

**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
JANUARY 8TH, 2008**

ROLL

APPROVED

Board Members Present:	Chair Kent, Crew (<i>arrived late</i>), Huntsberry, Olmsted, Alternate Summers
Planning Commission Liaison:	Sonnet
Board Members Absent:	Dickens
Community Development:	Director Brown, Community Development Director Raffi Boloyan, Principal Planner Kraig Tambornini, Senior Planner

AGENDA

A. Staff Communications

- 1) Past City Council, Planning Commission and Design Review Board Action on Design Review Matters

B. Board Communications

C. Minutes

- 2) December 4, 2007

D. Old Business

- 3) ED06-113 Request for approval of an Environmental and Design Review Permit for a “lift and fill” to an existing single-family residence requiring variance’s to permit the continuation of existing non-conforming setbacks.
343 D Street (Kraig Tambornini)
- 4) ED07-045 Demolition of an existing 4-story office building and construction of a new 4-story 82-unit residential condominium complex.
33 San Pablo Ave. (Raffi Boloyan)

E. New Business

- 5) ED07-090 Review of an Environmental and Design Review Permit and Sign Program to renovate the Northgate Mall.
5800 Northgate Drive (Kraig Tambornini)

6) Election of DRB Officers for

A. Staff Communications

- (1) Past City Council, Planning Commission and Design Review Board Action on Design Review Matters

Tambornini reported that the joint DRB and Planning Commission meeting for the former Salute site has been tentatively scheduled for February 26, 2008. Also, staff received building permits for 524 Mission and 1203-1211 Lincoln Ave projects.

B. Board Communications

Huntsberry asked about the project on the corner of Mission and Irwin. Boloyan responded that it is 15-unit town homes and they submitted for demolition and building permits. There was a condition for a follow-up review for the Board as a consent item in regard to roof venting and change in windows, so that will be scheduled for an upcoming Board meeting.

Huntsberry asked about the mixed-use project on B Street. Boloyan responded that in regard to 820 D Street, building permit applications were submitted and staff provided preliminary comments. Changes were made to the plans that were not consistent, so they must respond or seek an amendment, but they have submitted for permits.

Huntsberry announced that he is unable to attend the next meeting.

C. Minutes

- (2) December 4, 2007

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Olmsted moved and Huntsberry seconded, to approve the December 4, 2007 minutes as presented. Motion carried 3-0. Kent abstained. Crew and Dickens absent.

AYES:	Members:	Olmsted, Huntsberry, Chair Kent, Alternate Summers
NOES:	Members:	None
ABSTAIN:	Members:	None
ABSENT:	Members:	Crew, Dickens

D. Old Business

- (3) ED06-113 Request for approval of an Environmental and Design Review Permit for a “lift and fill” to an existing single-family residence requiring variance’s to permit the continuation of existing non-conforming setbacks.

343 D Street (Kraig Tambornini)

Tambornini summarized the staff report and asked that the Board provide a recommendation to the Zoning Administrator (ZA) as to whether the exterior façade details, such as shingles, siding, trim, windows and roof address the Board's September 5th comments, and the applicable design criteria. The Board may also provide additional recommendations for the ZA to consider before taking an action on this project. In particular, staff asked the Board to affirm whether the project achieves compliance with the pertinent criteria and comment on the six italicized items in the staff report.

Olmsted asked staff about the partition between the garage and storage whether or not it is a structural wall or a non-load bearing partition. Tambornini responded that it is a non-load bearing partition.

Laura Kehrlein, architect, explained that as stated in the staff report they have made the following changes since the last meeting from the suggestions made by the Board. The proposed internal stairway has been revised to work properly with required clearances. A building section has been provided to illustrate the revision. The proposed stairway is located at the location of the former fireplace that was removed when the residence was raised. A railing has been provided on the upper level along side the stairway. The entry porch at the lower level has been removed and new windows have been added to articulate the lower floor. Additional landscaping has been added to replace the existing concrete pad. They worked with staff to provide additional parking and due to the existing bearing wall between the garage and proposed living space the structural frame precludes widening the garage space. Also, there is an 18-inch elevation difference between the garage and storage area and there is an existing storm drain running under the existing garage space. An alternative plan has been included providing an angled parking space in the front landscaped area, but that is not proposed to be pursued given the recommendations of the City Traffic Engineer that this solution was not preferred and the second space should be accommodated in the existing driveway. The owner has obtained building permits to raise the home, and it has caused great financial hardship to stop work on the project. The exterior uses typical materials for craftsman home including wood shingles, stone base, and wood trim detail.

Olmsted clarified that the floor level of the storage unit behind the garage is at a different level, noting the elevations seem to show it as level. Ms. Kehrlein indicated that would be incorrect. The garage is 18-inches lower than the rest of the lower floor level, so the existing storage room is 18-inches higher. Alternate member Summers suggested removing the doors, and have the door go from the storage room to the family room, because by having stairs down into that garage they would not be able to keep the 20 feet clear for the vehicle. Ms. Kehrlein agreed that could be changed.

Olmsted asked if the garage level is 18-inches below the family room floor as well. Ms. Kehrlein responded in the affirmative. Tambornini noted that the issues with the grades could be addressed with the permit because there is an opportunity to modify the storage room to provide a door that is setback at level with the garage, so staff is confident that

there is a solution.

Chair Kent asked about the small retaining wall around the front yard. Ms. Kehrlein noted that the intent would be to continue that retaining wall so the whole front of the property could be landscaped.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

Hugo Landecker, representing Gerstle Park HOA, submitted a letter last June about this project and they addressed the outside stairway. He then questioned how many sets of stairs are needed to get from the ground floor to the second floor. They recommended that the exterior stairway be removed and that a ground level entry into the first floor be provided, which makes more sense. This is an architecturally awkward stairway that does not fit. In addition, the stairway proposed requires a variance and there is absolutely no justification for the variance. The Association objected to this variance. The open porch on the second floor is also architecturally awkward and does not fit the structure. Also, this building is located on a main thoroughfare of the neighborhood and it will be an eyesore to the neighborhood. It does not appear as a craftsman style home. The proposed changes to the ground level they do support, which are more appropriate.

Steve Patterson, Gerstle Park resident, believed this project has been a disaster from the start. He never heard the DRB respond so bluntly to an applicant about the intentions and this has always been viewed as an illegal unit work in progress. The applicant has received some bad advice and mixed signals because three different planners have worked on this project, so mixed signals have been provided in a variety of ways to the applicant. He urged the Board to consider viewing this project as if it were coming to the Board for the very first time as a “lift and fill.” The neighborhood desires an attractive, well designed “lift and fill.” Also, make it the best craftsman style “lift and fill.” Right now this will be the ugliest and most embarrassing “lift and fill” in San Rafael located on one of the busiest streets and desired help from the Board.

