

**MINUTES SPECIAL MEETING
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 21, 2007**

ROLL

APPROVED

Board Members Present: Chair Kent, Crew, Dickens, Alternative
Machnowski

Planning Commission Liaison: Kirchmann

Board Members Absent: Huntsberry

Community Development: Raffi Boloyan, Senior Planner
Sarjit Dhaliwal, Associate Planner
Jessica Leviste, Contract 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) January 31st, 2007

D. Consent

3) ED06-014 **Environmental and Design Review Permit for exterior renovation of 20 apartment buildings, one recreation building, four mailbox kiosks and six trash enclosures.**
1050 Cresta Dr. (Highlands of Marin) (Dhaliwal)

E. Old Business

4) ED06-015 **Request for an Environmental and Design Review Permit and a Use Permit for: 1) the legalization of an existing outdoor, radio controlled (RC) model car track to be used for product demonstrating; and 2) installation of a parking area with fencing, landscaping and viewing stand**
115 3rd St. (Marin RC Hobbies) (Boloyan)

F. New Business

- 5) PA07-002 **Conceptual Design Review of a new, 136,000 square foot, commercial retail building for a Target store with 676 parking stalls and landscaping on a 19.8-acre vacant parcel. The proposed project will be located on the rear 14.5 acres of the parcel with the front 5.28 acres being reserved for future development. The subject site is located northerly of the shoreline Parkway cul-de-sac within the Shoreline Center development.**
 Lot 6 of Shoreline Center (end of Shoreline Pkwy) (Dhaliwal)
- 6) PA07-001 **Conceptual Design Review for the proposed demolition of an existing 4-story 33,000 sq. ft. office building to allow new construction of a 4-story 93-unit residential condominium complex on approximately 1.9 acres.**
 33 San Pablo (Leviste)
- 7) **Discussion Item on Quality of Plan Submittal from Member Dickens**

A. Staff Communications

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

Boloyan indicated that staff is investigating the lighting at the BMW Dealership along Francisco Boulevard and will report back findings at the next meeting. Staff reminded the Board that the next regularly scheduled meeting is March 6th and the second meeting on March 20th Loch Lomond is scheduled. Also, staff will be directing the Loch Lomond applicant to return with the half size plans.

B. Board Communications

Dickens noticed that the Chapel Cove project in regard to Unit 16 has solar panels on the roof facing Point San Pedro Road and did not believe that was part of the Board's approval. Boloyan responded that the City is pre-empted from regulating the design or placement of solar panels on residential structures. The City has building permit control only, no design control at all.

Boloyan announced that Alternate Member Machnowski will be a voting member tonight.

C. Minutes

- 2) January 31st, 2007

The Board noted a few corrections.

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Crew moved and Dickens seconded, to approve the January 31st minutes as amended. Motion carried. Chair Kent and Alternate Machnowski abstained.

AYES:	MEMBERS:	Crew, Dickens
NOES:	MEMBERS:	None
ABSTAIN:	MEMBERS:	Alternate Machnowski, Chair Kent
ABSENT:	MEMBERS:	Huntsberry

D. Consent

- 3) ED06-014 **Environmental and Design Review Permit for exterior renovation of 20 apartment buildings, one recreation building, four mailbox kiosks and six trash enclosures.**
1050 Cresta Dr. (Highlands of Marin) (Dhaliwal)

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Crew moved and Dickens seconded, to approve the project as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

AYES:	MEMBERS:	Crew, Dickens, Chair Kent, Alternate Member Machnowski
NOES:	MEMBERS:	None
ABSTAIN:	MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	MEMBERS:	Huntsberry

E. Old Business

- 4) ED06-015 **Request for an Environmental and Design Review Permit and a Use Permit for: 1) the legalization of an existing outdoor, radio controlled (RC) model car track to be used for product demonstrating; and 2) installation of a parking area with fencing, landscaping and viewing stand**
115 3rd St. (Marin RC Hobbies) (Boloan)

Raffi Boloan, Senior Planner, summarized the staff report and requested that the Board comment and make recommendations to the Planning Commission on the project design and in particular on its compatibility with the Canal area design polices, landscaping requirements and signage.

