



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: December 1, 2016
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Robert Gooyer, Vice Chair Alexander Lew, Board Members Peter Baltay, Kyu Kim

Absent: Board Member Wynne Furth

Oral Communications

Chair Gooyer: Is there anyone who would like to address this Board on any item that is not on today's agenda? Seeing none, I'll close the public portion and bring it back.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Gooyer: Are there any Agenda Changes, Additions, Deletions?

City Official Reports

1. Meeting Schedule and Assignments
2. List of Staff Approved (Minor) Architectural Reviews

Action Items

3. **PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 799 Embarcadero Road [PLN16-00123]:** Applicant's Request for Architectural Review Approval of a Two-Story, 6,663 Square Foot Replacement Fire Station Building Located on the Northwest Corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads Adjacent to the Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction of Existing Structures). Zoning District: Public Facility (PF).

Chair Gooyer: Why don't we start with Item Number 3, a public hearing? 799 Embarcadero Road, applicant's request for Architectural Review approval of a two-story, 6,663-square-foot replacement fire station building located on the northwest corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads, adjacent to the southeasterly edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27-acre property. Environmental assessment, the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA, pursuant to Section 15302. Staff.

Amy French: Orienting myself to the microphone here. The last we were together regarding this fire station project was in June of this year. On the screen, you'll see the three conceptual options that were presented at that time: one with a flat roof, one with a gable eave sort of pitched roof, and a third with a curved, asymmetrical roof. They're on the screen there. I wanted to show that to you. At the time, the Board was supportive of the clay tile—what is it called? Terracotta tile. You have the sample at your places there. There were some other comments that came from the Board. Applicant has returned with a plan set with site sections as requested and other items, details. It's a complete set. I'll go back to the beginning of this. It is, for the benefit of the public, an 18.27-acre site that includes a Category 1 historic

resource and other potential resources, such as the Girl Scout House, that are being reviewed and studied at the moment in connection with the Junior Museum and Zoo project that has not yet come forward for review in a formal application. The other resources nearby are the Rinconada Library and Art Center, which are across the street, across Newell Road. It is within a neighborhood of single-family homes across Embarcadero and on the other side of Hopkins. The station is adjacent to the swim center and Rinconada Park, which is characterized by mature trees. Here are views of the existing station, the old view of it in 1948 when it was first constructed with its old fire engines there. We have some images of it today. On the upper-right image, you can see that's pretty well screened by some oleanders at the corner. There is this hedge and fence, kind of split-rail fence, that separates the site from the park next door. There are three protected trees onsite: two oaks and a redwood. The redwood is adjacent to this flagpole that is a stealth flagpole - we'll talk about that later - for cell communications. The project is to demolish a 15-foot tall, one-story building and construct a 33-foot and 5-inches tall, two-story building with the same functions on the site. Not an increase in the number of firefighters that can live there or temporarily live there or any other increase in demand, that kind of thing. It's just meeting current Codes, State Codes, Safety Codes, those kinds of things. On the site there are the 24-foot special setbacks on Newell and Embarcadero, which means that a building cannot be placed within that setback but other items can, such as the plaza that's proposed. In this site plan, you can see the three protected trees retained. There's some storm water, C-3 design to handle the runoff. There is this plaza, which the ARB had in June asked that there be more focus on that. It came back bigger with more amenities including a public art proposal that has not yet gone through the Public Art Commission. There are some other features. It still has an ingress for the fire trucks here and egress out onto Embarcadero as proposed in June. There is this placeholder for a cell tower, because the project will be removing the stealth flagpole, wireless tower. There's this potential site here in the corner, and there is a discussion that has been held so far with the purveyor of cell service about going into this corner and proposing a fake conifer tree. I'm just showing where that is. Here's the flagpole. Again, it's not part of this application, but as long as we're here, it's good to see where that would be proposed potentially. Here is where this site would be, seeing it from Newell and seeing it from across the street at the Art Center. This also shows that there is some shade now on the existing parking lot at the rear. That shade would continue to be there. The parking lot is being adjusted somewhat, so the 50-percent shade requirement comes in. That fake conifer can actually meet the requirements of the 50-percent shade if that's the plan that comes forward. Again, these are views of the site from the Rinconada Park in the proximity of the Junior Museum and Zoo and Girl Scout House. This is from that path across from the Art Center. The site sections provided do show that there are one-story structures opposite the roadways. Those are pitched roofs. This was something that the HRB was wrestling with a bit as far as roof options. Again, what the ARB saw back in June on roof options and the style. What came back to the HRB was this drawing in the lower corner. They were concerned that it was bunker like and needed to have something more to it. Staff had conversations with the applicant, who came back then with an additional window here—this is in the exercise room—and this split here with a glass feature to break up the box that is made of metal panel. Over on Embarcadero, the architect can go into this with more detail. There was concern that having some better window looks over here. The window size has increased as far as these clerestory windows. This is not window here. From the park, there was an image that was shown, that had a shrub of some kind, but that is, I think, not in existence. What's come back is vines here to screen some of that fence and provide a pleasant view. It also shows the tree that is showing up in the site plan and the landscape plans to mitigate or interrupt the views. You can also see this window that they added since the HRB meeting. One other thing that came up with the HRB was a discussion about borrowing some features from the Rinconada Library. The architect will explain how that was done in the original set with that terracotta tile as a nod to this and also the wall. I'll let them go. One more image is just showing you these fake cell tower trees, just so you get an idea of what could be coming forward in a future application. Thank you. I'm here for questions.