Chair Kent closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion and action.

Huntsberry agreed it is a shame to be reviewing this project in the wrong order by being approved by the Building Department and then being asked to bless what was built. It has gone through a variety of changes and it may not be the best “lift and fill” project in San Rafael, but it is a distinct looking project and he liked the outside porch. The stairway is not that unattractive. It will certainly be a better looking project on this street than other buildings on this street. Given the circumstances for how this was approved and going forward, the applicant has addressed the Board’s concerns. Also, he wanted to see the landscaping remain and the two cars provided in tandem. He believed the project has suffered enough under the hands of the City and will support as presented with the tandem parking. He further suggested raising the floor of the garage 6-inches to avoid some of the stepping issues.

Alternate Summers appreciated the revisions and believed they are doing the best job possible to remove vehicles from the street. Also, they should examine the garage floor level as suggested by Huntsberry. The removal of the entry was key at the lower floor. Once this project is finished and the landscaping matures it will be far more attractive, and he noted support.

Olmsted wished they had begun this project from the beginning and would characterize most of the problems being generated by the applicant. He commended the City for diligence in spotting the problems and bringing them to the Board's attention. They have struggled to try and correct some very bad decisions made that turned into construction. He does not believe it is possible for this to be considered a perfect world and they must deal with situations as they find them. The progress that has been made through the several meetings has resulted in a considerably better building than proposed before. They are not receiving everything they desired in terms of parking and the entrance, but the changes do represent a considerable step forward and believed they must approve the project.

Chair Kent agreed it is time to bring this project to resolution. It is key that this remains a single-family home and stays three bedrooms. This is a reasonable solution and believes the house works better with the entry on the second floor than the first floor, so he supported the stairs. The landscaping along the south side of the house is illogical. Hardscape should be placed at the edge of the house so that irrigation does not hit the side of the house. He recommended losing the turf and planting perennials and shrubs. He suggested stepping-stones in order to punch up the front as well as some colored concrete with stamping to make the front look as nice as possible.

Tambornini summarized the Board's comments:

- Project has responded to Board's previous comments
- Board agreed with Chair Kent's changes in landscaping.

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Huntsberry moved and Alternate Summers seconded, to approve the project as recommended with the changes in landscaping as recommended by Chair Kent. Motion carried 4-0-2. Crew and Dickens absent.

AYES:	Members:	Huntsberry, Alternate Summers, Olmsted, Chair Kent
NOES:	Members:	None
ABSTAIN:	Members:	None
ABSENT:	Members:	Crew, Dickens

The owner thanked the DRB and staff for their time and energy spent on this project.

- 4) ED07-045 Demolition of an existing 4-story office building and construction of a new four-story 82-unit residential condominium complex.
33 San Pablo Ave. (Raffi Boloyan)

Boloyan summarized the staff report and recommended that the Board review the revised plans and additional details/information provided by the applicant to determine if the Board's consensus items from the December 4th meeting have been sufficiently addressed. Staff requests that the Board makes its final recommendation on the projects architecture, landscaping, lighting and site improvements to the Planning Commission.

Olmsted asked about the portions of the building that seem not to comply with the terms of the height requirements and desired a resolution of those questions that were raised. Boloyan discussed the elevator enclosure and the Zoning Ordinance exempts mechanical equipments from height calculations, so height is measured from the top of the main building itself. Staff has indicated that it is consistent with how height has been measured in the past per the Uniform Building Code. The elevator providing access to the rooftop deck is not a required function of the building. If the Board determines that the height is an issue in its mass and bulk, the Board can request that it be removed. The Board could make that recommendation to the Planning Commission if it so chooses.

Olmsted asked staff whether or not Segment B met the full intent of the code. Boloyan responded that it was reviewed by the Building Official, and with the methodology used it was found to be a separate segment. For each segment the outermost corners were taken depending on the difference between the highest and lowest grade. The 10-foot bonus or the non 10-foot bonus was applied to that segment. If there was a 10-foot bonus it was given from the low side. Building Official reviewed and again believes it is consistent with the Uniform Building Code for measurement of height.

Olmsted asked staff if Segment C on the south side has been measured to the proper point, which has a height of four stories that seems to exceed the height allowed by the ordinance. Boloyan responded that the issue was reviewed and in terms of determining height it was determined based on taking four points of an outermost segment and the points are shown on Height Exhibit No. 1 in regard to measurement and that was found acceptable. The area where the garage dips down lower below the finished grade was not counted, the points were measured from the corners of the building.

Olmsted clarified with staff that if there is a "belly" in the wall plain at the lower garage entry that is ignored. Boloyan responded in the affirmative. In this case the belly was not counted. Olmsted clarified with staff that the low point of the building is not the low point of the building. Boloyan agreed not for the measurement of height.

Huntsberry asked about moving the driveway and entrance parking away from the house at 27 San Pablo and due to the redwood trees it could not be moved and after looking at Sheet L1, he is not sure if he can see where the existing redwoods are going to be affected by moving the driveway. It shows the redwoods located along the easterly property line. Boloyan responded that Sheet L4 provides a tree survey and the grove of redwoods being referenced are trees 15, 16 and 17 and the existing trees are superimposed on the proposed site plan. Huntsberry believed the last parking space must be removed if trees 16 and 17 will survive. Boloyan noted that those three trees in that grove would remain.

Jeff Hutchinson, applicant, believed this is a strong housing opportunity site for the City. It is close to transit, infill location, close to services and close to major employers. With the General Plan designation of this project in 2004, they will be able to provide 82 units of much needed housing, and 16 of those units will be held as below market units. They have received endorsements from several groups in the County and in the City including the Conservation League, League of Women Voters, Kaiser, and SEIU. The project complies with a majority of design and housing policies as well as compliant with all the zoning controls. Based on feedback received from the Board and neighbors back in February, the project was reduced to 83-units and then presented to this Board in August and Planning Commission in October and based on that feedback they spent the last few months addressing those comments as well as continuing to work with the neighbors. They wanted to preserve the grove of redwood trees, and in creating guest parking, those three trees must be eliminated and they must bifurcate the open space in the front of the property. They felt it is better to create a larger contiguous open space and preserve the trees. They agreed to build an 8-foot landscape soundwall along the entire property line between 33 and 27 San Pablo. They are able to create an additional buffer at the guest parking area. They can fit a 6-foot wide landscape buffer at the edge of guest parking without impacting the trees. In regard to ADA accessibility, there is a maximum of 5% slope and if guest parking is moved further to the east they would not be able to achieve that 5% slope. They agreed to put in an 8-foot high wood landscaped fence along the neighbors on Tarrant and agreed to upgrade the 5-foot wood fence along San Pablo. To create a larger lawn area they placed the fountain feature and amenity space further back. Also, there is more open space in the back near the redwood grotto. In addition, they have a path around the entire perimeter of the building along the County open space, so there are a lot of recreational opportunities.

