



ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT

GROUP 4
ARCHITECTURE
RESEARCH +
PLANNING, INC

LARC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING #6
LARKSPUR ROSE GARDEN CFP MASTER PLAN

MINUTES

MEETING ON

14 January 2013
@ 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	X	Library Director
Dick Whitley	DW	X	Recreation Director
Dick Young	DY	0	Planning Commission
Jeanne Friedel	JF	0	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
Cordy Hill	CH	X	RHAA
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	PUBLIC COMMUNICATION		
----	----------------------	--	--

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 6.01 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There were no public comments. | | |
|------|--|--|--|

A2	CO-CHAIR UPDATE		
----	-----------------	--	--

- | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 6.02 | AM presented the co-chair update. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The banner advertising the third community meeting is at City Hall. • Teens will be participating in the next two LARC meetings. | | |
|------|---|--|--|

A3	REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF:		
----	-------------------------	--	--

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 6.03 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The meeting minutes from the 12/10 LARC meeting were approved by the committee with two revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DSz clarified possible funding sources for the project. ▪ KW clarified that while the Library Foundation is still raising funds for ongoing library expenses, they are not actively seeking another donor at this time. ▪ The final versions of these minutes will be posted to the project website (<i>update 1/20: the meeting minutes have been posted to the website</i>). | | |
|------|--|--|--|

A4	COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS		
----	--------------------------	--	--

- | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 6.04 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LARC committee members should plan on attending at least one library/community center bus tour. The East Bay tour will be on Friday, 1/18 and the South bay tour will be on 1/25. CRC will pass around a sign up sheet. ▪ CRC will email those who cannot attend either date so they can plan their own self-guided library/community center tour. | | |
|------|---|--|--|

A5	COMMITTEE HOMEWORK		
----	--------------------	--	--

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 6.05 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The committee visited Dick Whitley at the recreation offices for homework. | | |
|------|--|--|--|

B	WORK PLAN	who	status
---	-----------	-----	--------

B1	SUPPLEMENTAL LARC MEETING		
----	---------------------------	--	--

- | | | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 6.06 | DM summarized the Supplemental LARC meeting (see PPT). | | |
|------|--|--|--|



6.07 *Questions/comments:*

If it is anticipated that Kentfield and Ross residents would use the library, should we include those communities when calculating library square footage? This may be a regional library.

- There will be some overlap, but for planning purposes it is sufficient to use 1 sf/capita for just the City of Larkspur. People will also continue to use the Marin county libraries.

Is Kathy Page's assessment of 1 sf/capita for library square footage acceptable?

- 1 sf/capita is well within best practice for master planning purposes.

We are creating a flexible facility.

- This is a good argument for one building rather than two.
- Efficiency for staffing; site efficiency, efficiency for operations.
- When it comes to the detailed planning, a more detailed assessment will be conducted further along in the process.

B2 MASTER PLANNING PROCESS

6.08 DS presented the Master Planning process (see ppt).

6.09 *Questions/comments:*

Does the design start before or after funding?

- Generally design starts after some funding is in place, although it can start before.

Is the way money flows in through a sales tax measure different than a bond measure?

- A bond is a debt like a mortgage. When it is approved by voters, the revenue stream associated with the vote (usually a parcel tax) is the security against which the market issues the funding. When a bond is obtained without a vote, the typical security is an asset like a building.
- The sales tax measure that the City is looking at is a 20 year measure, preliminarily this would generate about \$20 million; these funds would not necessarily all go to this project. If the sales tax measure goes through, the City would still pursue other funding sources such as grants and private donations.

B3 MASTER PLAN COMPONENTS

6.10 DM presented the master plan draft components (see PPT), and the committee discussed the draft titles and statements.



6.11 *Questions/comments:*

Will this master plan available to the public? If so, it should be written in such a way that it is accessible to all (provides background information, process, etc.).

- Yes, the master plan will be available to the public and will have all the richness of this process, including background information, site analysis, needs assessment, etc.

Questions/comments:

Who is the intended reader of the master plan?

- The master plan is for the City Council's consideration, although it will also be available to the public.

What are the advantages of two buildings versus one?

- Two buildings can create a campus feel and create unique spaces between the two buildings.
- Two buildings are easier to phase.

What are the advantages of one building versus two?

- Operational efficiency
- Easier for library and community center to share spaces
- Fewer surveillance points
- Smaller building envelope
- Restrooms (one of most expensive components in a building) are less expensive with one building

6.12 Need:

- Define what a community center is, or what kinds of spaces would go in it.
- Make sure all the background information about why a new library is needed goes into the master planning document.



6.13 Vision:

- Include outdoor space
- Break out into two parts: CFP and City Hall; need a vision for both
- The vision needs more soul; it is currently not very specific.
- It is also purposefully broad and not specific as these are overarching concepts that everyone agrees on.
- Maybe the master plan has one overarching vision and then parallel branches (CFP and City Hall); the branches are dependent on each other. Site Program (components)
- Reserve a certain percentage of the site for open space. Maybe we should define the percentage of the open space?
- It would be helpful to define the top cap of the program sf. (It seems like the range is 20,000-24,000 sf).
- One building is recommended by the committee. Each part is integral to the whole.
- Would like one building that looks like two phasable buildings put together
- Seem like the community will be looking for economies of scale; would not want to create duplicates. There are definite efficiencies in one building

6.14 Site Program (components):

- Reserve a certain percentage of the site for open space. Maybe we should define the percentage of the open space?
- It would be helpful to define the top cap of the program sf. (It seems like the range is 20,000-24,000 sf).
- One building is recommended by the committee. Each part is integral to the whole.
- Would like one building that looks like two phasable buildings put together
- Seem like the community will be looking for economies of scale; would not want to create duplicates. There are definite efficiencies in one building
- Prefer not to phase. Recommendation is for one phase,

6.15 Parking:

- Surface parking driven by cost.
- Master plan value – add in pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to and from the site and bicycle parking
- If funding is available consider under-building parking.
- 2.5-3 spaces/1,000 sf of building takes shared use into consideration.

B4 CITY HALL FLOOR PLAN

6.16 DM presented the 2nd floor of City Hall floor plan.

Questions/Comments:

What is the difference between the upstairs lobby gallery and the downstairs lobby gallery?

- The upstairs lobby is for self-service, customer support, and a waiting area (Place for forms, flyers, sign-up).
- The downstairs lobby gallery can have historical display space and is spill-out space/lobby area for the community room/conference rooms.



B5 SITE OPTIONS

6.17 NORTH - A CIVIC LANDMARK

DS and CRC presented the North site option.

- Strong civic presence - entire building frontage along Doherty
- Prominent visibility of building from Doherty
- Open space is tucked behind building - more of a “pocket park”
- Parking in back along Orchid
- Loop drop-off parking (not connected to parking lot)
- Good view of Mt. Tam and Blithedale ridge from open space and outdoor spaces
- Outdoor spaces support indoor program and spill out onto large open space

6.17 NORTH - A CIVIC LANDMARK

The LARC committee provided the following feedback:

- Distance from parking to the building is a concern
- Concern that people will use Doherty as a drop-off
- People will walk the shortest distance to a destination - north scheme encourages unsafe cut-throughs
- Outdoor spaces closer to neighborhood and away from Doherty
- Entry near the street
- Attractive nuisance for middle school students at Hall (if there is an entry on Doherty Drive, students may be encouraged to jaywalk)

- Informal polling
 - Supporters = 14
 - First Choice = 5



6.18 SOUTHWEST - A PLACE IN THE PARK

DS and CRC presented the Southwest site option.

- Civic and park presence with building and park frontage on Doherty
- Park and building visible from Doherty
- Park serves as a connection to Piper Park
- Parking in back along Orchid
- Loop drop-off parking - connected to parking lot
- View of Mt. Tam and Blithdale ridge from lobby, entry plaza
- Outdoor spaces support indoor program and spill out onto large open space

The LARC committee provided the following feedback:

- Entry flows out
- Civic presence without being on Doherty Drive
- The park in this scheme is less fragmented - makes the most of the open space
- Concern about Doherty noise on open space?
- How to screen east side of Lucky's for view to Tam East Peak?
- How will jaywalking across Doherty be discouraged?
 - Informal polling
 - Supporters = 19
 - First Choice = 15

B5 SITE PROGRAM/AMENITIES

6.19 CH and DM presented the site program/amenities. The LARC committee provided the following feedback:

- Multiple gateways for bikes and pedestrians
- Connection to downtown
- Combination of indoor to outdoor spaces
- Outdoor adult active areas not needed
- Outdoor adult fitness equipment not desired
- Would like a fire pit
- Entry sequence serves as a “teaser” for arrival
- Entry to building on Doherty (in center, not at the corners of the site) is problematic
- Like water in many combinations - marsh, fountain, aquatic feature (active water feature)
- Use water to mask noise
- No standing water
- Provide place for artists to sit and draw can be an active experience)
- Outdoor sculpture (maybe of books?)
- Would like experiential/interpretive gardens as you are waking through the site
- Maximize programmable space
- Like the children's garden
- Indoor/outdoor seating
- Evergreens for the winter
- Historical interpretative exhibit



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

C1 NO UPDATE

These minutes were prepared on 25 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