Chair Kent asked staff if nighttime use will occur, and if so, is there a lighting plan. Boloan responded that nighttime operations are not proposed. During the summer months, races would occur until 7pm at the latest, but no lighting is proposed for the outdoor track.

Jill Tardy, architect, felt staff did a great job summarizing all the modifications to the plans and believed the additional palm trees will enhance the location. She is also available to answer any questions.

Alternate Machnowski asked the architect to discuss the noise mitigation fence proposed. Architect Tardy responded that the fence is 70 feet long and there are no changes in height.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

Sandra Guidi, Kentfield resident, managed the property next door and pointed out that there are seven tenants upstairs with commercial downstairs along with five boat berths and is not clear on how the 8-foot wall will mitigate noise to the upstairs tenants. Chair Kent pointed out that a sound engineer looked at the plans and the plans were peer reviewed, so the Board is confident that the 8-foot wall is a good solution. Boloyan stated that measurements were taken at upstairs units as well as the property line, and the noise engineer indicated that the 8-foot tall fence would provide enough shield to mitigate the noise generated to the residential units above.

Ms. Guidi noted that her tenants expressed concern for the canal view and how that 8-foot solid fence will impact their view. She is not opposed to the project, but the fueled powered cars are extremely loud and she is not confident that the 8-foot barrier will significantly mitigate the noise from the fueled cars.

Andrea Valentine, Third Street resident, opposed any outdoor use at this location due to noise impacts.

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 Machnowski has reviewed this design several times and continues to have the same issues with the fencing. He is looking for more creativity in regards to the fencing. Sound can be redirected by shapes and elements, so maybe the 8-foot fence should be reconsidered as far as design, shape and height. He agreed with the transparency. He believed the owner is trying to move forward and most of the problems are from neighboring residents and hoped the developer could talk to the neighbors in regard to windows that would help control the sound in order to substantially resolve the noise control issue. He appreciated the landscaping in front and agreed the palm trees will enhance the area.

Dickens noted that there are certain acceptable and permissible noise levels with in that zone and asked staff if this proposal would exceed those noise levels. Boloyan responded that the peer review evaluated the noise generated by the proposed use and compared against the City's established noise standards. They found the electric cars would not raise the noise levels above the City's threshold nor would they change the ambient levels. The fueled powered cars would result in noise that exceeds the City's standards to

the property to the west in regard to the mixed-use building, but they recommended to mitigate that noise would be to install a 8-foot solid barrier to reduce noise levels back down to acceptable noise standards.

Dickens added that there is a lot of support for palms in this City, but he felt there are better choices. He pointed out that Los Angeles and Santa Monica are eliminating palms because they do not provide enough shade, but noted that he would support the landscape plan as submitted. In regard to the fence, he hopes it works and suggested that concerned neighbors attend the Planning Commission meeting to discuss hours of operation and the 8-foot tall fence.

Crew hoped the Commission takes into account the noise issue in regard to the fueled power cars. Also, she suggested that the architect review the landing at the door to the accessible part of the building in regard to ADA compliance. She further hoped the noise issue can be resolved.

Chair Kent believed the applicant has addressed the Board's previous suggestions and comments. He felt the palms in this location make sense in terms of a vertical element. He hoped there is a valve to support the drip irrigation. Each valve must have a 30psi pressure reducer and a mesh filter as well. The soil at this site is not that great and recommended mounding every place possible because the success of the project depends on soils supporting the plan. Again, the sound is an issue that the Commission will consider.

Alternate Machnowski discussed the curb cut on the north side at the vehicular entry area, which in his view is not realistic and asked the architect to review the curb shape and possibly reshape.

Boloyan summarized the Board's comments:

- Board felt the project has addressed previous comments.
- Board expressed concern for noise, which should be reviewed thoroughly by the Planning Commission.
- Design improvements for the site improvements and landscaping are found appropriate.
- Planning Commission should review hours of operation.