Alternate Summers asked if the current paving occurs in the same proximity to the redwood trees. Mr. Hutchinson responded that the paving pattern near the trees is the same. Also, an arborist looked at the trees as part of the tree survey report.

Michael Palza, architect, believed several comments in regard to landscaping, articulation, staggering of the building, positioning of the balconies and privacy have been addressed through the several meetings. He then discussed variety of railings and they are providing three types of railings that will articulate the building better. They have positioned those railings in different parts of the building, so they will create a difference. They are vertical pickets but position is different and the end result will create that articulation desired. They are proposing 8 by 8 posts for the trellises. They incorporated an engineered panel board that is a recyclable wood material and very sustainable materials that is consistent with the contemporary look of the building.

Olmsted asked if stair access is required for the elevator and whether or not the roof deck is feasible. Mr. Palza believed it is feasible. Olmsted noted that an elevator is not a legal exit facility. He noted that elevator access adds another story to the building. Mr. Palza explained that the elevator provides ADA access to the deck. They are meeting their requirement with the elevator, but if they have to provide a staircase to the roof deck they

would do so. Olmsted did not understand how the roof deck could work without stair access plus an actual habitable space that adds one more story to the building. Mr. Palza explained that if they limit the overall size of the roof deck to less than 750 sq. ft. a secondary access is not required. Boloyan noted that it is based on the occupancy load of that roof deck terrace. The elevator would not count as one. It will be reviewed by the building department. If two means of access were required, they must provide two stairs, reduce the size of the terrace or eliminate the terrace. The rooftop terrace is not required by the City, it is purely an amenity provided by the applicant.

Crew asked about the wood siding. Mr. Palza explained that it is wood paneling and it will not be stamped.

Rick Gallo, landscape architect, indicated that they added the size of the plant materials and estimated quantities on Sheet L1. They also adjusted the lighting details on Sheet L3 to match the architectural flavor of the building.

Crew asked for a 10-foot barrier between the parking and house to the south. Mr. Gallo responded that there is a grove of three redwood trees that they wanted to maintain and if the parking is shifted over any further it would encroach on the drip line and impact those trees. They were able to get a 6-foot planting buffer adjacent to 27 San Pablo along with an 8-foot concrete masonry wall along the perimeter of the property.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

Trent Ervin, 27 San Pablo Ave. resident, expressed concern for the grove of redwood trees in question, but given the scope and magnitude of this project and the impact that it will have on not only the adjacent properties, but also the whole area itself it seems the driveway will be a major element of this project. He then provided the Board with four photographs that clearly show exactly the location of the tree. The issue is not the location of the visitor parking lot, as much it is maintaining and using the existing driveway, which is 21 feet from his property line to the edge of the driveway. The egress and ingress is the overwhelming issue and it should have the least impact on the neighbors. The soundwall does not seem to provide much of a buffer. Also, the redwood trees should be removed in order to accommodate the egress and ingress. Also, the open space area in back will be a problem in the future with individuals congregating. He would appreciate a larger buffer.

Sean Cunningham, San Pablo Ave. resident, discussed height in relation to the top adjacent properties and reviewed the diagrams, and the building will be 60 feet above the peak of his mother's home, which is a concern. They must provide information about retaining walls to residences 35, 37 and 39 San Pablo. He estimated that they would be looking at a 10 to 15-foot retaining wall and a 6 to 8-foot soundwall above that. He appreciated the fact that the applicant wanted to retain the redwoods, but they would not object to removing those redwoods. He expressed concern for the height of the building due to privacy issues. Also, the developer should have talked about all the adjacent properties in relation to elevations. Story poles were not left up for 24 hours and

elevations relative to adjacent properties should be addressed. The overall height of this building is a concern. He suggested eliminating some of the guest parking and place underground. The height and massive size of this building continues to be a concern.

John Moesher, Tarrant resident, understands that an 8-foot solid wooden fence would be built along southwestern property line as a privacy buffer and urged the developer to preserve the foot of the hill above the existing retaining wall before demolition begins to reduce the chance of erosion and allow the existing bushes to grow back as a privacy buffer. They are relying on representations made in Mr. Hutchinson's letter that there views from Tarrant Court will be enhanced and that the southwestern edge will not extend beyond the existing one and that the new building will be 5 to 7 feet further away than the existing building. He would accept this new neighbor as the first development of what will be the civic center neighborhood of the future. With the train station, public safety building and higher allowable density, this whole neighborhood will appear different in 20 years. It is hard to accept that the neighbors had to be surprised by this proposal. According to General Plan 2020, 9 out of 30 neighbors already have neighborhood plans, but he could not find one for his neighborhood and asked if this proposal is discussed. He asked the Board for a chance to draft a neighborhood proposal before the first brick is laid and before the first shovel is struck. They must see the big picture first. He asked the Board to call a "*time out.*"

Huntsberry asked about the parapet design and wondered how it will be supported. Mr. Palza responded that it is bolted down into the back part. It is about 12-inch thick board that has worked in the past.

Huntsberry asked about Detail No. 8 in regard to corner posts and flashing and wood posts are always shrinking, so that must be addressed in terms of water leaks and so forth. Detail No. 1 shows the proper flashing but submitted that water will run right around the bottom of the window into the cocking area and suggested adding flashing. It is his opinion that 2 by horizontal elements do not work and suggested a 3 by.

There being no further public testimony on this item, Chair Kent closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion and action.

Alternate Summers believed the project has come along way and appreciated the further detail. The deck penetration detail is scary and should be reviewed. The issue with the redwood trees and location of the driveway and he recommended examining the removal of those trees. Also, redwood trees do not belong in residential neighbors due to their propensity of falling down. The elevator is not shown in the elevations at all and he could not identify the elevator on the actual elevations. He imagined there will be a stair required in case of a disaster and believed at least one staircase will be required. In regard to railings, the new code will require 42-inches not 36, so that will change the look of the building. The biggest point is the access and he is not convinced that an additional 4 feet of landscape buffer will make that much difference. He objected to the idea of the elevator tower effect and did not like the additional pop up, so he is not in support of the roof terrace with an elevator tower.

