IV. PROJECTS

1. Jacobs Hall [Le Roy Avenue at Ridge]: Informational Item to review the proposed UC Berkeley College of Engineering building.

Advisory Recommendations:
- Committee was mixed. Some thought that the project was appropriate, especially on the edge of the campus and not further into the residential neighborhood. Others thought that the materials should better reflect the adjacent residential neighborhood.
- Wood panels along with the Swiss Pearl would add warmth.
- Site plan and proposed entrance location appear to be appropriate. This appears to be a nice project with a lot of views and light from the interior.
- Lantern or beacon proposed on top should be toned down.
- Sloped roof doesn't work with the geometry proposed below.
- Proposed fence on Le Roy looks too harsh and industrial. Design should be richer and friendlier.
- Proposed landscape should blend in better with existing landscape. It should be more interesting, and indigenous.
- New plant material can better break down the scale of the project from the street; consider raised planters at the Le Roy entrance.

2. 1974 University Avenue [at Milvia] (DRCP#2013-0002): Preliminary Design Review to demolish an existing one-story auto parts and service building and construct a seven-story multi-use retail and apartment building with underground parking, 5 ground level retail spaces and 112 apartment units.

Preliminary Design Review was continued with the following recommendations about massing and unit design. Goring, Allen (7-0-0-0):
Recommendations:

Massing / Height
- Massing is too similar on all sides; look at massing changes on the Southwest corner.
- Ground floor is very successful, especially the step back at the 2nd floor.
- Height appears to be appropriate, but massing should change.
- Massing should reflect that there is a wall right next to the building to the south.
- Step back on top level is successful as well.

Neighborhood Context
- Both the Shattuck and Milvia elevations are very similar, but both the streets appear to be different. Consider how each elevation could respond more directly to that street. Not convinced that both elevations should be the same.

Building Design / Materials
- Committee was mixed on design aesthetic. While many thought a modern design would be more interesting, there was some support for a traditional design approach.
- Too many ideas; simply and refine design.
- Staff will check if this corner is called out in Design Guidelines as a significant corner.
- Building should be more background and not call out as much attention.
- Concerned with the travertine – it often looks too thin.
- Staff will check with Public Works on special sidewalk issues.

Unit Layout / Courtyard Design
- Unit plans on the 7th floor are good but most below that are not. It would be OK if only the kitchen looked into the courtyard, but not the living room. Open walkways directly next to units could be unpleasant. Consider some or all units on double-loaded corridors.
- Restaurant should open into courtyard (not a majority).
- Provide more information on the quality of the courtyard and the unit opening into it, including an acoustical study.

Ex parte communications: McCulloch and Woltag had been contacted by the development team to go over more detailed information on the proposal. The development team also presented the proposal to Goring and met Blake on site to discuss nearby landmarks.

3. 2631 DURANT AVENUE [between College and Bowditch] (DRCP#2013-0005):
Preview to demolish existing 18 unit apartment building and construct a new six-story 71 unit apartment, designed as fully ADA-compliant student housing with sufficient PV solar panels to be 90% self-sufficient.

Advisory Comments:

Neighborhood Context
- Design needs to be more sensitive to neighbors, especially the adjacent house to the east.
- Committee requests that this be reviewed by LPC to determine if the proposed design affects the adjacent landmarks.
Applicant will work with Staff to better clarify which setbacks are required, especially in light of the adjacent landmarks and significant front yard setbacks to the east.

**Massing**
- Consider double-loaded corridor and better massing for neighborhood.
- Building is taller than those to each side; develop massing carefully with this in mind.
- Consider other amenities that could help with massing.

**Building Design / Materials**
- Design does not appear to be much more than a box; design should be much more generous to the neighborhood and more interesting.
- Base does not appear to be well-defined.
- Materials should be high-quality.
- Look carefully at the entry. It may work better on the corner.
- Vary window sizes in elevation design.
- Elevator should go to the roof.

**Landscape / Open Space Design**
- Interior courtyard is not wide enough to get adequate light. Would rather move more open space out toward property line for more light and more space between neighbors.
- Carefully develop the front setback to fit in better with the neighborhood. Consider taller lacier trees for interest.

**Unit Layout**
- Courtyard is too much like a light shaft. Reduce the circulation and look at better units.

**ZAB Issues**
- Project should have loading capability, even if parking is not required.
- Some access to parking would be nice.

V. BUSINESS MATTERS

**Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**
- Minutes from 8/15/2013 DRC Meeting - approved.
  
  MOTION (Olson, Williams) VOTE (6-0-0-1) absent – Allen.

VI. ADJOURN

- Meeting adjourned: 10:50 PM