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Crew moved and Dickens seconded, to approve the design of this project with the provision that the Planning Commission review the noise issue very carefully. Motion carried 3-1. Alternate Machnowski opposed.

AYES:	MEMBERS:	Crew, Dickens, Chair Kent
NOES:	MEMBERS:	Alternate Machnowski,
ABSTAIN:	MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	MEMBERS:	Huntsberry

F. New Business

5) PA07-002

Conceptual Design Review of a new, 136,000 square foot, commercial retail building for a Target store with 676 parking stalls and landscaping on a 19.8-acre vacant parcel. The proposed project will be located on the rear 14.5 acres of the parcel with the front 5.28 acres being reserved for future development. The subject site is located northerly of the shoreline Parkway cul-de-sac within the Shoreline Center development.

Lot 6 of Shoreline Center (end of Shoreline Pkwy) (Dhaliwal)

Sarjit Dhaliwal, Associate Planner, summarized the staff report and requested the Board identify relevant issues, prioritize concerns and develop consensus as to the appropriateness of the conceptual design and its compliance with design review criteria and guidelines.

Crew asked staff if a snack bar is proposed. Dhaliwal responded that a snack bar is provided inside the store, but not outside.

Boloyan noted that there might be certain improvements required of this project to the Shoreline Park band. Generally, they are addressed through the Parks and Recreation Commission. The park site will be developed and there are certain improvements to be done along the park band that is called out in the Shoreline Master Plan. This development may help towards the development of the park itself, but it is not contingent upon this, there is a separate Master Plan for the Shoreline Park.

John Dewes, representing Target, discussed the site plan and there looking to purchase 15 acres of the 19-acre sit.. Target store is about 130,000 sq. ft. with a garden center of about another 6,000 sq. ft. They have gone through the PSP process in terms of trip generation. The entry off of Shoreline Parkway will be the main entry and will create a draw toward the building through landscaping. They have truck access to allow trucks to circulate without interfering with the main pedestrian and customer portion of the parking lot. They have a small food area within the store, no outside seating or food is proposed.

Jay Richardson, project design architect, explained the building, exterior and the design is straightforward. The building expression is a modern contemporary design. The construction would be a tilt wall construction with a textured finish in a variety of colors. The height varies and there would be some adjustment in order to screen the roof equipment. The main building height is 28 feet, but the portion with the sign would be 30 to 34 feet. They will raise the parapet walls in the rear because it is visible from a residential area nearby. The expression of the building is modern and there are features that help to enhance the scale of the building. The garden center offers more relief to the scale of the building. There are added pilasters along the parameter to provide variety. There area a variety of colors proposed to add interest. It was mentioned that the Board might be looking for more design or relief on the side of the building, especially facing the Bay and desired specific recommendations in that regard.

Alternate Machnowski understands the corporate design guidelines and asked the applicant to discuss the design. Architect Richardson responded that they are looking for a design that is very timeless. A very straightforward, simple design and one that places most of the emphasis on the front of the building, in particular the entrance. The entrance is a glass storefront, so light and activity is really focused on that entrance. They are looking for a very efficient structure and enclosure for the merchandizing activity.

Dickens discussed the third reduced sheet and the portion of the building supporting the Target logo and side appeared to be masonry. Architect Richardson responded that in some areas of the country the concrete masonry is a preferred technique for building, but tilt-up wall concrete is more successful and readily available in the Bay Area. He further noted that they are open to different materials and textures.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

Jean Starkweather, Las Colindas resident/Marin Conservation League, asked the Commission to discuss the following: 1) bulk; 2) setback; and 3) neighborhood. This is a very large building located above the bay and visible from every direction. This building will be the farthest out toward the Bay and its bulk will be obvious. In regard to the setback, they propose the minimum and an example would be Home Depot, which has all kinds of controversy. They do not want another mistake at this visible location and would appreciate a greater setback. When envisioning this large building, it is not a benefit for Shoreline Park, the City or neighborhood. They hoped this building can be part of the neighborhood and make sense for those that live to the north, walk the trail as well as the wildlife nesting, resting and feeding in the marsh. It would be very useful if story poles were erected for those to better understand the location of this building.

