



GROUP 4

ARCHITECTURE
RESEARCH +
PLANNING, INC

211 LINDEN AVENUE

SO. SAN FRANCISCO

CA 94080 USA

T: 650-871-0709

F: 650-871-7911

www.g4arch.com

JONATHAN HARTMAN
ARCHITECT

DAWN E. MERKES
ARCHITECT

DAVID SCHNEE
ARCHITECT

ANDREA GIFFORD
ARCHITECT

CAROLYN CARLBERG
ARCHITECT

GARY CHING
ARCHITECT

JILL EYRES
ARCHITECT

BENJAMIN IRINAGA
ARCHITECT

DANIEL LAROSSA
ARCHITECT

WILLIAM LIM
ARCHITECT

TERESA ROM
ARCHITECT

MEETING ON

29 May 2019

6:00-8:00 Pm

Room 4 - Barrett Community Center

PROJECT

BELMONT COMMUNITY CENTER

Community Advisory Committee Meeting 02

ATTENDEES

Name	Initials	Attended	Company or Organization
Warren Lieberman	WL	X	Vice Mayor
Julia Mates	JM	X	Councilmember
Chuck Cotten	CC		Parks & Rec Commissioner
Nicki Fox	NF	X	Parks & Rec Commissioner
Nathan Majeski	NM		Planning Commissioner
Amy Goldfarb	AG		Planning Commissioner
John Violet	JV	X	City Treasurer
Tina Hughes	TH	X	BRSSD school district representative
Kathleen Beasley	KB	X	Belmont Library representative
Alan Sarver	AS		Sequoia Union HSD Trustee
Greg Snow	GS		Youth Sports Representative
Maggie Pavao	MP	X	Youth Representative
Chelsea Chang	CC	X	Youth Representative
Rich Bortoli	RB	X	Member at Large, Senior representative
Judy King	JK	X	Member at Large, Senior representative
Adar Emken	AE	X	Member at Large
David Braunstein	DB		Member at Large
Becket Feierbach	BF		Member at Large
Harmandeep Madra	HM	X	Member at Large
Sergey Sergeev	SS	X	Member at Large
Lillian Svec	LS	X	Member at Large
Laura Reed	LR		Member at Large
Rev. Michael Barham	MB		Vicar, Good Shepherd Church
Mary Morrissey Parden	MMP	X	Vice-precedent, Belmont Chamber of Commerce
Karen Haas-Foletta	KHF	X	Executive Director, Footsteps Child Care
Karl Mittelstadt	KM	X	Parks & Rec Commissioner
Marco Esposito	ME	X	Principle, SWA
Brigitte Shearer	BSS	X	Director, Parks & Recreation Department
Dawn Merkes	DM	X	Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning
Andrea Gifford	AG	X	Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning
Kaifeng Zhang	KZ	X	Group 4 Architecture, Research + Planning

MINUTES

MINUTES

1. Project Schedule

DM Presented the updated schedule for the project, explained that the programs and site options phase will be extended through the summer (from June to August). This will allow for more extensive community outreach for this task.



Group 4 will return with recommendations for building and site program, as well as site concept design in November.

2. Task 1 – Assessments Summary

a. Needs Assessment

- i. KZ presented the outreach survey results that include all respondents and survey results that include only residents' responses. KZ pointed out that water play and aquatics are ranking #1 for both indoor and outdoor spaces. Gymnasium and health & fitness spaces are popular options as well. Ice skating rink fell from #4 to #5 on the ranking for indoor spaces if non-residents' responses are filtered out.

b. Comparable Community/Recreation Facilities

- i. AG presented the table for comparable community facilities, explained that based on Belmont's 2040 population, the appropriate size for community center ranges from 22,600 square feet to 45,100 square feet.

3. Task 2 – Program Options and Site Strategies

a. Draft Program Options and Analysis

- i. AG explained that the program included in the base option has been developed based on Round 1 Community Outreach results for both indoor and outdoor spaces. The total building square footage for the base option is 25,000 sf and requires 95 parking spaces.
- ii. AG presented the program options, pointed out that the program options are based on outreach results. All options include various enhancements to the base program, including a community room, a high school regulation gymnasium, an outdoor pool and an ice-skating rink.
- iii. AG explained that Option C – the base program plus a community room plus an ice-skating rink will leave the site with very little open space. Another option is to look at seasonal rink on the courts and fields.

The following input was received from the participants:

- iv. SS: What are the sizes for each program? How are the sizes determined?
 1. G4: Program sizes are developed based on standards as well as square footage at the existing community center and its current and proposed uses. Best practices for community centers are taken into consideration as well.
- v. LS: Will pre-school classrooms be dedicated to pre-school uses?
 1. G4: Based on researches on childcare, Belmont's childcare is in deficit, thus it is important to continue to provide pre-school childcare at this site. The rooms will be flexible, so that the rooms could accommodate future changes in programming.



- vi. AS: Acoustically, how do operable partitions work in flexible classrooms?
 - 1. G4: They will be built-in floor to ceiling partitions that have similar STC ratings as standard office partitions. They do have limitations in accommodating multiple events simultaneously.
- vii. RB: What are the staffing requirements for the programs?
 - 1. G4: After confirming the building program and building size, we will have a better idea of staffing requirements. Generally, operational cost will exceed construction cost in the long run. For the pool options, we are suggesting a seasonal outdoor pool, which requires seasonal staffing which is more possible for cost recovery. Cost recovery for a year-round pool is less likely, unless it's a indoor destination pool that is a regional draw for users.
- viii. SS: It looks like all of the parking are surface parking, why aren't we considering other parking methods such as underground parking?
 - 1. G4: underground parking is costly. Roughly, surface parking costs about \$10k-15k/space, structured/deck parking costs about \$100k-150k/space, underground parking costs about \$250k-300k/space. Unless the site is spatially constrained, we suggest surface parking.
- ix. WL: What does open space mean on the spreadsheet?
 - 1. G4: open space means unprogrammed outdoor space. This is a number to help us determine how the programs fit on the site. Open space also includes building setback on the site.
- x. HM: Can the pool stack on top of the gym?
 - 1. G4: it can be done but might be costly. There is opportunity to have a sunken gym where half of the 2-story volume is underground and users enter at the mezzanine level.
- xi. CAC member: As mentioned, 3 classrooms can be combined into a larger room. How is that different from a community room?
 - 1. G4: 1. Rentability – a community room can be rented out for private events. For example, the community room at Mitchell Park's community center is booked 2 years out. 2. The volume of the space will feel different. A community room is normally one and a half to two stories tall; classrooms are one-story tall. Additionally, there is a community room at Twin Pines Senior Center, which is approximately 4500 square feet.
- xii. LS: Will the gymnasium be flexible and multi-use?
 - 1. G4: Yes, the gymnasium will be flexible and multi-use. It will accommodate bleacher seating and opportunities to set up a stage for different programs.



2. RB: A gymnasium will attract a lot of people to rent for events, having bleacher seating will be important.
- xiii. JK: is the size of the pool large enough for it to be a regional draw?
 1. G4: it is planned to be a small 6-lane recreational pool, which will draw users locally. It is planned to be half the size as the high school's pool, similar to Highland's pool.
- xiv. MMP: My priority is having a multi-use gym. We (Belmont Chamber of Commerce) have been getting phone calls asking about a large venue to host events. It is one of the more common requests. The community room at twin pine is often too small for those events.
- xv. **Discussions about having an Ice-Skating Rink on the site**
 1. G4: median number of residents per ice rink is around 57,000. The site is far away from highway exits, will not be an ideal location for an ice rink.
 2. AS: Revenue projection will be similar to a pool. One question to consider is that do we want this site to be an attraction/destination for the region?
 3. JK: Do not want the new community center to be for the peninsula but only for Belmont. Do not want the parking and traffic impact that an ice rink might bring.
 4. WL: having an ice rink at the site is intentionally drawing visitors regionally.
 5. KL: For reference, the library draws visitors from Belmont, San Mateo, San Carlos, mostly within 10-15 miles.
 6. Community Member: what is an ice rink in everybody's mind? Advocates are talking about a competition size? How does it fit with other programs?
 7. SS: Look at Palo Alto Ice Rink. It is smaller in size. Consider the rink to be similar size as the recreational pool?
 8. Palo Alto Winter Lodge is a good example. However, it is not city-run.
 9. The old ice rink in Belmont was privately owned and it was closer to highways.
 10. LS: we need to keep in mind that the Ice rink is ranking #5 on the indoor spaces in the community survey, lower than some other programs.
 11. WL: We shouldn't rule out the ice rink option. There is a possibility for a someone to fund the ice rink, since the ice-skating group have been actively looking for funding.
 12. JV: Hypothetically if someone funds the ice rink, we need to consider if we can bear the ongoing maintenance and operation cost of the facility



13. Per SS's suggestion, a smaller recreational ice-skating rink was added to the options for supplemental enhancement spaces, along with a large competition size rink.

b. Site Evaluation Criteria and Analysis

- i. AG explained the evaluation criteria table.
 1. If the building is to be located on the north, the facility will have poor visibility, synergy and connectivity. Constructing the new building in the same area as the existing building will lead to the need for temporary facility for programs. Having the building on the north also has negative impact on the neighbors on Belburn Dr.
 2. If the building is located on the south side of the site, it offers better visibility and access, as well as better connection to the commercial area at Ralston/Alameda de las Pulgas.

The following input was received from the participants:

- ii. SS: Can we separate the building? Have one on Ralston and one on Belburn Dr?
 1. G4: by doing that, the facility will lose its operation efficiency. For example, you will need two lobbies; Construction cost will increase since the facility will be less efficient in its footprint.
- iii. AM: will the field lights impact neighbors?
 1. We are not planning to have lights on the field
- iv. RB: Neighbors will have issue with noise
 1. G4: No matter which option, a certain part of the building will be directly adjacent to the neighboring homes. Outdoor pools will also generate noise. But we can use landscape as buffer for noise & reduce the building mass when it's adjacent to homes.
- v. JV: Concerns about the east driveway: it is more residential on the east side; the parking will impact those homes.
- vi. NF: like that there is a drop-off, dog park location can be closer to the bank
- vii. AS: Concerns about impacts on neighbors, need to evaluate the driveway options more
- viii. TH: suggests to keep parking entrance where it currently is – on the west side of the site
- ix. Karen: suggests to keep the community garden where it currently is, since it will be difficult to relocate the garden
- x. LS: Current parking entry is extremely dangerous, especially the pedestrian crosswalk. If move forward with this layout, we will need to improve the intersection on Ralston.



- xi. AS: suggest that we have a traffic evaluation professional to study and evaluate the impact
- xii. CAC member: One thing to keep in mind is that the dog parks as shown on the plans are too small, plans need to be revised to include a larger dog park.
- xiii. **The committee members were asked to voice their opinions about the site evaluation matrix. Majority of CAC members expressed that they support locating the building on the south side, close to Ralston Ave.**

c. Site Strategies

- i. DM emphasized that the site strategies are independent from the program options. The purpose for the site strategies is to see how various programs can fit on the site at a very high level.
- ii. ME presented the site strategies, both options are looking at locating the building on the south side of the site, close to Ralston Ave based on the analysis from the site evaluation matrix. The main differentiator is the location of the driveway and parking – east driveway vs. west driveway. ME explained the thinking behind the two site plans, the relationships between different programs on the site.
- iii. Parking & Driveway:
 - 1. Existing number of parking spaces is around 60, in both options, we are at least doubling the amount of parking.
 - 2. West driveway: having a curved driveway to slow down traffic, a roundabout + drop off area adjacent to the entry of the building.
 - 3. East driveway: also providing drop off area. Having the driveway entry further away from existing driveway can mitigate dangerous intersection on Ralston.

The following input was received from the participants:

- iv. Consider drop off area on Ralston Ave? Group 4 responded that it will need more area for a drop off and we want to keep the mature trees on Ralston.
- v. Keep the prevailing wind in mind for the pool location. It will be crucial for the pool to be sheltered from the wind.

4. Participation

- a. The Community advisory committee members were given colored dots to indicate their top 3 priorities for the “supplemental enhancement programs” on the boards. The options include the following:
 - i. Gymnasium
 - ii. Outdoor Pool
 - iii. Community Room
 - iv. Small Recreational Rink
 - 1. This option was added per committee member SS’s suggestion



- v. Large Competition Rink
- b. In order for ranking, the following method is used to tally the results: first priority = 3 points, second priority = 2 points, third priority = 1 points. Below are the results from the dotting exercise:
 - 1. Gymnasium: 34 points
 - 2. Outdoor Pool: 32 points
 - 3. Community Room: 31 points
 - 4. Small Recreational Rink: 9 points
 - 5. Large Competition Rink: 6 points

Attachments: Community Advisory Committee Meeting #2 Presentation

These minutes were prepared on August 7th, 2019. Discussion of this meeting has been recorded as understood by the recorder noted below. If there are any omissions or corrections, please contact this office within 5 days. Unless notified to the contrary, these notes are assumed to be accurate.

GROUP 4 ARCHITECTURE, RESEARCH + PLANNING, INC.

END