



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH

City Hall Design Committee

Minutes of the City Hall Design Committee meeting held in the City Council Chambers, City of Newport Beach, on Monday, October 27, 2008, 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Members present:

Larry Tucker, Chairman
Andy Bowden, Landscape Architect
Rush Hill, Architect
Walt Richardson, Architect
Stephen Sandland, Architect
Linda Taylor, Architect

Staff present:

Dave Kiff, Assistant City Manager
Steve Badum, Public Works Director
Shirley Oborny, Administrative Assistant

Members of the Public:

Barry Allen	Patricia Koffman
Anne Balderston	Michele OBrien
Wendy Brooks	Mary Stapleton
Marcia Dossey	Jan Vandersloot
Terri Geml	Jim Warren
Ron Hendrickson	Sandra Warren
Rob Jones	

2. Approval of Past Meeting's Minutes

The minutes of the September 29, 2008, meeting was approved.

3. Public Comments on Non Agenda Items

No comments were offered.

4. City Hall and Park Master Plan Project

Chairman Tucker said the focus on this meeting is to come up with the committee's rankings of the five designs and review the draft report to City Council.

Mr. Sandland ranked his top three firms as follows and provided detailed written comments showing each plan's strengths and weaknesses (Mr. Sandland's written comments are attached):

1. Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
2. LPA
3. Gonzalez Goodale

Mr. Richardson's top three firms:

1. Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
2. LPA
3. Gonzalez Goodale and Johnson Fain (tied)

He said Bohlin Cywinski Jackson was the most dramatic, exciting piece of architecture. It's a "must-see." It nicely follows the site, has an excellent light, air, energy sustainability concept, and has a great Council Chambers icon structure which could be combined with the community room. He liked the parking solution against MacArthur. He thinks the problem with the individual buildings can be easily solved under the canopy.

He liked the simplicity of LPA and the fact that the very functional parking structure is separated from city hall and pushed against MacArthur, has simple building shapes, economy of construction, simple auto and pedestrian circulation scheme, keeps the MacArthur Boulevard berm, has good natural light and ventilation, nice pedestrian entrance from Avocado, simple navigation to city hall functions, direct access from parking to offices, good one-stop shop, Council Chambers and multipurpose building are well designed and well located. Good energy solutions with pleasant architecture.

He had a tie score between Gonzalez Goodale and Johnson Fain. They both had nice assets but have some serious parking issues with the parking structure underneath the buildings.

He thought Rosetti was far too complicated. He also submitted a copy of his notes (attached).

Mr. Hill's rankings were:

1. Johnson Fain
2. LPA
3. Gonzalez Goodale

He said his comments about LPA and Gonzalez Goodale were generally the same as Mr. Sandland's comments. His selection for number one, Johnson Fain, is clearly in opposition. He feels the RFQ was written recognizing that any plan would be substantially changed so a significant emphasis is necessary on who would be easiest to work with. He thinks the desired design should be unique but kind to the real estate located above MacArthur. He said Johnson Fain's design was truly a building in the park and the landscape architecture with Olen involvement clearly won the award for the most exciting park. The concept of vehicular and pedestrian circulation and separation had some issues but was very clean. Their solution brought the park down to the library better than the other designs. The connection to the library was better and exciting. Any plan that hides the parking has his support and the non-reflective roof comes closest to the promise the City made to the residents above the site to keep their significant ocean views. He realizes there are many problems with this design as well as the others but he feels this firm would be easiest to work with.

Ms. Taylor ranked her firms as follows and also provided her statements in hard copy (attached):

1. Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
2. Johnson Fain

3. LPA

She said she spent a lot of time at the site trying to envision what each scheme would look like and what it would take to put them there. She used the judging criteria to help her come up with her rankings. Functionality was the area the committee awarded the most points to but the functionality of building, park and integration of the three were separate functionality rankings. For building functionality she rated LPA and Bohlin Cywinski Jackson high. For park functionality she rated Bohlin Cywinski Jackson high but the Johnson Fain was the best natural park design.

For integration functionality Ms. Taylor agreed with Mr. Hill that Johnson Fain brought the park all the way down to the city hall and engaged the library, provided ocean views and a wonderful terrace. The design makes the most of the progression from a structured man-made environment at the library and becomes more natural as you move up the hill into the park. The Bohlin Cywinsky Jackson and Gonzalez Goodale designs had points where they integrated the city hall and library. The LPA and Rosetti schemes had some serious barriers - a parking structure and a service road.