Roger Roberts, So. Heights Blvd. resident/Marin Conservation League, talked about landscaping and believed the City can do a better job with parking lots and this parking must help break up the large concrete parking lot with landscaping. Trees planted can break up the visibility of that mass. He recommended clusters of trees and that careful attention be given to the landscaping close to the building.

Robert Wright, TWM architect, reminded the Board that this project and this site have been in the works with the City for over 20 years. This is the last major project to be done at the Shoreline Center. It has always been considered to be a big box site, which has been a focus of Council and Commission for a number of years with all projects in this area his firm has done, they are very sensitive to design, building orientation, wetland and environmental issues. He worked with Target and their architect in siting this building as carefully as possible to protect the area. The setback is 37.5 feet from the Shoreline Park band as shown in the Master Plan that was approved for the site and this building is well over 100 feet back from that, which is very important for him to make sure they did not infringe on that Shoreline Park band. He felt strongly that this is the only way to locate a building of this size at this site to create minimal impact against the wetlands and Shoreline Park band. He then reminded staff and The Board that many issues are spelled

out in the Master Plan the project is consistent with permitted uses, heights and so forth at this location. It is more of an architectural issue tonight, and issues regarding use should be discussed at the Planning Commission level. TWM takes pride in the building in this area and feel they are very nicely done and appropriate. They looked at the design that Target has developed, and they find it acceptable from their standpoint from an aesthetic point of view and felt that it has appropriate articulation. Entrances work well as well as colors. It would be a nice enhancement and wanted to see this project constructed.

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.

Dickens did not think for a minute this is The TWM's best work. For some reason landscaping in that area does not thrive and wanted to see an extremely intense and ambitious landscape plan for this project with three or four rows of trees between the building and Shoreline Park. Must be respectful of what the building looks like from the water. He felt there is a missed opportunity for the road along the south side of the property and building, and some of the other roads to introduce an easygoing curve so as one drives through the view unfolds. There are several ways to soften the straight paving by introducing some slightly curved linear traffic forms that will be much more pleasing. There should be some type of public gesture on the part of this developer. He did not see why some type of outdoor facility could not be provided for the public to enjoy and embrace and bring the Shoreline Park into the building slightly. That may be a stretch for Target, but he would like to see that sort of gesture in this community. The tilt up building will be dreadful if they do not mandate textures of some other materials. Articulation and screening will help. He agreed with Ms. Starkweather and Mr. Roberts about the importance of landscaping and story poles. He desired much bigger drawings as well as a video of this project.

Crew understands this is a designated use and the City would like to generate revenue, but felt this project belongs in Novato. Even with landscaping and trees, it is still pretty stark. She desired more articulation on these facades and more shadow lines. She expressed concern for the view the residents to the north will have and the view from the water should be addressed. Also, there is a huge amount of wind in this area and the garden center should have fencing to protect the plants. Another issue discussed in the staff report is the other two lots and desired some sort of canopy. It is very hard to get in and out of Home Depot and just two lanes will not be sufficient, especially during the holiday season, so the narrow entrance is not acceptable. She desired a fully dimensioned plan, that lighting levels be provided, possibly some awnings and a signage program. She also desired a plan with a real color board. There must be more sensitivity to the two frontages along the Bay. Bicycles and pedestrians are not addressed. She further asked that the mechanical screening should be accurately reflected in the elevations provided at the next meeting.

Alternate Machnowski views a modern contemporary building of the 1950s. He sees massing and no articulation. He did not understand how this big box can fly. There is no plaza, no intent to parking, no breaking up the building intent, and there is no interior

activity created. He finds it to be another big box with color. The approach to the building and parking lot must be carefully considered. He recommended that this project go back to the drawing board to totally start over. The colors are very traditional and there is no attempt to have better finishes such as metal to help break the massing similar to RAM or Toyota. He further noted that he cannot recommend this project as presented.

