

Memorandum

To: Anne Burns, Design Review Secretary
From: Rhoades Planning Group
Date: March 2, 2017
Re: 3000 Shattuck/DRC2015-0022: Responses to DRC Comments from January 19, 2017 Meeting

Dear Ms. Burns,

This letter and the attached materials show the revisions made to the 3000 Shattuck Avenue project, in response to the Design Review Committee's comments during the January 19, 2017 preview of the project.

The following is the DRC Summary from the January 19, 2017 meeting that you provided with the Applicant's responses below each item:

3000 SHATTUCK AVENUE [at Ashby] (DRCP2015-0022) Preview to redevelop two parcels at 3000 Shattuck Avenue, which includes the demolition of one commercial structure; and the construction of a 5-story, mixed-use building with 6,225 square feet of commercial space and 44 dwelling units. The project would include parking for 17 vehicles and 62 bicycle spaces

Advisory Comments:

Building Design

- Vertically-oriented design is good, but the bays should read stronger.
Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: The bays along Ashby are set back from the street with a refined window layout, and a vertical siding material in the recessed bays. Verticality reinforced with rooflines and double height decks at the 3rd floor. Bays along Shattuck are each recessed at greater depth away from the corner with the same roof & window treatment.
- Massing appears to be busy; not all of the pieces are working together yet.
Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: window types and pattern were standardized to provide a cleaner look
- This site is harsh with the traffic that travels by. Look carefully at the corner balconies and other ways for articulation.
Response: See Pages A2.10-A2.1: corner has been revised to a 3-stepped massing to give more prominence to the corner. Corner decks eliminated.
- Ground floor level appears to be too short.

- *Response: See Page A3.0: The ground floor increased to 17' floor to floor. Upper floors were reduced to keep the same overall building height.*
- Consider parking lifts. That will increase the parking supply and the ground floor height.
- *Response: See Page A1.1: After looking at similarly sized projects, it was determined that the parking provided is appropriate for the location and proximity to BART and other transit. (for example, at the Overture project, 1812 University Avenue, Berkeley, there is no additional parking demand than what was provided on site for a similar scale project). We've also found that underground parking at this site would be prohibitive because of the shoring depths required and significant waterproofing challenges at city sidewalks & state highway CA13.*
- 'Slot' windows would be unpleasant as the only window into a bedroom.
Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: Proportions of windows were adjusted to be wider and shorter (2'-6" wide x 7'-0" high, reducing the appearance of a narrow slot. Several bedrooms have windows on 2 sides.
- 'Slot' window look too much like prison. Look at different rhythm or in combination with larger windows.
Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: Window type was standardized and the rhythms adjusted to create larger openings and more light in units.
- 'Wood-like' material on the ground floor is not durable enough for this location near the sidewalk.
Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: Base of building revised to glazed brick tile.
- Retail design should be more porous and easier to enter.
- *Response: See Pages A1.1, A2.0-A2.1: Ground floor was revised to have larger recessed areas at each entry; the corner was stepped back even more to provide relief from the busy corner.*
- Retail spaces should have the opportunity to make each suite more individual.
Response: See Page A1.1: Retail is shown with 2-3 potential tenants.
- Design for ground floor retail is too cold and should be more welcoming.
Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: retail entries are more gracious, with pedestrian scaled tile details and awnings.
- Stairwell facing Shattuck would be a good art location.
Response: Reserved for art per the 1% for Art requirement.
- Some of the unit plans could be more efficient.
Response: See Pages A1.2-A1.5: unit layouts were refined for greater usability.
- Some bedrooms appear to be too small for furniture placement.
Response: See Pages A1.2-A1.5: unit layouts were refined for greater usability (closet locations, bed locations).
- Strongly recommend solar panels, not just solar ready.

Response: See Pages A1.6: solar panels are shown, however, we can't determine yet what type of solar will be used on this building. At other projects, it depends on project details regarding the energy code whether solar PV or solar water heating makes the most sense.

- Colors shown are drab. This intersection needs more life.

Response: See Pages A2.0-A2.1: corner materials revised for more prominence.

- Look at the codes and confirm if open parking in the podium is allow.

Response: See Pages A2.2-A2.3: We reviewed the code, and determined that the southern wall can be 75% open because of proximity to the property line, while the western wall can be 15% open. We've adjusted the opening sizes accordingly.

- Open air corridor would put more light into units.

Response: New unit layout does not lend itself to open corridors, but it does have more openings into the shared courtyard.

Landscape / Open Space Design

- Recommend south-facing courtyard.

Response: See Pages A1.2-A1.6: The southern side of building was reconfigured to have south-facing courtyard. Building steps down along the west side to 2 stories above podium so we will have western light in the afternoon as well as southern light the rest of the day.

- This is a busy intersection, and it will be difficult to have seating right at the corner. Consider recessing into the building so it is more protected.

Response: See Page A1.1: corner recessed with larger operable glazing.

- Move the outdoor seating away from the corner.

Response: See Page A1.1: corner recessed to allow protected seating area.

- Look carefully at the podium open space and show where a group can meet.

Response: See Pages L1-L3 (forthcoming, will forward when received from landscape architect): layout revised to add more group areas.

- Existing Magnolia trees on Ashby are messy.

Response: See L1-L3 (forthcoming, will forward when received from landscape architect): city forester recommended these, but we are seeking an alternative.

ZAB Issues

- There does not appear to be enough parking for this project.

Response: No additional parking will be added to the project.