Chair Gooyer: Is the applicant here?

Jodie Gerhardt: Just to confirm, Board Member Baltay arrived during the staff presentation. Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: While they're getting ready, do either of you have any questions of staff?

Board Member Kim: I have a quick question. On page 6 of the staff report, under building finishes and details, that first paragraph, the last sentence of the first paragraph says glass rollup vehicle doors are proposed on both front and rear elevations. When I look at the plans, the elevation facing Embarcadero, it looks like those are actually side-folding doors. I want to get some confirmation on whether they're the same glass rollup doors or not.

Ms. French: I'll let the architect address that.

Alan Kawasaki: Thank you. You've noticed. You're looking at the elevations closely. In talking with the Fire Department, the side-opening will be used in the front because those are fast acting and very safe and durable. The less expensive rollup will be used in the back.

Board Member Kim: Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: You have 10 minutes.

Mr. Kawasaki: Chair Gooyer and Board Members Baltay, Kim and Lew, thanks for seeing us again. I just want to also express that this a great opportunity for us as architects, because the topic and the site and all that is extremely interesting. I want to make mention about modernism. I think there have been discussions about that. In our view, modernism as a style or a movement in general but mid-century in particular had—it's really about some principles rather than actually forms. It's about principles. That's why we believe that modernism today still endures. It's the same principles. Those principles included industrialism and technology, a belief in that and that those would be in service to humanity or to make, say, livable forms. There's limited reference to historical styles in it. They don't look back; it's all about today; it's all about what is relevant in today's environment. A lack of ornament. These are all things, of course, we've all had in school, so just a reminder. Of course, form follows function. Somehow out of the program and sort of solving problems, real problems, the form of the building would come. I'll take a minute talking about some of the functional elements, and that'll help us decide about the form. The first point I would make is that in designing fire stations, the first thing we do is we worry about safety. One of the reasons why we're doing this station is because of safety and the Fire Department coming to us and saying, "We have a really unsafe situation where we have fire trucks that are backing up from Embarcadero into the station." There are, of course, children and other people coming along Embarcadero. What we want to have is a drive-through station. In order to get this station, which is approximately twice as much square footage, onto the site, you can imagine the major constraint besides the desire to do this are the trees. We're saving three major trees on the site. Not surprisingly, the footprint ends up being pretty much the same footprint for a two-story building as a single-story building with some adjustments in order to accomplish the program. The first programmatic element is when you're putting an engine onto a station in a drive-through, you need—the prevailing thought is 60 feet minimum, 65 feet ideally. We don't have that kind of room. We pushed the station forward a bit, about 5 feet. That is the apparatus bay. We have about 55 feet, and still that wasn't enough. What we did was we widened the doors a little bit. Actually we're not completely perpendicular until we're actually inside the station. That gives you an indication of how tight this site is. Fitting between the trees and getting this in, getting all the turning radiuses, etc., was really important. You see also where the entry is. The current entry is off of Embarcadero, and you walk across the drive where the apparatus are coming out and people with bicycles getting registered. It's not safe. We said, "Let's put the entry on Newell." That's why essentially we have these little pods or squares left over on the site in terms of the building footprint. The section closest to Newell is where we put the building entry. Getting into the plan. From that entry, you'll see that you come in, and then what you have is a watch room—that's just like an office—on the right and the public restroom. There's a low wall with a door on it, so the public doesn't come into the station. You have the apparatus bay and then of course the port for the apparatus. Those are all pretty much what you have to do based upon this footprint. Upstairs, we went through several options with the Fire Department. Of course, it's all about speed, right? What we're trying to do is get the firefighters into the apparatus as quickly as possible. We decided—in the dayroom is where they are most of the time—to put that back towards the entry stair. There's also a pole that

goes straight down; I don't know if you noticed that in the plan. That is the closest area. They wanted the dorms, the sleeping areas, on the park side of the building. We discussed with you during our study session we were going through three styles. I did mention to you that the Fire Department had a preference for the flat—roofed building and also for the terracotta. We discussed that. I think pretty much everyone seemed to be in line with the terracotta. There was more discussion about whether it should be flat or whether it should be sloped. I think what came to us also during the study session is, guys, if you want to do slope, if you want to proceed with the slope, these are some things that we would ask you to come back and address. That's we've come back today for. If I just note that the one point—it's kind of hard to read on the far left. Somehow, you said, we need to break the mass up. If we're going to use these sort of cubes or flat roofs, we need to either vary the height, maybe we need to add some windows. You also said that we need to activate the corner. You were concerned about the kids queuing up for the crosswalks, and maybe we can do something more, to do something at the corner. Most particularly, you said let's think about the entry plaza and sort of make that whole pod there more welcoming. What we're showing you today is something developed in the past 3 weeks. It actually is something that the HRB has not seen. Many of your comments are really the same kind of concerns that they had, and I think we've addressed that. This is a rendering of the most current design. As I mentioned to you, what we've done is the side gray boxes have been lowered. The center terracotta box has been raised about, I think, a foot and a half, and the others were lowered a foot and a half. It's about a 3-foot difference between the two kinds of elements. I'll show you some plans on the corner, and then the civic design that we've done for the plaza. Just again to recall the material selection that we had. Firefighters, fire stations, if you ask a firefighter what they want, they'll say, "Give me a brick fire station. Give me that traditional station." We want to do something of our time, so terracotta, and we want to do rainscreen these days because of energy concerns. Rainscreen has continuous rigid insulation on the outside of the building. The façade, the terracotta, is hung off that or in this case terracotta or metal panel. This is new technology related to green building and reflective of our time, of course. That's what we proceeded with. Of course, we liked the terracotta because we could refer to the screen around the existing library, which is built of terracotta. As a second primary color, we chose to have this sort of dark, gun metal gray also within the library complex. Those are the two colors we chose to tie the two projects through color rather than necessarily shape. Other things we did were, for instance, the wall that surrounds. They want a really abuse-resistant wall, so we pulled in—there's a cast concrete wall at the front of the library, a new one, so we pulled that same thing into the surround of the new structure. This is resultant as again for the elevation or perspective. Note the sign that's at the corner. What this really says is this is a civic building. This is what we discussed with you. Should it be civic, should it be residential? I think the determination was, we all agreed, it should be a civic gesture. We're coming into a civic area. We coming into Rincon Park, so the signage here denotes that as does the building. What we did was we widened the area along the corner to give it a little more room for the kids in the crosswalk. Of course we have in a dry streambed for water conservation, and then we've added some California native landscaping through here. On the plaza itself, because we have the grade change, we used things like steps and ramps, and then we added elements such as benches and water fountains. There's even a bike area now, of course, for LEED as well as a bike repair station that's there as well. Those things together with addressing your concerns about the façade—we've broken up the boxes and added more fenestration as was mentioned. There's almost, I would call it, more of a cubist style of design here. This is more sculptural in terms of the front entry elevation. The rear elevations have quite a bit of trees. We've actually added more. I know that there was some concern about variation. As I mentioned, we have varied the box look. Let me just remove some trees so you can actually see what's behind them. The lower box, the dorm box, is as I said 3 feet lower than the main box as is the entry cube as well. That wall has now been—there's a creeping vine across that entire concrete wall so that actually begins to mimic what's there now, which is a wood fence, of course, with planting on it. This is just the front-on elevations, inside elevations with that wall. I know one of the comments was thinking about that wall and its relationship to the metal panel above. Our decision was to flesh it out; we thought that would be really nice. The metal wall and the surface and the concrete wall surface are in the same plane. Architecturally, it'll be interesting, the fifth façade. The other thing, I think, that was really nice about your suggestion to increase the height differences is that we now have a better place to hide some of the mechanics, including PV panels. PV panels today have to be changed

over time. Another shadow study is in here as well. The net shadow in red is very small. That is our presentation. Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: Thank you. Are there any questions of the applicant?

Board Member Kim: I have a quick question. Could you tell me how many firefighters there are at the station at one time?

Mr. Kawasaki: They will be using the same number of firefighters, which should be three. There are three rooms. One of the rooms has got another bed in it, and that's what we call our ride-along. They have training people who come. At maximum, there will be four. In terms of the parking in the back, you can also note that you have to deal with shift change, so there's more than four parking spaces. At 8:00, the new crew comes on, the old crew goes out. We can't really park them across the street; we've got to keep them on site.

Board Member Kim: Are there any guest parking requirements?

Mr. Kawasaki: Unfortunately, there's not enough room on the site. There's no requirement for that other than the accessible parking. I know when I go to the station, I actually park at the library, and I walk across the street. I think that's probably what guests will have to do.

Board Member Kim: Just one final question. I know that with today's regulations, there's an exhaust capture system that has to happen inside the fire station. I didn't see any—maybe I missed it. How does that work? Where does that exhaust come out of the station?

Mr. Kawasaki: They're called Climavent or Nederman systems. Basically there's like a dryer hose that goes to the tailpipe, and then it goes up. There are tracks above. That's one of the reasons why stations are very tall; it's actually 1 1/2 stories compared to other houses. It's 18 feet floor to floor on the first elevation because of all the stuff that goes up there.

Board Member Kim: Once it goes to the ceiling, does it exit out the side of the building or does it actually continue up through the second floor and out the top?

Mr. Kawasaki: It goes up through the second floor, and up to the roof.

Board Member Kim: Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: Anything else?

Board Member Baltay: Very quickly if I could. On the west side of the site, facing the park, as I'm looking at the drawing to the right, there seems to be an area in the parking lot that, as I read the keynote, says emergency generator and then trash enclosure. Can you just tell me more completely what's in that section of the site?

Mr. Kawasaki: Yes. Actually I'm wondering if maybe I can go back to a floor plan. You're talking about on the left. There's a generator. From the orange part on the left, above that, the first set of boxes. That's a trash enclosure. We like to put a covering on that, but leave the sides open so the air can come through. There's an emergency generator. Part of the Essential Service Act is that if there is an emergency and we lose power to the building, we need to maintain power to the fire station for 72 hours. There's a generator there with a diesel belly tank, and that powers the station.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Kim: I have one more question. I'm just kind of curious. I noticed that there are these firewalls in certain areas of the building. With regards to the pole, if we're looking at it in a plan, I know

that horizontally that's covered with the firewalls. How does that work vertically? Is there some kind of a filter?

Mr. Kawasaki: You have to separate the apparatus bay, which is S occupancy, from the R occupancy, which is above. It's a one-hour separation. Actually what happens is there's a closet around that. You can see in the plan there's a closet on the second floor.

Board Member Kim: The separation actually happens at the wall, so there's no separation between the floors per se?

Mr. Kawasaki: The floor is also rated one hour between the apparatus bay and the floor above.

Board Member Kim: There's an opening where the pole is, right? It's a ...

Mr. Kawasaki: Where the opening is, see where it says dayroom?

Board Member Kim: Mm hmm.

Mr. Kawasaki: Just to the left of the day, you can see the X where the pole is. That's a closet; we call it a pole closet. That one-hour rating comes up into the closet, and the door has a closer on it.

Board Member Kim: Understood. Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: Anything else? Is there anyone in the audience that would like to address this Board on this issue? Seeing none, I'll close the public portion and bring it back to the Board. Peter, you want to start?

Board Member Baltay: Sure. Good morning. Thank you for the very clear presentation. I do find myself persuaded, as I was back in April, about your site planning choices, about the need for the drive-through fire station. All that makes sense. I appreciate the complexity of a constrained site, etc. I have, I guess, two concerns. They both have to do with the building, in my mind, just looking a little bit too boxy. I appreciate your wanting to make it modern and support that. Other buildings in the area were modern for their time, and this should be the same. However, I think it just looks boxy, especially the two-story apparatus bay. My biggest concern is the element to the left of that as you're looking from Embarcadero, the dormitory rooms. I see no change to the floor plan whatsoever from the presentation you gave us in April. At least I made a pretty clear statement, I thought, that the two-story element next to the park was inappropriately tall. It's right at the property line or what people would construe to be the property line. I haven't changed my opinion of that. I go back to the site; I look at the plans. I'm trying very hard to want it to be modern and understand the boxiness may be appropriate or at least necessary. I'm not persuaded by the dormitory element next to the park. My question about the emergency generator had to do with wondering if you've explored the possibility of lowering that element and perhaps stretching the building along the boundary line there into that area where you have a trash enclosure and a generator. Perhaps you could put the generator in the very back corner between the parking stalls, which is not really useful for anything else. It strikes me that it's worth exploring somehow lowering the height of the element next to the park to be one story or a sharply sloped roof or do something to make it not just a two-story, gray wall. In my trips to that site, there are people relaxing in the park there. The shadow studies confirm that this will have a big impact on the park, on the use of that part of the park. I think it will also just look not the way a civic building should look. It's not an attractive something people are proud of from the park. Rather, it's just a tall box, the part you see from the park. I contrast that to what I see from Newell Road, which I find attractive. The main entrance, that rendering you showed, I think is a very admirable piece of architecture. The entrance looks good. I can easily see the citizens liking this building, over time it becoming part of our cultural fabric. I really wish I could say the same for the other side of the building, and I can't. My other thought has to do again with the proposed metal paneling for what I call the gray box. I'm concerned that that will end up being reflective. I'm also concerned that it might not pass the test of time as far as a civic building lasting for

50, for 100 years without needing undue maintenance. Maintenance doesn't always happen on public buildings. You want to design for something that's really bulletproof. Have you considered just a poured-in-place concrete, textured, colored, something like that? You could have the same architectural effect and you may find that it's just a lot more long lasting without—that was my initial reaction looking at the elevations, what a cool use of concrete. Get somebody good to build that, and it'll look great. I find your use of the terracotta very nice. I think it's appropriate for a fire station. The detailing you're doing does hark back to what's done at the library. I think it's appropriate. Again, my biggest concern is the massing next to the park and then some thought about the metal panels. Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: Kyu.

Board Member Kim: Thank you for coming back to the Board and giving us that very clear presentation. I wanted to thank you for some of the changes that I've seen and that you've made. Such changes as giving some more thought to the corner and the crosswalk areas; keeping the two separate bay entries and two separate doorways; the entry plaza, the more civic plaza area there. Also, there seems to be some change in proportions of the materials. I think originally the metal panel or concrete or the gray areas were a little bit smaller in proportion. I like that you've varied that to be a larger proportion in contrast to the smaller proportions of the terracotta. I know originally I had some opinions regarding some of the proportions and maybe even the materials. I think with the proportions that you have going on right now, it feels much more natural and something that looks aesthetically pleasing. While I like the corner cutout for the crosswalk area, I'm just wondering if it could be even a little bit wider. The reason I have that thought is because I was looking at the—could you go to the slide that shows that corner actually? It was a colored plan. I think you get a lot of both pedestrian and bicycle traffic coming from Newell as well. I know that the curb cut at the actual corner there is a very small slope, but I think the actual portion of non-sloped curb cut as you make your way around that corner to cross over Embarcadero becomes a little bit too thin. I'm thinking maybe that plaza could be—not plaza. What do you call it there?

Chair Gooyer: Paved corner.

Board Member Kim: Paved corner could be a little bit more generous to the Newell side. I noticed that you have a water foundation at the civic plaza. I almost thought maybe it could be nice if the water fountain was actually at that corner area, where the kids riding to and from school and home. Maybe it becomes a regular stop for them to come into that corner and to take a sip of water. I'm just wondering how many people are going to actually use the water fountain when you've got to go up the steps or the ramp to that civic plaza there. I appreciate the benches, the seating. I think the change in level there is actually quite nice. Thank you for the bicycle parking as well. Overall, I realize it's somewhat of a utilitarian building. It's a civic building. It's a fire station. I understand that, I think. Having said that, the corner treatment at the Newell-Embarcadero corner, I think it's acceptable the way it is, but I would really encourage you to see if there's a way of breaking that up a little bit. I think the HRB made some similar comments to that corner. Actually, I do have a quick question. You did mention in your presentation that some changes have been made, that the HRB did not see. Is that change in height between the metal panel areas and the terracotta areas, was that something the HRB did not see?

Mr. Kawasaki: I can answer now. They saw the change in elevation. I think the changes since HRB were primarily in the fenestration, the windows and that sort of thing.

Board Member Kim: I would just encourage you—if we can take another look at the corner, perhaps it feels a little bit too boxy still. I think overall it's a very handsome building. I think it's coming along very nicely. I appreciate the thought that you've put into our comments and addressing the firefighters' needs. I think it's going to be a great contribution back to the City and to the community. Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: Alex.

Vice Chair Lew: Thank you. You gave a great presentation, and the drawing set really was very complete. I think you've made a lot of improvements from the last time we saw it. Generally, I can support the project. Like Board Member Baltay, my main concern was from the park side view of the project. I guess in my mind when I was looking at the set, I wasn't quite so worried about having the two-story element right on the edge of the park. In my mind, it was more of the character, just having a concrete wall with the creeping fig. It seemed a little out of character for the area. I would just say just by comparison—I don't think you're that far off from the rest of the park. I guess I would say the pool building is concrete block, but it's a warmer color and there's a trellis. The substation has a wood screen fence around it. It's just a different palette. It's a little bit more open. It seems to me that you have constraints with the diesel generator and you would want a solid wall around the generator and what not. It would seem to me that if there's a way of making the fence a little bit more open, even if it's just on one side, maybe if it's not solid all the way around or if there is a way to enhance the planting actually on the park side of the property. I think you're proposing to remove the oleanders, which is fine with me. That's good. It seems like there could be more on the park edge. There are picnic areas that back up right up against the fire station. I guess that would be a question for your landscape design. Also, I understand there's the park boundary, but I would imagine the project boundary could be different. Could the project boundary extend into the park or no?

Ms. French: The project boundary and the park boundary are the same. Since it is a City project, enhanced plantings in the park that would be associated with this project would be just a coordination with the Master Plan ...

Vice Chair Lew: Of the park.

Ms. French: ... with the landscape architect for the City.

Vice Chair Lew: As it is now, does this have to go to Parks and Rec for review, like the Parks and Rec Commission or whatnot?

Ms. French: The plantings in the park, I'm not sure whether that needs to go to the Park and Rec. It's not a different use. When it's a use consideration, that would go to the Parks and Rec. Certainly they're not proposing to change the park boundary. Certainly that would have to go all the way up to Council.

Vice Chair Lew: It would go to the voters actually.

Ms. French: Yeah, beyond Council.

Vice Chair Lew: Thank you. That was my main concern. I did have a secondary concern which is your Newell Road-facing portion of the building. I think for the public that's going to be the biggest change that they're going to really see. The rest of the building is different but it's not that far off from the existing building. When I was looking at the metal siding that you're proposing, I was actually worried that it would be too light. The sample's actually very dark. That's actually much darker than I would normally see in it. I think that that's actually better. I was actually wondering if there are any other alternates. I'm not going to propose anything in particular, but I was just wondering if there was another option. There was a contingent of the HRB that was concerned about the character of the building, that it was a little out of character. It seems to me that the metal siding would be the one place where it could be more residential looking. It could still be modern, but it seems to me that would be the one place that you could make a change. Generally, I do support the project.

Chair Gooyer: Thank you. I wasn't here for the first go-around, so these are sort of my first inputs. I agree. To me the building is just too boxy. I understand the whole concept of modern and that sort of thing. First of all, part of it is fighting the modern aspect of it, just the location and the background with the trees and everything else. Not that I expect it to be a fuzzy, wood building, one-story. That's not really necessary. I understand the requirement for the two stories, so I don't really have a problem with the volume of it. It's more a matter—I've done a couple of fire stations. Let's face it, that's the way

they're built now, in one side, out the other. That's the way they need to be. I like the terracotta. I just have a real problem with the metal. Part of it is also what my fellow Board Members said here. As with so many other things like this or even the existing one is approaching 70 years old, I just think from a longevity standpoint, I don't think the metal is going to last 70 years. If it is, it's going to be a horrendous maintenance issue 30 years down the road. I don't know with concrete, but it is a viable thing that still has a modern edge to it. Let's face it, there's not a longevity issue with concrete. I'm not telling you what the material should be. I just don't think metal is the right solution. The other thing is that yesterday was the first time I'd seen this sort of option 1, 2 and 3. I think probably I would have voted more for Option 3 with a sloped roof. I don't think, like I said, you need to copy what's across the street, but this building—if you look at it just standing by itself, it's a very delicate, nice looking building. Unfortunately I don't really think it relates to anything around the area other than maybe the terracotta. I'd like to see more possibly of a sloped roof. Not a hipped roof but a sloped roof maybe with a little bit of an overhang so it does somewhat relate to the buildings across the street. The angle can be different, that sort of thing. It's just the whole idea of more of a top to it, a cap on it. I think that would eliminate a lot of the boxiness of it. It's mainly the perception of boxes when you have a flat roof and no overhang. It's almost a given that you create that. Also from the view we're looking at, this is not a very—not that it needs to be inviting, but it's a very—I don't know. I have a problem with this as far as the front entry to the building. I think it's something—again it may work in some other situation, but based on the location and what people have been used to for the last 50 years, this is an awful drastic change. I'm not saying that's not always a good thing, but I think in this particular case that needs to be toned down a little bit. Like I said, I like the plan. The other thing is if you're going to go to this sort of edge, the first thing that I thought about is with the metal panel to do something like the de Young Museum did. If you're going to go out on a limb like that, then it makes it more of a relationship to across the street with the Edward Durell Stone, sort of mimicking—not that I'm saying it's appropriate here, but that was sort of the first thing that caught my eye. Then I could see it's a definite statement, that's why the metal is there rather than just it's an alternative. Like I said, I'm not expecting a mini de Young Museum standing there. That was just the idea that it's something that would relate to across the street in a very unusual fashion. Any other ...

Vice Chair Lew: Robert, could you clarify that? You mean the copper color or the texture?

Chair Gooyer: No, no, I'm talking about the actual texture of the finish itself. Let's face it, it's a huge—you've seen it I'm sure. It's a huge building with small holes around the—in that scale, I think it's way too big. In this scale, I think it might be interesting. Again, it relates to the fence, for instance, that you saw across the street. It's a way to pull the variation in. Any comments from anybody else?

Board Member Kim: Yeah. I was curious about the gate that you see here in this perspective, the more open gate. Are there some details of that gate, what material is it, what is it painted? I was also wondering can that be used all the way around the site instead of the fully solid concrete? I don't think I have so much a problem with the two-story façade against the park, but I do think that the fence there, with it being a solid concrete, might feel a little bit too harsh even with the vine on it. I'm wondering if you can use this kind of fence design instead or maybe even something like a gabion fence or at least it feels a little bit more open and a little bit warmer and inviting. I forgot to mention earlier, but I really like the slit that you have going on here for the entry at this box here. I think with regards to Chair Gooyer's comments about the entrance, I like that the door is wood. Maybe there's an opportunity to use a little bit more of that wood to create an even warmer, inviting entry. I think your choice in doing that was appreciated by me. Thank you.

Chair Gooyer: Anything else? I think that's it.

Mr. Kawasaki: Can we respond? Is that appropriate?

Chair Gooyer: Pardon me?

Mr. Kawasaki: I can give some generally response. Obviously we will need time to ...

Chair Gooyer: Sure if you like.

Mr. Kawasaki: ... flesh it out in detail. Board Member Baltay, I want to address your concern, because certainly we did hear that concern about the height and all that along that part. We did drop it 1 foot, no a foot and a half, that box. What we did is we took the parapet of the gray box down a foot and a half and then we raised the parapet of the terracotta up a foot and a half, so there's a 3 foot delta. It's still not a gravel stop. As we know, we could take it down all the way to a gravel stop. The other thing we could do is we could talk to the Fire Department. Right now, I believe we have 9-foot ceilings. That's what they like to have, but we know in many residences they're 8 feet. If there's concern about the height, maybe we can work on that a little bit and see if we can reduce it. The problem is—I know why you were also suggesting perhaps to consider going out towards the generator is to maybe make the rooms thinner and pull them back off the fence. Certainly we'll take a look at that as well. I want to say we did not ignore. We'll take another pass at your concern regarding the height of the building along that edge.

Board Member Baltay: If I can chime in quickly, if we're going to do this kind of discussion. I'm convinced by my Board Members saying I think it's not a matter of the height. It's a matter of how it looks from the park. Ultimately I think you may well have a two-story building there, but it has to appear appropriate, it has to appear pleasant. Something when you're having a picnic with your family you don't mind looking at. Right now, I wouldn't characterize it that way.

Mr. Kawasaki: We will go back and take a look at that side. That was one topic inclusive of we will take a look at the material and whether or not it could be more transparent somehow, perhaps even pick up some of the—for instance the fence around the library has some level of openness to it. We'll take a look at other materials there as well. As far as the metal panels, also we'll take a look at other materials. I hear the concern. As we know, the first choice of the terracotta is exactly because it's forever. You never paint it, you never maintain it. Yes, there are concrete materials, so we'll take a look at the concrete materials. We are trying to use a rainscreen, so there are thin concretes that can be used in a rainscreen manner. We'll take a look at that as well. There's some landscape issues; I don't know if you'd like our landscape architect to address that. It's on the corner. I know we tried to make it as large as possible. I don't know if there is any additional design. Is the landscape architect not here? No. We will give some additional direction to the landscape architect to see if we can't improve the dimension of that area. I think actually the drinking fountain idea is a great idea. I would love that if I was a kid and coming home, to be able to drink from there. In any case, we do appreciate your comments, and we will address all of them. Thank you very much.

Chair Gooyer: Sure, go ahead.

Vice Chair Lew: I just had one last comment. This may be for staff. On the public art component, which is tentatively proposed for the plaza, I was wondering if there had been any discussion about putting something on the park side. Like a mural or something on the park side.

Ms. French: I hadn't heard, but that's certainly something that the applicant, who would be meeting with the Parks and Recreation Commission—the Public Works staff are here. They may know if there's a date.

Matt Raschke: Matt Raschke, Public Works Engineering. The public art liaison, Elise DeMarzo, has informed us that they've selected an artist. The idea was to put the art in the front plaza on Newell Street. The artist they selected tends towards mechanical art that is interactive, where you might turn a crank and something happens. He had some very nice examples of his work.

Vice Chair Lew: That sounds great. That sounds perfect for all the kids going by the fire station.

Mr. Kawasaki: Amy, can I make one other response point to one of the concerns? I do want to just—we didn't have time to go through this. I also appreciate, Board Member Baltay, your saying that as long as

we address some of the issues about shadows. In terms of the height, you can see it. There is a difference to the shadow, but the delta is actually on that side very small. This funny shaped thing on the left, the one on the upper right is actually the casting from the wall not from the building. There's a shadow created by the building into the parking lot, but the wall itself is casting a shadow. The second story at the dorm room does have a small, but nonetheless it's a concern. I think we will definitely address the issues of the feel of that side, so it's more interesting. At least the shadow part was not a lot in our opinion.

Chair Gooyer: You pretty much know what we're thinking then?

Mr. Kawasaki: Yes, we do.

Chair Gooyer: Sounds good. Thank you. I think that'll be it then.

Ms. French: One possibility as far as we need to continue the public hearing on this, is what I'm hearing. We'd want to suggest that there are some dates out there, January 19th being the first possible date. If the applicant's architect is ...

Chair Gooyer: That's pretty much okay. See what they can work with.

Ms. French: We're wrecking the holidays, but you know.

Chair Gooyer: Are you comfortable with coming back at that time?

Mr. Kawasaki: Yes.

Chair Gooyer: That'd be fine.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Lew: We have to make a motion and whatnot. I will move that we continue the project to January 19, 2017.

Board Member Baltay: I'll second that.

Chair Gooyer: Can I get a second?

Board Member Baltay: I second that.

Chair Gooyer: All in favor. Opposed.

All Board Members voting in favor with Board Member Furth absent.

MOTION PASSED

Chair Gooyer: We'll see you on the 19th then.

Study Session

None.

Approval of Minutes November 3, 2016

Chair Gooyer: The only other item we have is the approval of the minutes. Are there any comments on the minutes, other than the fact that, my God, you begin to see when it's like this either people do a whole lot of talking or it just seems like it. This is a mini book by the time you get done, 24 pages.

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to reiterate my comments from last time. This is an inappropriate way to produce minutes. Just flat out, it's inappropriate. The public cannot use this.

Chair Gooyer: I think inappropriate is a bit harsh, but I think it's a waste of paper realistically. Every word verbatim is—I think all of us probably trust your judgment to summarize what the comments were. Maybe something like this is where this stays online. If somebody wants to see the verbatim report, then they can do that. That's approved. I think ...

Vice Chair Lew: We have to make a motion.

Chair Gooyer: We just did.

Vice Chair Lew: For the minutes?

MOTION:

Board Member Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes for the November 3rd meeting.

Chair Gooyer: Second?

Vice Chair Lew: I will second that.

Chair Gooyer: All those in favor.

All Board Members voting in favor with Board Member Furth absent.

MOTION PASSED

Subcommittee Item

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Flood Protection Project [12PLN-00378]: Request for sub-committee review for design details required as conditions of approval for the previously approved project to provide 1% (100-year) flood protection improvements, riparian corridor enhancements, and recreational opportunities along San Francisquito Creek between Highway 101 and San Francisco Bay. Environmental Review: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared by the lead agency (JPA) and was certified by the JPA Board on October 18, 2012. Zoning District PF(D).

Motion:

The Subcommittee approved the proposed details provided in the staff report related to the flood wall and extension of the friendship bridge associated with Planning Conditions of Approval 3, 4, an 6 for the approved San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority Flood Protection Project. The Subcommittee also directed that once detail regarding the proposed benches and signage is available in accordance with Condition of Approval 5, this detail shall return to Planning staff, rather than the Subcommittee, for approval prior to implementation

Chair Gooyer: There is a subcommittee item, but I'll move the Board ...

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Jonathan Lait: Chair, just one comment. I noticed that our agenda's a little bit out of order here. Before you adjourn, though, under the Board Members comments and announcements, I just had a question for the Board about the staff reports and the amount of information that we provide in terms of what an applicant is proposing, what we write in a staff report as to what an applicant is proposing in terms of window detailing or all the kinds of details that you might look at when you're looking at plans. Does the Board find that helpful in our staff reports or is there an opportunity for us to present something that's a little more concise and not have staff get into sort of these tables of all these different changes that are being contemplated? If that is helpful, we can certainly continue to do that. I was interested in some brief feedback. We can continue the conversation if we need to with Wynne too.

Chair Gooyer: It would be better if all five of us were here for that. I'm okay with the way it is. Some of the stuff is a bit excessive. I don't really need it, but then I've been doing this for umpteen years. It's a little easier for me, but that's why I said we should probably have all five members here before we make a decision on that. Any other input?

Board Member Baltay: We should not make any comments now?

Chair Gooyer: No, no, no. Go ahead and make a comment. I'm just saying make no final decision on it.

Board Member Baltay: On the positive side I always appreciate and enjoy reading what staff has to say. It's usually got some interesting points on how the design has either started out or changed. You guys have talked to the applicants a lot. I typically find that very helpful to read. I like to read it after I've looked at the stuff myself. I find that somehow is just so much paper. I'm just wishing you could leave a lot of it on a website or download or email somehow. This is a book. I didn't read all of this. None of us did I'm sure. I don't need to. A lot of what we're deciding doesn't need a full printed copy of an arborist report in here, one paragraph in the staff report summarizing it.

Chair Gooyer: The stack we got, I pulled it apart. The front 20 percent was mainly what I was interested in; the rest of it I scanned through. I could easily go online for that. I agree.

Board Member Baltay: I'd be very happy if those were just available on the website, and I can download them like any member of the public if I want to dive into it. Keep the staff report to—I would tell my people no more than 5 pages. Just figure out a way to say it in that many pages, because that's what gets read. The same comment as with the minutes. If you keep it short, it actually gets used and read and appreciated.

Chair Gooyer: I do like your input on how—there's nothing worse than sitting up here and all of a sudden realizing that it's totally different than what staff was thinking about. I'd like to get your input on there. Like I said, I agree that a lot of the back may be a good idea, but five copies of it. I guess it's the same concept we talked about as the full-size prints versus the half-size prints. Most of us are fine with the half-size prints. We'll leave it at that option. If somebody wants them larger, that's fine, but not everybody. To me that's just a waste of paper. Our paperless society, we use three times more now than we ever did, seems like. Any other comments from anyone?

Board Member Baltay: I don't know if this is the appropriate time. Tell me if it's not. I'm concerned about how our Board is relating or interacting with the HRB. I think this application is yet another example of where we're not really sure what to make of their comments. They're not sure how they should interact with us. There doesn't seem to be much of a back-and-forth between our reviews. On this particular project about the fire station just as an example of process, I'm still not sure what they were supposed to be commenting on or about. When I diligently went through and looked at their meeting and listened to what they all had to say, they're basically talking about the architecture as we would. I didn't really get much of a sense about what the historical aspect of the architecture is. I think it would be really helpful to have some sort of liaison or meeting or some way of somebody from the ARB and the HRB being able to inform each Board of what's going on and sort of linking together. I think that

might be a lot. I think the HRB Board is a larger Board and doesn't often come up with a strong point of view perhaps. Something's just not working in my opinion.

Mr. Lait: As a suggestion, maybe in the new year we can get the Chair and Vice Chair of both Boards together and have an initial conversation to talk about how the two Boards work well together or how they could work better together. We can even follow that up with a joint session if you thought that was appropriate.

Chair Gooyer: I had that same sort of concern for this. I can see when we're talking about downtown and some of the other things. I don't really even understand why was the HRB involved in this. It wasn't the magnificent structure that's there now or was it because it's 70 years old? Is that basically the concept?

Mr. Lait: I think Amy can—Amy's not here. Amy turned into Clare. The park itself has got some historic significance. Because this is located on that property, we wanted to send it to the HRB to get their feedback for that perspective. Not that the existing fire station had any historic significance necessarily.

Board Member Kim: It seemed to me that this was almost a one-off. It didn't have to go to the HRB, but Planning felt that it would be beneficial to get their input.

Chair Gooyer: I didn't really see the connection.

Board Member Kim: I did see that in the HRB ...

Vice Chair Lew: It's actually not a one-off. If you look at 429 University, the same issue came up. I would anticipate actually that it'll come up again any time there's something. It's not an issue of the historic structure. It's like if the neighborhood ...

Board Member Kim: Context.

Vice Chair Lew: Yes. It's our subjective issue of the context.

Board Member Kim: I take that back saying one-off. It did sound like in the minutes from the HRB meeting that either the Chair or the Vice Chair would be here today. Unfortunately it looked like they couldn't.

Board Member Baltay: I experienced this with the Avenidas project, where I actually went and spoke to the HRB. It was determined that that was an inappropriate thing to do. I respect that, but at the same time I'm incredibly frustrated that there just doesn't seem to be communication. They really didn't get the way we were looking at that project. I don't think we understood their angle on it.

Chair Gooyer: In all fairness, it's not usually—it's because of how quickly these projects—the applicant requests how quickly these projects move, and then you really can't have a logical flow of one looks at it, and the other one looks at it. That sort of thing.

Board Member Baltay: You're right, Robert. I'm feeling a little bit like we're being so cautious to not overstep some sort of quasi-judicial legal principle, that we're not just talking to each other more. The HRB understood the angle we saw it at, and we understood their take on it. We're going to do the applicant a world of good by just coming to cleaner answers quicker.

Mr. Lait: Since we don't have this as an agenda item, I think we should probably stop the conversation here. If the Board is interested in my suggestion of the Chair and the Vice Chair next year getting together and having an initial conversation, is that valuable to ...

Chair Gooyer: Either that or in something like this, the pre-meetings that we have, would it be worthwhile having a representative at one of those?

Mr. Lait: We could certainly explore that as well.

Chair Gooyer: Something like that.

Mr. Lait: We could explore that.

Chair Gooyer: At least then the Chair and the Vice Chair would be in tune to exactly where they were coming from.

Mr. Lait: The message is clear, we want to tighten up this review process. We'll figure out some ways to do that.

Board Member Kim: Separate question. The revised findings that the City Council approved, are we going to (crosstalk)?

Mr. Lait: We had talked with the Chair and Vice Chair about having a retreat where we would bring the findings as a discussion point to familiarize the ARB with the new standards.

Chair Gooyer: We want to do that sometime before the end of the year. Is that what we're talking about or not?

Mr. Lait: I think before your first January meeting. It'll probably be the second meeting in January.

Chair Gooyer: That would be before the 19th or something like that?

Mr. Lait: Something around there.

Adjournment

Chair Gooyer: That's it then. Thank you.