



**Design Review Board/Cultural Heritage
Board
Regular Meeting Minutes - Draft**

Wednesday, October 16, 2019

4:30 PM

1. 4:30 PM CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Kincaid made a brief announcement at 4:31pm regarding a 10 minute recess to wait for Chair Edmondson.

Meeting went into Recess

Meeting Reconvened

Present 11 - Chair Scott Kincaid, Vice Chair Warren Hedgpeth, Board Member Eric Goldschlag, Board Member Adam Sharron, Board Member Drew Weigl, Board Member John McHugh, Board Member Brett Kordenbrock, Chair Casey Edmondson, Board Member Henry Wix, Board Member Curtis Groninga, and Board Member Brian Meuser

Absent 2 - Board Member Mark DeBacker, and Board Member Laura Fennell

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 October 2, 2019 Draft Joint Meeting Minutes

Approved as corrected.

3. BOARD BUSINESS

Chair Kincaid read aloud the Design Review Board Statement of Purpose.

Chair Edmondson read aloud the Cultural Heritage Board Statement of Purpose.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Edmondson opened public comments at 4:47 pm.

There were no public comments.

Chair Edmondson closed public comments.

5. STATEMENTS OF ABSTENTION

Board Member Kordenbrock abstained from Item No. 6.1 and left

the meeting at 4:47 pm.

6. SCHEDULED ITEMS

6.1 CONCEPT DESIGN REVIEW - CARITAS VILLAGE - 437 & 465 A STREET; 516, 520, 600, 608 & 612 MORGAN STREET - FILE NO. DR19-047

BACKGROUND: Concept Design Review of a proposal to redevelop a full city block into a comprehensive family and homeless support services facility (Caritas Center) to be operated by Catholic Charities; and, a 126-unit affordable housing development (Caritas Homes) to be operated by Burbank Housing. The project includes the demolition the existing Catholic Charities facilities and residential buildings on the project site, which is located within the St. Rose Preservation District. Project Planner: Toomians

Senior Planner Kristinae Toomians gave the staff report.

Catholic Charities CEO Len Marabella gave a presentation.

Architect Mike Pyatok gave a presentation.

Chief Program Officer, Catholic Charities, Jennielynn Holmes-Davis, responded to Board questions.

Tina Wallis, Attorney, responded to Board questions.

Meeting went into Recess

Meeting Reconvened

Chair Edmondson opened public comments at 6:04 pm.

Jo Lilienthal Spoke in opposition to tearing down historic buildings, and a project that does not blend with the Historic District.

Chris Grabill Spoke in support of the project.

Mark Parry, Historic Architect - Spoke in opposition to the project.

Denise Hill Spoke in opposition to the project.

Johanna James Spoke in support of the project.

Carol Bellutini Asked that if built, the project be maintained in good repair; opposed height of the project.

Steven Shaver, Priest - Spoke in support of the project.

Benjamin Le Roy - Santa Rosa Community Health - Spoke in support of the project.

Chuck Fernandez, COTS - Spoke in support of the project.

Sher Ennis, West End Neighborhood - Asked that the applicants salvage and reuse materials from the demolished historic structures.

Chair Edmondson closed public comments at 6:25 pm.

Meeting went into Recess

Reconvened 6:35 pm

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD: There are two sides to the coin - preservation of historic resources, and the Council mandate for housing. Design Review Board does not have purview over demolition of historic resources, but can comment on the design before the Board and how it relates to the adjacent historic neighborhood. Review Design Guidelines Chapter 4.7-6 G, Historic Properties and Districts, states in part that designs can be contemporary, but should be compatible in scale and materials. Consider bringing elements from the west, south, and east elevations of Caritas Center to the north elevation. Bring the Caritas Center design elements to the residential buildings, bringing the character of the Center through the entire project. East and west elevations of the residential are overly busy, and contain elements not on the Center. There might be space to add more units in lieu of tall parapets. Explore a bridge in lieu of stairs for safety. Make

homes and the Center more outwardly-focused and interactive with the street.

Keep the personal storage and bike rack areas to help prevent impact on neighborhood. Reconsider the color palette, and other accent colors besides purple. Design on homes is bland/institutional. Encourage playfulness of the center in the housing element design, integrating entire block together. Reconsider the shading elements on the north elevation. Interior elevations on both buildings are plain and flat. Dropping transitional materials on secondary towers might help with height restrictions. Strengthen the interior residential elevations - purple or other strong accent is fine; the project as a whole is 4-sided design, but check the interior facing the courtyards. Continue in the current direction. The Center could be taller, possibly 4-5 stories.

Explore ways to provide safety and security for residents and neighbors. The two project components are separated by parking; a connection is needed between the Center and the homes. Find ways to draw families to the Center from the homes; create cohesion visually, such as paving treatment, vines. The two courtyards are adult focused; add amenities for children, such as playground areas. Create cohesion with the exterior architectural elements; add liveliness of the Center to the homes. The screening trellis elements with as much vegetation as possible are appreciated. At next submittal, show more developed renderings, sections/perspectives of courtyard areas and how they thread together the site; use plant palette to work for cohesion; make it a distinct whole.

The entire ground floor is animated; purple accent is fine. Transitional housing does not need any architectural changes. Consider fired plank quarry to break up the stucco of the residential element and to add warmth, especially to the north elevation. Consider eliminating tile roofs; try metal or composite. The residential element does not feel like a home; it feels institutional.

CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD: Revisit how the building fits in with the historic district, and how it looks from the street; reflect more of other contributors than the museum and St. Rose School in the design. There is concern that 6 or 7 contributing structures will be demolished: a whole block. Work more with the St. Rose neighbors to gain more support. The Project should fit in with the historic neighborhood; neighbors have invested in the neighborhood based on it being a historic neighborhood, and expectations of things being a certain way. The project addresses a long overdue need; it is possible to go higher, but needs to balance with the historic district. Consider whether the windows in the St. Rose office building are original or reflect the original windows.

The Southern part of the project is not adjacent to historic districts, is more contemporary, and is less challenging than the north part. Create more playful character on the north side such as the south elevation. Accountability with neighborhoods across 7th St is an important issue. Concurrence with Design Review Board that the ground floor is more active; but there is a more institutional character going up the the buildings. Consider a more contemporary design on the northern elevation with more detail work, especially as height increases. Create a less institutional, more residential character. Break up flat surfaces; the north elevation has lack of interest; use materials and color to add texture. Do outreach to Cultural Heritage Board Members who were absent today.

7. BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

There were no Board Member reports.

8. DEPARTMENT REPORTS

There were no Department reports.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Edmondson adjourned the meeting at 8:03 pm.

PREPARED BY:

Patti Pacheco Gregg, Recording Secretary