

**MINUTES REGULAR MEETING
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
OCTOBER 2, 2007**

ROLL

UNAPPROVED

Board Members Present: Chair Kent, Dickens, Huntsberry,
Alternate Summers

Planning Commission Liaison: Mills (Absent)

Board Members Absent: Crew, Olmsted

Community Development: Raffi Boloyan, Principal Planner
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) August 21, 2007
- 3) September 5, 2007

D. Old Business

- 4) ED06-111 Request for an Environmental and Design Review Permit and Use Permit to allow three 32" long wireless telecommunication panel antennas within a new, 6' x 6' x 10' high warehouse faux chimney enclosure proposed to be located on the existing roof of a storage warehouse building, and an approximately 100 sq. ft. fences, ground-mounted equipment area located between the existing storage building and fence.
380 Merrydale Ave. (Sarjit Dhaliwal)
- 5) ED05-076 Final lighting review of an illuminated entry portal as required by the conditions of approval for a previously approved Environmental and Design Review for an auto dealership addition and remodel (Toyota Marin)
445 Francisco Blvd. (Raffi Boloyan)

A. Staff Communications

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

Tambornini reported that 820 Pine Lane received approval from the Planning Commission and will be forwarded to Council on appeal in November. Also, 33 San Pablo is scheduled for the Planning Commission on October 9th with a recommendation from staff for denial based on the fact that the project did not receive Board support and did not address the criteria. Staff will report back findings from that Planning Commission meeting.

B. Board Communications

Dickens asked staff the status on the paint out for Albert Lofts. Boloyan agreed to follow-up with the applicant and report back findings.

C. Minutes

The Commission noted a few changes.

- (2) August 21st, 2007

Alternate Summers moved and Dickens seconded, to approve the August 21st, 2007 minutes as amended. Motion carried. Crew and Olmsted absent.

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

- (3) September 5th, 2007

Alternate Summers moved and Chair Kent seconded, to approve the September 5th, 2007 minutes as presented. Motion carried.

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

D. Old Business

- (4) ED06-111 Request for an Environmental and Design Review Permit and Use Permit to allow three 32" long wireless telecommunication panel antennas within a new, 6' x 6' x 10' high warehouse faux chimney enclosure proposed to be located on the existing roof of a storage warehouse

building, and an approximately 100 sq. ft. fences, ground-mounted equipment area located between the existing storage building and fence.
380 Merrydale Ave. (Sarjit Dhaliwal)

Dhaliwal summarized the staff report and supported the proposed project because it is in keeping with the General Plan 2020 policies, meets all zoning code requirements, is of stealth design, meets the performance standards established for wireless communication facilities and will blend in with the existing land uses on the project site. The Board, in fulfilling its role of providing professional design advice to the City, may have additional concerns, information requests, and may provide any additional recommendations it deems appropriate. Following the recommendations of the Board, the application will be forwarded to the Zoning Administrator for consideration and action.

Maryann Miller-Novak, Metro PCS planning consultant, explained that they lowered the height to the 7-foot tall chimney that is now architecturally integrated into the building. She further noted that she is available to answer any questions.

Chair Kent asked if a chain link fence surrounds the ground-mounted equipment. Ms. Miller-Novak responded in the affirmative. She noted that slats could be installed or they could propose a wood fence, if so desired by the Board. Chair Kent desired the chain link fence with slats. The Board agreed.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for action.

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Huntsberry moved and Dickens seconded, to approve the project as submitted with the amendment that slats be placed in the chain link fence that encloses the ground-mounted equipment. Motion carried unanimously.

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

(5) ED05-076 Final lighting review of an illuminated entry portal as required by the conditions of approval for a previously approved Environmental and Design Review for an auto dealership addition and remodel (Toyota Marin)
445 Francisco Blvd. (Raffi Boloyan)

Boloyan summarized the staff report and asked the Board to review the lighting of the portal and provide their final recommendations as to whether the revised as-built lighting of the portal is appropriate and consistent with their previous approval.

Bob Wright, architect, apologized that the portal was not fully operational early on so the Board could review. They have been experiencing some mechanical problems and the reason for a portion of the panels being off. That matter has been resolved and they are back on. He then explained that originally the parking lot lights were 400 watts at the time Tom Price acquired the property for Toyota and during the construction process they re-lamped at the same existing wattage. Obviously the lamps were very old, they lost their brightness and the new lamps caused some attention, so they changed all the parking lot lamps to 250 watts. The portal lights are 55 watts and after discussion with electrical engineer dimming the lots is not possible. He further hoped that by toning down the parking lot lights, the Board finds the entire site lighting appropriate.

Dickens asked the type of fixtures proposed. Architect Wright responded that they are 55-watt ceramic bulb. Christine Oaks, applicant, noted that they specifically designed for long life because they are very difficult to replace.

