

# MEETING OF THE CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Monday, May 20, 2024

2:00 p.m.

Hybrid Meeting

## Draft Minutes

Chair Abby Sadin Schnair called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

### 1. Roll Call

(00:33)

**Commissioners Present:** Abby Sadin Schnair (Chair); Seth Brenzel, Patrick Carney, Jessica Rothschild, Janine Shiota

**Staff Present:** Ralph Remington, Director of Cultural Affairs; Sarah Hollenbeck, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration; Mary Chou, Director of Public Art and Civic Art Collection; Paris Cotz, Program Associate; Manraj Dhaliwal, Commission Secretary

Chair Schnair announced the meeting instructions.

Program Associate Paris Cotz announced public comment instructions.

Chair Schnair began the meeting reading the Arts Commission's land acknowledgement statement.

### 2. General Public Comment

(6:15)

There was no general public comment.

### 3. Civic Design Review Small Project Updates

(6:57)

Director Remington presented the following proposals: project exemptions from Civic Design Review for those City projects involving only modifications or additions to street furnishings, such as streetlights,

benches, and signage, whose estimated construction costs are under \$1 million; to authorize the Director of Cultural Affairs to determine, for projects with estimated costs between \$1 million and \$5 million encompassing changes to street furnishings or structures smaller than 500 square feet, whether administrative or single-phase review is necessary; and; to direct staff to update the Civic Design Review guidelines consistent with the above and return to a future CDR meeting for approval of such updated guidelines.

Director Remington explained that these changes were in an effort to streamline the Civic Design Review process.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Brenzel, seconded by Commissioner Shiota, moved to approve Civic Design Review Small Project Updates.

The motion was unanimously approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Brenzel, Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota

#### **4. 11<sup>th</sup> and Natoma Park: Phase 1 and 2** (14:53)

The project team shared the neighborhood context and project goals: promote neighborhood connection, connect people to nature, and design for sustainability. The park is sited in western SoMA, where there are limited green spaces within walking distance. The team noted the park concept, featuring an active space, a garden space, and a play space. The park is working in partnership with the Arts Commission to commission an artist designed fence, and a community led park naming process.

The project team addressed previous committee comments about the location of the dog relief area and the location of the Recreation and Park Department shed. The team has updated the design to incorporate a sun motif into the basketball court and children's play area, as identified by the Filipino community as an important cultural element. The team reviewed the materials, equipment, color palettes and planting palettes for the park.

Commissioners asked whether there was going to be a restroom installed

in the restroom. The project team answered a restroom was not feasible due to budget and staffing.

Commissioners also asked whether it had been considered to place public art on the surrounding building walls. The project team answered that because those buildings are private property, they cannot place public art on them.

Commissioners asked why the surrounding fence was designed to be eleven feet tall. The project team explained that the fence needs to be a certain height for operational and safety concerns and the fence is pre-fabricated and customizable, which allows for the public art to be embedded into it. The team also assured commissioners that depending on the art that is selected, the fence will be fairly transparent and will be a bright feature in the park. The design team will also work with the selected artist to ensure that the basketball court design will be complementary to the art fence.

Commissioners asked whether there was any shade nearby the play structure. The team answered that there is shade at the picnic tables, and they found during a shade study that the play structure area is not particularly sunny due to the building it is next to which provides shade.

Commissioners asked what the maintenance process would be for the exercise equipment. The team answered that they have not encountered problems with damaged exercise equipment in other parks. Commissioners inquired about the maintenance of the dog relief area. The team answered that synthetic turf would be filled with a neutralizing mineral and have an irrigation system that allows for the area to be washed every night. Commissioners also asked the team to look into screening the maintenance shipping container on one side with plantings to soften the look of it for the resident neighbors.

Commissioners asked about toddler play options. The team responded that there was not a lot of young families in the neighborhood, and that the nature exploration area could serve toddlers.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Brenzel, seconded by Commissioner Carney, moved to approve 11th and Natoma Park: Phase 1 and 2.

The motion was unanimously approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Brenzel, Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota

## **5. SFWD Campus at 2000 Marin: Phase 2**

(58:46)

The project team gave background information on the campus and the reasons for the need for a new campus, including: hazardous work conditions, mixing of vehicular and pedestrian pathways, and overcrowded work spaces in the current campus. The campus is rebuilding at a new site due to the 24/7 operational requirements of the current campus. The new campus is located between Evans Avenue, Marin Street, Cesar Chavez Street, and the CalTrain.

The design team shared the following design goals: secured campus, pedestrian safety, fostering community, public facing of the Water Department, and integrated public art.

The design has updated the organization and vehicular flow for the campus, and added a pedestrian only community hub and stormwater garden. The design team responded to comments from Phase 1 review and screened the rooftop mechanics with a butterfly roof. The fleet parking has been moved from the center of the building to the southern edge of campus. The team also redesigned the administration building to distinguish it from the rest of the campus by expressing the screens, accentuating its verticality, framing the building and courtyard, and optimizing the views while addressing interior shading with a refined glazing treatment. The team shared their plans and designs for landscape architecture, fencing and gates since this is a private facility.

Commissioners asked about the status of the parking garage which features the public art integration. The project team explained that since that they are at the start of the process of working with the artist to integrate the art with the architecture, and they have had one preliminary meeting at that point and were working collaboratively.

The team explained that they were on a short construction bid timeline and asked to return to the committee with an updated parking garage structure if they could receive approval for the design as is. The public art project manager explained that this value engineering will result in an increased scope for the selected artist to work around the removal of the architectural fins on the parking garage.

Commissioners also asked the design team to make the Cesar Chavez side of the campus to be more appealing and neighborly. Commissioners also commented on the color palette and asked the team if more color could be incorporated into the palette.

The project team proposed building the parking garage as originally design with the selected artist's artwork integrated into the pre-existing architectural design.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Shiota, seconded by Commissioner Brenzel, moved to approve SFWD Campus at 2000 Marin: Phase 2 with the parking garage designed as is shown in the documentation, with the fins, and Walter Kitundu's proposal.

The motion was unanimously approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Brenzel, Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota

## **6. Treasure Island Water Resource Recovery Facility: Phase 3**

(1:53:49)

The project team gave background on the site and Treasure Island. The team reshared the project objectives: addressing aging infrastructure, ensuring regulatory compliance, and meeting wastewater needs of the future Treasure Island/Yerba Buena Island development.

The project team responded to previous commissioner comments surrounding the reflectivity of the glazing in concern to bird safety. The final solution that would maintain the desired design aesthetic was to use a less reflective glass but still slightly tinted and that incorporates a white

dotted frit pattern. The design team also responded to the previous concern about wildlife animals access to the wetland area through the fencing. The team explained that the openings of the mesh on the fence and the gap at the bottom of the fence allow for a variety of sizes of wildlife to pass through.

The team reminded commissioners of the public art opportunity, and shared with commissioners that the selection process is still in progress. The team shared their final plant palette, of formulated hydroseeds, shrubs and grasses.

Commissioners expressed that whichever artist design is selected, that it fill the artwork opportunity space from bottom to top to simplify the design of the building as a whole.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Brenzel, seconded by Commissioner Rothschild, moved to approve Treasure Island Water Resource Recovery Facility: Phase 3.

The motion was unanimously approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Brenzel, Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota

## **7. Japantown Peace Plaza Renovation: Post-Phase 3**

(2:10:00)

Before sharing the updates to the site plan, the team reminded commissioners of the site and current design plan. The team then explained the changes being made to the entry way on Geary Boulevard – the stair, the entrance wall, and the flagpoles are all being slightly modified.

The reasons for the changes are as follows: adding an additional stair for increased circulation; scaling down the entry wall; and moving the flagpoles to decrease congestion near the ADA ramp. The community identified the flagpoles as a significant cultural element so they wanted to bring them front and center to the design. The design goal is to make a

more grand, formal entry on Geary Boulevard. From the plaza view, the entryway wall is now one continuous surface rather than a stepped surface. The eternal flame and signage will stay in relatively the same location as proposed in the original design.

Commissioners commended the solution to creating a more inviting, formal entryway on Geary Boulevard. Commissioners asked whether the façade on Geary Boulevard could be a flat surface and the team responded that the surface is set back due to the property line.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Brenzel, seconded by Commissioner Rothschild, moved to approve Japantown Peace Plaza Renovation: Post-Phase 3.

The motion was unanimously approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Brenzel, Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota

## **8. New Business and Announcements**

(2:26:40)

There was no new business nor announcements.

There was no public comment.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33pm.