Chair Kent stated that the desire is to have these buildings enhance the Bay. If food service is provided, there should be an opportunity for a food plaza facing the Bay, possibly enclosed due to the wind. The building totally lacks creativity. There is not much going on with landscaping and there is more parking than required so some trees should be parking fingers. The entryway is pretty narrow. Overall it is a very boring building. Light must be screened from the Bay and a lot better landscape treatment between the building and Bay must occur.

Kirchmann expressed concern for the proposed subdivision of these two small lots with very little building capacity in front of this site and asked the developer to give that some consideration, which possibly might open up some space to provide greater setbacks from the park.

Chair Kent discussed the amount of hardscape and asked the Board to keep in mind that there are two more parcels able to be developed in this area.

Boloyan announced that this is a conceptual application, so the Board's comments will be transmitted to the applicant and they heard the Board's feedback and they will use that information in developing their formal application.

Board took a short recess.

- 6) PA07-001 Conceptual Design Review for the proposed demolition of an existing 4-story 33,000 sq. ft. office building to allow new construction of a 4-story 93-unit residential condominium complex on approximately 1.9 acres.
33 San Pablo (Leviste)

Jessica Leviste, Contract Planner, summarized the staff report and requested the Board comment and make recommendation to the ZA on the design aspects of the project. The Board is asked to make recommendations to the ZA on the setback waiver, conformance with the Hillside Design Guidelines in general with special attention to the bulleted items, as well as the overall design.

- Whether the deviation from the stepback requirements on the front (east) elevation is appropriate or if additional articulation is warranted.
- The appropriateness of the front yard setback and whether setback waiver is appropriate given the site conditions and potential impacts to the hillside if the project were to comply with the setbacks.
- The proposed removal of the oak trees, the appropriateness of the tree replacement proposal on this site, and the repainting of additional trees to mitigate the loss of the Acacia trees.

- The appropriateness of the proposed on-site drainage system with the absence of drainage report.
- The accuracy of the identified 2% driveway slope.
- The appropriateness of allowing a waiver or reduction of the one additional covered on-site parking space for review by the hearing body.
- Whether this portion of the structure is well articulation and meets the intent of the Hillside Design Guidelines in terms of bulk and mass.
- The visual impact of the downhill (front) elevation, specifically in terms of the section of the wall greater than 20 feet tall.

Crew asked staff to explain the two concessions. Boloyan clarified the parking concession and stated that the State Density Bonus regulations identified parking rates that are lower than the City's normal requirements for parking, and if applicants meet certain affordability are allowed to use the lowered parking rates, which is one space for one bedroom units; two spaces for two bedroom units; and does not require any guest spaces and tandem parking is allowed as well.

Jeff Hutchinson, applicant, purchased this property almost a year ago, it is an older outdated office building that has been vacant for four or five years. They purchased the property with the intent of making a nicer and better use of the property. They met with staff last summer to discuss the potential for housing and the City is encouraging housing development, in particular a housing development that provides below market rate or affordable units. In regard the concessions, on this particular project they ask for one concession and that is using the State parking ratio for the density bonus. By providing the 20% below market rate units, they asked for the one concession that the State parking of one space per one bedroom unit and two spaces for a two-bedroom unit be used. They provide a number of exterior parking spaces for guests. In regard to the height, they intend to make it compliant with the zoning of 36 feet. They will provide a mix of one and two bedroom units as well as exterior terraces to take advantage of views to the north and toward the Bay.

Dickens asked the applicant if this will be rental units or for-sale units. Mr. Hutchinson responded that these would be for-sale market rate homes.

