



ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT

GROUP 4

ARCHITECTURE
RESEARCH +
PLANNING, INC

211 LINDEN AVENUE
SO. SAN FRANCISCO
CA 94080 USA
T: 650-871-0709
F: 650-871-7911
www.g4arch.com

WAYNE GEHRKE
ARCHITECT

DAWN E. MERKES
ARCHITECT

DAVID SCHNEE
ARCHITECT

DAVID M. STURGES
ARCHITECT

JILL EYRES
ARCHITECT

JONATHAN HARTMAN
ARCHITECT

PAUL JAMTGAARD
ARCHITECT

WILLIAM LIM
ARCHITECT

ANDREA WILL
ARCHITECT

LARC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING #4
LARKSPUR ROSE GARDEN CFP MASTER PLAN

MINUTES

MEETING ON

26 November 2012
@ City Council Chamber at City Hall - 6:30 - 9:30 pm

INVITED ATTENDEES

Name	Initials	Attended	Company or Organization
Adrienne Brown	AB	X	
Mary Clyde	MC	X	
Melissa Dawson	MD	X	
Patti Doherty	PD	X	
Dan Dunn	DD	X	
Michael Folk	MF	X	
Frank Gold	FG	X	
Katherine Green	KG	X	
Christen Hutton	CH	X	
Doug Mowbray	DMY	X	
Joan Lundstrom	JL	0	
Ronald Peluso	RP	X	
Elise Semonian	ES	X	
Matt Smyth	MS	X	
Todd Ziesing	TZ	X	
Brad Marsh	BM	X	Council Member
Ann Morrison	AM	X	Council Member
Dan Schwarz	DSz	X	City Manager
Neal Toft	NT	X	Director of Planning & Building
Frances Gordon	FG	X	Library Director
Dick Whitley	DW	X	Recreation Director
Dick Young	DY	X	Planning Commission
Jeanne Friedel	JF	0	Parks and Recreation Commission
Don Graff	DG	X	Library Board of Trustees
Marilyn River	MR	0	Heritage Preservation Board
Sallyanne Wilson	SW	X	Heritage Preservation Board
Susan Schmidt	SS	X	Tamalpais UHSD
Susan Christman	SC	X	School District Representative
Kris Wade	KW	X	Library Foundation
Lorraine Weiss	LW	X	Design Development Review
Dawn Merkes	DM	X	Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning
David Schnee	DS	X	Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning
Carolyn Wong	CW	X	Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees



A PROJECT OVERVIEW **who status**

A1 CO-CHAIR UPDATE

4.01 No updates.

A2 REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF:

- 4.02 ▪ The meeting minutes from the 10/29 and 11/12 Ad Hoc meetings were approved by the committee. The final versions of these minutes will be posted to the project website (*update 12/5: the meeting minutes have been posted to the website*).

A3 COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS

- 4.03 ▪ The banner for the next community meeting on 12/6 is now up at the CFP site.
▪ DM reminded the committee to send the community meeting flyer out to friends and neighbors.

A4 PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

4.04 ▪ There were no public comments.

A5 COMMITTEE HOMEWORK

- 4.05 ▪ The new name for the Ad Hoc Committee is the LARC Planning Committee – Library And Recreation Community Planning Committee.

B WORK PLAN **who status**

B1 PROGRAMMING NEEDS

- 4.06 DM presented the programming and activities needs, the City Hall program option, and the three CFP site programming options (16,000 sf, 20,000 sf, and 24,000 sf facilities).
- The 20,000 sf program as a two-story building is not efficient in terms of circulation, operations, etc. The two-story option makes the most sense with the 24,000 sf program.

Questions/comments:

Is a community room at both City Hall and the CFP site necessary?

- The community room in City Hall will replace the Council Chambers. It will be appropriate for City Council meetings, boards and commissions, and some community functions, but not appropriate for large community events.



The community room on the CFP parcel will be able to support a larger and wider variety of community functions.

What is the retail space in the City Hall program? Was this identified in the focus groups?

- The retail space was pulled from the Library Program and is the Friends of the Library Bookstore. This would be a great opportunity for the Library to still have a presence at City Hall.

Can the retail/reading room at City Hall be used for programs – Baby Bounce, etc.?

- Yes.

Could the conference rooms at City Hall be used by the community for small meetings or for tutoring?

- Yes, although the use will also depend on how it is programmed by City staff.

What would the City Hall workroom be used for?

- It could be used by boards and commissions, (for example, the Historic Preservation Board identified a need for workspace for archival work), committees, or possibly City Hall staff.

It seems like the main difference between the CFP program options is the size of the community room. Could a larger community room be accommodated in smaller facility sizes?

- Yes.

Why does the library square footage not change?

- The 12,000 sf program is from the Library Needs Assessment and is well within best practice – a more detailed breakdown of library spaces will come at the next phase of the project.

How much square footage is dedicated to the core library program?

- The exact program is yet to be developed, but from the Needs Assessment, about 9,500 sf would be dedicated to core library functions.

Teen Space (comment)

- The teen space should be flexible for different generations for optimal use.
- The need for music practice rooms and performance spaces was discussed. Smaller, acoustically separated rooms could be used for recording/music practice space.

B2 ROSE GARDEN CFP SITE

4.07 **Parking.**

DS presented on-site parking standards for the site. A higher parking standard means more parking, and increased convenience. A lower parking standard means less parking and more space for other site amenities (including open space).

The parking regulations are for on-site parking (parcels A and B). Other parking nearby should be considered for peak-use.

Questions:

Why is there no parking strategy with parking off Doherty Drive?

- In the parking strategies that have been developed the intent has been to have the traffic flow off of Doherty Drive and not create congestion on the



street.

- Visually, we do not promote having a parking lot on Doherty Drive. The building and open space have been identified as high priorities to have frontage on Doherty for civic and park presence.

4.08 **Site Options.**

DS presented the options for number of buildings (1 or 2) and the phasing options.

Questions:

Regardless if there is one building or two, would the community room be 1.5 stories high?

- Community rooms are not regulated to be 1.5 stories, but for good room proportions, it is appropriate for community rooms to be this high. A lower ceiling in such a large room would feel cramped.

B3 **WHAT OPTIONS CAN YOU SUPPORT?**

4.09 A poll was conducted to see which options committee members felt they could support at this point. Committee members voted on the following options, and could vote more than once, if they felt they could support more than one option:

- City Hall upgrades
- CFP Facility Size
- Parking
- Number of Stories
- Number of Buildings
- On-site Parking Strategies

22 committee members participated in the poll. Council members did not vote.

4.10 **CFP Facility Size**

16,000 sf – 14 committee members can support this program size

- Adequate space to meet needs
- Given the size of taxes/bills and how wary people are with increased taxes, it is sellable
- Money is big issue in this project – not sure how much Foundation will support non-library spaces
- The Mill Valley Community Center is too big for the Larkspur community
- Green space is valuable and should be used well.
- The community is going to gain space in City Hall, and these new spaces should be taken into consideration when evaluating program options

20,000 sf – 12 committee members can support this program size

- This option provides adequate community space; community spaces has been identified as important to the Larkspur community
- Large-scale spaces may not be used not as often, but Larkspur does not currently have a large, quality community room elsewhere
- Not a lot of quality of spaces out there – need a quality large space
- Middle of the road option – will preserve enough open space and not create too much parking; not too small, not too big
- If outdoor spaces are used as spill-over spaces for large events, tents can be



brought in to accommodate everyone

24,000 sf – 7 committee members can support this program size

- From all the spaces that the community wanted as a result of the dot exercise (performance, exercise, etc.), it seems like this is the only option large enough to accommodate everything
- Mill Valley CC rentals are around \$2,800 for a wedding – this makes up a huge portion of their revenue (although it is understood that community centers usually do not have full cost recovery); need a large community room for these big events
- The facility could be a hub that supports other businesses, restaurants, etc., especially considering its location in the middle of Ross Valley

4.11 City Hall

19 committee members support upgrades to City Hall.

- City Hall should continue to be an active space for the community with small-scale programming

4.12 Parking

2.5 (numbers of stalls per 1,000 sf of facility space) – 10 committee members can support this parking option

- Maximizes open space
- Promotes exercise
- Opportunity for community to show they are a walking community
- Used to only 4 spaces at the current library!
- Parking lots are good walks ruined

3 (numbers of stalls per 1,000 sf of facility space) – 13 committee members can support this parking option

- This is the number used on site examples and does not seem like too many
- Better for neighborhood (people are not parking in residents' driveways)
- Number one complaint at Piper Park is the lack of parking

3.5 (numbers of stalls per 1,000 sf of facility space) – 2 committee members can support this parking option

- Only supportive if parking is underground
- This option is good for bringing more people in who are coming from further away
- Do not want it to be difficult to find parking

4.13 Number of Stories

1 Story – 14 committee members can support this option

- Like the look of a one story building
- Allows access to the outdoors throughout whole facility
- Flows easier space to space – no climbing stairs



- Could have high ceilings
- 2 stories** – 8 committee members can support this option
- Smaller building footprint
 - Good second-story views of the ridge
 - Opportunity for rooftop terrace

4.14 **Number of Buildings**

- 2 buildings** – 10 committee members can support this option
- Draw people out between buildings, makes open space more vibrant
 - Allows the library portion to move ahead even if City funds are not available for the community center
- 1 building with phased addition** – 10 committee members can support this option
- easier to share spaces
 - smaller footprint
 - better flow
 - Allows the library portion to move ahead even if City funds are not available for the community center
- 1 building in single phase** – 12 committee members can support this option
- If we try to do two phases, the 2nd phase may never happen
 - Would we need to go to voters twice? If library funding goes through, we may just need to go to voters once with the community center funding

4.15 **On-Site Parking Strategies**

Cost differences: it is approximately \$40/sf for surface parking and \$200/sf for under building. Podium is less expensive than underground because mechanical is not needed.

- Surface parking** – 17 committee members can support this option
- A lot less expensive
 - Can be nice (paving stones, trees, planters)
 - Easy to patrol
 - Can support multiples uses – could be used as a farmers market for outdoor space
 - Less expensive
- Podium parking** – 1 committee member can support this option
- Could have smaller section of podium parking tucked under the library
 - Would like camouflage the parking
 - Fewer cars would be visible
- Underground/Under building** – 7 committee members can support this option
- Provides enough parking, but also maximizes open space
 - Cars out of sight
 - Nice to park under the building in inclement weather
 - “Champion option”
- Perpendicular parking** – 19 committee members
- The committee would like to explore this option



4.16 **Building Orientation**

The committee valued having both the building and a portion of the open space on Doherty Drive for both civic and park presence. The committee expressed concern about having the parking buried too deeply in the neighborhood (with access only on Orchid).

North – 16 committee members can support this option

West – 8 committee members can support this option

South – 0 committee members can support this option

East – 7 committee members can support this option

NW – 9 committee members can support this option

SW – 13 committee members can support this option

B4 OTHER

4.17 **Community-Wide Polling and Youth Input**

Questions:

Would it be possible to conduct a community-wide survey with closed-ended questions to figure out what community members really want/need? In particular, kids and teens have been underrepresented in the process.

- It is agreed that there is not enough youth input in the master planning process. An educator's meeting has been *scheduled (update 12/5: the educator's meeting is on 12/10)* and opportunities for youth input will be discussed. The best way to engage student may be to work with them in a focus group, or in informal groups at school.
- The idea of community-wide polling/surveys will be discussed and considered by the PMT.
 - o DSz: Usually we do not conduct a survey unless it is done scientifically and have an understanding of what the goal of the survey should be. The City has conducted surveys in the past, and usually work with survey experts.
 - o G4's experience has been to either hire a consultant to do a scientific poll or use something like SurveyMonkey to supplement a needs assessment. Surveys/polling can be useful, but it important that the timing of the poll and the questions are well-thought out. At this point, it is important to understand what the community needs are and to start building community support for the project.

If there is a survey, who would author it?

- If there is a survey, it would likely be done by collaboration between City staff and survey specialists so the right questions are asked. City staff has conducted surveys before.

4.18 **Homework**

The homework is to either attend the next community meeting on 12/6 or the kiosk on 12/8 at the Bon Air Center (*update 12/5: the kiosk on 12/8 will be in front of Mollie Stone's*).



C	WRAP-UP	who	status
---	---------	-----	--------

C1	NO UPDATE		
----	-----------	--	--

These minutes were prepared on 29 November 2012.

Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

Dawn Merkes
Principal

DM/cw