



ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT

GROUP 4

LARC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING #5
LARKSPUR ROSE GARDEN CFP MASTER PLAN

MINUTES

ARCHITECTURE
RESEARCH +
PLANNING, INC

MEETING ON

10 December 2012
@ City Council Chamber at City Hall - 6:30 - 9:30 pm

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

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	0	
Doug Mowbray	DMY	X	
Joan Lundstrom	JL	X	
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	0	Library Director
Dick Whitley	DW	X	Recreation Director
Dick Young	DY	X	Planning Commission
Jeanne Friedel	JF	X	Parks and Recreation Commission
Don Graff	DG	X	Library Board of Trustees
Marilyn River	MR	X	Heritage Preservation Board
Sallyanne Wilson	SW	0	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 Carlberg	CRC	X	Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning

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

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees



A	PROJECT OVERVIEW	who	status
---	------------------	-----	--------

A1 TOUR LIBRARY & CITY OFFICES

- 5.01 The committee took a tour through the existing Library and the City staff offices in City Hall.

A2 PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

- 5.02 One member of the public attended to comment:
Ron Arlas
- The consultant is doing a good job on public outreach – the community workshop last week was informative
 - Concerned that 20,000 sf program has the largest support – hoping that this will get a lot of review
 - Since the donor pulled out of the project, the entire city can have what they need
 - Think that the community would be willing to support a larger building
 - Thank you for reaching out to the community

A3 CO-CHAIR UPDATE

- 5.03
- The City and the donor were not able to reach an agreement on the terms and conditions; the donor is not longer with the project.
 - The City is still working with the Library Foundation and the Foundation is still looking for funding.
 - Dan will present more information tonight regarding funding strategies.

Questions/Comments:

Does the absence of a donor affect the timeline of the master plan or whether or not the project is phased?

- The timeline of the master plan remains the same. The option to phase the project should remain on the table.

A4 REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF:

- 5.04 The meeting minutes from the 11/26 LARC meeting was approved by the committee. The final versions of these minutes will be posted to the project website (*update 12/12: the meeting minutes have been posted to the website*).

A5 COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS

- 5.05 CW presented email input to the LARC Committee from larkspur@g4arch.com:
- Susan Grant is interested in a Pickle Ball Court as a great activity for all ages.



CW presented the updated findings regarding Larkspur Library patrons and items checked out. CW will email the full summary to the committee.

- 7,583 Larkspur residents currently hold a library card. This number has remained relatively steady over the past several years. Note that the Library database automatically deletes inactive patrons after four years.
- 146,357 items were checked out of the Larkspur Library in 2011, and 153,149 items were checked out in 2010.

Questions/comments:

What is the breakdown of items checked out for children versus adults?

- The project management team will work the Library on answering this question.

A6 COMMITTEE HOMEWORK

5.06 The committee homework from the previous session was to attend either the community meeting (12/6) or the community kiosk (12/8).

Questions/comments:

Kentfield and Ross communities see Larkspur as their downtown too. When thinking about outreach, it may be advantageous to include surrounding communities; they may be very supportive of the project and willing to help with funding.

B WORK PLAN **who** **status**

B5 EDUCATOR'S MEETING

5.07 DS presented the Educators' Focus Group (12/10/12) and the teen needs that were discussed at the meeting (see PPT).

- Important to be agile when programming for youth

Questions/comments:

Would teens and tweens be able to share space?

- From experience, DS thinks they will be willing to overlap. Older teens tend to gravitate more towards the adult areas (to study).

How are we going to reach out to the teens?

- The principals and superintendents think that setting up a kiosk at lunch (at Hall and Redwood) would be the best way to interact with teens/tweens and get their input. The PMT will be organizing this effort.
- A survey could possibly be part of this outreach.
- Outreach to other nearby schools is a possibility.

Teen Needs and Trends

- Teens need a place to study and hang out after school
- Teens access information in all different ways – through books, online, etc; one 8th grade class is using iPads (pilot program)

**B1 PROGRAMMING NEEDS**

- 5.08 DM presented the City Hall program option, and the three CFP site programming options (16,000 sf, 20,000 sf, and 24,000 sf facilities).

16,000 sf – Core Needs

- No committee members supported this option

20,000 sf – Balanced Needs

- 20 committee members (out of 20) supported this option

24,000 sf – Diverse Needs

- 11 committee members (out of 20) supported this option

City Hall Program (1st floor)

- 19 committee members (out of 20) supported this option

Questions/comments:

- Important to have a building that breathes and adjusts over time

Meeting Room

- Would like a performance space
- Would like the meeting room to be located away from the surrounding neighbors; concern about noise; want to be a good neighbor
- Need space for large events; would like a meeting room that is expandable for larger events but can also support smaller events – flexibility is key
- Would like the option of having the meeting room operate independently from the rest of the building for late night/weekend access
- Appropriate flooring for multi-use/wear and tear

B2 ROSE GARDEN CFP SITE

5.09 One Building vs. Two Buildings

One Building

- 19 committee members supported this option.
- 14 committee members thought that having one building would be the best option.
- More efficient use of site
- Greater flexibility

Two Buildings

- 8 committee members supported this option.
- 5 committee members thought that having two buildings would be the best option.
- Creates a campus environment
- Shared outdoor space enriches the day-to-day feel of the site and may be used more often than one large outdoor space



5.10 North Building Orientation vs. Southwest Building Orientation

North Building Orientation

- 12 committee members supported this option.
- 9 committee members thought the north orientation would be the best option.
- Creates downtown building fabric along Doherty
- No setbacks
- Closer to Hall Middle School and overflow parking
- More flexible open space

Southwest

- 13 committee members supported this option.
- 10 committee members thought the southwest orientation would be the best option.
- Park on Doherty reflects green values of Larkspur
- Parking tucked in the back
- Good connection of open space to Piper Park/Hall Middle School

5.11 Parking Strategies

DS reviewed the parking strategies for the CFP site.

- The committee confirmed the desire to use off-site parking strategies for peak use
- The committee confirmed the desire to minimize the impact of parking on the site

B3 PROJECT FUNDING STRATEGIES AND COST MODELS

5.12 DSz explained the situation with the potential donor for the Library portion of the project.

- The City of Larkspur makes a regular practice of vetting the terms and conditions of proposals/donations.
- The potential donor for the Library portion of the project wanted to build a stand-alone facility and was not open to the range of uses on the property that the City supported. Since the terms and conditions of the donor did not marry well with the goals of the City for this site, the potential donor is no longer with the project.
- Other donor opportunities may present themselves in the future, especially as the project moves forward; donor like to pay for the “bells and whistles” in a project – furniture, finishes, etc.

5.13 DSz presented the funding strategies for the project.

- The City of Larkspur is well within best practices for money management
- There are quite a few projects that are top priorities for the City; road repair is the number one priority; building a new library/community center facility is high on the list
- The different program options (especially the \$16-20 million range) are



- within the range that the City is looking at for this project
- Whether or not the project is phased will impact how it is funded, and is something that the City will need to know
 - The City is looking to including a sales tax on the November ballot that would be used to fund the project
 - In order to get on the 2013 ballot, the City will need to submit by August
 - In addition to getting voters on board, it is also important to gain support from local businesses

Questions/comments:

Would it be possible to target a larger service area (include Kentfield and Greenbrae) to cast a wider net for funding?

- Some of these communities are already being taxed for the county Library system
- There may be ways to included them – will need to look into it

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

B5 HOMEWORK

- 5.14 ▪ Visit the Parks and Recreation offices and Community Room at Hall Middle School.

These minutes were prepared on 11 January 2013.

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

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

Dawn Merkes
Principal

DM/crc