Michael Plaza, architect, briefly discussed the design concept and would address all concerns raised in the staff report. They are complying with the 26-foot isle for the parking. The main concern is the height of the building and they are complying with the 36-foot height limitation. However, there is a definition of height per the UBC that allows for hillside conditions and they have an additional 10 feet on the lower part of the building that they interpreted this condition and they will work that issue out with staff in order to comply with the 36 feet as required by the City. He explained that there are three parts of the design: site layout; bulk and mass; and overall architecture of the building. As far as the site plan and layout, they have an existing building. They will be replacing the existing building with the new building. They want to provide as much distance from San Pablo Avenue, which has been done in order to maintain and keep the existing trees that are adjacent to San Pablo Avenue as well as the existing entryway. The overall footprint

is responding to the site. They intend to terrace the building with the slope of the site. They tried to maximize views for the units. They provided a series of amenities on the site. They have a high percentage of landscape areas. They have view patios and maintained the existing grove of trees. In regard to bulk and mass, the intent is to create a very residential structure. Stepping and terracing helps to create that residential feel along with landscaping. They hoped to create enough articulation on the most critical elevation when viewed from San Pablo Avenue. In back, they placed porches and balconies to further articulate the overall mass of the building. They want a roof that will decrease the overall height. They provided additional exhibits where they took the property and superimposed perspectives of before and then after with the new building along with three different points of view. The intent of the architecture is to compliment the neighboring properties. It blends well and respects the neighboring architecture and they are setting up a very residential feel. It is a contemporary interpretation of craftsman style. They can articulate better the elevations and treat different parts of the building separately through the use of these materials such as siding and wood trim. Potentially introduce stucco as well in order to blend in and articulate the elevation further. They are adding gables and dormers to further articulate the building. This building, although large in scale, they have 35% coverage and placing parking underground. He further noted that the entire building is set within the hillside.

Crew asked the architect if noise impacts have been considered due to the close proximity to the freeway. Mr. Plaza responded in the affirmative. He added that landscaping will provide a buffer and low walls could be added to help mitigate noise as well as windows.

Dickens asked the architect if this will be a Type V wood framed building. Mr. Plaza responded in the affirmative. He also noted that they have area separation walls to comply with Type 5 building.

Alternate Machnowski asked the architect what is the floor separation assembly between the residential units. Mr. Plaza responded that this is a Type 5 building and there would be wood joist with insulation in between each unit.

Chair Kent asked if this building would be reduced in height as opposed to what the Board is viewing tonight. Mr. Plaza believed it conforms to the 36-foot height limitation as per the zoning for San Rafael. However, there is an interpretation per the UBC to allow them on the lower end that additional 10 feet on the bottom.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item.

Jeannette Ervin, San Pablo Ave. resident, opposed the bulk and mass of this project. She is concerned about parking placement and size of the property, but most importantly the traffic. She opposed the location for guest parking due to noise impacts. She requested a soundwall for the noise impacts. She asked the Board to reduce the size of the project in order to help mitigate noise and traffic in the area. She also expressed concern for the fitness, lounge and special events areas in relationship to neighbors and noise levels. She expressed concern for privacy in regard to the balconies. She requested that the redwood

trees be preserved in order to provide privacy.

Sean Cunningham, San Pablo Ave. resident, expressed concern for traffic, noise levels and parking congestion from this development on behalf of his mother. They prefer to have the redwood trees removed and replaced with either a wall or another specie that would not be as intimidating over his mother's property. He also expressed concern for the wildlife in the area that will be impacted from this development.

Peter Davis, San Pablo Ave. resident, believed this development will greatly impact the neighborhood. His concern is for the maximum height in regard to UBC. 9 feet will change the density and lot covered so that must be addressed. He further hoped the Board addresses the height of this project.

Bill Willingly, Laurel Glen resident, major concern is the size and height of the building, but also traffic. He asked the Board to consider having the entrance and exit off of North San Pedro rather than San Pablo, which is already a very congested street. He agreed the 9 feet is an issue and must be addressed in terms of height. Also, 143 parking spaces is not adequate and must be addressed as well.

Bryan Cunningham, San Rafael resident, reiterated his brother's comments that traffic and noise will greatly impact the neighborhood and his mother's quality of life. He hoped the Board would address traffic and parking congestion.

Trent Ervin, San Pablo Ave. resident, pointed out that he would be directly affected by this project. The mass and bulk of this project looking down into his backyard is not acceptable. This is a dead end street and there is no thoroughfare, so adding additional traffic is not appropriate in this area. This proposed height of this building is unacceptable and asked the Board to reduce the height as well as mitigate the traffic issues in the area.

