Comment

SSF Design Review Board Comments and Recommendations

Response

Design Review Board Recommendations The Board liked the overall design concept. The design is well thought out and accommodates the site configuration. Noted and appreciated 2 The façade design and articulation create a nice project with interest and cohesion around the buildings and provide for a nice open Noted and appreciated central Plaza The outdoor spaces are well thought and provide ADA accessibility Noted and appreciated the narrow and wide panel/fin element on the facades helps with the overall massing of the main building Noted and appreciated 5 Consider increasing the height of the hand rails along the balconies for increased safety as well as incorporating security features The balcony railings shall be set at at least the code minimum of 42" above the for the balconies balcony walking surface. Another comment was raised in regards to the usability of the balconies with their limited depth as they were shown. We modified the balconies to extend only to the South and increased the depth of the balconies by 5' or 6'in order to make them more usable and enjoyable for the building tenants and their visitors. 6 The placement of the parking structure was well thought out as the GOP buildings adjacent to will act as a wind barrier for the Noted and appreciated campus Within the discussion had amongst the DRB, the members expressed their general 7 The board felt that the West façade of the parking garage did not necessarily fit in with the overall design of the buildings. Consider adding a material finish or landscaping to help break up the big white wall comfort with the West façade of the parking garage. Ultimately, the feedback we received was that the color was too stark white and should be perhaps something a bit more neutral in tone, which we plan to do and is reflected in the most recent version of the renderings. Also, we plan to incorporate more vertical trees along this façade to help soften the face of the elevation. 8 Consider adding an art element sculpture within the central Plaza as an art feature would be a nice element along the rails to trails We absolutely agree with this recommendation and are excited to implement by way of commissioning via the public art requirement. and serve as a focal point for the project 9 The board is concerned with potential sun glare reflection from the proposed vin element on the building façade towards the Understanding the potential for glare into the building spaces and to the persons enjoying the plaza, we decided to remove the fins from the West Elevation and open Plaza slightly modify the façade to give it more of a horizontal identity, differentiating it from the West façade. 10 The proposed planters along the parking garage need more thought into how they will be integrated into the structure and how The planters are intended to be integral to the structure. The plants themselves shall they will be maintained consider using planting species that will grow vertical instead of overhanging the garage wall such as require minimal maintenance and may change to a more vertical style of plant as Sansevieria trifasciata (Mothers in law's tongue) or one of the upright agaves or Aspidistra elatior (Cast-Iron Plant) suggested. П Consider extending the trellis element on the parking garage roof to overhang and serve as a sort of eyebrow element for the The fire marshal commented that the trellis cannot extend beyond 12" beyond the structure face of the parking structure, which is what our current design is showing. The trellis is set back from the face of the parking garage on the South side. 12 Consider using aluminum material for the light poles, as steel poles tend to rust overtime and may fail during a big windstorm, Noted causing safety issues



SSF Design Review Board Comments and Recommendations

| <u>#</u> | Comment | | <u>ponse</u> | | |
|----------|--------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | Review the proposed landscaping plan and utilize more low water species. The proposed plans include too many plant species that are high in water use | Noted | | |
| | 14 | Consider replacing the proposed arbutus Marina trees along the accessible pathway by the parking garage as this species drops seeds and fruit which is hazardous and slippery and will stain the walkway | Noted | | |
| | 15 | Consider adding columnar shrubs along the service drive entrance off Eccles Ave. as well as the rear of the service Dr. accessible from the rails to trails approximately 30 to 40 feet into the drive on each side | Need to confirm the area allocated for planting in this area of the site. Will try to allocate some more columnar shrubs into the design, area permitting. | | |
| | 16 | Consider adding more St. frontage trees along Eccles Ave. and or using a tree species other than western Cottonwood that grow tall to enhance the area and create a pattern of larger trees in scale with the buildings | Noted | | |
| | 17 | The applicant will return to the design review board for future tenant signage for the buildings | Noted | | |
| Depa | Department Comment | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Architectura | 1 | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| AI | For the proposed office/lab building the site plan shows the plan West fire separation distance is 27'-5" from the exterior wall to the property line. CBC table 705.5 requires 2 hour rated exterior walls where the fire separation distance is less than 30 feet for an L occupancy building. Please address | Table 705.8 Allows for unlimited exterior wall openings for Unprotected, Sprinklered, Buildings with 25-30' fire separation distance. |
| A2 | sheet AE-21 shows a projection that is located in the fire separation distance check the maximum projection distance per CBC 705.2 | Our projections area all greater than 5', and our projections shall be typically less than 40". We are allowed for unlimited exterior openings based on previous comment. |
| A3 | At the upper floors of the office building, please confirm and note on the plan the exterior stair will not be a required exterior exit stair as CBC 1027.2 does not allow the use of exterior stairs in a high rise or a building over six stories high | The third stair is intended to be a required exit stair. As a result, we have moved the stair to the interior of the building, resulting in a revision to the façade that best addresses the massing without the presence of the exterior stair. Also, we had to make some slight adjustments to the massing in order to capture some additional square footage as the stair shaft being interior to the building meant it was excluded from area allowed by the 2.0 FAR. |
| A4 | At the upper floors review and address the highlighted sections of CBC 1023.7 noted below | Noted, exterior walls adjacent to the stair shall be rated in accordance with CBC 1023.7 |
| A5 | Elevation Views: Material Legend Note #8 calls for high-density exterior panels a. Review the requirements of CBC 14054 combustible materials on the exterior side of exterior walls and CBC 14064 metal composite materials (MCM) b. Provide a written response clarifying whether combustible exterior elements are proposed for the project or not c. Provide a narrative describing how compliance with these code sections is met if applicable | a. Noted b. We have identified the cladding system to be a composite panel system, which is not combustible. c. We may entertain the use of High-Pressure Decorativeexterior-Grade Compact Laminates (HPL) panels, and shall meet all fire rating requirements as stated in CBC 1408.8. Also, we will be meeting the exception as we will be using mineral wool insulation on the exterior of the building at these locations as needed, and not foam plastic insulation. |