For creativeness and timeliness she gave the edge to Bohlin Cywinski Jackson. The design is compelling in its richness of form layered upon underlying structural simplicity. It has the requisite open air feeling; the rhythmic ocean roof is a graceful metaphorical expression of Newport Beach. It uses simple and appropriate palette of materials. It has the most potential for an exciting iconic presence without overwhelming the site.

Mr. Bowden said that, as the Committee's landscape architect, he put more emphasis on the park designs. It was a city hall in the park and the park design was equally as important as the design of the city hall. He ranked them separately (below) but his total rankings were as follows:

1. Gonzalez Goodale
2. LPA
3. Johnson Fain

His park rankings were:

1. Rosetti
2. Johnson Fain
3. Gonzalez Goodale

The Gonzalez Goodale amphitheater and wetlands were too large but there were other aspects Bowden did like. For Johnson Fain he felt there were too many walkways that connect from Avocado into the park. He felt Rosetti's presentation of their landscape was very good.

For the building, his rankings were:

1. Gonzalez Goodale
2. LPA
3. Johnson Fain

Mr. Bowden felt there were still questions about Johnson Fain's architecture and parking area down below. He likes LPA's building but feels it should be pushed back a little from Avocado. He thought Gonzalez Goodale's design had a great civic plaza as a welcoming

feature but there are issues with their turn-in to the parking lot. He liked how Rosetti provided above-grade parking for the park and thinks Gonzalez Goodale's plan could incorporate on grade parking as well.

Chairman Tucker reviewed the committee's rankings and asked Mr. Hill and Mr. Bowden for their reasons for not including Bohlin Cywinski Jackson in their top three. Mr. Hill's reasons were:

- transition from park to building;
- parking structure with cars on top had potential for glare;
- glow/glare of building with respect to residents above;
- flexibility of space was the poorest;
- glass will cause heat gain and glare for staff's computers;
- heating and ventilation issue;
- no flexibility in one-stop shop;
- didn't like aesthetics of parking garage;
- more expensive to construct;
- east glass would create glow objectionable to properties above MacArthur.

He thought the glow of the site from Avocado would be fabulous and exciting but it would be a major objection from MacArthur. He liked the parking access for the library and the good connection to the library.

Mr. Bowden's reasons:

- six different pod entrances from Avocado;
- not sure how practical the design is although he agrees it's the most exciting;
- tot lot shouldn't be near MacArthur;
- walkway from MacArthur to tot lot appears flat but it's really a steep slope;
- large wetlands area takes up too much park land.

Chairman Tucker asked the committee to rank the firms using five points for the first choice, four points for the second, three points for the third, two points for the fourth and one point for the fifth choice. The point tally was as follows:

	BCJ	LPA	Gonzales-Goodale	Johnson-Fain	Rosetti	
Bowden	1	4	5	3	2	
Hill	2	3	4	5	1	
Richardson	5	4	3	2	1	
Sandland	5	4	3	2	1	
Taylor	5	3	2	4	1	
	18	18	17	16	6	75

Due to the tie for first place, Chairman Tucker invited the public to make comments to see if that would change the vote.

Public Comments

Ms. Stapleton said she likes Johnson Fain because the land was donated to the City to be a park. She likes the way the park extends over the roof of the building. Thermally she thinks it's good to have the building underneath the land for expenses. She's concerned

about glass and glare from the other designs and she feels Johnson Fain has addressed that.

Mr. Allen said he felt the Committee didn't seem as though they wanted to rank the plans. He felt they wanted to talk about the pros and cons and recommend something to the City Council that might include a little from each plan, which he felt might be the best idea.

Mr. Hendrickson felt the two key elements are aesthetics and affordability. He thinks the Bohlin Cywinski Jackson has a lot going for it but the floor plan is weak. The two top themes with separate parking structures will help with the affordability of the project. When DMJM and a cost consultant previously analyzed a city hall and parking structure underneath it on the OCTA site, it was determined the parking structure would cost \$10 million more than a separate above grade parking structure. He also thinks the amphitheater in the Bohlin Cywinski Jackson plan could be converted into parking for the park.

Mr. Vandersloot feels the Johnson Fain plan most reflects the voter's intentions for a city hall in the park. He likes the integration of the park, the civic center and the library. He thinks the Bohlin Cywinski Jackson could have some potential with its light impact on the park. He thinks their park plan could be modified to not alter the natural area of the park as much. The light and glare could be addressed by using special glass or tilting it. The glow at nighttime might be an attractive iconic element to the City. He doesn't like the LPA plan because the building is massive and takes up too much space and their park plan is the weakest. His two choices are Johnson Fain or Bohlin Cywinski Jackson.

Mr. Warren lives at 1201 Surfline Way in CdM. He thinks his lot might be the most impacted lot in regards to view as well as the Broadmoore addition he lives in. Anything two feet above the hill affects their view. The housing tracts were terraced to allow the most views and scenery. "During the election the opposing side promised no views would be blocked or interfered with," he said. It seems like that was forgotten because now the site line is above the dirt hill. From where the election originally started the process has moved into a big problem, wanting to put up waves and a sail. Rosetti was the only firm who came and talked to the residents about how they felt. "We used to fear The Irvine Company but now we fear the City," Warren said. The residents have to view the roof tops as opposed to the view from the ground. "We paid a lot of money for our views and we don't want our property values to go down because the views have changed to waves or silos."

Ms. Balderston said she's concerned about the protection of the natural park. She hopes the committee would show more consideration for the history of the situation. It was voted on and passed three times to keep the land protected as open space. She's concerned about the protection of the view plane and opposed to anything that would stick up into the site line, as iconic or exciting as it may be.

Rankings

Mr. Sandland suggested that points can be deceiving. He said of the five committee members, three ranked one design superior. Mr. Hill said by separating the park concept from the building, he ranks Johnson Fain first on the park and Gonzalez Goodale first on the building. He thinks the concepts of those two combined give the best solution. Mr. Richardson thinks the first place vote should carry more weight than the second place vote

even if the overall points are close. Chairman Tucker said if the consensus is not agreed upon the majority will pick which one is first. The committee continued to discuss the plans.

Chairman Tucker asked the committee to rank the two firms tied for first place again. Committee members in favor of ranking Bohlin Cywinski Jackson for first place were:

- Ms. Taylor
- Mr. Richardson
- Mr. Sandland

The final ranking for the recommendation to City Council is:

1. Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
2. LPA
3. Gonzalez Goodale
4. Johnson Fain
5. Rosetti

Mr. Hill said he would like the record to show he is in total disagreement of the rankings.

Chairman Tucker asked the committee members to state their rationale for why they chose Bohlin Czwinski Jackson and what improvements are needed.

Refer to Ms. Taylor's detailed report (attached) for her comments. Regarding what she'd change, she would recommend the firm talk with Mr. Badum and staff at the City about how the customers enter and move around the structure. She believes the floor plan is flexible.

Mr. Richardson said some of his issues that would need to be changed are:

- redesign of entry plaza to eliminate pedestrian conflicts;
- increase the amount of surface parking;
- reduce size of amphitheater;
- improve pedestrian circulation from city hall to park;
- lobby entry areas for offices should be on parking garage side;
- floor plan needs to be redesigned;
- light and glare can be mitigated easily with louver systems and tinted glass;
- needs parking on north park parcel;
- too much water element;
- community room needs larger outdoor function area or be combined with Council Chambers;
- AV needs to be considered for Council Chambers.

Mr. Sandland said this firm committed to work closely with staff on the final project and scope and quality. That's one of the reasons he selected them (see his attached notes). His suggested improvements are:

- building and grading needs to be looked at to maintain view for residents above;
- reorienting axis of the project so the clerestory windows are not as prominent from residences above MacArthur Blvd.;
- staff lounge and eating area should be maximized for library/city hall patrons.

Mr. Hill's suggested improvements are:

- functionality of broken up floor plan;
- significant conflict of vehicular/pedestrian access from park to city hall and library;
- glare from east wall clear story;
- parking garage is not a green roof structure and glare from vehicles need to be mitigated;
- thinks this firm would be the most difficult to work with in terms of changes to the plan.

Mr. Bowden's suggested improvements:

- improve the connection from civic plaza to library;
- connectivity from city hall and park needs work;
- major problem with walkway coming from city hall to parking crossing over entry street;
- has least amount of green roof area and doesn't think wavy roof is energy efficient;
- needs explanation of library's parking connection to city hall parking;
- Council Chambers needs ability to be expanded.

Chairman Tucker said Mr. Kiff would provide a draft report to the committee members for their review and comments. His goal was to finalize the report at the November 10th meeting. Any changes made at this meeting would be verbally given to the City Council at their November 12th meeting.

5. Confirming or Amending the Committee's Calendar

The next meeting was scheduled for November 10th. The City Council will meet on November 12th, where the Committee will present the draft final report. At that same meeting, the Council will discuss the Committee's draft final report, the design plans and take public comment. The Council will likely make their decision at the Council's meeting of November 25th. The City Council asked the City Hall Design committee to attend the November 12th meeting and maybe the November 25th meeting if necessary.

6. Adjourned to next meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

#