MEETING NOTES - CITY OF BERKELEY ROUNDTABLE + FOLLOW UP with PLANNING DEPT

**DATE & TIME:** February 22, 2017-Roundtable Meeting  
**PLACE:** City of Berkeley GoToMeeting  
Multiple meetings occurred with different departments after the Roundtable, and are documented below.  
October 11, 2018 Update

**PROJECT:** 2012 Berkeley Way, APN: 057 205302201

**BY:** Vanna Whitney

---

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT ITEMS FROM ROUNDTABLE MEETING**

**ATTENDEES:**
- Roundtable Meeting: see Attached Sign-In Sheet from Roundtable Meeting  
- Follow-Up Call: Layal Nawfal, Jamie Hiteshew, Vanna Whitney  
- Roundtable Follow-Up Meetings:  
  - City of Berkeley: Greg Powell, Layal Nawfal, Steve, Amy Davidson, Sharon Gong, Farid Javandel, Danette Perry, Tony Yuen, Jesus  
  - BRIDGE: Jamie Hiteshew  
  - LMS: Vanna Whitney, Marsha Maytum  
- 10.11.2018 Plnng Meeting: Development + design team met with city (Steve Buckley, Shannon Allen, Greg Powell, Sharon Gong, Amy Davidson, ? from City Attorney’s office, Mark Rhoades, Scott Falcone, Kelly Hollywood, Neil Saxby, Vanna Whitney)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Completed items in grey cells</strong></th>
<th><strong>Italic items: city responses / Bold items: action items</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **“MIDBLOCK CONNECTION”** from the Downtown Streets & Open Space Improvement plan: Confirm that this is not required. (see SOSIP p.53 + Site Plan sheet A1.0)

   **RESPONSE**
   - 2.22.17 Meeting: The interior private access (that is locked outside of business hours) through the Laundromat (from University through to the back yard) might be considered a part of a mid-block passage. City interpretation required.  
   - 3.8.17: Midblock connection, not a city requirement. Location of the connection can be anywhere across the site, does not need to be as shown in the diagram. City asked if this crossing could be combined with the Fire Chief’s request for a shorter easement. Team to meet with Fire Chief to understand the Fire Dept’s requirements for the easement and get feedback on the current easement diagrams provided to the city. Meeting Request has been made, Fire Chief to respond. (see below for Fire Dept. meeting minutes, item closed in this location)

Team to provide a statement, to Planning Dept., about the consequences to the project of adding a Mid-block Connection to the project. **Team to submit rationale for why the Mid-block Connection should not be implemented at this site (note loss of program elements and increased costs).** Statement included in Design Review Drawing Submittal set and in SB35 Application Drawing Submittal Set. Item Closed.
2. **PRIVATELY OWNED PUBLIC OPEN SPACE**: this is the front yard at the entry area for this project. The team would like to design this area so that it is a visual amenity for the neighborhood and for this project’s residents, and also make it a place where people will not camp or store belongings. This design will help with long term management of the building. Given these management considerations, is it acceptable for it to be all non-habitable landscape (“passive recreational use” Chapter 23F.04: Definitions) and no hardscape

**RESPONSE**
- 3.8.17 Meeting: Greg believes this is acceptable.
- 07.12.2017 Sharon Gong email: Staff believes it can be supportive of the “non-habitable” open space. The ZAB/DRC may have a different opinion, and will make recommendations if they feel the need. Resolved: The project is not going to ZAB or DRC. Item closed.

3. **DENSITY BONUS**:
- 3.8.17 Meeting: Layal to set up meeting for team to meet and the City to provide feedback on the Density Bonus diagrams and calculations.
- 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Group discussed Density Bonus Base Project requirements being revised from the Berkeley Base Project layout guideline to allow maximum allowable footprint per planning and building code requirements. Group thought that this approach would comply with Density Bonus Government Code Section 65915(f), allowing for the 6 story proposed project to comply without needing a Use Permit for the 5th floor. Group determined that the development team should submit this revised Density Bonus Base Plan and calculations with the SB35 Application. (see Density Bonus Diagrams and Calculations attached- reviewed at meeting) Item closed.

4. **STOREFRONT HEIGHT REQUIREMENT**: Confirm the following responses to guidelines are acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOWNTOWN BERKELEY DESIGN GUIDELINES</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. 35, Item 1: Maintain storefronts with generous windows along streets where commercial and higher levels of pedestrian activity can be expected.</td>
<td>Since this part of the block does not have commercial activity or high levels of pedestrian activity, the storefronts described in this section are not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. 35, Item 2: Storefront spaces should have taller ceilings (at least 15 feet high).</td>
<td>Since this project does not require storefronts the height requirement does not apply either.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESPONSE**
- 2.22.17 Mtg: Per Anne Burns, if this property is not designated as public serving street frontage area in the Public Serving Street Frontage diagram then this above storefront and ground floor height provisions do not apply. LMS followed up via email with city diagram confirming this is not a Public Serving Street Frontage. Ann confirmed this.
- 3/13/17 email from Anne Burns: confirmed that at 21012 Berkeley Way these storefronts are not required (though they are welcomed) as they are not one of the Public Serving Street Frontages, and therefore where storefront is provided the 15 ft. height requirement is also not required. Item Closed.
5. USE PERMIT:

RESPONSE
• 2.24.17 Call + 3.8.17 Mtg: Project Team to apply for following under one Use Permit:
  o Multi-Family Use
  o Mixed-Use
  o Group Living Use
  o Height increase from 50 ft. to 60 ft. (allowed with Use Permit per Table 23E.68.070)
  o Density Bonus height increase
  o Height Exception to Use Permit height limit (to allow 5 ft. beyond the limit, the occupancy of the area extending beyond the limit is office space)
  o Parking Exception (for no residential parking and one story of public parking)
• 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Team to replace Design Review Submittal set with an SB35 Submittal set and not request a use permit. Item closed.

6. CAR PARKING REDUCTION: The project proposes no parking spaces for the use of residents and staff of the project and as many parking spaces for the public that will fit on one level of underground parking. Quantity will depend on response to the loading zone question in section 6.

RESPONSE
• 3.8.17 Mtg: Apply for Car Parking Waiver: the city would need to make a finding that it’s not detrimental neighborhood- residents, businesses, employees-project to make a case in documents. It will be a ZAB + City Council decision - OR - Apply for Density Bonus concession: make a case for how adding more will add cost to the project. Team to up with DPW and Planning about how we demonstrate the impact (or lack of impact).
• 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking reduction to no parking can be provided via a Density Bonus Concession or through SB35 application. This will be noted in the SB35 Application Submittal set. Item Closed.

7. USE PERMIT HEIGHT EXCEPTION: BFHP Non-residential area located on the 6th floor setback from the street and rear yard.

RESPONSE
• 3.8.17 Mtg: This area is to apply for an exception to the use permit height limit for the 5’ it exceeds the permitted height established by the Use Permit height increase.
• 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Team to replace Design Review Submittal set with an SB35 Submittal set and not request a use permit. Item closed.

8. ENCROACHMENT INTO FRONT + SIDEYARD SETBACKS: Side yard setback (required at east side of the site above 21 feet) + Front yard setback (required across from the residential zone across the street).

RESPONSE
• 2.24.17 Call & 3.8.17 Mtg.: Include this area in the density bonus area increase (this is not a concession)
• 10.11.2018 Update: to be included in Density Bonus diagrams and calculations submitted with the SB35 Application. Item Closed.

9. UNIT STORAGE:

RESPONSE
• 3.8.17 Mtg.: City of Berkeley has no municipal code requirements for unit storage. Item closed.
### 10. PUBLIC ART:  
*(see City of Berkeley One-Percent for Public Art on Private Development Fact Sheet)*  
This project will have a long term regulatory agreement restricting the rent and limiting tenancy to qualifying households for 100% of the residential units.  

**RESPONSE**  
- 3.8.17 Mtg.: Per city One-Percent for Public Art on Private Development Fact Sheet this project does not need to provide public art as it is a “Multifamily housing that has a regulatory agreement with a government agency restricting the rent and limiting tenancy to qualifying households not exceeding specified incomes for at least 60% of the units”. Item closed.

### 11. HISTORY STUDY:  
**RESPONSE**  
- 3.8.17 Mtg.: This project is not a part of this study, therefore it does not affect this project at all. Item closed.

### 12. PLANNING DEPT. SUBMITTAL PROCESS: Staff, DRC, and ZAB  
**RESPONSE**  
- 3.8.17 Mtg.: Planning Dept. provides design review, commenting on zoning and design. After planning dept. review + CEQA/Neg Doc. is complete (commonly 6 mos.), project submitted DRC for preview, then submitted to ZAB for preliminary review, then submitted to DRC for final review.  
- 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Previously submitted Design Review Application was reviewed and review letters issued by the city. Team to resubmit project with changes described in the meeting (removal of parking garage, and relocation of utility areas to the ground floor) in an SB35 Application by 11/1 (before if possible). Review to be by staff, and follow up roundtable might be held.

### 13. 5 COAST LIVE OAK TREES ON SITE adjacent to sidewalk: *(see survey sheet T-1)*  
**RESPONSE**  
- 11/9/16 email from Dan Gallagher “full City Council can decide to grant special permission to allow coast live oak trees to be removed. Street trees to be planted, unless the coast live oak trees were preserved.”  
- 2.22.17 Roundtable Mtg. City Response: Dan Gallagher (Parks-Forestry) noted that the 4 live oaks would need a 20 ft. diameter for root structure health, and that there are 3 other live oaks on adjacent properties that would have to be removed due to excavation for the parking garage. Dan G. + Greg P: This is an item for city council approval, not a concession. He noted that the project would need to get a Council member to advocate for an exception/override to the moratorium on removal of live oaks, and this would require full City Council approval to allow the override. Team is also consulting arborist and Dan G. regarding the possibility of moving the trees to another city site.  
- 10.11.2018 Update: June 26, 2018 City Council adopted ordinance No. 7, 615-N.S. item 6.52.010 D, which grant an exception that if any tree in the ordinance, would substantially interfere with a development project that includes 50% or more units affordable to Extremely Low, Very Low or Low income households, as defined in Berkeley’s Affordable Housing Trust Fund Guidelines, so long as any tree removed is replaced by the developer with another Coast Live Oak either on the development site or at another location within the City of Berkeley. Item Closed.

### 14. 1 LARGE COAST REDWOOD PARTIALLY ON SITE, also on 2008 Berkeley Way: *(see survey sheet T-1)*  
**RESPONSE**  
- 2.22.17 Roundtable Mtg: Dan Gallagher (Parks-Forestry) noted that the redwood is not in good condition and would be approved by the city for removal, the ownership team would need to get approval from the neighbors. Team to follow up with neighbor, arborist and Dan G. Coast Redwoods are not protected by city ordinance. This is a private property matter not relevant to
15. STREET TREES + SIDEWALK REQUIREMENTS: Are there street, tree, and sidewalk requirements beyond the Downtown Streets & Open Space Improvement plan requirements?

RESPONSE
- 2.22.17 Roundtable Mtg: See attached Street Tree city hand-outs provided by Dan Gallagher. Dan noted that Civil dwgs + survey to be provided showing location of utilities, and a landscape planting plan to be provided. New street trees will require irrigation. There are no other requirements.
- 3.8.17 Roundtable Mtg: Team to follow up with Dan Gallagher + Diana Aikenhead directly.

16. TREE + SIDEWALK RELATIONSHIP: The existing sidewalk along the project site is 8'-0". Based on Berkeley’s Tree Planting Location Standard, we are required to have a 3' x 6' tree well size to grow a medium sized tree. The spacing of street trees shall be 30'-0" O.C. Please confirm tree well and tree size.

TREE GRATE: Will the city allow for us to use decomposed granite (dg) or are metal tree grates a requirement. Please confirm tree grate options.

RESPONSE
- 3.8.17 Roundtable Mtg: Team to follow up with Dan Gallagher + Diana Aikenhead directly.

END OF MEETING NOTES

FIRE DEPARTMENT ITEMS FROM ROUNDTABLE MEETING

ATTENDEES:
- Anthony Yuen, City of Berkeley, Fire Marshal (in person)
- Jesus, City of Berkeley, Fire Dept. Plans Examiner (in person)
- Amy Davidson, City of Berkeley, Senior Community Development Project Coordinator (call in)
- Sharon Gong, City of Berkeley, Associate Planner, Land Use Planning Division (call in)
- Jamie Hiteshew, BRIDGE Housing (call in)
- Vanna Whitney, Leddy Maytum Stacy Architects (LMS) (in person)

Completed items in grey cells

italic items: city responses / Bold items: action items / City Response needed

17. EASEMENTS:
- Nash Easement:
  - 2.22.17 Meeting: Tony Yuen (Fire Dept.) noted a concern regarding the length of the Nash Egress easement (220 ft.) and the fire rating/ protection of the two sides of the egress court. LMS noted that in previous pre-app with Dori Tieu, it was noted that the egress easement had to be open to the sky and could not pass under the proposed project at 2012 Berkeley Way, even if designed and rated as an Exit Passageway. LMS understood that the Fire Dept. and Planning Dept. were going to discuss the easement; as the involvement of the development team was not desired, LMS sent a diagram of the egress easement for the Nash, to help clarify the proposed design.
07.19.17 Follow Up: We understand that the easement currently shown on the attached Site Diagram is acceptable for the Nash and Univ. Hotel. Please notify team ASAP if there are further comments/ concerns. (see attached Site Plan Diagram)

a. University Hotel Egress path extension:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: extension requested by the Fire Department. Team to extend the Nash egress easement currently shown to reach the University Hotel. This will result in a longer total egress path length when measured from the University Hotel to the sidewalk. Fire Marshal Yuen thought this would be acceptable.
   - Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: Fire Marshal requests that the project team add gates from west and east yards of the Univ. Hotel. New stairs will need to be built on the Univ. Hotel property, and thus will change the usability of these yard. This is to be coordinated with the Univ. Hotel. Who pays for the new stair is TBD. (see attached Site Plan Diagram)
   - 10.11.2018 Update: It appears that stairs and gates exist from the west and east back yards of the University Hotel. With revised plan eliminating the garage and keeping the easement elevation at the existing elevations, new stairs and ramps should not be required. Confirm with Fire Dept. that this is acceptable.

b. Easement @ Property Line Fence and Building Wall:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal Yuen noted that the west building wall adjacent to the west part of the easement is to have a 1 hr. fire rating up to 10 ft. above the easement’s finished floor. The fences at the south and west property lines, bounding the easement, can be open fence structures. Fire Dept. prefers for the fence between the courtyard and the easement to be a low fence. Ownership and Design team to review and determine if this can be provided while maintaining security for the courtyards and buildings.
   - Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: Fire Marshal notes high fence on the straight runs of the easement are acceptable, it is at the corner that the guardrail on at the property line should be short at the corner in order to allow for the ladders to extend over the property line as fire persons carrying ladders round the corners (18’ ladders). It is acceptable to have a high fence on the at the property line opposite the building and a gate at the south side of the building and at the north side of the building (at sidewalk). (see attached Site Plan Diagram)

c. Easement Radius @ Southwest corner:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Dept. to provide team with recommended radius for the southwest corner of the easement.
   - Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: Fire Marshal noted there is not a radius, but made request noted in item “b” above. Item Closed.

d. Gate to Easement at Sidewalk - size:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal requests a 48” wide gate.
   - 10.11.2018. 48” gate provided. Item closed.

e. Easement Egress Lighting:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal requests egress lighting on entire egress path. This can be on occupancy sensor, but must be set to fail in the on position, and is to be connected to the emergency power system.
   - 10.11.2018. to be provided. Item closed.

f. Tender Green Exiting:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: The Fire Marshal and Amy Davidson think that the newly built concrete ramp at the rear of this property, up to the parking lot is not an exit path.
   - Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: Fire Marshal confirmed that Tender Greens at 2071 University Ave does not require a rear exit, all required exits, exit to the sidewalk Item Closed.

g. Spatz Exiting:
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal Yuen requests confirmation that the
rear door from Spatz to the parking lot is not a required exit.

- Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: It is confirmed that there is a required rear egress door to Spatz. Development team to provide a new legal egress easement for Spats. This will be an egress easement only, trash cannot be stored in this area, though trash can be moved to the curb from this area. Spats is to provide a 2 hour rated door at this exit. 2012 Berkeley Way project to provide an egress easement under the building adjacent to the property line. The wall between this egress easement path and the garage ramp is to be 2 hour fire rated. The gates at the north and south end of this path can be open gates allowing for ventilation. (see attached Site Plan Diagram)

- 10.11.2018 Update: Spatz egress path provided. Item Closed.

### 18. BULB OUT + RED CURB

- will be located in front of the entries to the BFHP and BRIDGE sides of the building, ending just to the west of the west side of Henry Street. The bulb out and the loading and drop off zones have been laid out per the direction we received from Public Works. The bulb out will contain landscape planting and bike racks. The drop-off zone will be immediately to the west of the bulb-out and will extend the same depth from the sidewalk as the bulb-out. The loading zone will be located at the curb nearest the northwest corner, just east of the adjacent driveway, where the majority of deliveries will be made for the BFHP community kitchen and food pantry.

- 2.22.17 Meeting: Follow up with Farid in a separate meeting.
- 3.16.17 Meeting: This should be 6 ft. deep, with 10 ft. reverse curb. The width should be **approximately 1 or 2 parking spaces long max.** (ea. Parking space is 22 ft.). If want to go longer, must have good justification for how it is a city amenity. Crosswalk is desirable if a mid-block crossing is provided, and less desirable if there is no mid-block crossing is provided. Check with Fire Dept, but for transportation dept. it seems that the current red zone is to remain the same and that parking and or bulb out can occupy where current parking is outside of the red zone.

- Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal Yuen will review with the Fire Chief and provide comments to the team.
- 7/28/17 Mtg. w/ Fire, Planning, Traffic & Waste Depts: Fire Dept. provided a markup of the site plan showing the extend of red curb required (from the east side of the site to the east side of the bulb out). The bulb out, as proposed, is acceptable to the Fire Dept. (see attached Site Plan Diagram with markups from Fire Dept.)
- 10.11.2018 Update: bulb out and red curb provided as described above. Item Closed.

### 19. UNDERGROUND PARKING GARAGE

- The parking garage entry is located at the east side of the site for two reasons. 1. It is the high side of the site (which is 6.7 ft. higher than the west/low side) which saves on excavation costs, and keeps the underground garage above the water table (saving cost by not requiring a "bathtub" type enhanced waterproofing system and not requiring added structural strength for hydrostatic pressure). 2. It is located closest to Shattuck where most people are likely to go after parking as they go to shop on Shattuck and University. The Fire Department’s concern is that cars may be lined up in front of the Fire Station in order to get into the garage on big event days and thus get in the way of the emergency vehicles.

- Added notes from after the meeting: if the parking garage access were to be moved to the west side of the site (200 ft), there would still likely be a line of cars in front of the station. One suggestion is that the city agency that will run the garage could provide a special management plan for big event days.

- Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal Yuen will review with Fire Chief.
- Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: Team to set up meeting with the City Parking / Public Works Dept. to discuss traffic mitigation measures to address the Fire Dept. concerns.
- 7/28/17 Mtg. w/ Fire, Planning, Traffic & Waste Depts: Fire Dept. understands that to change the garage ramp to the opposite side of the ramp would mean a complete redesign of the project that has already been submitted for entitlements and is in the Design Development phase. Traffic Dept. clarified that the lever arm for the garage will be
at the bottom of the ramp and will allow for a number of cars to line up on the ramp (off the street). Fire Dept. suggests that if there are other reasons for the entire project to be completely redesigned, that moving the ramp be considered, otherwise the proposed design is acceptable.

- **10.11.2018 Update:** Parking garage removed from project per City Council resolution. Revised project to be submitted to the city in an SB35 Application. Item closed.

### 20. DAS system: confirm if fire rated conduit is require for the digital antennae system.

- **2.22.17 Meeting:** Team to follow up with the Fire Dept. in a separate meeting.
- **Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17:** Fire Dept. will send City DAS requirements to project team, to clarify if 2 hour fire rating is required to protect the DAS conduit or not, as well as clarifying other city requirements. City has seen DAS systems required in similar buildings in Berkeley in the past. DAS systems closet must not be in the exit stairs, while they can be in a shared electrical or IDF closet.

### 21. FIRE WATER LINE CONNECTIONS, PUMPS, PUMP ROOMS, FDCs:

Confirm for whole project.

**RESPONSE**

- **2.22.17 Meeting:** Tony Yuen (Fire Dept.) noted that from a fire pump, and sprinkler perspective the building will be viewed as one building. Each stair going to the roof will be required to have a wet standpipe and a valve at the roof. 1 FDC will likely be sufficient. A new fire hydrant may be required. Follow up with the Fire Dept. in a separate meeting to determine if a new fire hydrant is required. Email request for information sent 7.27.17. Fire Dept. follow up necessary.

**END OF MEETING MINUTES**

### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS + PARKING MEETING

**Bold items:** action items

**Grey cells:** not further discussion required.

### 22. UNDERGROUND TRANSFORMER VAULT IN SIDEWALK: Diana Akenhead + Paul Kaushal: “As long as you carefully plan the location of the transformer, we’d approve the location in the sidewalk.” What specifically is meant by “carefully plan”? (see Ground Floor/ Level 1 plan sheet A2.1)

**RESPONSE**

- **3.16.17 Meeting:** Follow up with Diana Akenhead separately meeting.

### 23. STREET LIGHTS: none are being removed, all pole lights being removed are inside the property line. Is any work related to street light required? (see survey sheet T-1)

**RESPONSE**

- **2.22.17 Meeting:** Follow up with Farid + Diana Akenhead in a separate meeting.
- **3.16.17 Meeting:** Street lighting to be kept as is, moving the existing lights on the 2012 Berkeley Way property (that hang over the sidewalk) onto the sidewalk would be acceptable. No light study is required. If a cross walk is added, street lights should light the crosswalk, add another street light if necessary to light this, if the 2 relocated ones provide adequate light an extra is not required. DPW wants street lighting to remain consistent with lighting patterns now. Street lights are not required to provide the light, building mounted lights that cannot be turned off would be acceptable if they light the important areas: the terminus of Henry, the garage entry, and...
the northwest corner near the neighbor's driveway Item Closed.

**24. PARKING GARAGE EQUIPMENT + CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS:**

7.28.17 meeting:
- After parking review meeting, Danette will send parking equipment standards to team.
- Team to request construction standards from David Lopez.
- Farid to provide contact information of the person from the Engineering Department, who can provide the team with elevator and lighting standards
- **10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.**

**25. PARKING GARAGE ENTRY LOCATION:**

7.28.17 meeting:
- Location of parking garage entry at the east side of the site is acceptable to the Fire Dept. and Transportation Dept.
- Fewer parking spaces (112 down to 70) and fewer entries to the parking will offset each other, so that should have a net zero traffic impact the impacts are relatively well mitigated. (Farid)
- Occupancy Sign to be placed so that it is easily visible from approaches from both directions on Berkeley way.
- Gate arm to be provided at the bottom of the ramp, allowing for 3-4 vehicles to cue before entering the parking area. To be reviewed in Meeting the 2nd week of Aug.
- Lot will not operate 24 hours.
- Sound of alarm for cars exiting the garage should be kept to a minimum while meeting the ADA, and other requirements. Farid suggests selecting the lowest tone allowed.
- **10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.**

**26. PARKING SPACE QUANTITY:** Discuss number of spaces, levels, parklifts. Confirm path forward to approval (through city council).

RESPONSE
- 2.22.17 Meeting: Follow up with Farid + Danette + Dipan in a separate meeting.
- 3.6.17 Meeting: Team to:
  - apply for an exception to City Planning code for residential parking requirements.
  - design, construct and deliver a new underground parking garage to the city.
  Team to present cost for one and two levels of parking garage design and construction compared with revenue generation estimates for one and two levels of parking. Construction considerations to adding a second level of parking: encroaching into the zone of influence at the BART tunnel, water table issues/ increased hydrostatic pressure, waterproofing enhancements, added drainage, excavation off haul, ventilation, lighting, security, construction. City is confident of adequate demand, only needs to know if revenue will pay for additional level of parking. Parking metered as demand based in Berkeley. Off-street parking to be less than on-street parking. Off-street parking cost can fluctuate based on demand up to the cost of on-street parking cost. Meters in garage will be same as at other city locations. City uses Laz parking.
  - Danette will send city parking contractor (Doug Lakeman) contact to Jamie, for Jamie to follow up on parking revenue generation estimates for one and two levels of parking.
  - A TDM (transportation demand measurement) plan/study is required
  - 7.28.17 Mtg: Danette to send team information on where Berkeley Way parking lot revenues are used in the city. Some team members will be meeting with Mayor next week and will discuss qty. of parking provided.
- **10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: See item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.**
27. PARKING GARAGE CITY REQUIREMENTS: Provide city requirements for the garage (Amenities, ticket meter, surveillance, open hours, building signage requirements, vehicle gate requirements, staff requirements, etc.)

RESPONSE
- 2.22.17 Meeting: City contacts for City Parking Garage requirements are Danette, Farid and Dipan (Public Wks/ Transportation). Follow up with Farid, Danette + Dipan in a separate meeting.
- 3.6.17 Meeting: Arrangement to be similar to the Oxford lot at Brower Center.
  Danette will send city standards for parking garages the team.
  City will default to building code requirements for code compliance.
  Team can opt to design to the LEED standard of Parksmart.
  Trash bins will be required around garage + a trash room will be required.
  Team to follow up with Danette for a design meeting.
  Garage to be locked during off hours. Approx. 7 am to 12 am
  Provide roll up door. More solid grate preferred. Danette to send info. on acceptable specs.
- 7.28.17 Mtg: Jamie will set up meeting for Watry, Jamie, Vanna, Structural engineer to meet with Danette and Farid in second week of August to review parking plans. Sharon will provide plans to Farid and Danette in the meantime.
- 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.

GARAGE ENTRY VIEW ANGLES: Provide city requirements.

RESPONSE
- 2.22.17 Meeting: Sight Angle: Per Dipan, a 5 ft. x 5 ft. sight angle at the parking garage exit is to be maintained for pedestrian safety. Follow up with Dipan in a separate meeting.
- 3.6.17 Meeting: Provide for pedestrian safety at entry to garage. Preference is for an unobstructed 10 ft. x 10 ft. sight angle (see orange triangles in diagram below). If this cannot be provided, provide for pedestrian safety via light and sound alarms and possibly a mirror.
- 7.28.17 Meeting: Options to be reviewed in Meeting the 2nd week of Aug.
- 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.

COMPACT PARKING SPACES: Confirm 10% allowed and process for this to be approved, confirm that this is not a concession.

RESPONSE
- 2.22.17 Meeting: Follow up with Farid + Danette + Dipan in a separate meeting.
- 3.6.17 Meeting: 10% compact cars are acceptable, review locations with Danette.
- 7.28.17 Meeting: to be reviewed in Meeting the 2nd week of Aug.
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- **10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.**

- **ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATIONS: Confirm location (see Parking Plan sheet A2.0)**
  - **RESPONSE**
    - 2.22.17 Meeting: Follow up with Farid + Danette + Dipan in a separate meeting.
    - 3.6.17 Meeting: Locations acceptable. Review with Danette, where possible, a charging station should serve two vehicles.
    - 7.28.17 Meeting: to be reviewed in Meeting the 2nd week of Aug.
  - **10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.**

28. **LOADING + DROP OFF SPACES:** Are these required? If so, can they be located at the street? If the loading spaces cannot be located at the street, this will significantly impact the number of public parking spaces that can be provided in the subterranean parking lot. The project proposes a public parking garage that is +/- 31,000 SF, with +/- 9,500 SF of office space (excluding lobbies, kitchen and community room) above. Berkeley Food & Housing Project will inhabit the commercial space, and they only will use curb side delivery and loading. Loading from the underground parking garage would be too far to travel. A loading bay cannot be provided at the street level since it would be in conflict with planning guidelines that require the project to maintain storefronts at the sidewalk. We believe that locating the loading zone on the street best allows the project to deliver the uses outlined in the original development RFQ while also complying with the zoning requirements for the site. (see Site Plan sheet A2.0)

Municipal Code states:

(23E.32.030) Off-Street Loading Spaces for Manufacturing and Mixed Use Districts:
Any construction which results in the creation of 10,000 square feet of new or additional commercial … gross floor area shall provide off-street loading spaces at the ratio of one space for the first 10,000 square feet of gross floor area of commercial or manufacturing space and one space for each additional 25,000 square feet of gross floor area of commercial or manufacturing space thereafter.

(23F.04.010 Definitions) Commercial Use: The categories of commercial uses of a property include …. food service establishment, entertainment establishment, office… mixed use development, … parking lot and any use listed as a sub-category of the above uses; or any other use determined to be a business activity (except home occupations), as these terms are defined in this sub-title.

**RESPONSE**
- 2.22.17 Meeting: **Loading Zone:** Greg Powell noted that a loading zone is not required for the project if it has less than 10,000 SF of office space (excluding lobbies, kitchen and community room). He noted that the public parking garage area does not contribute to the requirement for loading zone spaces. Regarding commercial loading zone space at the curb side: development team to follow up about location, and hours. Follow up with Farid+ Dipan+ Layal +Greg in a separate meeting.
- 3.6.17 Meeting: on street **Loading zone will be a yellow curb, 8 ft. x 25 ft., and if located at the west side, it is best adj. to neighbor’s driveway to allow for more loading space behind the vehicle. A Drop off zone will be a white zone, 8 ft. x 20-22 ft. If there is a bulb out, it will be best placed adjacent to the bulb out. Item Closed.**
- 10.11.2018: **New commercial space is not proposed so loading is not required, work with the City’s Traffic Engineer for the location of loading zones during plan check**

29. **BICYCLE:** confirm interior + exterior quantity requirements. Can these be located on the sidewalk or must it be within the property line? (see Project Data A0.1C)

**RESPONSE**
- 2.22.17 Meeting: Follow up with Farid + Dipan in a separate meeting.
- 3.6.17 Meeting: They can be placed on a bulb out, Farid to check on if publicly serving racks can be placed in the sidewalk, and if so, what the restrictions are.
Quantity to be confirmed (not discussed in meeting). Team followed with email to Eric Anderson. Eric confirm quantities in attached bike parking documents.

- 7.28.17 Meeting: to be reviewed in Meeting the 2nd week of Aug.
- 10.11.2018 Update: More bike parking than is required by the city (requirements provided by Eric Anderson) is being provided. See bike parking calculations in the submitted Design Review Set, this table will remain unchanged in the SB35 application set. Item Closed.

30. MOTORCYCLE: confirm none are required.
   RESPONSE
   - 2.22.17 Meeting: Follow up with Farid + Dipa in a separate meeting.
   - 3.6.17 Meeting: None required. If space is available city may request motorcycle spaces to be added in the available area.
   - 10.11.2018 Planning Meeting: Parking garage deleted. See also item #6 in Planning Meeting notes, above, regarding car parking reduction. Item Closed.

31. TRASHBins @ STREET FRONTAGE: The trash room for BRIDGE is located in front of the Fire Station main building, and clear of the truck bays. Spatz’s trash, which appears to be a 2 cu. yd. bin will continue to be wheeled out to where it is currently wheeled out to, which is the area in front of the Fire Station vehicle bays. BRIDGE has the ability to wheel their trash bins out to a location to the west or east of their main trash room if that is preferred.
   - Fire Department Meeting 04.11.2017: Fire Marshal Yuen to review and provide direction to the team.
   - Fire Dept. Mtg. 07.19.17: Fire Marshal’s follow up email: “Currently, solid waste truck drives into the parking lot to pick up the trash from Spats. Many of them raised the concern of the dumpsters and recycling containers being let on the sidewalk overnight will present problems that the city has been experiencing in front of 1931 Center Street where the containers are being turned over and pilfered. Often they are moved away from the curb and onto the traffic lane. “ Jamie to set up a meeting with Solid Waste/ Refuse Services to get their input regarding Fire’s concerns as well.
   - 7/28/17 Mtg. w/ Fire, Planning, Traffic & Waste Depts: This meeting addressed the above concerns. The outcome was that the city is to talk with neighbors about putting their trash out on the sidewalks in front of their businesses at the street frontages in lieu of out in the parking lot, and report back to team.
   - 10.11.2018: BRIDGE + BFHP to discuss location for the proposed project’s trash collection and whether or not curb cuts should be provided, and if so where they should be located.

32. WASTE: Confirm one for trash + one for recycling is acceptable + Confirm that it is acceptable to have composting bins at each floor trash room that will be brought down to the main trash room composting bin on a regular basis by maintenance. (no chute for compost).
   RESPONSE
   - 2.22.17 Meeting: Confirmed. Heidi Obermeit noted one for trash is the only chute required. Recycling and Composting can be handled without a chute, and that 4 waste streams required. One trash, one compost, and two recycling. See attached Waste handouts. Chutes are not required, and not even recommended for compost.
   - 3/20/17 email: Heidi confirmed that the following is acceptable: having waste vestibules/rooms at each floor. Each of these rooms would have (2) chutes (one for trash and one for recycling) and (1) bin for composting, and (1) bin for a second stream of recycling that would be taken down to the main trash room by maintenance staff.
   - 7.28.17 Mtg: BRIDGE setting up meeting with Stopwaste and Fire dept. to be held to discuss where trash will be put out for waste dept. for BRIDGE, BFHP, Spats, and Tender Greens.
33. MAIN TRASH ROOM: AT 1ST FLOOR. Confirm that this does not need to be accessible per CBC
RESPONSE

- 2.22.17 Meeting: Heidi Obermeit noted that the main trash room does not need to be accessible when it is not for resident's use, and is only for janitorial staff use. *Item Closed.*

ATTACHMENTS
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*END OF MEETING MINUTES*