Fire Comments



SSF Design Review Board Comments and Recommendations

| <u>#</u> | Comment | | Response | |
|----------|---------|--|--|--|
| I- | 12 | Projects shall be designed and construction in compliance with established regulations as adopted by the city of South San Francisco affecting or related to structures processes premises and safeguards in effect at time of building permit application | Include ian email comments and responses confirming sent on whatever date | |
| Fire Co | ommen | ts From Ian Hardage dated 09/20/2023 | | |
| I | I | Between building and aerial fire apparatus access maximum mature height of trees shall not exceed 15-feet | DGA: Agreed. | |
| | | | lan Hardage: Thank you. | |
| 2 | 2 | Proposed hanging planters at aerial fire apparatus access shall be located nearer the bottom of horizontal wall so that ladders can rest on the top of the wall at each level. | DGA: We intend to have staggered planters on each garage floor, which means that there would be multiple openings with unencumbered fire apparatus access on each floor. Does that work for you? | |
| | | | lan Hardage: This will need more detail to properly evaluate our access and if it reduces the minimum opening of the open-garage design criteria. | |
| 3 | 3 | Even though it was suggested the trellis cannot overhang the exterior wall as it would impact aerial fire apparatus access design and functionality. | DGA: Understood. Would a 12-inch overhang be acceptable? | |
| | | | Ian Hardage: We can evaluate this more once we have construction documents, this does not need to be determined at the planning stages, but I think there is some potential. | |
| | 4 | Bollards will not be removable; they can be hydraulic (fail-safe down) or collapsible in the direction of ingress. | DGA: Agreed | |
| 5 | 5 | I believe on a high-rise your egress stairs are required to b interior; I do not believe you can have exterior egress stairs. AS smoke control and vestibules are required. | DGA: Agreed, please see the revised ground floor layout attached below with interior egress stairs. | |
| | | | Ian Hardage: Thank you. | |
| • | 5 | I would like to evaluate a little closer the proposal to have the highest portion of the garage structure not accessible to the aerial fire apparatus access. | DGA: As I noted in my previous email, there will be aerial access at the front of the garage, which is the top level at that point; however, the back left portion of the garage does ramp up from there. See attached garage image below. | |
| | | | Ian Hardage: There is aerial access required at the front and right side of the garage, see attached previously discussed fire apparatus access plan. I think we're good with the proposed top-level layout I just wanted to be sure that there were not any occupied spaces that were not directly accessible to the aerial ladder. Looks like it will just be parked cars on a slopped surface from where we will have direct aerial access from. Can you provide a top level floor plan and elevation or section to be certain. | |



SSF Design Review Board Comments and Recommendations

| # C | omment Res | <u>esponse</u> | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | DGA: Provided | |
| | | lan Hardage: Thanks Chris this is helpful to understand. I think we are in a good place as shown. Do not add any more planters in the aerial access areas. We'll want to evaluate the fin system at the front to make sure aerial access is not impeded, more construction detail oriented than planning so we gat look closer once we get to construction phase. | |
| 7 | Utilities will be required to be undergrounded between Forbes and the High-rise. | DGA: I believe you meant to say along Eccles (please confirm). We are working with PG&E and do plan to underground any the power lines along the Eccles frontage that would conflict with any proposed aerial access points. Please let us know if that addresses your comment. | |
| | | lan Hardage: Correct Eccles, thank you. | |
| Water Quality Control Plant Comments | | | |
| 1-25 | The following items must be included in the plans or are requirements of the water quality control storm water and or pre treatment programs and must be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit | Noted | |
| Water Ef | ficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) | | |
| I-2 | Review the landscaping section of the zoning ordinance 20.300.008 for the requirements and regulations. | Noted | |
| Developn | nent Impact Fee | | |
| I | Review development impact fee for applicable fees. | Noted | |
| | • Enclosure Material. Enclosure material shall be solid masonry or concrete tilt-up with decorated exterior-surface finish compatible to the main structure(s). | Noted | |
| | Gate Material. Gate material shall be decorative, solid, heavy-gauge metal or a heavy-gauge metal frame with a covering of a view-obscuring material. | Noted | |
| | Access to Enclosure from Residential Projects. Each solid waste and recycling enclosure serving a residential project shall be designed to allow walk-in access without having to open the main enclosure gate. | Noted | |
| | Enclosure Pad. Pads shall be a minimum of four-inch-thick concrete. | Noted | |
| | Bumpers. Bumpers shall be two inches by six inches thick and made of concrete, steel, or other suitable material and shall be anchored to the concrete pad. | Noted | |
| | Protection for Enclosures. Concrete curbs or equivalent shall protect enclosures from adjacent vehicle parking and travel ways. | Noted | |
| | • Landscaping. The perimeter of the recycling and trash enclosure shall be planted, if feasible, with drought resistant landscaping, including a combination of shrubs and/or climbing evergreen vines. | Noted | |



Comment Response

END OF COMMENTS