Chair Kent desired comments on the design specifically because traffic and parking is more of a Planning Commission issue.

Holly Wippler, San Pablo Ave. resident, expressed concern for traffic and parking. She provided letters from the Traffic Engineer in regard to posting police in the area for parking and speeding problems, which has not occurred. Her concern is for height due to the evening sun. Also, demolition of the project is a concern. She believed the amount of units should be reduced.

Diane Johnson, San Pablo Ave. resident, expressed concern for the lighting of the property because it will impact the wildlife and neighborhood. She also expressed concern for parking and reiterated previous comments.

John Lowser, San Rafael resident, expressed concern for the size of this building and believed it is inappropriate. His concern is that this project will impact his view.

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 appreciated the parking problems, but as indicated that is a Planning Commission issue. This is a very visible site traveling south from 101 and the architecture has not addressed some of the bigger issues. It is near the Civic Center and this is a major gateway into the City of San Rafael and a 45-foot structure will be very obvious. The sketches do not address the major issue. It is not at all clear what the structure will appear and materials as this moves forward will be very important. The building itself is massive. The road is very narrower in this area. Lighting is a concern and must be addressed along with landscaping. Privacy and retaining walls are necessary and very important. They must view a noise study in regard to demolition of the office building as discussed by the residents. She desired more than just one section of this building and asked for several sections and several directions when this project comes back to the Board. In regard to ceiling height, it could be lowered and 9 feet is very generous and could possibly be lowered to 8 feet. The existing office building tried to look more like a two story building rather than a four-story building and there have been no concessions made to make this building appear smaller. She desired unique style architecture more fitting for this particular site. She desired this project to be reduced in height and size and that the impact on the immediate neighborhood be taken into consideration. Also, noise issues must be addressed. She asked that the architect provide four-sided architecture and pay more attention to materials in regard to landscaping.

Alternate Machnowski appreciated the renderings provided, but this type of project will need a three dimensional model to provide a better understanding. He expressed concern for the ratio in regard to the amount of bedrooms. He views more one-bedrooms versus two-bedrooms and providing more two-bedroom units should be considered that could alleviate the parking issue. More guest parking should be provided and the ratio of guest parking should be increased. Highway 101 noise must be addressed and the building must respond to that issue. He believed the balconies should be useable balconies and not facing Highway 101. He desired one large space as opposed to two large terraces. He suggested placing the building more toward the southwest side to have a larger setback and better views. He agreed this is a very visible site and does not respond to the Civic Center, so the applicant should respect and respond more toward the Civic Center. In regard to the demolition, there is a lot of concrete and that will create a lot of traffic. He suggested using "Green" methods in regard to the concrete. He is concerned with the height and the amount of natural light in terms of underground parking. Also, trash collection must be addressed.

Dickens recommended that the neighborhood form a small committee and initiate regular meeting cycles with the developer and architect, so when this project comes back the neighborhood will feel more comfortable that most of their concerns are mitigated. He asked the architect to consider breaking the building up in units rather than a massive single building. A four-story building with a gable roof looks okay from a distance but up close one will receive no sense of the roof, so this may not be the correct kind of architecture for this four-story building. It is a tough site and will have serious noise

impacts. He asked for bigger drawings for not only the plans, but larger drawings of roof and elevations. Also, he recommended building berms from the demo material to help with noise impacts.

Chair Kent agreed it is a very ambitious project. He believed this is a perfect example where the State housing bonuses and parking concessions can really destroy a project. This building appears as a six-story building. He desired an arborist report when this project comes back to the Board to locate the drip line and construction protection must be included for those trees that will be maintained. There must be some thought in regard to privacy and lighting for the neighborhood. He recommended breaking it up with smaller units, more landscaping areas and provide more pedestrian opportunities on the site. There must be more landscaping on the Highway 101 side. The driveway must be more interesting such as a paving pattern. The biggest problem is the perceived bulk and height of the project.

