with art. Regarding building paint colors, the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 10, 2017

larger monolithic elements should be changed to a slightly contrasting color and non-blue. In terms of the fence, they covered this and to add planting on the property and define paving materials and they will provide site details.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Welter) to continue PLN16-385 to March 22, 2017; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Welter and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Leader, Livingston and Whitty).

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None**
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None**

The Board adjourned at 9:40 p.m. to the next meeting on March 22, 2017.