Olmsted has a strong belief that this building is out of scale with its neighbors and setting. He raised issues regarding whether or not it has been properly evaluated in terms of the code and it now appears that some of the height issues have been solved by raising a very low grade 10 feet higher with retaining walls that do nothing to reduce the apparent height of the building, but do try to solve a technical code issue. The total number of stories that are seen is 7 when entering the site. The height of the building is 76 feet in a 36-foot height zone. It may meet the technical requirements of the ordinance, but the question is to whether it is appropriate and right to design a building of this size and magnitude has not been addressed. In his view it is a crime to build a building so large that it dominates its entire setting all done for the purpose of maximizing the sites development capabilities. Appropriate attention has not been given to the community needs and tricks have been used to get this project through. There are units that front the pedestrian drop off turnaround. The only window wall on the building is almost next to the pavement in front and no room for terraces or patios. It strikes him as one of the most dismal living environments that one could imagine. For these reasons and others mentioned in other meetings, it is a mistake to approve this building and he simply cannot support.

Crew expressed concern for quality of the materials. She did not think true wood sounds like a durable siding. She objected to the light color proposed for the top of the building. The details are very ordinary. This is a hugely visible site coming into San Rafael from the north and desired a quality project. She agreed removing the redwood trees would be better to provide more buffer to the neighbor to the south. There is not enough guest parking provided, so vehicles will impact the surrounding streets. She is sorry that this is not a higher quality project.

Huntsberry stated that this is a tough project. They used creative measurements to make a 7 story building fit within the letter of the law. He desired one less story on the top of the building. The driveway and parking needs to move over. They must align the planting side setback with the setback of the building, which is 15 feet. The three redwoods must be removed in the middle. In terms of 5% ADA sidewalk, he did not view as a problem because there is a very easy solution to make it work such as lowering the building by 6-inches. He thinks the details are appropriate for this kind of a project. It will need a lot of maintenance. This will be susceptible to regular maintenance so all the exposed walls will fade and crack. There are no overhangs on the building to shield the walls from rain and weather. He has concerns about the project and they certainly need housing in the City and applauded the developer for building such a project that will serve the community, but it has some shortcomings. They have their hands tied with the parking, and they must think in terms of reality and vehicles will be impacting the surrounding streets.

Chair Kent in general liked the site plan in terms of circulation and siting of the trees. He liked the open lawn area but it would not be compromised too much by shifting the entrance 5 to 6 feet to the north. In regard to trees, he suggested arbutus marina. Also, the tree at the end of the parking lot loses its leaves, so he suggested a more interesting tree because it is located in a real focal point. He has not seen this building in context with the

neighborhood and based on the information presented it is very hard to evaluate and desired sections on how it relates to surrounding homes.

Huntsberry felt the siding detail that has the horizontal grove expresses a horizontal wood siding is a good detail and noted support in that regard. Also, they did create a planter on the south side and he asked for an even wider planter.

Crew believed the planter should be 10 feet not with the overlap of the car. Huntsberry noted that once the redwoods are removed there is no reason why the setback could not be made the same 15 feet to the building and still end up with a good size lawn area. He then commended the applicant on the setbacks and modeling, so there is an awful lot of articulation that is not readily seen with these elevations.

Olmsted recommended that the model be presented to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Tambornini summarized the Board's comments:

- Support for shifting driveway further 5 to 6 feet to increase buffer from adjacent residence
- Removing the three redwoods trees is desired
- Achieve a 15-foot landscape buffer on south side
- More durable materials should be considered
- Overall height seemed tall and it would be helpful to have sections and a model showing the projects contextual relationship to neighbors.
- Planning Commission and the City Council should make the final determination on acceptability of the mass and scale

Liaison Sonnet stated that the Planning Commission understands that it is a big building but looking for direction on how it best fits in from an architectural standpoint. Was the articulation done to its fullest degree? Was the stepping appropriate, so the mass of the building was mitigated as far as possible? The process was leapfrogged and the Board was not able to comment on the details. The Planning Commission wanted all those comments in the hopper before a final decision was made. He then asked the Board if the project has gotten to the point that putting aside some of the logistical neighborhood issues are the cosmetic and aesthetic issues addressed sufficiently.

Alternate Summers felt it is hard to separate and not discuss the mass and scale, in his opinion they brought in interesting details, but it is still a big building.

Huntsberry stated that given what they know about the parking it is off the table, even though they feel in their hearts that it is not adequate parking. Also, the Board feels the project is too high, but they must respect the opinion of the City's Chief Building Official who feels it meets code.

Chair Kent noted the following consensus items:

- Quality of building materials (maintenance is a concern)

- Colors (white color on top is too light) (darker alternate color should be used)
- Landscaping
- Shifting entryway to north

The Board asked for a revised site plan to come back for final recommendation with the revisions suggested before moving forward to the Planning Commission. Huntsberry desired documentation from the architect on the wood products. Alternate Summers stated that if the rooftop terrace will create an even higher element popping up he objected. Huntsberry had no objection to the rooftop terrace if it is no visible. Also, suggested that the architect think about proper detailing of the decks.

Liaison Sonnet clarified that the Board's opinion as far as having the building fit into the neighborhood and if that is off the table, is the Board satisfied with the footprint, versus the use of parapets and no parapets, vertical offsets, orientation of the decks to minimize privacy concerns. He then asked the Board if the applicant has gone as far as they are able to go.

Olmsted felt the applicant has gone into his bag of tricks fairly successfully, but it did not solve the big problem. The number of units and number of vehicles is a secondary item. The big item is the massiveness of the building. Tambornini noted that the Planning Commission found the density acceptable and that translated into a larger building. Also, parking should be as allowed by the State and it was referred back to the Board to review the details and make sure the building was well articulated. The Board generally felt that the massing and stepping came along way and fine with the massing if it satisfies City code. Staff concluded that massing issue has been put to rest and now it is a matter of detailing and articulation. Staff then summarized the consensus items:

- That the site plan should be adjusted to provide a 15-foot landscape buffer.
- Address Chair Kent's comments in regard to trees.
- Further information on quality and durability of materials should be provided for the Board to review.
- Show deck sloping so drainage issues are addressed.

Mr. Hutchinson agreed to work with staff to relocate the driveway as far as possible to maintain Fire Department circulation and ADA accessibility. They propose to bring the project back before submittal of the building permit for final review of the details and maintenance issues associated with the details. Huntsberry pointed out if the driveway is moved over the full 15-foot setback, the driveway will still not be aligned with the garage door, so there is plenty of room.

Crew asked about roofing vents. Boloyan responded that they are reviewed to minimize penetration, but the roof penetration locations could come back to the Board. Huntsberry desired a flat roof parapet condition, and then all vents will be hidden.

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Huntsberry moved and Alternate Summers seconded, to approve the project as submitted with the exception that the guest parking area be moved to the north to where the setback goes to the 15-foot mark, which is the same as the building above it; that the three redwood trees be removed; and that the Board review before the building permit stage some kind of a presentation on the quality of materials and further expansion on the details, so the Board is comfortable; that the upper colors of the building be darkened; and include the other landscaping suggested made by Chair Kent. Motion carried 3-2. Crew and Olmsted opposed. Dickens absent.