Huntsberry asked if there is another lamp other than the ceramic bulb that could be used in its place. Mr. Oaks responded that he is not aware of another light. He explained that a lower wattage bulb would not work with the fixture proposed. Architect Wright indicated that this is the image occurring across the country and they have been told by the lighting manufacturer that this is what it is and it cannot be changed. He hopes the Board finds the lighting appropriate and not offensive. All they can do is lower the lighting for the parking lot, which has occurred, but the portal itself really is what it is.

Alternate Summers visited the site last night and the wattage was lowered along the street, but the more internal parking lot lights were brighter, so he did not believe they all have been changed. Architect Wright presented the most recent photometric and pointed out that there are a couple of "hot spots" and those can be adjusted, which are the parking lot lights that have nothing to do with the portal. The portal lighting itself is very low.

William McDevit, general contractor, explained that the bulbs used are the lowest possible wattage for that use and they are not dimmable. He was told by the lighting manufacturer that the lights were dimmable, but as indicated after discussions with the electrical engineer they were informed that dimming the lights is not possible, so when the Board first approved the project they were presented with misinformation. He explained that foot-candles are perception and that portal is big, not bright. It is a substantial architectural element. He further noted that the transformation of Francisco has had a positive effect on the entrance to San Rafael and as a landowner, he is highly supportive of the project as presented tonight.

Chair Kent opened the public hearing on this item, and seeing no one wishing to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for discussion and action.

Huntsberry believed re-lamping the parking lot lights from 400 to 250 helped tremendously. When they first reviewed they did not realize how close those poles are to

one another and 400 watts was extremely bright. Overall, the lighting seems appropriate. He is concerned about long-term relationship of these special fixtures in the portal. If they can remain at an even glow that is acceptable, but if not, then he recommended that if there is a problem keeping the portal uniformly lit that they either be removed and replaced with a more dependable unit or turned completely off, which was one of the original criteria in approving the project.

Dickens felt the project is a handsome addition to the gateway of the City. He visited the site and also viewed half of the lights on and half of the lights off. With the parking lot lights at 250 watts, then by contrast the portal will seem brighter. They are primarily present tonight to evaluate the portal, but he is not convinced at this point that it is what it is. He would like to view the portal when it is up and running. He further suggested a 90-day approval in order to properly review the portal and then have the applicant come back to the Board for approval.

Alternate Summers visited the site last night and agreed that it is a handsome structure. In regard to the photographs included in the packet, it is not what he witnessed last night. He did not see the yellowish amber hue as the photographs depict, it seemed more white. He also wanted to be assured that it will remain uniformly lit or off and agreed with adding a condition of approval as suggested by Huntsberry.

Chair Kent stated that overall it is a good project and he believed the portal is a very handsome architectural feature. He is pleased to see the light levels in the parking lot reduced. Also, light levels are perception and that is the reason for lighting reviews. The perception in this case is two parts of the equation:

- What is the light intensity?
- What is the size of the element?

He further believed it is pretty dramatic and pretty bright.

Tambornini summarized the Board's comments:

- The portal must be uniformly lit or removed
- Demonstrate a long-term solution
- Lighting levels are too bright and the Board needs assurance

Dickens felt turning the lights completely off would be a waste. He further agreed to visit when the portal when it is up and running.

Tambornini recommended that staff work with the applicant and bring this matter back in December to the Board with a system that is fully operational and that staff can verify is up and running and then the Board can consider approval.

Contractor McDevit apologized for the lights being off and on for the last six months. They ignored the recommendations and rewired inside the sign because certain specifications did not work. They explored several methods to implement the requirement for a ground floor interrupter circuit, which is why that section continues to go out, but has been fixed. They believe the other section might need to be fixed as well because it

has to do with moisture that is causing the problems.

Alternate Summers asked why they are locked into one fixture. Contractor McDevit responded that it would be very difficult to change the fixture out, not impossible. It would be very expensive. The light fixtures are extremely long life and that type of bulb combined with a special type of reflector inside makes the even lighting, so that bulb is critical to this type of application.

Huntsberry desired a copy of the cut sheet because the Board has varying degrees of knowledge on light fixtures and they might be able to offer some suggestions. They all like the idea of the illuminated portal, but they do not want a structure that is half on and half off all the time. Contractor McDevit agreed to provide the cut sheet to staff.

Boloyan noted that the condition is written that 90-days following final approval of the building permit work, which still has not occurred and within that 90-days staff can review. Staff believed December would still be within that timeframe or potentially January. Staff further noted that the applicant received the list of what must be addressed.

Chair Kent asked the Board if the lighting level is acceptable, and the problem is just mechanical. Huntsberry has not reviewed the portal fully illuminated, so he is unable to answer whether the lighting is acceptable or not.

Chair Kent asked for a motion.

Dickens moved and Huntsberry seconded, to continue the matter for approximately 90-days, which would be December; and as soon as the applicant has this situation resolved to their satisfactory to notify the Board in order to individually review. Motion carried unanimously.

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

ADJOURNMENT

By order of the Chair, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Jessica Woods, Recording Secretary