

**CITY OF ANTIOCH
JOINT MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
AND DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**Regular Meeting
7:30 p.m.**

**May 7, 2008
City Council Chambers**

Planning Commissioner (PC) Chairman Travers called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. on Wednesday, May 7, 2008, in the City Council Chambers.

PC Chairman Travers stated that all items that can be appealed under 9-5.2509 of the Antioch Municipal Code must be appealed within five (5) working days of the date of the decision. The final appeal date of decisions made at this meeting is 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, May 14, 2008.

ROLL CALL

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS:

Present: Commissioners Westerman, Johnson, Vice Chairman Azevedo and Chairman Travers

Absent: Commissioners Delgadillo and Trail

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS:

Present: Board members Lotito, Langford and Edwards, Vice Chairman Peniche and Chairman Clark

Staff: Deputy Director Community Development Wehrmeister
Prewett Park Community Project Manager Facilities Karste
Police Lieutenant Vanderklugt
Minutes Clerk Lawson

JOINT DESIGN REVIEW BOARD / PLANNING COMMISSION

NEW ITEM

- 1. Study session on the schematic design for the next phase of the Prewett Park Community and Police Service Center located at 4701 Lone Tree Way (APN 055-071-010-7).**

Prewett Park Community Facilities Project Manager Karste provided an overview of the Staff Report dated April 25, 2008. He also displayed conceptual drawings that were available for review and presented a power point presentation that elaborated on the following:

- Facilities Plan
- Environmental Review

-
- Design Budget Impacts
 - Project Site
 - Building Program
 - Add/Alternate . Funding Available

Janet Tam, Noll and Tam Architects, provided a power point presentation that was used to further elaborate on the following:

- Site Analysis
- Selected Conceptual Design Option
- Schematic Design Site Plan Base Plan . Base Plan 8,000sf Gymnasium
- Schematic Design Site Plan Base Plan - With Alternates: Amphitheatre 11,000sf Gymnasium
- Schematic Design . Example Amphitheatre Image
- Schematic Design . Example Bioswale Image
- Schematic Design . Example Gabion Wall Image
- Schematic Design Floor Plan . Base Plan - 8,000sf Gymnasium
- Schematic Design Floor Plan . Base Plan . 11,000sf Gymnasium
- Schematic Design Rendering - South Elevation
- Schematic Design Rendering . Main Entrance
- Schematic Design Rendering . View From Water Park Drop-Off
- Schematic Design Rendering . Building and Sustainability

Ms. Tam stated that the City Council had made comments regarding:

- Respond to the curved geometry of the existing crescent
- Create a more generous entry space for a kiosk, and an entry to the library express directly from the living room
- Provide a more visible police entry
- Amphitheatre for 300 people
- The City Council did not want a boxy+building
- Consider heating and cooling issues in the hot Antioch climate

Design Review Board member Lotito asked about why a more thorough schematic design package was not provided tonight, wherein Mr. Karste stated that the purpose of tonight was mainly to hold a study session and receive additional feedback. He wanted to ensure that the project was on the right track and that the ideas and agendas are being met before additional funding is spent before the final development phase.

Design Review Board Chairman Clark stated that per the City Council's actions on this item, he felt that something different would come out of this meeting, in terms of additional information that would have provided options and choices to provide direction on the part of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board. He expressed concern that additional options were not presented to build off what the City Council approved and felt that what had been presented tonight was further development of what the City Council approved. He felt this was quite confusing because it was not just further development, but a lot of development.

Deputy Director Community Development (DDCD) Wehrmeister stated that this study session was for the Board and Commission to provide feedback and comments to be brought back to the City Council, wherein they would determine whether to direct Noll and Tam Architects to make changes to the project. Ms. Tam interjected that she had been directed to place the building in a specific area, but the massing is in the conceptual stages and is not set in stone and welcomed any additional feedback.

Mr. Karste clarified for the Board and Commission that the inside building program is fixed, and in terms of the design, it is staff's request that the Board and Commission provide comments to move forward with putting the project together.

Design Review Board member Edwards expressed concern to the gabion wall, in terms of trash being collected over time. He also felt that there were safety issues with children having a tendency to pull on the cage material. Ms. Tam stated that this was chosen for aesthetic reasons, but felt that these were important concerns and would look into these issues. Board member Edwards envisioned that the bios wales would be used and incorporated in a more park-like design and asked if the bios wales would be used for water collection. Mark Reed, Noll and Tam Architects, responded that any water traveling down the hill would travel directly towards a storm drain and not into the bios wales.

Design Review Board member Edwards stated his dislike for stucco walls, wherein Ms. Tam responded that she would rather use another type of upgraded material, but due to budgetary restraints, she felt that the stucco could be made to appear smoother and aesthetically pleasing.

Design Review Board member Langford stated that he disliked the stucco finish and felt it was used too much throughout the community, and further felt that brighter colors tend to require higher maintenance. He stated that he was hoping to see a grander entryway into the project and felt the design of the building did not fit the surrounding area. He further expressed a concern to the layout and the proposed uses of the different rooms, and disagreed and expressed a concern to the types of materials that were being proposed because he felt that this brought the quality of materials down to a lower level. Ms. Tam interjected that due to budgetary concerns, material use could not be upgraded or promised at this time, and noted that the entryway would be continued to be developed, in terms of size. Also, she was advised they did not want to match the Water Park building, in terms of aesthetics. Mr. Karste also interjected that space could be traded off, through recommendations of the City Council, but he noted that they were concerned to losing specific space if the building design would change dramatically. He further spoke to the past master plan of the project that explained the history of the project, in terms of size and planned uses.

Design Review Board member Lotito expressed concern to the aggressive schedule and the tight budget and felt this would make the City lose a great City opportunity to build a good project for the community. He also expressed a concern to the entry size

and felt it was too small and it was overwhelmed by the building itself. He expressed a concern to the sundial wall, in that it could be more expressive in some manner. Also, that the massing of the building was overwhelming and could be broken up, in terms of a different roof design. He stated that he also disliked the color scheme and that it did not reflect the City's image.

Planning Commissioner Brandt stated that she was disappointed in the community, in that, she felt that the community lost an opportunity to create an important center within the community. She felt that a larger library would have benefited this project, rather than the addition of the police substation. Commissioner Brandt stated that she disliked the proposed color concept, as well as the design concept in relation to the Water Park, and felt this project should blend with the surrounding and adjacent buildings and the proposed building design resembled a disjointed project. She felt it did not adequately address the intention of the original City's Master Plan and that it was important to maintain cohesion throughout the community, in terms of the Design Subcommittee Guidelines that are currently being studied. The sundial wall could be more unique, in design, and that the pathway for the children now traveling back and forth to the surrounding schools is maintained in some manner, because she felt that children would still use the same paths if somehow they were changed or moved. She also wanted to ensure that future vandalism issues needed to be addressed. Furthermore, Commissioner Brandt wanted to ensure that the bios wales be more safely constructed, and pointed out other areas of the community where she felt they posed a safety concern in stepping in or around them. Also, make sure that the grass seating not be wet when sitting at the amphitheatre. Moreover, Commissioner Brandt felt that the design was not quite at the final stage.

Design Review Board member Clark expressed a concern that Title 24 issues be researched to ensure that any cost savings would be real and not cost more in the future. He wanted to ensure that the architectural theme of the project reflected the City and questioned what aspects of the project said "Antioch" or "Community Center", in terms of its design. He further stated that he disliked the sundial wall, the entry and generally the overall design and suggested that a gateway or breezeway be provided so that a walkway could be put through the middle of the project.

Planning Commissioner Johnson expressed concern that the entry way was too small, but did like the concept of a gateway or breezeway being placed between the community center. He expressed concern to the small windows on the administration building and suggested that energy efficient glass be added to reduce the afternoon heat of the sun.

Design Review Board member Peniche felt the design of the building did not fit within the community and suggested separate clusters of buildings, in that, they might look more aesthetically pleasing and could also create more conducive walkways. Mr. Karste stated that it was felt that activities could be better monitored if they were all contained in the same building. Board member Peniche asked why the project was

located closer to the Water Park and also felt that the architectural elements should match the Water Park to create a more cohesive look.

Planning Commissioner Westerman stated his dislike of the design of the entryway, and per his request, Mr. Karste further explained the burrowing owl mitigation issue.

Vice Chair Planning Commissioner Azevedo expressed concern to the south side of the building, in terms of afternoon sunlight. He stated that he disliked the color scheme but stated his satisfaction that the needs of the community would be met with this community center and understood the budgetary restraints and felt that issues could be addressed to stay within the budget, and at the same time meet the needs of the community. In responding to Commissioner Azevedo, Antioch Police Lieutenant Vanderklugt explained staff and services that would be provided at the Police Service Center.

Design Review Board member Lotito spoke to value engineering and questioned why the Kalwall material was being used and asked if other materials were looked at for the gymnasium. Mr. Karste stated that he was concerned that other materials would create glare and attract heat and felt that the Kalwall material would be best suited for this area.

Chairman Design Review Board Clark wanted to ensure that the best intent of the design was being achieved as the project moves forward, and he wanted to make sure that the goals were being achieved for the project, in terms of generating revenue. He questioned if decisions were being made that would negatively impact the project.

Chairman Planning Commission Travers felt that the project should have synergy with the adjacent Water Park, in terms of the same type of color scheme or design factor that would make the area flow between the two projects. He felt that a larger entry way was needed and that it also provides a view to the amphitheatre and hills, which he felt was an asset to the City. He questioned if a fundraising effort was reviewed to provide additional revenue and suggested that bricks be sold, similar to the ones that were sold for the City Park Playground. He also suggested that pathways be added that could break up the area and provide a more meandering walkway.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

ADJOURNMENT OF DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Planning Commissioner Chair Travers adjourned the Joint Planning Commission and Design Review Board meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

A recess was taken at 9:50 p.m. and reconvened at 10:00 p.m. to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENTS

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Westerman, Johnson, Brandt, Vice Chairman Azevedo and Chairman Travers
Absent: Commissioners Delgadillo and Trail
Staff: Deputy Director Community Development Wehrmeister
Minutes Clerk Lawson

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. Approval of Minutes March 5, 2008

On motion by Commissioner Brandt, and seconded by Commissioner Johnson, the Planning Commission approved the Minutes of March 5, 2008.

AYES: Brandt, Johnson, Westerman and Azevedo
ABSENT: Delgadillo and Trail
ABSTENTION: Travers

NEW ITEM

3. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Chair Travers nominated Vice Chairman Azevedo for the position of the Planning Commission Chairman.

On motion by Chairman Travers, and seconded by Commissioner Brandt, the Planning Commission moved that Vice Chairman Azevedo move into the position of Planning Commission Chairman.

AYES: Travers, Brandt, Westerman, Johnson
ABSENT: Delgadillo and Trail
ABSTENTION: Azevedo

Chairman Azevedo nominated Commissioner Brandt for the position of the Planning Commission Vice Chairperson.

On motion by Chairman Azevedo, and seconded by Commissioner Travers, the Planning Commission moved that Commissioner Brandt move into the position of Planning Commission Vice Chairperson.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Vice Chair Brandt expressed a concern to large banner signs, wherein DDCD Wehrmeister stated that a Commercial Code Enforcement Officer has now been dedicated to this issue.

Vice Chair Brandt brought to the attention of staff a sign that blocked site distance near the Wallace Arms building and noted that the Relay for Life event would be held on June 21 and 22 and encouraged the Commission's participation.

Chairman Azevedo expressed his appreciation to the Commissioner Travers for his time served and leadership as past Chairman of the Planning Commission.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Westerman reported that the Design Review Subcommittee met on May 5 and that the revisions should be made available for review in approximately one month. He further noted that the Highway 4 Aesthetics meeting had been delayed.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Azevedo adjourned the Planning Commission at 10:05 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held on May 21, 2008.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debra Lawson