Boloyan summarized the Board's comments:

- Majority of Board felt the building was massive.
- Break up building into smaller components.
- Privacy, lighting and outdoor space must be reviewed.
- Concern about parking and the Planning Commission must address traffic.
- Suggestion for additional landscaping along the southwest side.
- Provide landscape arborist report.
- Preserve existing trees proposed.
- Improving the decoration of the entry driveway and roundabout to alternate material.
- Consider soundwalls and potential reuse of demo concrete in some site improvements.
- Some Board members desired more consideration and respect for the Civic Center building.
- Concern that the gable roof style on four-story building would not work well and that an alternate concept should be reviewed.
- Noise issues in regard to demolition and new residential units in terms of placement of outdoor space, balconies and windows should be reviewed.
- Suggestion that neighborhood form a committee to work with developer.

Boloyan noted that the Board asked for the following information when this project comes back for review:

- Surrounding buildings
- Window placement
- Location of structure
- Lighting
- Photometric
- Model or visual simulation to understand various buildings
- Several more sections in both directions
- Noise study

- Clarity on height in regard to UBC

Mr. Plaza asked the Board to elaborate in regard to compliment the Civic Center. Dickens responded that it is extremely difficult to do but the building north of the Civic Center has curves in their architecture even though a wood building, they were sensitive to the Civic Center. How it is achieved will be difficult, but it is such a gateway project and the project must be sensitive.

Alternate Machnowski believed materials can have an impact and use of materials similar to Civic Center would help. He then asked the applicant to consider better quality two-bedroom units to provide better flexibility as well as reduce mass. Bob Brown, Community Development Director, pointed out that the State has increasingly constrained and tied the hands of local government when it comes to housing projects. The State has passed laws that dictate the amount of parking required for multi-family projects and the City has no ability to vary from that. In terms of density, the City has control over the bulk of the project and if bulk is a concern, the Board can direct the applicant to reduce the bulk by making smaller units.

Mr. Hutchinson thanked the Board for their time and agreed to consider comments. This is the first step in the process and they will continue to interface with the neighbors. It is an interesting neighborhood with a lot of higher density uses and the infrastructure of the street is inadequate for what is there now and probably what was there 10 years ago. They have a nice wide sidewalk immediately in front of their property and they probably will look as part of this project try to enhance the infrastructure that serve the site and neighborhood to address some concerns.

7) **Discussion Item on Quality of Plan Submittal from Member Dickens**

Dickens discussed his suggestions provided in his memo as following:

- Volunteer architect
- Prepare a special brochure "*How to Pass the DRB with Flying Colors.*" Provide examples of projects for quality of design, completeness and accuracy in presentation.
- Not review those minor applications to simplify staff and the Board's frustration.

Crew pointed out that the Board volunteers their time and believed their time is valuable and should be respected. Crew desired professional standards, and if not, the Board has the right to reject the application.

Chair Kent expressed concern for applicants not being prepared and presenting incomplete projects and then the Board designs the entire project, which is not appropriate.

Alternate Machnowski believed the Board should be more restrictive. He did not agree with having a desk volunteer. He also desired three-dimensional modeling.

Brown asked the Board to help define those minimum standards, so staff can enforce. Also, the staff report could indicate adequacy of the project to better assist the Board.

Boloyan apologized to the Board for the quality of the plans due to new staffing.

Dickens desired graphic examples because a site plan must embrace certain items. He suggested providing photographs as good as well as bad examples to show the contrast. He also asked staff to provide a recommendation upfront. Boloyan responded that staff points out issues in terms of consistency with certain policies, but recommendations are not provided.

Crew asked staff to point out inadequacies in the project. Boloyan agreed to add a completeness section to help the Board.

Boloyan asked the Board to comment on the staff reports. Crew felt too much planning information is provided at times. Dickens desired more efficiency at the meetings.

Boloyan agreed to return with the criteria they currently have in order for the Board to review and provide examples of a great site plan and/or sections. The biggest part is training new staff. Crew recommended scheduling a mini training session. Boloyan agreed to schedule a working session with the DRB and staff.

ADJOURNMENT

BY ORDER OF THE CHAIR, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary