

HERCULES PARCELS Q&R DESIGN REVIEW COMMENT LOG			
8-Feb-18			
Comment Number	Reviewing Agency and Comment	Applicant Response	City Staff Response
<b>Comments from Completeness Review Letter dated November 30, 2017</b>			
CR-1	Grading Plan. While the sheet titled "Layout and Grading" plan shows finished grades (Sheet C-200), and Sheet C-100 calls out existing grades, no single drawing illustrates project grading so cut and fill can be determined, or whether retaining walls are needed and the height and location of any such walls etc. In addition, calculations need to be included that quantify the amount of cut and fill proposed, so it can be determined whether the site will be balanced or whether off haul or import will be needed.	Amount of cut and fill have been provided in Resubmittal Sheet C-200.	Done.
CR-2	Parking Plans. Sheets A-06 and A-07 depict the layout of the proposed parking structure. However, no dimensions are provided to distinguish the various types of parking spaces proposed (full sized, compact, handicapped etc), as well as a tabular breakout summarizing the number of parking spaces by type. In addition, drive aisle and driveway widths need to be dimensioned.	Parking dimensions shown in Resubmittal Sheets A-06 and A-07. Dimensions meet ULI standards.	Done
CR-3	Open Space Areas. The plans include a range of open space areas, including two multilevel internal plazas. A table needs to be included that summarizes the size of the various open spaces areas being proposed, as well as their aggregate size. While the landscape plans depict the plaza areas, it is difficult to understand how these important plaza areas will function given the small scale of the plans (1 inch equals 40 feet is used). A larger scale, possibly 1:10, would allow the details of the two plazas to be clearly seen. In addition, no dimensions of the plaza areas are shown on the plans, which makes it difficult for someone viewing the drawings without a scale in hand, to get a feel for the size and related usefulness of the open space areas. The same is true for the street level landscape drawings, as more details need to be provided, as well as key dimensions called out.	Enlarged Podium Plans shown in Sheets L6.01 and L6.02. Size of podium spaces provided on Sheet L0.00.	Done

CR-4	Fencing/Walls. The plans need to include proposed fence locations, the type of fencing proposed, as well as the fence height. Pictures/graphics should be included to illustrate a specific fence type/design being proposed.	Fence locations shown on Sheet L3.02, <b>which shows all fencing on the site, both on and off the podium decks.</b>	
CR-5	Utility Boxes: The approximate location of utility boxes should be shown, particularly the larger above ground structures that would be most visible, such as above ground boxes located at corners.	Utilities shown on Sheet C-300. <b>Above ground structures now shown on C-300</b>	Shown, but the riser is very very visible.
CR-6	Window/Door Details. Given the critical importance of windows and exterior doors to the building's appearance, details of both windows and doors need to be included with the drawings and with material samples, as was done for Block "N".	Sections show windows and doors but enlarged typical sections/details needed prior to Planning Commission approval	Need sections/details prior to PC Approval.
CR-7	Exterior Lighting. While exterior lighting plans are provided, along with a legend calling out the type of lighting, no information is included on the light fixtures themselves or on the height of the pole lighting proposed. Pictorial examples should be include of the type of lighting fixtures being considered, along with an illustration showing the approximate height of the fixture.	Photos are shown in Resubmittal set on Sheet L3.00. Bldg mounted lighting shown on Sheet A-19.	Done
CR-8	Cross sections of the Loop Road need to be included so the width of the various components of the street (width of travel lane, on street parking etc) can be easily visualized.	Resubmittal set shows street sections on Sheet L5.02.	Section of Typical EVA shows no landscape on far side.

CR-9	<p>Perspective Drawings. The majority of the drawings of the proposed building and parking structure are in the form of two dimensional building elevations. While these are useful in helping to understand how the building will appear when built, three dimensional perspective renderings provide the best, most accessible view of what the project will look like, particularly for the layman. While two perspective views are included in the packet on Sheet A- 02, a couple of additional renderings are needed to provide a more complete view of what the project will look like. It would be helpful if these added renderings were prepared in the form of a photo montage, rather than the more artistic "hand drawn" look shown in the submitted perspective drawings on Sheet A-02. Let's discuss what would be the best view points and technique to use.</p>	<p>Photo sims underway.<b>Draft Rendered views are provided in 2/8/18 submittal set sheets A-02.1, A-02.2</b></p>	<p>Provided with Staff Report.</p>
<b>Comments from Design Review and Conformity Analysis Memo dated January 11, 2018</b>			
DR-A	<b>General Comments</b>		
DR-A1	<p>Break between Block Q and Block R: the regulatory document for this project is the Bayfront Plan (the Form Based Code, or FBC). The Street and Circulation Standards in the FBC shows a block structure that divides Block Q and Block R with a continuous space (in some diagrams this space contains a street). The submitted plans show a single building across both Block Q and Block R, with two separate courtyards - one facing towards the Bay and one facing away – rather than a through space. Following is a discussion of the code compliance of this arrangement.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· View Connection. The through connection between Block Q and Block R could potentially provide a view from John Muir Parkway through the buildings towards the Bay beyond. However, a careful review of the drawings show that this view connection would not be possible with any arrangement, because the elevation of the ground level at the building is higher than the elevation on John Muir Parkway, and also because the edge of the neighboring Muir Point houses, when complete, will block the view. Therefore, a view connection to the Bay is not possible, and is not required.</li> </ul>	N/A	Complies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Vehicular Connection. The through connection could potentially provide vehicular access to the eastern edge of the project. However, there is not a street on the east side of the project, so a vehicle connection is not needed, and is not required.</li> </ul>	N/A	Complies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Pedestrian Connection. The through connection could provide pedestrian circulation. The Form Based Code puts a strong emphasis on a pedestrian environment by having a walkable scale of blocks as done in traditional downtowns. For this reason, the Applicant should consider ways to allow pedestrian connectivity across the block. This could be done by creating a pedestrian passage from one courtyard to the other all the way through the building. This would benefit residents and other pedestrians, and could be handled the same as in the plans for Block N, with limited hours for public access.</li> </ul>	A more pedestrian friendly entry to project from the southeast side facing the North Channel is provided on Sheet A0.7 and Sheet A-12 in the Resubmittal.	Complies

	<p>· Massing. The through connection provides a strong break in the mass of the building. As mentioned, the Applicant's plans show two courtyards, one in each direction. This design achieves this break, especially on the side away from the Bay. However, there is a multi-story bridge shown across the opening at the courtyard facing the Bay. This bridge will potentially make the block read more like a single long building than is desirable. For this reason, the Applicant should reduce the massive appearance of the bridges as much as possible. This means moving the bridge back as far as possible from the street edge of the building. In addition, the structure and railings on the bridge should be as lightweight and transparent as possible. Lastly, the Applicant should provide a photo simulation of this part of the building from a ground level vantage point, for discussion.</p>	Bridge has been redesigned and lightened in the Resubmittal set on Sheet A-12. It has also been pushed back from the frontage as shown in plan on Sheets A-08, A-09, A-10	Provided.
DR-A2	Additional Perspectives: In addition to the photo simulation requested above, a request was made for additional perspective views in a photo simulation style from John Muir Parkway.	Perspectives underway.	Provided with Staff Report.
DR-A3	Additional Site Sections: A request was also made for additional sections showing neighboring development.	Site Sections provided in Resubmittal.	Done.
DR-A4	Linus Pauling EVA Connection: Applicant has provided several alternatives for a cul-de-sac turnaround and EVA connection at Linus Pauling Drive in a drawing by BKF dated Dec 15, 2017. This drawing should be included in the revised set of drawings. The Fire Department prefers the cul-de-sac alternative closest to the Northwest corner of the building, with a direct EVA access to the extension of the Loop Road. Note: in addition to being required for Block Q & R, this improvement will be required of Bio Rad when approving any future development on that site.	Preferred Linus Pauling turnaround and area to be removed is shown in the Resubmittal set Sheet C-200, although the Arch. Site Plan on Sheet A-04 shows the previous version.	Done.
DR-A5	Width of Loop Road Extension. The EVA heading northeast from the end of the Loop Road should be shown on drawings as 15' + 26' + 15' total width, per Fire Department requirements. This includes a 15' setback to any future Block P building from the 26' EVA.	These dimensions are shown in the Resubmittal set on Sheet L5.02, Street Sections.	City/FD should track to ensure future Block P sets back to accommodate required width.
DR-B	Form Based Code Analysis		

DR-B1	Along the John Muir Parkway frontage, the distance between ground floor entries should be no more than 50' maximum. It appears this can be solved by putting a street entry into the "Internet Café/Lounge space".	Additional entries and dimensions between entries are shown on Sheet A-06.	Done.
DR-B2	No information is provided regarding awnings at the John Muir Parkway façade. Provide layout and dimensions that shows that awnings are between 4' and 10' deep.	Awnings are shown dashed on Sheet A-06 and A-07 and dimensioned on A-07	Done.
DR-B3	Confirm that the Arcade over the sidewalk is no deeper than 14'. Also, show columns for the Arcade on Floor Plans Sheet A-06 and A-07. Finally, ensure that scale of the columns is appropriate to the overall scale of the building.	Shown in plan on Sheet A-06. <b>Columns size called out on sheet A-15 Gold Rush wall section.</b>	Done. Column 8x8 tube, nice size.
DR-B4	The long side of the building does not appear to be a series of buildings no wider than 100'. The total length of the façade along the Loop Road is 470', which would require the building's appearance to read as a series of five buildings. The North Elevation on A-12 gives an appearance of four buildings, two of which are very long. Add another siding material and/or color on the recessed part of the Victorian buildings.	As shown in Resubmitted elevations on Sheet A-17, the buildings at the north end of the site are not all differentiated to read as 100' max. <b>A note from Applicant states that FBC does not require differentiation at private drive.</b>	Modify elevations along Loop Road Extension and along North Channel to meet requirement. No need to change at Business Park edge.
DR-B5	For the "Gold Rush Style" buildings, neither of the two building forms is shown with brick or brick veneer; one is cement plaster while the other is cement board siding. Change to brick or brick veneer for both buildings. Style 1 should be different material from Style 2. Consider use of gray brick or another color to contrast with red brick building.	Designation of facades on John Muir Parkway has changed from two Gold Rush Buildings to one Gold Rush and one Victorian building. Now meets standard.	Done.

DR-B6	For the “Victorian” buildings, there are portions of the building that show a stucco finish. Although the FBC does not mention stucco, this material was often used at the rear and interiors of Victorian buildings in San Francisco. Therefore, stucco may be suitable for the rear facades and podium courtyards, but the buildings most visible from John Muir Parkway and the Loop Road should be wood siding or cement board. Change Victorian Building 1 on both sides of the block to wood or cement-fiber siding.	Resubmitted drawings show cement board siding on all facades, except cement plaster (stucco) base.	Siding is now appropriate to the architecture.
DR-B7	The “Victorian” buildings have tall ground floors, but they are not visually connected by a continuous base as required by the FBC. For Victorian Building 1 on both sides of the block, a continuous belt trim or other detail within each sub-façade should provide a stronger base for the upper floors to sit on.	Resubmitted drawings show a continuous base on most buildings. <b>Base has been accentuated through color and water table detail. See renderings and elevations.</b>	Done.
DR-B8	The cornices shown in the Victorian 1 and Victorian 2 styles are all very similar in detail, scale, and material. More variety for the cornices at the different sub-facades would help give more differentiation and break up the long facades.	Resubmitted drawings shows more variety in cornice height, depth and detail.	Track drawings to ensure details follow through to Building Permit.
DR-C	<b>Other Design Comments</b>		
DR-C1	View of John Muir and Loop Road. The blue corner element is set out from the surrounding building walls, but the floor plans do not match this. Change the floor plans to show the pop-out, and ensure the scale of the pop-out in plan matches the perspective. Also, the building recess at the entry lobby on John Muir Parkway looks quite substantial in both perspectives. Ensure the recess in plan matches the scale of the recess in the perspectives.	Resubmitted plans show a 2'0" bump-out at the corner element. This is better than original but still does not seem very strong.	<b>Provide additional Victorian detail at corner feature.</b>

DR-C2	Details of railings. Show example photos of anticipated railing types for all balconies, bridges, and podium spaces. Railings should be different in the different building types (Victorian 1, Victorian 2, Gold Rush 1, Gold Rush 2).	Did not find example photos in Resubmittal set. <b>Example images provided for steel and wood rail types on sheet A-15</b>	Provided.
DR-C3	Fencing locations. Please show proposed fencing for the site, including height and materials, on a new plan sheet or clearly delineated on an existing site plan sheet. Show locations of all gates and provide a written strategy for allowing public access and fire and police access.	Fence and gate locations shown on Sheet L3.02. <b>At all gates including EVA vehicular access gates and podium access gates, Knox boxes will be provided.</b>	Done.
DR-C4	Fire Access. Provide a separate fire access route map showing access for vehicles, as well as firefighter access into podium courtyards and the buildings. Show hydrant locations, FDC's, and standpipes.	Fire Access site plan is shown on new Sheet C-500. On-site fire access is shown on Sheets A-04.1, A-04.2, A-04.3.	Provided.
DR-C5	Internet Café/Lounge. The space does not show an entry from the sidewalk. As mentioned, this should have an entry to sidewalk to satisfy code requirement of an entry per 50', to provide additional interest along the sidewalk, and in case it becomes public in future.	Provided in Resubmittal set.	Provided.
DR-C6	Doors along Sidewalk. Any doors or gates opening out onto the sidewalk should not impede progress of pedestrians; change doors to inswinging, or if required to swing out due to egress, recess the doors.	Resolved on Sheet A-06, all doors swing in or are set back from public r.o.w. to swing out.	Provided.
DR-C7	Sidewalk Obstructions. Provide details regarding type of signage and landscaping, if any, will be allowed along the two sidewalks, and how it will be regulated.	<b>Any landscape features or signs in public r.o.w. for benefit of the project will be maintained by Owner</b>	Provided. Condition of Approval.



DR-C8	Entry Lobbies. Clearly label Elevator locations on all floors. In addition, the lobby on John Muir Parkway does not have a stair that continues to upper levels. Attractive and convenient stairs for residents to use instead of elevators should be provided. Also, floor plans on Sheet A-9 and A-10 do not show the stair at the Loop Road entry correctly.	Elevators now labeled. Stairs are not provided at elevator lobbies, meaning residents do not have a convenient way to not take the elevator.
DR-C9	Sheet A-06 shows a Trash Room next to the vehicle entry to the garages. Relocate Trash Room to the other side (uphill side) of the garage entry. Provide a written description of the trash collection and pick-up process for future residents and trash service provider. Note - Republic Services (trash service provider) to review plans before approval.	Trash Room moved away from garage entry. Done. <b>Written Trash Service plan approved by Republic Waste Services was provided to the City on 2-6-18. It is as follows:</b>
		1. One very large trash room will be provided in the center of the project which will contain 2 separate chutes. One for recyclables and one for non-recyclables.
		2. The trash room will be located on the ground with direct access to the trash room from the Trash Company (Republic) from the outside.
		3. It is located not further than 100 feet from where the trash truck would park on the street while the property is being serviced.

		4. The room will have a capacity to store a total of six, 4-cubic yard bins, but will start operation with only 4 bins (2 for recyclables and 2 for non-recyclables) and additional bins can be added later, when and if demand dictates.
		5. The bins will be checked daily and rotated by property management staff once they become full beneath each trash chute to ensure no overflow of trash out of the bins occurs.
		6. Republic Trash Company anticipates servicing the property 2 x per week but can increase service days based on actual demand, up to 5 x per week.
DR-C10	Move-in Plan. Relocate Move-in Path shown on Sheet A-06 to the other side (uphill side) of the garage entry. Where do moving trucks/vans park? Provide a written description of Move-in process.	Moving-in path has been relocated. <b>Temp Loading will occur curbside on the Loop Road in yellow curb spaces.</b> <b>Move-in plan should be provided.</b>

DR-C11	EVA Obstructions. In areas of planned amenity use on the EVA, provide details regarding how the EVA will be regulated to remain unobstructed in the future.	No parking or blocking Signs will be posted in all Fire lanes or EVA areas.	Done.
DR-C12	Bike Storage. Easily accessed bike storage should be provided for all residents. There is good bike storage on Floor 1 of the parking garage, but this storage is not convenient to the residents closer to John Muir Parkway. Additional bike storage should be identified.	Bike storage provided on both floors in Resubmittal set. <b>10% of total unit count (232 x 10%) or 23 bike storage or racks will be provided per zoning code</b>	Provide bike storage per Draft Circulation Element - 20% of total number of units provided as on-site storage, and 10% of number of units as on-street racks.
DR-C13	Parking Access. Is one parking entry enough for 304 cars? Provide a letter from a licensed Transportation Engineer or Planner stating this is within best practice guidelines for parking structures.	Plan revisions show separate entries to parking levels.	Done.
DR-C14	Gates at Parking Access. Provide details of gates at parking access drive, if any. Gates should be recessed back from the sidewalk. Corners at driveway should be chamfered or windows provided to give visibility to pedestrians crossing the driveway. Also, provide a description of how the parking access will safely interface with pedestrians at the sidewalk.	There are now two gates to parking. <b>See Landscape Sheet L3.02 for details of vehicular gates along EVA and parking access drive</b>	Done
DR-C15	Electric Vehicle Charging. Show electric charging spaces for vehicles on parking level plans.	These are now shown on Sheet A-06 and A-07. For the lower level, EV spaces are 7 per 221 spaces total. For the upper level, EV spaces are 3 spaces per 91 spaces total.	Done.

DR-C16	Design of Parking Spaces. The spaces shown in the plans seem to be entirely compact spaces, along with accessible spaces. Please note standard, compact and accessible spaces, and provide dimensions showing width and depth of spaces and aisles. Note - there is enough space between the columns to swing car doors open, but if shear walls are required, any spaces adjacent to walls will need to be enlarged. Typical code language requires additional 2' where parking stall abuts a fence, wall or other obstruction.	Compact and accessible spaces are shown on both levels in the Resubmittal set. Where shear walls are located, spaces are wider.	Done.
DR-C17	Parking for Future Commercial Uses. Provide a strategy for how parking will be accommodated if the ground floor spaces along John Muir Parkway are converted to publically accessible commercial uses.	None provided. <b>14,000 sf of retail to be provided on Block N above FBC reqmts</b>	<b>Provide a plan for parking management that includes a strategy for parking for commercial uses on the ground floor should that happen.</b>
DR-C18	Fire Access to Parking Structure. Access to the upper level of parking is through the lower level. Demonstrate this arrangement is safe by providing a letter from a Fire Code Consultant showing how Fire Department access will be provided. Add a direct access point to the upper level parking area from the EVA along the east side.	Fire access resolved by providing direct drive access from both levels.	Done.
DR-C19	Entry Stair to Podium Courtyard at Loop Road. The scissor stair shown is not acceptable to the Fire Department. Revise to accommodate ladder access by providing removable railings, or a straight or L-shaped stair, to meet Fire Department requirements.	Stair has been revised to make straight line access to podium on Sheet A-07 and A-08.	Done.
<b>DR-D Landscape Comments</b>			
DR-D1	Material Plans		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show locations and example photos of fencing types, including exterior fences and space defining fences on podium courtyards.</li> </ul>	Exterior Fences are shown in example photo. <b>See Landscape Sheet L3.04 for Fencing Plan including locations, details, and example photos</b>	<b>Interior podium courtyard fences not shown yet. Please provide.</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide cross-sections showing landscape for the Loop Road and the EVA at all three sides of Block Q &amp; R.</li> </ul>	Shown on Sheet L5.02	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure West Podium "Break-out Space" allows for egress. Drawing shows conflict between furnishings and door swings.</li> </ul>	Enlarged Podium Plan has been revised to eliminate conflict.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Four tree cut-outs or planters for "elbow" of Loop Road should be enlarged—5' wide would still fit the space.</li> </ul>	Four cut-outs reduced to two, now with Jacaranda trees. Planting opening can be larger - consider 5' square. <b>Tree cut-outs have been revised to be 5'x5' at parking access drive.</b>	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow planter at south corner of East Podium is too narrow for 36" box Crape Myrtles.</li> </ul>	Planter has been widened to 6' or more in Resubmittal set.	Done.
DR-D2	Planting Legend and Notes		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Platanus trees on John Muir Parkway are shown on Street Level Planting Plan, but they are existing trees, correct? Please clarify what is existing and what is proposed in the project.</li> </ul>	Resubmittal Sheet L-2.02 shows existing Brisbane Box trees.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider reducing size of tree boxes to achieve better tree growth in long-term. Proposed 36" box sizes will be challenge to site in some of the narrow planter areas proposed. At least consider varying sizes to accommodate actual planter conditions proposed.</li> </ul>	24" box and 15 gallon trees now provided. Where 36" box, planters have been enlarged to accommodate.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shrubs, grasses, or perennials are not called out at this submittal.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planting notes call for plants to be minimum 3 feet from back of curb or edge of planter—this is not followed in the planting plan.</li> </ul>	Resubmittal fixes this.	Done.
DR-D3	Planting Plans		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oak trees in south corner of project are in area with ample room for root and branch growth. Ensure that oak trees in West Podium also have ample room for root and branch growth.</li> </ul>	Planter has been widened in Resubmittal set.	Done.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oak trees along southern façade / EVA access (as space narrows towards the northeast) will be challenging to maintain long-term. Consider more upright/fastigiated trees and create “grove” effect as portrayed in existing plan.</li> </ul>	More upright Catalina Ironwood trees now mixed in with Oaks.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider replacing Red Bud trees at four planters at “elbow” of Loop Road. These trees are small and delicate—larger, taller tree would be more effective and provide shade and sense of entry.</li> </ul>	Replaced with Jacaranda trees.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crape Myrtles at 36” box size in some areas of the East Podium planters are too large for the planters. Consider 15 gallon size.</li> </ul>	Crepe Myrtles now 24" boxes.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider downsizing Myrtles in some areas or centering all trees. Remove Myrtles from narrow planters or plant 15-gallon specimens.</li> </ul>	See note above.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At maturity, olive trees at the NE end of the terrace will conflict with Bay Laurel hedge—suggest adjusting planter layout to accommodate both in proper mature growth spacing.</li> </ul>	More room provided.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planter width for Bay Laurel hedge is narrow, as little as 3’ wide. Ensure plant container sizing is appropriate for healthy growth and long-term maintenance and viability</li> </ul>	Planter now shown 4'6" wide.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees planted along EVA should be a more columnar shape. Review species with Fire Department.</li> </ul>	Catalina Ironwood and Oaks now shown.	Done.
<b>DR-D4</b>	<b>Irrigation, Lighting, Site Furnishing Plans</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Irrigation Plans are incomplete at this point, no review.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide example photos of light fixtures and poles. Light fixtures along the Loop Road street should match City standards for the waterfront area.</li> </ul>	Photos provided.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lighting should consider Dark Sky certification criteria to reduce light pollution—there are significant habitat areas adjacent to this project.</li> </ul>	Uplights have been minimized.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate L1 “Catenary Fixture – hung from cables” overhead lighting with fire access.</li> </ul>	Catenary fixtures removed from Plans.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there any building-mounted lighting on John Muir Parkway or the loop road?</li> </ul>	Yes, see note above.	Done.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site furnishings are depicted as general character images in this submittal – no comments.</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
<b>DR-E</b>	<b>Other items to be shown on Drawings</b>		

DR-E1	The scale on Drawings L5.00 and L5.01 should be shown, whether through a scale bar or noted in the title block. Sections on these drawings do not appear to be at a typical scale.	Scale revised to 1/4".	Done.
DR-E2	Show locations for utility boxes, risers, and backflow preventers visible from public right-of-way.	<b>All above ground and underground utility structures are now shown on Sheet C-300.</b>	Done.
DR-E3	Provide additional information on materials on soffit undersides at exterior vehicular and pedestrian passageways, bridges and arcades.	<b>Soffit material information has been noted on elevation sheets A-17, A-18</b>	Done.
DR-E4	Provide typical approach regarding location of building numbers on exterior elevations. Ensure they are well lit at night.	Building number details not shown yet.	Condition of approval- show signage before building permit.
PW	<b>Public Works Comments</b>		
PW-1	Provide a way for vehicles to turn around on the Loop Road (including trash pick-up). Construct the entire Loop Road and connect back to John Muir Parkway, or provide a temporary turn-around per City standards, to be removed when the next phase is built.	Proposed temporary turnaround is shown as 50'. <b>The 50 foot radius temp turnaround shown on Sheet C-200 has been verified by City PW Director.</b>	Done.
PW-2	Show an easement for Storm Drainage maintenance where provided.	Not located on drawings.	Condition of approval- show easement for maintenance before building permit.
PW-3	Confirm street abandonment for the end of Linus Pauling Drive beyond the new cul-de-sac ending.	"Area of Linus Pauling to be removed" shown on Sheet C-200.	Abandonment to be resolved before Building Permit issuance
PW-4	Show Slope Easement from Bio Rad property on a site drawing. Settle easement prior to building permit issuance.	Slope easement shown on Sheet C-200.	Done.

PW-5	Provide a gate for emergency vehicle access at the EVA on John Muir Parkway between the North Channel and the building. Also, North Channel needs a fence along the whole length to prevent access to open water.	Gate provided on Sheet L-3.02	Provide continuous 3'-6" high fencing at North Channel
PW-6	Show cross-sections, with dimensions, for the EVA on all three sides of Block Q&R.	Cross-sections with dimensions shown on Sheet C-200.	Done.
PW-7	Pipes shall be 12" minimum.		To be shown before Building Permit issuance.
PW-8	Provide replacement parking for the on-street parking lost because the two planned street connections (from Loop Road up to Linus Pauling Drive and the connecting road between Block Q and Block R) are not being built.	12 lost between Q and R, 14 lost between P and R. 12 will be provided in garage in Q and R. 7 and 7 will be made up on Blocks O and P respectively.	

14

#### Comments from Rodeo-Hercules Fire District Memorandum dated January 10, 2018

#### Access Issues

FD-1	Fire Department access roads shall be provided to within 150 feet path-of-travel distance of all portions of first floor exterior walls of all structures and hazardous materials use or storage areas. Access roads shall be designed to current Fire Department standards: 20 feet wide minimum for structures two-stories or less in height, and 26 feet wide minimum (with Aerial Apparatus Access compliance) for structures more than 30 feet in height. Turning radius 25 feet inside and 45 feet outside. Dead-end private access roads more than 150 feet in length shall have an apparatus turn-around per current Fire Department standards. CFC 503.	Provided. See Fire Access Plan on Sheet C-500.	Done.
------	--	--	-------

#### Apparatus Access Issues



FD-1a	Is an EVA the best fire access for the W side (aerial) of the building?	West side access revised to be street connection with vehicle access to upper driveway to parking.	Done.
FD-1b	Is there a functional connection to Linus Pauling? C-200 has bollards. Removable?	Operable gates shown on Lighting and Fencing Plan on Sheet L-3.02	Done.
FD-1c	Is the drive-over curb between Loop Road & the EVA navigable by fire apparatus without damage to equipment?	Curb removed from plans.	Now a driveway.
FD-1d	L-102, Planters, seat walls, trees and Bocce ball courts placed in the EVA impede aerial apparatus access to future Lot P (no aerial access for Lot P under this proposal).	Planters, seat walls and ball courts removed from Plans. Trees similar to Street Trees remain. <b>Final design to be reviewed with Fire prior to building permit submittal</b>	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-1e	L-302, Catenary lights and cables over EVA impede use of aerial ladder truck.	Catenary lights removed from Plans.	Done.
<b>Personnel Access Issues</b>			
FD-1f	Floor 2, East Podium. Apartment rescue windows open into the Podium and require a ground ladder to reach. The podium is accessed by stairs. The stairs shown on A-08 are "scissor switch" with a 180 degree turn which prohibits carrying a ladder to the 2nd level. "Straight run" stairs were discussed in the first pre-meeting.	Stairs replaced with "straight run" stairs as shown on Sheet A-07 and A-08.	Done.
FD-1g	The "vine trellis" on L1.02 and the "shade canopies" on L1.03, do either interfere with placing and raising a ladder to rescue windows?	Fire Dept to review new Podium Enlargement Plans on Sheet L-6.01 and L-6.02. <b>Fire Dept to review and verify at time of building permit submittal</b>	Discuss.
FD-1h	Catenary lights and cables shown on L3.03 over the East Podium will interfere with placing and raising a ground ladder to rescue windows.	Catenary lights removed from podiums - confirm.	Done.

FD-1i	Gold Rush 2 on A-16 and Victorian Style on A-17 shows a balcony creating a covered walkway. Can a ground ladder reach a rescue window on Floor 2, 3 or 4 with this projection that appears to prevent the ladder from touching the windowsill?	Fire Dept to review and verify Bldg Permit submittal at time of building permit submittal
FD-1x	Overall, should the developer upgrade to Type 1 construction in order to eliminate the rescue window requirement in order to accommodate all manner of architectural and amenity features that prevent the fire department from achieving basic access to a residential apartment building?	N/A N/A
<b>Other Fire Dept Issues</b>		
FD-2	A Fire Flow Analysis including proposed building areas, type of construction, and calculated available fire flow at the proposed fire hydrants shall be provided to the Fire Department for review and approval concurrent with submittal of Grading plans. Minimum adjusted (50% sprinkler credit) Fire Flow for this commercial project is estimated at 4,000 gallons per minute with 20 residual psi in the water main. Applicant shall contact East Bay Municipal Utilities District to have a flow test performed for the nearest existing hydrant to be used for the hydraulic design prior to submitting the Fire Flow Analysis. <b>The project does not incorporate "fire walls" without openings (has corridor throughout, 4-hr wall cannot have any openings) therefore the calculation floor area is uncontained and this creates the large fire flow. CFC 507.</b>	EBMUD provided calculations Done. on 1/29/18 demonstrating a residual pressure of 102 psi will be provided at a flow rate of 4,000 gpm. Therefore the need for fire walls is not required.
FD-3	Hydrant spacing for this commercial project shall comply with current Fire District standards of CA Fire Code Chapter 9 and Appendix C and three (3) copies of the final site plan shall be submitted for approval of hydrant locations. Location of Fire Department Connections (FDCs) for the required automatic fire sprinkler system and standpipe system are a deferred item but shall be on the street side of the development. <b>FDC's for the large mixed use building sprinkler and standpipe shall be inter-connected and located on the EVA fire lane and another on John Muir Parkway. CFC Appendix C.</b>	Applicant to provide answer. Bldg Permit submittal All proposed fire hydrants and FDC's are shown on Sheet C-300. Their final location will be reviewed and approved by RHFD prior to issuance of building permits.

FD-4	The Rodeo-Hercules Fire Protection District has adopted a local ordinance which requires automatic fire sprinkler systems in certain type/size of new construction. All structures shall be protected with automatic fire sprinkler systems in accordance with CA Fire Code Chapter 9 as adopted by the Fire District. CFC 903.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-5	Project is required to provide a Class 1 standpipe system throughout. System shall be in-service prior to any construction occurring at or beyond 40'. CFC 905 & 3313.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-6	Private Underground Fire Mains (aka on-site mains behind the detector check) require a separate Fire Department permit. Public or private fire mains may not run under buildings. <b>There is only one fire service water connection on C-300 for a 305,000 ft/2 project. CFC 507.</b>	<b>So noted. Final location of fire mains will be reviewed and approved by RHFD prior to building permit issuance.</b>	Bldg Permit submittal

FD-7	<p>The Fire District response to the Development Review Application is: The project is served by Fire Station 76 (Refugio Valley Road). Currently, units are dispatched from Fire Station 76 (1680 Refugio Valley Road, Hercules), Fire Station 75 (326 Third Street, Rodeo) and automatic aid from the Pinole Fire Department Fire Station 73 (880 Tennent, Pinole), the Contra Costa Fire Protection District Station 69 (4640 Appian Way) and the all-volunteer Crockett - Carquinez Fire Department (736 Loring Avenue, Crockett). Budgetary constraints have subjected Fire Station 74 (Pinole Valley Road, Pinole) to a closure 100% of the time (brown- out); significantly affecting response time and weight of fire attack. The arrival of the 1st alarm assignment that permits interior firefighting is delayed due to these conditions and the Fire District does not satisfy the Hercules General Plan Safety Element (VI.II.D.1) Fire Service Response Time Standard (5 min response 90% of the time). This property is underserved related to fire protection capability. The present Fire Service Development Impact Fee will not (by itself) overcome the cumulative impact of this project. This project and proposed adjacent developments will further erode emergency response times and fire protection delivery. The Fire District is evaluating long term mitigations to overcome this issue however the District will be requesting this developer to mitigate the impact of this development as an offset to the demand this development is creating.</p>	<p><b>A new EVA connection to between the subject site and Linus Pauling has been shown on Sheet C-200 to improve emergency response time.</b></p>
FD-8	<p>Below-grade Garage access limited to the vehicle ramp at the SW area and one stair enclosure at the NE corner stair enclosure. Minimally, a second means of egress is needed for the public. <b>Does the Fire District want to implement the Creekside garage solution? NE stair enclosure enlarged to 60" with 48" door assemblies along the fire access route? Also, the Garage mechanical exhaust system shall be equipped with fan switches at the Fire Alarm Control Panel and all stair enclosure openings to the Garage; all as a means to provide a form of smoke control to provide a more tenable environment during firefighting.</b></p>	<p><b>Garage will now have two separate entrances for both vehicular and man apparatus.</b> Done.</p>

<b>FD-9</b>	An exit analysis shall be submitted with the Building permit set. Areas of Refuge or Areas of Assisted Rescue shall be identified and provided with a two-way communication system per CFC 1009. Preliminarily, the Residential Lounge door swing needs to be reversed to swing in the direction of exit travel. CFC 1003.	<b>So noted.</b>	Bldg Permit submittal
<b>FD-10</b>	The height of the building exceeds the maximum reach of the RHFD ladder truck. As mitigation for delays in establishing rescue and fire attack aloft, the District will be evaluating built-in fire protection enhancements.	<b>So noted.</b>	
<b>FD-11</b>	As mitigation for delays in response time, traffic signal pre-emption (Opticom or compatible) shall be provided on traffic signals lacking same. Locations within the response route to be identified by the District.	<b>So noted.</b>	
<b>FD-12</b>	Review of the Environmental Site Assessment, re-use of the site and implementation of the construction program shall be approved by Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), Contra Costa Hazardous Materials Programs, 4585 Pacheco Blvd. Suite 100, Martinez, CA 94553, ccchazmat@hsd.cccounty.us (925-335-3200).	<b>N/A.</b>	
<b>FD-13</b>	Site address signage per current Fire Department Standards shall be established and maintained during and after any combustible construction or intensification of site use. A complex directory shall be provided at the main entrances. CFC 505.	<b>So noted.</b>	Bldg Permit submittal
<b>FD-14</b>	Elevators shall accommodate a medical stretcher. The fire resistive smoke assembly used for the elevator must be operable from the elevator cab (by first responders). CBC 607.	<b>So noted.</b>	Bldg Permit submittal
<b>FD-15</b>	Required Fire Department access roads shall be signed "No Parking-Fire Lane" per current Fire Department standards and the CA Vehicle Code. CFC 503.	<b>So noted.</b>	Bldg Permit submittal
<b>FD-16</b>	Traffic calming measures or controls (speed bumps, humps, undulations, gates, etc.) are not approved as a part of this review and require specific approval from the Fire Department. CFC 503.4.	<b>Agreed.</b>	

FD-17	Structures and lockable gates limiting vehicle access to commercial facilities shall be equipped with a Fire Department approved locking device or Fire Department approved key system ("Knox" lock or "Knox" keyed lock). Access controls on fire department response routes shall be equipped with pre-emption and Knox-key override (gates, barriers, retracting bollards, etc.) CFC 506.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-18	A bi-directional public safety emergency responder radio system, designed and installed per current Fire Department standards, is required in all new structures. System can be building specific or a campus-wide system can be provided. CFC 510.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-19	Rooftop Solar Photovoltaic Systems shall comply with the CA Fire Code and CA State Fire Marshal Guideline. CFC 605.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-20	Required Fire Department permits that are eligible for deferred submittal: <b>Construction;</b> Underground Fire Main, Automatic Fire Sprinkler System, Fire Standpipe System, Fire Alarm System, Sprinkler Alarm Supervisor Service (water-flow monitoring), Fixed Extinguishing System (if cooking facilities), High Pile Combustible Storage (if >8' in retail or 12' in storage), Fire pump, Generator Fuel Storage (if proposed). <b>Operation;</b> Apartment Building, Bi-Directional Repeater System. CFC 105.	So noted.	
FD-21	The developer shall remit the Development Impact Fee with the Building Permit submittal.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-22	The developer shall remit the Rodeo-Hercules Fire District Review Fee 2.1 in the amount of \$729.00 for the planning review.	So noted.	
FD-23	the developer shall submit a "Fire Safety During Construction" plan to the Fire District at the time of Building Permit submittal. CFC 3308.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal
FD-24	Emergency Evacuation Guide and signage (entrances, stairwells, elevator lobbies) and Stairwell identification signage shall be provided and submitted to the RHFD for review to ensure all required information is provided in the plan and on the floor plans. CFC 403 & 1023.	So noted.	Bldg Permit submittal

FD-25	Storage or use of any hazardous materials at the site (such as diesel fuel for the on-site generator or acid for batteries) will require a Hazardous Materials Business Plan be submitted to the CUPA. CFC 5001.	So noted.
FD-26	Access roads and water supplies for fire protection shall be installed and made serviceable prior to storage or construction of any combustible materials. CFC 3312.	So noted.