AYES:	Members:	Huntsberry, Alternate Summers, Chair Kent
NOES:	Members:	Crew, Olmsted
ABSTAIN:	Members:	None
ABSENT:	Members:	Dickens

E. New Business

- (5) ED07-90 Review of an Environmental and Design Review Permit and Sign Program to renovate the Northgate Mall.
SR07-91 **5800 Northgate Drive (Kraig Tambornini)**

Tambornini summarized the staff report and asked that the Board provide feedback on the site plan details, and give direction to the applicant on revisions and additional information needed to improve the concept and facilitate thorough review. Specifically, staff recommends the Board provide comments on the issues outlined in the staff report.

Crew asked about the promenade and asked if the detail will be detailed in this project or come along later. Brown explained that there are a couple of components. Certainly the parameters, the cross-section of the promenade must be worked out in this process with the DRB, Planning Commission and City Council. However, there will be a separate and subsequent process called for in the promenade plan that calls for community input on details such as color of the concrete, signage, and historic marker details. Staff hopes to have a defining cross-section of the promenade for the DRB to evaluate.

Chair Kent clarified that the expectation is that not all of this will be accomplished in a 15-foot setback. Brown indicated that it would be wider than 15 feet. Chair Kent discussed the area near Sears that appears to have no promenade. Brown responded that they would ramp down to a regular sidewalk. The idea of the promenade is that it will go over the Merrydale overcrossing. There will be a class 2 bike pathway along Northgate, so that is for the real commute cyclist. In terms of the public promenade, which is more of a recreational path, it is intended to get over to the Civic Center, so it will go over the Merrydale crossing. Staff further noted that south of Merrydale is not designated as part of the promenade plan.

Olmsted did not understand about the Rite Aid modifications and asked if they are to be presented to the Board tonight. Tambornini responded that at the last meeting the Board talked about modifying the entry location of the building and trying to get closer to the street and the applicant developed a concept to present tonight in order to have more

feedback.

Huntsberry asked staff if the new drive entrance off the side of Del Presidio is one-way or two-way. Tambornini responded that it is single lane, one-way in only because of traffic conflicts.

Huntsberry clarified with staff that the existing parking would be maintained at 8.5 feet. Tambornini responded in the affirmative. Huntsberry asked staff to discuss the parking ratio. Tambornini responded that currently they would be about 179 cars over the City standards for the revised building area and with the 9-foot standard they would only be about 40 cars over. Huntsberry stated that they are increasing the size of the single planters, which are nose-to-nose of the cars and wondered if they looked at providing some token island planters in the long strings of cars.

Chuck Davis, applicant, explained that tonight they will provide an in-depth presentation of their intent to bring the experience beyond the four walls of the Mall and into the 21st century. They believe it is the time to fundamentally change the experience at Northgate, not just the shopping experience, but also the place itself and re-establish the Mall as the strong social heart of the broader Northgate District. They felt they needed to take a more open outward expression and be more inviting from the perimeter of the site. They studied in detail the North San Rafael Vision and General Plan documents to see how they could step up from what other wise would have been a cosmetic remodel. They wanted to push the envelope and make this a more inviting and exciting place. They do have constraints as shown on their exhibits. They have two entitlement processes to get through, the public review, and then they must go through unilateral approval of all the owners that have rights specified in the REA that is much like CC&R's that runs with the land. They have three goals they are trying to achieve: 1) creating much more of an indoor - outdoor experience; 2) playing out the exterior gathering places being more inviting and friendly; and 3) circulation changes to improve entrances and circulation. The new drive aisles specifically will address circulation changes. They are proposing to incorporate the promenade component that extends well to the west. Between the promenade commitment and increase in the landscape area, they will be increasing the overall landscape area and using a minimum 7-foot by 7-foot planter for every one of the tree wells and have a tree for every four spaces in the parking lot. They asked for the 8.5-foot wide parking stall as a standard to be maintained, but they will commit to reducing the number of compact spaces to the City's standard of 30%, so they will be increasing the standard count by about 300 stalls. Thus, they will provide over an acre of additional landscaping, which is paved today, they will provide half mile of the promenade to accommodate needs, and decrease the compact spaces on the site to provide more standard spaces. On the promenade, they are trying to get help establish the framework to set a standard that could be adapted. They had initial conversations and site walks with BPAC and the City's Traffic Engineer to meet all standards. They wanted to get the concept and constraints established and accepted by the Board, Planning Commission and ultimately City Council and then continue to evolve the design details as part of the community process.

Jason Fong, civil engineer, explained that part of this redevelopment is not only to make the Mall more attractive and inviting to the public, but also to address some of the technical issues and really create a safer environment from an engineering standpoint. The promenade is a work in progress and they have been coordinating with BPAC and the City and will continue into the future and then will present to the community to get a better idea of what is going on and make sure it fits in with the City's General Plan. A lot of the pavement is damaged and warped and does not work and there is poor drivability. They will be re-circulating the traffic and re-stripping the drive aisles and replacing all the damaged pavement for improved drivability. Also, they will be improving the existing sidewalk around the building to make sure the entire site is ADA complaint. Currently Golden Gate Transit has a bus stop south of the entry and makes a left turn on Merrydale that is a very tight turn, and there is not a dedicated turnout provided, so they will create a dedicated turnout to the north of the entrance to allow for a great distance to turn left on Merrydale and create a separation from the traffic flow for improved flow. The Mall has poor lighting and they propose to improve the fixtures to metal halide lights that are gentler and more efficient. Also, they will be adding accent lighting and pedestrian lighting to eliminate dark spots and create a safer environment. All the trash, oil and grease from the parking lot is collected and dumped directly into the Bay without any treatment, so they plan on treating the entire site along with a portion of the adjacent area with a series of hydro dynamic separators that will capture all dirt, oil, grease and trash and treat it before flowing into the Bay.

Manuella King, landscape architect, explained that all landscape improvements were driven from key goals. One is to reflect the lifestyle of Marin and enhance the sense of place. They want to create comfortable places that invite people to linger, similar to the Village at Corte Madera. They want to develop a sequence of places and experiences. They want to create a main gathering place and develop connections to the North San Rafael Vision Plan. They are creating places of interest for children, teens and adults. They want to upgrade the materials in lighting and use landscaping as a framework for seasonal change. Also, they want to be sustainable. The buildings are highly articulated with a lot of detail, so they will create a simple paving treatment that unifies all the different buildings as well as specialty paving to identify the key areas. Also, low water use and sustainable planting for the majority of the site will be used. Starting with vehicular entries they wanted to create a hierarchy and make them distinct with their planting materials. The Las Gallinas entry is an extension of the surrounding Marin landscape. The secondary entries they are looking at more formalized plantings. All entries will have expanded pedestrian walkways and lighting so people are encouraged to move in and out of the site. There is a striped bicycle lane as well. She provided a view showing how people would be coming into a community place with a plaza and trees and a variety of experiences. The perimeter landscape is still under discussion. This is an opportunity with a 24-foot wide band of landscaping to create a wonderful multiuse bicycle/pedestrian path that links through North San Rafael and eventually to the Civic Center. The area creates an identity so it is very important what occurs. They will plant a combination of trees, shrubs and ground cover and provide plantings that are approximately 4 feet high at the lower story to screen the views of the fronts of the cars from the road. The food court area is a wonderful opportunity that has a very strong

indoor/outdoor connection. They are providing vine-covered trellises for the outdoor food court that is associated with the indoor food court. In addition, there are two existing sycamore trees and the understory is unusable and they feel it has the opportunity to have a much stronger relationship to the food court and be used for different types of programming including weekend programming, concerts, and outdoor dining and possibly a paved area for the guide dogs for the blind who use Northgate Mall as a training center. They met and received feedback from this group, and their desire was to have a parking area for the puppy van as well as to include plants with scent and that would help to orient and enhance the experience of those with limited vision and provide items that support guide dogs for the blind. They are framing their planting areas wherever possible with low stonewalls that can be used for seating as well as defining the edges of the plantings. The interior streets are the two sides of the Mall that runs on the west and east. There is very limited planting and the major changes that happen to this area will animate the sidewalk. The new architecture will bring outdoor cafes, glass and visuals to the area. They propose new tree planting and lower story planting as well as new seating to animate the space, in areas with planting pockets that are 10 feet by about 6 feet, with trees, shrubs and ground cover for those to feel as if they are walking in a landscaped area as opposed to a sidewalk. The main gathering area is called, for now, "*the Oak Garden Terrace.*" It is the primary gathering area that has limited vehicular access. There would be a central specimen oak tree, so it becomes a signature space. They are looking at stone seat walls surrounding specialty garden areas planted with perennials and flowers. There will be a lot of outdoor dining for the two new restaurants that face onto the space with specialty paving within the whole zone and within the drive aisle. The area could have removable bollards at either end so during special events it could be completely closed off and during the day it would have limited cars coming through and limited parking areas. Also, it will have specialty lighting and access lighting as well as infrastructure, if concerts were held. She then presented several images to the Board for their consideration. The concept of driving through pedestrian space is the trend in retail design which activates the space, such as Santana Row in San Jose and Bay Street in Emeryville have these types of places where cars travel through. The north entry court is the area outside Macy's and there are some large existing sycamore trees that will be preserved as well as the existing olive tree. They are proposing reworking the area beneath those trees, adding new stone planters around the olive tree and possibly even bringing in a wood deck under the sycamores to raise the paving up to allow the roots more breathing room as well as some stone patio areas down below. Also, they are bringing in bicycle parking. In addition to reconfiguring the parking areas it was not worth keeping the trees, so they propose tree islands that are 7 by 7 that fits in the parking space in between the two spaces that face each other, which is almost doubling the size of the existing tree wells. Also, improving the soil to ensure the compaction used for grading the parking lot is not compacted within the tree planting areas. They are looking at a sustainable drainage solution in the parking lot by processing all the storm water through the different solutions to purify the water before released back into the Bay and creating clear connections that link people from the parking areas to the Mall. There is an opportunity created for outdoor programming and events. By creating the three outdoor spaces with design flexibility, with the infrastructure and the commitment to programming these areas, Northgate has an opportunity to become even more of a heart

of the Terra Linda community where people come to spend time, not just to shop. They are still making decisions on the material. Majority of paving is concrete and the specialty areas they propose a combination of either pre-cast concrete pavers or permeable pavers and smaller areas of wood decking or treks, with stone walls to edge the planters. They are looking at a series of lighting types, but taking opportunity for specialty elements of trellises to create an inviting ambiance, and incorporating bike racks. The planting plan continues to evolve as they move forward. The tree types were differentiated by the areas and trees were selected for their year round effect and their size and shape. In the interior gardens trees were selected based on flowers and sense. The parking lot trees they are looking at a variety of suggestions. The promenade will have a combination of oaks, redwoods and other understory trees. The trees become an identity element on the site. Also, on the ground plane, the perimeter landscape will be lower water use, native and combination of grasses and shrubs. The interior spaces where people are congregating they bring in more flowers, pots and vine so they concentrate their highest maintenance and water use plants in areas where they will be appreciated the most. Sustainability is important and they strongly believe in sustainability where possible, so they are looking at low water use irrigation. Full cutoff pedestrian light features are proposed as well so the light will not provide night pollution in the sky. They will have sustainable storm water solution and small areas of permeable paving. Interpretive signage is also considered important to teach individuals how to do the same in their own gardens, which can be in multiple languages as well as Braille. They are looking at recycling materials and looking at a variety of furnishings to feel more homey than corporate. Also, highly reflective paving will be used to reduce the heat island effect.

Crew asked about skateboarders. Ms. King responded that skateboards do not like rough stonewalls, so the walls will be protected.

Alternate Summers asked if the oaks proposed would be resistant to the sudden oak death. Ms. King believed so.

Chair Kent expressed concern for the trees not maintaining a thriving condition. Ms. King explained that they will use every trick in the book to ensure new trees will thrive, and welcomed further suggestions. They are completely aware of the problems in planting trees in parking lots. They plan to do appropriate soil prep and making planting pit as big as possible given the conditions at this site, and are looking at an aeration system and to monitor the health of the trees.

Chair Kent expressed concern for the windy site conditions, and asked the landscape architect if this will achieve the 50% shade in 10 years. Ms. King could not guarantee 50% in 10 years, but they did their best on the tree selection. The goal was to bring trees every four spaces.

Chair Kent is not convinced that the traffic will be limited in the oak garden area. Mr. Davis believed there is a very careful balance of multiple goals. He is unable to lease the back restaurant space if he does not provide some sort of a visual definition in the front.

This plan will not work if he cannot have at least in the non-peak hour's vehicle access. At this point, to get this off the ground and retailers excited about Northgate, they need limited vehicular access and asked the Board to trust him. They will provide smooth ADA access where needed, and any vehicle traveling faster than 5mph will be very uncomfortable.

Chair Kent asked how much influence the restaurant tenants will have over accent paving. Ms. King believed some of the outdoor dining areas have outdoor terraces similar to the Cheese Cake Factory in the Village and within their terrace they did the paving. Mr. Davis explained that with outdoor dining areas they leave dirt and they come in and infill with a design product that matches their architectural motif, but that is part of the tenant criteria and package.

Alternate Summers asked the most important hours of operation that traffic is allowed through and would it be unreasonable to ask on weekend evenings and days that bollards be put in when more families are present. Mr. Davis stated that they must allow the momentum build upon itself where it compels itself to close during that period of time. They are trying to bring together the best merchandising mix possible. They will not make that a very wide drive aisle. Also, on the ADA front they will be committing to replacing all hardscape and sidewalks. On the promenade, they provided a couple of conceptual cross-sections for the Board's consideration. Their traffic study looked at vehicular circulation, but also bike circulation, pedestrian circulation and transit circulation.

Huntsberry wondered if any thought was given to not providing as many small island planters and putting in double full finger island planters to have a better change that the trees will survive. Mr. Davis explained that they lose about 100 spaces and they start to lose more. The parking ratio with the City is 4.0 and the parking ratio with the department stores is 4.25, so he cannot violate the parallel entitlement process.

Huntsberry asked how Rite Aid will be located in the corner site if Federated has control. Mr. Davis suggested recreating the opening and providing a better parking field directly to their door is worth the trade.

Anna Willsey, Rite Aid representative, discussed changes made to move the building closer to Los Ranchitos Road, so they removed the front parking and moved the building down closer as well as flipped the entry as suggested by the Board at the previous meeting. She presented the new proposal of the bus stop location and the new parking location to address more parking for the front end of the building. Mr. Davis discussed the goal to incorporate a new bus stop location and site distance requirement, so a bus stop was moved around the corner that allows plenty of distance to cross traffic and the site distance line is able to be preserved as well. The parking count is adequate for Rite Aid and now they created a larger landscape feature. Ms. Willsey discussed elevations noting they tried to match the Mall and added more trellises on the north side and added awnings along the backside as well. They provided a covered walkway all the way around the front, so they provided a complete walkway. She then asked the Board if they

were moving in the right direction.

Alternate Summers agreed with Rite Aid's direction. He felt they have tied the elevations in with the appearance of the Mall. Flipping the building was very successful and believed they are definitely going in the right direction with the reduction of signage as well. Chair Kent concurred. Huntsberry felt there is too much going on along the elevations and believed the massing of the walls needs to be broken up. Also the dead end parking is a poor solution because it does not work. Also, he suggested expanding the sidewalk out and allows the cars to overhang because people trip over wheel stops.

Crew asked if they have a landscaping plan for Rite Aid. Ms. Willsey explained that landscaping issues would be addressed at the February 5th meeting. Huntsberry asked if there is a roof over the drive-thru. Ms. Willsey responded in the affirmative.

Crew agreed with Huntsberry that more unity is desired, but liked the awnings and found it much nicer than the original proposal.

Olmsted felt the architecture of the building is headed in the right direction and liked the fact that it is broken up in differing sized elements, but continues to express concern for the corner entrance. It seems wrong to separate the building entrance from the other stores in the center. Also, the drive-thru area seems awkward and space consuming and hardly attractive and did not understand why it has to be part of the program. Ms. Willsey explained that Rite Aid feels people going to Rite Aid are not necessarily going to the Mall, so they wanted to address more in and out kind of movement with the entry facing one of the main areas of the street. Rite Aid always has drive-thru for the convenience of the customers. Mr. Davis stated that Rite Aid is not 24-hour operation and it operates the same hours as the mall. Also, they have been present on the site for a long time. They have competition from Wal-Mart and they do not want failed businesses at Northgate. They are very supportive of having Rite Aid operate as they desire, but aesthetically fit into the site, so they strongly encourage the drive-thru to be internally facing not facing the backend.

Crew asked if they will have plant sales at this Rite Aid. Ms. Willsey agreed to investigate.

Huntsberry stated that the rear side elevation for loading could use help. Ms. Willsey indicated that seating area is proposed for the bus stop along with trellises to block the loading area. Also, in terms of off loading, this is a smaller operation so a large formal dock is not needed.

Mr. Davis briefly discussed the promenade. They have a combination of existing sidewalk along with striped bike lanes. There is a couple of alternatives based on feedback from the City, so they provided an alternative for the Board to consider with a 5-foot separation from the public road, 8-foot bike path and a 2-foot transition zone with a 4-foot landscape separation to the parking. Staff suggested considering sandwiching a 14-foot multiuse path with 5-foot landscape buffer on both sides to provide a visual

separation from the vehicles. The challenge is trying to serve many masters. Northgate Drive is wide enough to stripe for serious cyclist, but the promenade is intended to be more family friendly. They are creating a series of biking opportunities. There thought is the multiuse path versus two paths and landscaping strip. Also, they are looking at providing lighted bollards.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

David Hoffman, Director of MCBC, commented they are very excited about the bicycle and pedestrian improvements at the Mall. He thanked the applicant for setting the stage for good dialogue of future design of bicycling and walking elements at Northgate. He preferred the separated design that was presented to the Board, which would be better for cyclist and walkers and less opportunity for conflict. At times tension can be created between high-speed cyclist and pedestrians with strollers.

Don Madden, BPAC, stated that they are getting bicycle access into the Mall itself. If they look at the whole area there is no central gathering point and this will create the nucleus as well as connecting with the Civic Center and the lagoon. This will be a destination point. It is more than just the Mall. They are looking at a community interface that allows bikes and pedestrians in and out of Northgate, which will be a significant improvement. He preferred the split path as well as long as the aesthetics of the path works out. The 14-foot path has a broader appeal, but as a cyclist, he would rather have the separated path, but they are grateful that this is being proposed and either one of the proposals would be a win.

Rockey Birdseye, representing MCIL, was very excited about this project. This plan increases pedestrian accessibility and provides new sidewalks. The pathway half-mile section is a fantastic start. They are excited about the ADA improvements as well. In regard to the outdoor food court, he suggested if reduced travel lanes down to 10 feet vehicle speed would be reduced. Instead of a straight shot to the plaza, he suggested to make a curve to also slow traffic down in regard to traffic calming and allow restaurant to have exposure and be safe for pedestrians. They have concerns about interaction between bicyclist, pedestrians and transit users. Also, specialty pavers is a concern for those in wheelchairs because many people are sensitive to vibrations and the path of travel through those specialty paved areas must have access on a flat level, slip resistant and vibration free path of travel would be gratefully appreciated.

Tamara Hill, Meadow Drive resident, supported the project. She is looking forward to the Rite Aid drive-thru and the general remodeling of the entire facility. She is hoping to get affordable or infill housing at the facility as well. She discussed the design and asked if there will be a solid landscaping piece because from her perspective the parking lot will be a drag racing oval circuit and recommended breaking it up to avoid problems.

There being no further public testimony on this item, Chair Kent closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion and action.

Crew stated that the project continues to get better and appreciated all the attention to the various aspects. She had no objection to the oak garden area and would support. For the promenade, it has been discussed for several years and it is nice to see it finally happen. Also, enough space must be provided for bicyclist and pedestrians. The shading on the west wall looks like several trees are proposed, but hoped they are evergreen. The main problem is that the trees do not have a large canopy and it was indicated that the trees would have a large canopy so that is sufficient. In regard to the parking lot area is very narrow, but fits the number of spaces. She desired close up details of the oak garden area, seating and courtyards in front of Macy's and by the theater. She believed Rite Aid has come along a great deal and looked forward to seeing their improvements.

Huntsberry is excited that they have an owner that wants to improve their community and has gone through an awful lot to make it happen. He would like to see if some of the larger island planters could be installed because he expressed concern for the trees. The circulation as presented and landscaping details are wonderful. He has concerns with the Rite Aid and liked the idea of breaking up the massing of the box, but desired more consistency in the design so it appears well thought out. The dead end parking must be revisited. Even though the drive-thru lane backs up to Macy's that island planter must be twice as wide with the canopy or trellises, which he does recommend due to the long and heavy rainy season in Marin, so a larger canopy would help break up that area. Also, they must break up the eastern elevation as well and suggested exploring the idea of a trellis to provide some interest. He further appreciated their desire to revitalize their shopping center.

Liaison Sonnet discussed the two-foot strip separation in regard to the promenade path option that in his view is a mud path or some kind of obstruction because it is not wide enough to provide separation. Also, he did not understand why the applicant would not achieve LEED certification when the applicant is making such a point of sustainability. Mr. Davis responded that they have a commissioning agent on board and a LEED checklist that they are going through. They do not know if they will achieve LEED certification until the project is built and malls are one of the animals that LEED does not have its arm around. He added that they are less concerned about meeting the checklist than meeting the intent of the green approach. They will be looking at ways to integrate solar when redoing roofs. They will be putting in full CDS storm drain systems to completely wash all the parking lots, including drainage from areas above the site which is not required. They will be looking at landscaping and permeable paving and they hope to be successful and be LEED certified or LEED silver because they took the right approach, not because they were trying to meet a checklist.

Alternate Summers commended the owner because the entire team is first class. The presentation tonight was dynamite as was the last and commended the entire team for their great attitude and spirit. He noted his excitement for this project. He will trust the applicant on the oak garden drive-thru area, which he believes has potential. The bike path and promenade there is a lot of support for the split idea and to find a way to make that work would be advantageous. He desired some attempt to provide some standard stalls in the parking lot because not everyone drives a compact vehicle, so some full size

spaces would be appreciated. He agreed with Huntsberry's comments in regard to Rite Aid in order to hide the loading area.

Olmsted feels the effort is commendable and competent as well as professional and the City is lucky to have the entire team working on this project. He has some reservations about the Rite Aid store. He did not want to mess with marketing knowledge, but has concerns about the drive-thru court (and after his field trip to Park City he persuaded himself that it is acceptable). He appreciated the tree planting in the parking lot and that is a remarkable addition. Also, along the walkway adjacent to the buildings is splendid. The circulation has vastly improved. The bicycle/pedestrian pathway is a wonderful addition and how it is designed he would leave to others that are more knowledgeable in that regard. He further looked forward to this project moving forward.

Chair Kent agreed it is a good concept and hoped for a good execution. Keeping trees alive is a critical issue, so they must consider the 50% cover after 10 to 15 years. If they do not believe they can achieve that coverage, then it is worth looking at larger trees. The more space provided to the trees for growth would be beneficial and recommended obtaining advice from the best arborist possible in order for the trees to thrive. He recommended looking at the drainage and provided as much good soil as possible because if the trees die then they are right back where they started. Another issue is the drive-thru plaza, but he is somewhat convinced and will live with it. He stated that the new area must be special because it will be a community gathering space. It appears they are on the right track, but the paving materials must be carefully reviewed as well as lighting. He liked the way items have been realigned and the drive-thru on Del Presidio makes sense. When they do review the oak garden plaza, he would still close the area as much as possible. He believes people are more comfortable when there is separation from cars and the outdoor eating experience will be enhanced by not having to breath car fumes.

Tambornini summarized the Board's comments:

- Supportive of the concept presented
- Must come back and show more details on all concepts presented
- Move forward with more refinement
- Rite Aid loading area must be screened with the expansion of the trellis concept
- More consistency in the Rite Aid building materials is encouraged
- Provide as much planter space as possible to be successful

Tambornini asked the Board if a minimum standard must be achieved in regard to the promenade or leave it to the applicant to maximize landscape planter areas. Crew stated that as the promenade is developed it would be worthwhile to go back and revisiting the ideas from the vision.

Huntsberry felt having a split two-lane situation will not achieve what is desired because bicyclist will ride on the pedestrian side and pedestrians will walk on the bicycle side. There is an area in Long Beach that works very well, which is the concrete beach path and they just simply paint a line down the middle and keep fast moving people on one

side and pedestrians walk on the other side, which seems to work. He suggested some meandering of the path in order to provide more interest and the little bump outs could be areas to install benches. He supported a single lane, possibly narrower than 14 feet, but appropriate enough for two lanes of traffic.

Liaison Sonnet added that there is a great bike path down on the Monterey peninsula and it goes down along the ocean through Pacific Grove that is wonderful, but the portion that goes through Cannery Row bicyclist must slow down because there is a lot of people walking and, as a cyclist, he takes pride in respecting pedestrians and people need to learn to do that, so with proper signage along with some of Huntsberry's ideas he believed it can work. The benefit is that they are working with an overall smaller area of pavement so more landscaping could be installed in order to have a better buffer from the parking lot and street.

Chair Kent pointed out that there was some discussion about a Class 2 bike path on the street, so those that must travel at a fast speed there are options, so he supported the unified path and achieving more of a landscape buffer on either side. Crew agreed.

Mr. Davis appreciated the Board's time and looked forward to coming back next month with more refinements.

6) Election of DRB Officers for 2008

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Crew moved and Alternate Summers seconded, to accept the revised rotation schedule for the Board by appointing Huntsberry as Chair of the Design Review Board for 2008 and appointing Olmsted as Vice Chair of the Design Review Board for 2008. Motion carried unanimously. Dickens absent.

AYES:	Members:	Crew, Alternate Summers, Huntsberry, Chair Kent, Olmsted
NOES:	Members:	None
ABSTAIN:	Members	None
ABSENT:	Members:	Dickens

ADJOURNMENT

By order of the Chair, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary