

**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
JANUARY 23, 2008**

**ROLL**

**APPROVED**

Board Members Present: Chair Olmsted, Crew, Dickens, Kent  
 Planning Commission Liaison: Lang  
 Board Members Absent: Huntsberry, Alternate Summers  
 Community Development: Kraig Tambornini, Senior Planner  
 Sarjit Dhaliwal, Associate 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 18, 2007

**D. Old Business**

- 3) ED06-101 Environmental and Design Review Permit for a new 83,068 gross square-foot (maximum allowable) single-family residence in three levels on a vacant hillside parcel.  
**51 El Camino (Kraig Tambornini)**

**E. New Business**

- 4) ED07-38; Deign Review of a new single-story, 137,679 sq. ft. commercial retail  
 GPA07-004; building for Target on a +/- 19-acre site adjacent to the San Rafael  
 ZC07-002; Shoreline Park.  
 UO07-018 **125 Shoreline Parkway (Sarjit Dhaliwal)**

**A. Staff Communications**

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

Tambornini announced that the joint Planning Commission and DRB meeting for the Salute site would not occur until March or April, so staff will keep the DRB updated. Also, the 4000 Civic Center Sign Program application received approval from the Planning Commission. The Commission struggled with the compatibility of the existing sign, but ultimately the Commission did accept that program with the existing sign to remain. Staff also noted that Commissioner Kirchmann recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant fill in the holes to match the exterior when the old signs are taken down.

**B. Board Communications** - None

**C. Minutes**

(2) December 18, 2007

Chair Olmsted asked for a motion.

Dickens moved and Crew seconded, to approve the December 18, 2007 minutes as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

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

**D. Old Business**

(3) ED06-101 Environmental and Design Review Permit for a new 83,068 gross square-foot (maximum allowable) single-family residence in three levels on a vacant hillside parcel.  
**51 El Camino (Kraig Tambornini)**

Tambornini summarized the staff report and requested the Board's comments and recommendations on the landscaping and amount of undisturbed area proposed, building area, setback waiver, and general conformance with the Hillside Design Guidelines, with special attention to the bulleted items outlined in the staff report.

Dickens asked staff if the soil engineering report that was done recently the same as the one before. Tambornini responded that it was done in 2003 and done for the application prior to this one, which was essentially the same house footprint and then peer reviewed in 2004. It was for essentially the same development. It will need to be revised and updated for this particular house plan. Dickens asked staff if the soils report addressed the particular foundation design proposed tonight. Tambornini responded in the affirmative.

Kent stated that his impression from the staff report is that the City is still not comfortable with the proposed drainage system and sewage. Also, from previous meetings, the Board is aware of downhill neighbors that already have water problems.

Tambornini responded that the City would permit the sewage to be pumped back up into the sewer system up the street. There are some concerns with the drainage, the previous plan had some of the roof drainage being drained to the street, so that must be revised to accommodate as much of the roof top drainage directly into the storm drain. Kent noted that the closest catch basin would be El Camino/Second Street. Tambornini responded in the affirmative.

Chair Olmsted clarified with staff that the sewer and storm drain issues must be addressed, but not tonight. Tambornini explained that there is an accepted solution. They would allow the sewage system to be pumped up the street and to the sewer line. In regard to drainage, the City requires a final drainage analysis for this project.

Crew desired a color board. Tambornini provided the color board to the Board for their consideration.

Chris McMahan, architect, explained that the project is on a steep slope. The sanitary sewer is typical of the houses having injection sewer pumps up to the sanitary sewer line in the street. In regard to the storm sewer, there is a swale and a ditch on the uphill side of the street that water would drain to the storm injection pump. The footprint of the house is about 1,300 sq. ft., so the actual amount of water that would be added to the storm sewer would be minimal. They incorporated some environmentally sound elements. They used the open turf block pavers for a large part of the parking as shown on Sheet A2.

Crew desired an explanation on the flat roof area. Architect McMahan explained that the flat roof was used due to the steepness of the site and slope, If a gable was used it would have exceeded the height limit. Dickens noted that there is a loophole in that ordinance if called an “*architectural feature.*” Architect McMahan liked the appearance of the building because it adds simplicity to the house as well as balance. Tambornini pointed out that the 20-foot step back limit would limit the wall height, so a slope roof could be required, so there is an opportunity to provide some roofing if desired.

Chair Olmsted is having difficulty following the intent of the grading plans. He believed the intent is to build a wall along the downslope side of the driveway and a wall along the upslope side of the driveway as well, but he cannot tell whether that downslope wall meets existing grade. Architect McMahan explained that instead of totally grading into the slope they have some fill on the downside and cut on the upside, which is the reason for a much lower wall on the downside that ranges from 1-foot to 3 feet tall.

Chair Olmsted discussed the parking plan and questioned the turnaround and back up access if there are more than two vehicles. Architect McMahan responded that there would be room for 2 cars to turnaround but not 4. Additional cars would have to back up to the street.

Chair Olmsted asked if there has been any consideration of further improvement and grading on the City’s right-of-way. Architect McMahan responded that there have been none. Tambornini agreed to explore a condition of approval with Public Works in order

to improve maneuverability and the turning radius at the end of the street.

Crew asked staff if the fire turnaround has been found acceptable. Tambornini responded that the Fire Department had concerns related to adequate water pressure, not the turnaround. Dickens noted that a retention water source was discussed as well as a swimming pool to be used in-lieu of a 20,000-gallon tank. Tambornini agreed for fire suppression, but that requirement was removed as long as the site had adequate water pressure.

Chair Olmsted asked what provisions have been made to keep debris from rolling down the hill onto Fourth Street during construction and after. Architect McMahan responded that a debris and safety fence would be installed as well as a worker safety fence. No topographical changes are being proposed. Chair Olmsted desired some permanent thought to be considered as a long-term remedy due to the steep slope. Architect McMahan believed it will be addressed.

Kent asked the intent below the house in regard to landscaping. Architect McMahan responded that the landscaping proposed is for aesthetic purposes and to stabilize the bank itself. Native grasses are proposed as well.

Chair Olmsted discussed the downhill elevation on Sheet A0, the center section projects forward of the two side sections by several feet and the two side sections are on the same plain. Architect McMahan explained that the side sections step back just as the whole building steps back. There is not just three plains, but nine different plains. Each side section has three sections. Chair Olmsted noted that the grade is higher than the two side sections and believed it should be lower since it is further down the slope. Architect McMahan must investigate and it might need to be reversed, but he could not state for certain at this point.

Chair Olmsted opened the public hearing on this item.

Owner of the site addressed a few concerns and stated that in regard to the Fire Department, in the previous application they agreed to upgrade the fire hydrant and the line coming from Fourth Street that will occur prior to the issuance of the building permit. They submitted a construction plan and more negotiations would occur. There will be provisions made to keep construction debris maintained and worker safety. The geological report is requiring rock bolts to stabilize the larger portions. They discussed possibly some netting to keep the smaller stones from rolling down the hill, so a permanent solution will be discussed to minimize the debris. They are open to modifying the color as proposed by staff. In regard to landscaping, the intent is to use low irrigation and natural grasses.

Jen Oliver, El Camino business owner, did not understand what the plan is from the story poles and wanted to know how they plan to build a house if it is too dangerous to erect story poles. She wanted the business owners in the area protected. She wanted to make sure the story poles have been certified by a surveyor and are accurate in representing the

true location and dimensions. Also, parking on this street is horrible. There are no guest parking spaces provided. She further expressed concern for this house being the biggest home on the smallest lot.

Martha Sherratt, El Camino Ave. resident, has very little confidence with this builder. She expressed concern for construction hours and code enforcement. With the lack of story poles, the neighborhood has not been given the respect desired. When it rains the street turns into a muddy river and the idea of another roof draining onto that river is a concern.

Sharlene Moss, President/West End Neighborhood Association, stated that the fire truck access and turnaround is very important. Also, backing out onto a substandard street is prohibited, so that must be addressed. They agreed that the color must be darker. There needs to be water available on this site during construction. After construction, the sewer drainage and debris issues must be reviewed even further. They requested that the street be paved since it is very poor condition.

Brian Hassett, El Camino resident, expressed concern for water runoff and flooding.

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

Dickens stated that most concerns of the neighbors are public works and engineering issues. He agreed the street is in a poor condition and this home will be improving the neighborhood, at least architecturally. To place the burden on having the applicant being responsible for increasing the street width or the pavement quality or drainage situation is probably over burdensome, but believed Public Works can require a certain element of that. In regard to the aesthetics of this catchment element, he did not want to view an ugly wire fence hanging off this cliff, so that must be addressed. It must be realistic and permanent, and the Board should review. They must review the flat roof as well. This project is two stories below grade and there are serious opportunities for draining and waterproofing that goes beyond conventional buildings. He is not sure if the tile proposed is the correct material. He further agreed that the parking situation is difficult.

Crew agreed that there are several public works and engineering problems that are not in the Board's purview to review, but must be addressed. She agreed with the idea of putting in some sort of permanent debris catching wall. She desired darker colors to be used. In regard to lighting, she is not terribly happy with the exposed light and believed the lighting should be reviewed. The construction schedule must be revised in regard to Saturday construction being removed. The skirt wall is very high and she proposed that the lower floor level rather than being siding be some sort of stone facing to blend in more with the hillside and have a change in materials in that area. She agreed with a reduction in the building size. In regard to the story poles, she sympathized with those trying to install on such a terrible site, but the photo simulation goes a long way and suggested a photo simulation on the east side as well. She further objected to the flat roof because they leak.

Kent agreed with the comments of the Board. The tile proposed is not compatible. He expressed concern about releasing water to the street. They must review the French drain details more closely. The filter fabric between the soil and gravel should be removed. In regard to landscaping, they must consider hydroseeding native grasses without irrigation because that bank did not need additional water. As for the parking pad, the turf cells will open up a big weed patch. Turf cells work best for emergency vehicles. Permeable pavers should be considered as an alternative. He further suggested an alternative maple specie rather than the Japanese maple.

Chair Olmsted noted that the driveway is not illustrated on the photo simulation and they will form a major part of the architectural collection and should be addressed carefully. The colors on the photo simulation do not match the color board. A darker color is desired. He agreed that the tile roofing materials seems odd on a building meant to be fairly modern in its character. He is bothered most by the details of the site development that make it a very difficult site to use. Particularly, the backing out of vehicles up a steep hill onto a road that is nearly impossible to turnaround, which is awkward. He hoped greater attention was spent on just how the improvements are done both on the property and in the right-of-way. He believed there is an opportunity to improve the turnaround space within the right-of-way that was not addressed and there may be room for further encroachment of the right-of-way space that would improve the driveway. The notion that they are considering approval of a building where drainage has not been worked out and sewer system is not fully known is putting a lot of trust in events that may or may not occur in the future and would have rather seen them worked out in detail on the plans prior to submittal. He would like to see where the debris collection is located and how it will appear. He wanted to see the collection system for rainwater and where it will be located. There are enough details missing that he is uncomfortable approving in its present form. He stated that greater attention should be given to reworking the grades at the turnaround. More attention should have been paid to the grading in the turnaround area with the intention of improving not just this property, but for others as well. He finds some of the architectural details troublesome. The excuse given for not improving the flat roof on the east side seems to be driven by Hillside Design Guidelines policy rather than good sense. Architectural features are exempt and more attention should be given to that such as a conventional slope roof.

Dickens supported a portion of the skirt wall being cantilevered to make a reveal underneath and he knows that is discouraged, but some type of partial cantilever to put a reveal and soften the impact of that wall would be appropriate in his view.

Tambornini summarized the Board's comments:

- The roof tile proposed is not appropriate and different roof materials are desired.
- Debris catchment system and drainage system must be resolved for this plan before coming back to the Board.
- Improve turnaround space onsite and utilize more of the right-of-way.
- Landscape palette on downhill side should be revised to be a hydroseeded mixture and instead of the Japanese maple use another maple specie.

- Flat roof section must be revised to address the sense of incompatibility.
- Add different material treatment on the skirt wall or cantilever section to break up the flat wall plain.
- Engineering on French drain must be reviewed in regard to the filter fabric.

Chair Olmsted asked for a motion.

Dickens moved and Kent seconded, to continue this item to a future date to provide the applicant the opportunity to address the Board's comments as outlined by staff. Motion carried unanimously.

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

#### **E. New Business**

- (4) ED07-38; Deign Review of a new single-story, 137,679 sq. ft. commercial retail building for Target on a +/- 19-acre site adjacent to the San Rafael Shoreline Park.  
 GPA07-004;  
 ZC07-002;  
 UO07-018 **125 Shoreline Parkway (Sarjit Dhaliwal)**

Dhaliwal summarized the staff report and recommended that the project design needs additional enhancements to be consistent with the City's development standards and design-related policies. Staff requests that the Board review the project and provide comments on whether the:

- **Site Design:**
  - Project is appropriately sited and designed to respect and enhance views from the Bay from Shoreline Parkway roadway and the Shoreline Path as well as views of the hills and ridgelines from the Shoreline Path.
  - Proposed entryway design is appropriate.
  - Project should provide special entry features for pedestrians and bicyclists.
  - Pedestrian access located along the westerly driveway and crossing the parking lot provides safe pedestrian access.
  - The proposed parking near the east boundary of the site should be relocated to the proposed "*naturalized landscape area*" thus freeing up more space for additional landscaping between the project and the Bay and the Shoreline Park Band.
- **Architecture:**
  - Project presents a design that enhances the Bayfront and provides surveillance of the Shoreline Park Band.
  - Building facade and setbacks are appropriate for the location along the Shoreline Park Band.
  - Massing and articulation of all four building elevations is adequate.
  - Building elevations provide adequate interest.
  - Building design is of equal quality on all four elevations.

- Architecture provides ample variation in building height and mass.
- Building should be provided with one or more awnings.
- **Landscape:**
  - 37.5' wide landscape buffer between the project and the Shoreline Park Band should be wider.
  - The project provides appropriate landscaping and the required berming.
- **External lighting:**
  - The pole mounted lighting fixtures be lowered in height and have side skirting.
  - The proposed lighting would create excessive light spillover and glare.
- **Signage:**
  - Whether the proposed signage is appropriate.

Chair Olmsted asked staff to discuss the intent and progress of the Shoreline Park. Tambornini responded that the Shoreline Path has been improved as development occurs. Staff will report back the current status at the next meeting.

Chair Olmsted discussed previous minutes where the issue of how close the building should be to the parkway was raised and a considerable increase in the setback was recommended and the design seems not to accommodate that recommendation. Dhaliwal agreed. Staff explained that the minimal required landscaping along the property line is 37.5 feet, which is what the project is proposing, but staff suggested that it be increased.

John Dewes, applicant, briefly discussed the changes since their last meeting and there was a discussion of the building being too close to the Shoreline Parkway and wetland areas, so they pulled the building forward another 100 feet over and above what it was before from the wetlands area and pushed it further to the west away from Shoreline Parkway. From the Parkway there is a minimum of 37.5 feet to the paved parking and the building itself is over 200 feet away, so there is a significant difference in terms of actual distance to the building itself. There is an existing use of car storage for one of the car dealerships that is part of a long-term lease, but they have withdrawn the subdivision plan which was part of their initial application and left it as one 19-acre parcel and will provide some naturalized landscape area in front, and possibly including some pedestrian connections. Since they pushed the building back, they are able to create a significant berming and landscape buffer added up to three to four rows of depth in trees that will adequately screen that area. There has been a number of changes and as he reads through the conditions he sees where there is even more room to work with the City in terms of further refinement of the plan. In particular, there was the discussion of the 37.5 feet to the first row of parking and the potential to eliminate some parking along the eastern perimeter and possibly push it further out to the natural landscaped area creating a stronger buffer on that eastern side along the Shoreline Parkway, and they are more than willing to work with staff to increase that buffer even more. Also, the comment and question about pedestrian walkway that runs through Shoreline Parkway Drive and up to the front entry, there is another one across the secondary drive that ties into the Home Depot property and then cuts across in an east/west direction through the parking lot and staff indicated that potential conflicts are being caused between pedestrian and

automobile circulation and agreed to work with staff in that regard. In terms of site lighting, they are willing to work with the City to make modifications. He agreed to possibly lower their light poles, but then more light poles would be needed, but agreed to consider. They use a vertical type light fixture that has cut offs in it, so at the property line the idea is to have zero light spillage. The technical cut sheet would be able to help staff understand how that will work. The City ordinance talks about allowing one building sign and they have the Target bulls eye and the word, "Target" and then a much smaller sign that states, "Pharmacy." The total square-footage is about 191 square feet, which is less than 50% of what is allowed in terms of signage. The pharmacy sign is more of an identification signage that there is a pharmacy within the store, so they asked the Board to allow for the separation between the building signage and pharmacy sign itself since they are below 50% of what is allowed in terms of total building signage.

Jay Richardson, project manager, stated that the building design has changed since last presented. They tried to think about the design in terms of people approaching the building and experiencing the building. He tried to organize his thoughts in terms of the siting of the building and spaces created by decision made by real estate. The building is oriented east/west, which is very natural and correct. There are four quadrants created outside of the building: entry/approach; rear space; Bay side; and service quadrant. Also, the demographics of individuals shopping at this store, most will be female and they might have children. Every time individuals come to this Target and shop, they will be coming to the Bay and practically to the shoreline, so as one drives in and parks, the Bay will be visible. The front walk faces the tremendous vista out across the water. The entrance is the dominant transparent glass open space oriented toward the water. The front of the building has been broken up vertically and horizontally by architectural massing. There are masonry piers and cross beams that provide shade and human scale for those moving along the walk. There is a significant amount of landscaping proposed. There are vine trellises proposed in three different locations as well. There is a variety of height also provided on the building. The main entrance and main façade face south, so shadows and light conditions change that adds its own type of variety to the building. The rear side of the building is experienced by the neighbors who live across the wetland and will view from a distance. There is a rhythm of recurring treatments. The façade faces the Bay itself and has the addition of pergola (*masonry piers and cross beams*) as well as plantings that will cover that element. The addition of a patio with a pergola covering is provided to the right of the main entrance. A glass wall is also provided at the back towards the Bay side as a windbreak. The service side is simpler and the mass is higher because they made that stock space taller. The building will only be visible for a few years; once the landscaping matures it will more or less disappear.

Mr. Dewes reiterated that the project is designed based on LEED certification as required by the City.

Board member Crew discussed the entryway and expressed concern for the two lanes only. Mr. Dewes responded that the two lanes along with the drive further to the west ties directly into the parking that forms a secondary egress/ingress seems to be sufficient in his view.

Crew asked if signage is proposed at the secondary entrance. Mr. Dewes responded that there is signage proposed along Francisco Blvd. Along Shoreline Parkway there is an issue with the auto dealerships long-term lease, so they must work through what rights they have in terms of signage at the secondary entrance. They are mostly relying on the building signage that should be sufficient.

Chair Olmsted opened the public hearing on this item.

Andre Janshete, Bellam Storage Owner/San Rafael resident, expressed concern for litter and landscaping. She hoped if this project is approved that Target would pledge that the property would be clean, litter free and landscaping maintained in a thriving condition.

Jean Starkweather, Marin Conservation League (MCL), Los Colindas Road resident, stated that the park plan was adopted in 1980 and there have been a few revisions and updates, which affect areas next to this property. The Shoreline shows six entrances and five have been built, all with help from a local property owner that helped fund the entrance. The one at the end of Shoreline Parkway has not been built, which is adjacent to this Target property. The plan was updated last year, so it is ready to be built when funds are available. In regard to Target, they are concerned about issues such as height, mass and setbacks. A parking lot is no different than a building, so there should be no building in the setback and that includes paved parking lots. On Sheet C3.1 there is a cross-section that shows fill toward the Canalways Marsh, and if the building is not located on that section, then why is there fill proposed at that point. It also shows a lot of trees, but would not want trees on the marsh edge, shrubbery would be much better. On Cross-Section BB, it shows a lot of empty land and they are not sure if that is setback from the road or marsh and desired an explanation. Shoreline Park is of great interest and concern since the Shoreline Park has become more and more used since businesses are locating in the area. Target's plan shows from the edge of the building a pathway going out to the Shoreline Park, which would divide the habitat in the area in half. They do not want it divided with a pathway, so recommended that the applicant think about joining with the City in improving an entryway at the end of their site, at the end of Shoreline Parkway in cooperation with the City for a site already shown as an entrance to the Shoreline Park. The City's plan for this site shows 37.5 feet and that is always stated as a minimum and certainly hoped this is more than the minimum. Some revision of the paths proposed must be done to provide pedestrian access from Target to Shoreline Park and believed it is more logical to come down the eastern side. They urged the Board to increase the side of that setback, particularly from Shoreline Park side and desired some questions answered in terms of what the setback is in the back.

Kent asked the reason for choosing the plants, is it in terms of the wildlife corridor. Ms. Starkweather responded that it is for protection, resting, nesting of species, not only birds, but little animals. Trees help break up the landscaping. From the cypress planted earlier at the marsh there are only one or two left from 1985 due to the wind. In fact, they found out that unless protected by the hill the trees would not remain. That southwestern wind removes the root ball, so shrubs are the best solution. Live oaks are located at China

Camp and they are salt water tolerant as well as buckeyes. Plant palette has been California natives and failure in plants has been mostly shrubs. They tried various kinds of California native plants to fit the conditions. Trees planted near the building are acceptable to hide the building as long as there is a 15-foot setback from the top of that little hill.

Roger Roberts, MCL, believed it is rather premature to be holding this design review session at all when the environmental impact report has not been completed that will discuss alternatives to the siting and massing for this Target building. It seems to be a waste of time for all parties involved when in fact they may find mitigated alternatives and better solutions to all proposals being discussed tonight. They are curious as to why this is even proceeding. They do not object to it in any legal sense, but feel it is premature. They are happy to hear that this will be a LEED silver building, but hoped the LEED silver applies to all the lighting to minimize the energy impacts of the use on this site as a large commercial establishment and asked the DRB to take that under serious consideration as part of the design guidelines for this project. The north side of the building has no articulation and there will be trees they hope will survive to help screen the back side of that building, but as a design features and for purposes of breaking up the mass for those walking along Shoreline Park and those living to the north of that building looking back that there should be some articulation at the rear of the building as well as the front. Also, looking at the pergola proposed on the front of the building seems very much as an afterthought because it has no relation to the scale of the building. Another design feature that must be considered is the fact that this is a very windy site and the way in which the entry and resting area is handled needs to take into consideration the effects of the wind on that site. They will follow this project closely and look forward to further improvements in the design. They continue to express concern for the mass of the building, which deserves attention.

Bob Spofferd, Sustainable San Rafael, appreciated the fact that this project will be LEED silver under the new Green Building Code. There are different ways to approach and hoped with a structure of this size that there would be some sort of visual commitment. It would be wonderful if this building made a statement about its environmental impact in the manner in which it is designed as seen with many office buildings built in the Bay Area, for example, Autodesk. Also, this is a 19-acre site on the Bay, so it deserves a really exciting building as Loch Lomond. Target does not deserve a pass just because they are Target to build another big beige box. This should be a building that reflects the site and designed specifically for this site. Materials and appearance must provide a sense that it is sited on the Bay. It requires Target to think outside of the box. It should read something special and win a reward and be on the cover of "*Architectural Review*."

Dwight Steve, Vista Del Mar resident, expressed concern for the setback and requested that it be moved back as much as possible. Also, traffic is a concern and must be addressed, so a creative solution is needed. Kerner/Bellam to Bellam/Andersen are beyond saturation many times per day. Also, added traffic will come from County Health Services, so addressing traffic should be given consideration. He desired an innovative solution to address the traffic such as another entrance to I-580 because it will only

become worse with future development.

Andy Easterlin, Secretary/Baypoint Homeowners Association, discussed landscaping and they desired evergreen trees to be planted. The community objected to another Home Depot site, so landscaping is very important to screen the building. He requested that the plant palette be more flexible in order to have more durable evergreen plants in order for the landscaping to maintain in a thriving condition.

Louise Yost, Canal resident, discussed adequate mitigation measures and asked if the City believes that Target's geotechnical study is truly objective, scientifically sound, thorough and complete. Is it potentially possible that Target could influence the results of this study so the City would not have the information needed to comply to the General Plan. If so, what kind of actions could the City take to remedy this problem. She knows that the proposed Target store is located on an old garbage dump and this fact raises extremely serious safety and health concerns. She asked how well is this landfill constructed, is it lined with clay and if so lined all the way around thoroughly. Chair Olmsted informed Ms. Yost that her comments are not appropriate at this time because it has nothing to do with the architecture. Tambornini pointed out that Ms. Yost could provide comments regarding any safety concerns to staff, which will be incorporated as part of the environmental review, but tonight the intent of the Board is to hear any site designing issues.

John Reynolds, Larkspur Street resident, recommended that Target build a "*Green*" Target store that would be in harmony with the environment and have all the different alternative energy options incorporated. Chair Olmsted suggested that Mr. Reynolds provide his "*Green*" suggested to staff.

Roger Stole, Lincoln Avenue resident, discussed the design of the store as a "*big box*" store. Such stores promote low paying jobs with high turnover jobs. He asked the Board to not allow this project to move forward because it destroys small businesses. Chair Olmsted reiterated that tonight the Board is present to hear design related issues.

Chair Olmsted discussed the parking ratio and staff suggests that the project is over parked and asked the applicant if he agreed with that statement. Mr. Dewes responded that he did not. He explained that the industry standard is closer to 5 cars per 1,000 or 4.5 per 1,000. The City referred to about 4 cars per 1,000. They do not believe the 4.5 is an excessive amount. Again, he believed they still feel there is some movement.

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

Kent stated that the project is not very interesting with very little site-specific architecture. The outdoor seating area is a token gesture to the Bay. The building must stand on its own, not hidden by the trees. The side of that building should have a relation to the Bay. The outdoor seating area should be fully enclosed with access to the inside of the building. View corridors are needed. Areas along the walkway have very nice views of the hills, so view corridors are needed from the pathway up to those hills, not a dense

corridor of trees. In regard to parking, as little as possible on the east side and the landscape corridor must be as wide as possible. The main entry focuses on the pharmacy sign and the focus should be on something more architecturally interesting. The berms are important for headlights and quality soil to maintain thriving landscaping. Paving must be used to identify those pedestrian walkways as entries and every time pedestrian pathways cross the parking lot. The foot-candles must be reduced in regard to lighting. He pointed out that poplar is not a good tree due to the wind and suggested another specie. He further stated that the building needs more articulation

Crew agreed the lighting is too high and too bright. The east and west elevations have no redeeming features. It would be nice to have some sort of indication of a floor plan, so some sort of plan to understand the functions proposed should be provided. The food area on the east corner is extraordinarily windy so that must be considered. This site is not designed for the wind and it must be. The word, "*pharmacy*" is not necessary and the Target sign alone with the logo would be sufficient. She desired to know the materials of the signs. She agreed that pedestrian access from the west side might even be eliminated because there is not that much pedestrian traffic and just have a pedestrian access at the end of Shoreline Drive that would be sufficient. This building has no enhancement to the Bay. Comments from Ms. Starkweather about planting of the trees are very pertinent and should be considered in the design itself. She agreed they need a much wider conservation area to the east of the site along the Bay. She further noted that some of these issues would be addressed in the environmental study.

Dickens agreed the outdoor patio must be larger and addressed in regard to the existing weather conditions. This is the kind of architecture that gives "*big box*" retailers a bad name. In the hands of skilled architects much more is possible. This is an extremely unique site along with unique challenges and it is difficult for a "*big box*" retailer to think outside the box, but asked that they take a fresh look because this building and the use are not blending with the existing site opportunities. They can have a garden shop and outdoor eating facility that can embrace the site opportunities of the water and corridor that is extremely hostile, but they must embrace site opportunities that are present. On Sheet L1.1 at the left of the entrance there is a mass of landscaping and more must occur. They must address the wildlife corridor and oceanfront.

Chair Olmsted noted that it is a remarkable site, but it is a building that belongs in any flat land community spread out all over America. There is no attention in the building to the special characters of the site. It is a big box, more than 3-acres and an experience of being in the building must be provided. Where is the joy and fun of being inside the facility. He objected to the building encroaching on the Bay side. Regarding site lighting, it is clear that the tall poles are inappropriate as well as the lighting levels. The lighting levels should reach that of safety, but not for merchandising purposes. As to orientation on the building, the introduction of the red color seems inappropriate on a site such as this. Little ribbons of red on the backside of the building seem gratuitous and the trellises seem almost pasted on concepts. He finds the whole design depressing. The fact that the entry is not oriented toward the driveway entrance also seems to indicate that it is a

formula building. The outdoor open area on the southeast corner is nowhere near the food area of the building and too small and does not relate to the Bay.

Tambornini summarized the Board's comment:

- Very remarkable unique and large site on the Bay and building must be designed to relate to the Bay.
- The design presented tonight must move away from the conventional formula design and be designed to embrace the special characteristics of the site (*orienting more towards the Bay; taking advantage of unique site and location; and consider impacts of wind and other factors that occur*).
- The naturalized landscaped area has been identified as an area not appropriate and could be used to move parking into that area.
- The 37.5 feet buffer along the Shoreline Park Band should be widened and using the naturalized landscaped area will help achieve that (*50 feet or more was suggested by the Board; 100 feet being the ultimate as suggested by Ms. Starkweather*).
- Site pole lighting too tall and must be lowered and lighting levels must be reduced with the standard relative to provide safety and security, but not serve as merchandising the site.
- Outdoor seating areas must relate to the Bay and building (*screened or enlarged; related better to the building; and facade oriented towards the Bay.*)
- Better quality of materials must be presented.
- Whole concept of land use must be blended with the site opportunities that will take fresh thinking.
- Paving materials used for walkways must be distinguished.
- Provide a floor plan and identify uses that will help building relate to the site.
- Eliminate walkway from the site to the Shoreline Park Band and the applicant is encouraged to work with the City to utilize the pathways that have been designed as part of the Shoreline Park Path and eliminate another redundant crossing across their site.
- Consider location of trees near the wetlands and selecting hardy materials appropriate for the site and suggestions from Kent.
- Eliminate the "*pharmacy sign*"; the Target sign and logo is sufficient.
- Driveway does not align with the building and must be considered.
- Significant redesign is needed.

Kent suggested hiring a biologist to review some of these points because this will be specialized landscaping. Also, he recommended that the EIR be completed before the project comes back to the Board given the sensitive nature of this project. Tambornini felt the comments from the Board are helpful and will take that under advisement. Dhaliwal pointed out that the Board's comments would be considered in the EIR.

Chair Olmsted asked for a motion.

Kent moved and Dickens seconded, to continue the project to allow an opportunity for the applicant to respond to the consensus items outlined by staff. Motion carried unanimously. Alternate Summers absent.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

By order of the Chair, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary