

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES CITY OF SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO

DATE: October 15, 2019

TIME: 4:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mateo, Nilmeyer, Vieira & Winchester

MEMBERS ABSENT: Nelson

STAFF PRESENT: Adena Friedman, Senior Planner
Christy Usher, Consultant Planner
Patricia Cotla, Planning Technician

1.	Administrative Business – None	
2.	OWNER APPLICANT ADDRESS PROJECT NUMBER PROJECT NAME	ARE-SF No 40 LLC ARE-SF No 40 LLC 751 Gateway Blvd P18-0064: UP19-0013, TDM19-0006, DR19-0035 & EIR19-0005 New 7-story Office/R&D Building (Case Planner: Adena Friedman)
	DESCRIPTION	Use Permit, Transportation Demand Management Plan, and Design Review to construct a new 7-story Office/ R&D building consisting of 215,000 gross square feet at 751 Gateway Blvd in the Gateway Specific Plan District (GSPD) Zoning District in accordance with Title 20 of the Municipal Code and per the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
	The Board had the following comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Board liked the design concept, the architecture features, landscape design and window design.2. The Board liked the connection between the new and existing buildings, as this unites the campus together, as well as the interaction with Gateway Blvd.3. Ensure the building is solar-ready.4. The Metal Walls along Gateway and the corner seem foreign to the site.5. Consider using materials such as concrete or material/finish which works better with the larger landscape palette.6. The wall at the service enclosure should remain metal wall to match and work with the building panels.7. Overall, the landscaping plan works for this site.8. Plantanus racemosa is a great native choice for informal planting, but should not be used for formal planting (bosque, parking lot planting, etc) since they are susceptible to pests. Usage here seems appropriate.9. Centranthus species, Pennisetum orientale, and Stipa species are typically invasive species. The DRB recommends using different species. Landscape Architect to confirm the final species will	

	<p>not populate volunteers in adjacent landscape areas.</p> <p>10. Design Review Board does recommend Muhlenbergia rigens in SSF.</p> <p>11. The proposed Cedar trees will work well in this location.</p> <p>12. Acer rubrum is a good choice.</p> <p>13. The proposed stormwater flow through planters along the street and sidewalk compliments the campus.</p> <p>14. The screen wall should extend and continue around the mechanical equipment.</p> <p>15. Will the bus stop be open to the public, as well as to the employees?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is for a commute.org shuttle (public transit), as well as potential private shuttles <p>16. Show ride share parking pick up/ drop off location on the site plan</p> <p>17. Show delivery truck parking (FedEx, UPS etc) parking location on the site plan</p> <p>Recommend Approval with Conditions</p>	
3.	OWNER	SFF Realty Fund III LP
	APPLICANT	GNU Group
	ADDRESS	800-890 Dubuque Avenue
	PROJECT NUMBER	P19-0063: Signs19-0028 & DR19-0036
	PROJECT NAME	Master Sign Program
		(Case Planner: Adena Friedman)
	DESCRIPTION	Master Sign Program for a commercial building at 800-890 Dubuque Avenue in the Freeway Commercial (FC) Zone District in accordance with Title 20 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code and determination that the project is exempt from CEQA.
	<p>The Board had the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Board liked the proposed sign concept; it adds a nice architectural element to the campus. Consider reducing the height of the freestanding signs along the frontage road, make sure it is in scale with the buildings. Applicant stated intent to re-use the existing 6” concrete base. If this is not feasible, height to match existing (6”). Submit for building permits if needed. The signs may need to be on a flat surface, check with the building department on the requirements. <p>Recommend approval with conditions.</p>	
4.	OWNER	William Adasiewicz
	APPLICANT	Ryan Morris, Morris Architecture
	ADDRESS	360/364 Alta Vista Drive
	PROJECT NUMBER	P19-0028: UP19-0016 & DR19-0040
	PROJECT NAME	New Planned Development consisting of 14 Single Family Dwellings and 14 Accessory Dwelling Units.
		(Case Planner: Christy Usher)
	DESCRIPTION	Preliminary comments from the City's Design Review Board are requested by the owner/applicant of an incomplete application for a Planned Unit Development to merge 4 parcels and construct 14 Single Family Dwellings with 14 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) at 360 and 364 Alta Vista Drive in

	accordance with Title 20 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code.
	<p>The Board had the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board had many pedestrian circulation concerns with the project. 2. Citing safety and liability, the Board voiced concern over the roadway design which incorporates a pedestrian path into the roadway. A sidewalk, with a grade change, separate of the roadway, was recommended and preferred by the Board. 3. Pedestrian circulation was unclear and unsafe to the Board. 4. The Board wondered and questioned how residents will get from their houses to bus routes in the existing surrounding neighborhood. The Board suggested providing a sidewalk to Alta Vista. 5. The crosswalk as designed is not ideal being proposed at the widest part of the roadway and terminating into a private driveway. Consider relocating the cross walk to a narrow point in the roadway. Consider pedestrian signage at crosswalk. 6. Pedestrian safety and pedestrian access to the park needs to be addressed. 7. Consider bike/pedestrian pathways east/west to the open space. 8. Not clear how residents walk/bike to the park. 9. Access to the park is not resolved. 10. Paths to the open space from the guest parking spaces should also be provided. 11. The park needs sidewalk access from Alta Vista Drive. 12. Vehicle parking is a concern and will be an issue. As proposed vehicle parking is too limited and will be difficult at best. 13. The Board was concerned residents will end up parking down Alta Vista Drive. 14. The Board expressed concern with the density, stating the project is 28 units rather than 14 SFDs each with an ADU. 15. Concern there is too much being squeezed on the site and too much is being shoe horned into the project. 16. Side elevations are underwhelming and require more visual interest and architectural detail. 17. For the Craftsman architectural style units, consider a tighter lap siding (6 inch or less) rather than 8-10 inch. 18. Consider a landscape pocket to buffer to the wall proposed along the East property line. 19. Avoid Crape Myrtle in the proposed landscaping plan because they mildew in SSF. 20. Prefer to see more of a landscape buffer along Alta Vista Drive. 21. Concern that as proposed there is no place for anyone to play on the project site. 22. The grade change in park itself is problematic from an accessibility stand point. There is only one concrete pad is accessible which is not acceptable. The project needs to provide an accessible path to get up to main features in park not just one pad that is wheel chair accessible. 23. The pocket park has stairs but should be available to everyone. It should be wheelchair accessible. It should be ADA compliant. <p>In conclusion, the Board stated there are large site planning challenges that haven't been remedied. These issues are all described in detail above by the Board.</p> <p>The applicant will revise and resubmit plans for review.</p>
	Miscellaneous - None