

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Richmond, CA 94804**

August 26, 2020
6:00 P.M.

All Participation Via Teleconference

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, Contra Costa County and Governor Gavin Newsom had issued multiple orders requiring sheltering in place, social distancing, and reduction of person-to-person contact. Accordingly, Governor Newsom had issued executive orders that allowed cities to hold public meetings via teleconferencing. Due to the shelter in place orders, all City of Richmond staff, members of the Design Review Board (DRB), and members of the public participated via teleconference. Public comment was confined to items on the agenda and limited to the specific methods identified on the agenda.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Brian Carter
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Brian Carter, Jessica Fine, and Macy Leung

Absent: Vice Chair Michael Hannah and Boardmember Karlyn Neel

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Hector Lopez, Emily Carroll, and Enzo Cabili, and City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 12, 2020

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Fine) to approve the minutes of the August 12, 2020 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah and Neel).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Emily Carroll described the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

Public Forum

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

CORDELL HINDLER: *Good evening, Chair Livingston, Board members and staff, I have a couple of comments to go into the record. 1. I have been in conversation with Fairmede Hilltop and they were not happy that the applicant did not communicate with the group in regarding the Aspire Academy Project. There were concerns regarding the building structure and the traffic during the morning and afternoon commutes. 2. Also if you recall when the owner of USA Carpet came to talk with the Board about the expansion of El Tapatio restaurant, I should have suggested that the applicant first talk with the North and East Neighborhood Council to provide some input in regarding the style that they had in mind. And in conclusion that I must REMIND the Board that anytime when projects are being considered the applicants MUST communicate with the Neighborhood Councils to schedule a presentation once this virus gets lifted. Sincerely, Cordell.*

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Tuesday, September 8, 2020 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. PLN20-008	RAMIREZ NEW DUPLEX
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY DUPLEX ON A 5,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location	4401 JENKINS AVENUE
APN	408-011-032
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	HOME RESCUE TEAM, L LC
Applicant	MANUEL RAMIREZ
Staff Contact	ENZO CABILI
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Enzo Cabili presented the staff report dated August 26, 2020, for a design review permit to construct a 2,710 square foot two-story duplex as well as a 288 square foot storage shed in the rear of a vacant lot on Jenkins Way in Parchester Village. Each living unit offered three bedrooms and two and a half bathrooms for a total floor area of 1,355 square feet. Two previous planning applications approved for new construction had both been withdrawn. He recommended approval of the application.

In response to questions from the DRB, Mr. Cabili verified that there was some foundation on the property from previous approvals and while most would be demolished, some of the foundations would be reused; there were no topographic or civil surveys provided for the application although a page to identify the materials board had been included in the meeting packet; and there were no notes in the file as to why the two previous applications from 2005 and 2006 had never come to fruition.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Chair Livingston noted that without civil engineering plans, the grade of the property was unknown as was the type of foundation and drainage.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Other questions from the DRB related to whether permeable paving or pervious hardscape would be provided; and the intention of the symmetry for the two units, whether the materials and finishes would be the same or whether some effort would be made to individualize the units. Boardmember Carter noted the location of a spotlight on the plan and questioned its purpose, and referring to a rectangular area above the spotlight he sought more details and supported a plant wall or trellis in that area of the front porch. Given the large amount of stucco, he also asked where control joints would be placed to make the belly band lines, the sills, and the jambs of windows align with the rest of the composition.

Boardmember Leung referred to Site Plan A-02 and the concrete driveway with pavers and with a triangle in the middle, and suggested there could be a better way to treat that area and extend the pavers to the end of each side. She sought a better treatment of the entrance to each unit, commented that the interior elevation appeared to be two feet above the garage, and with respect to Sheet A-04 asked if it was possible to center the windows on the second floor to the garage and/or make the entryway arched window next to the door flat to improve the composition. She also recommended that the top of the two windows on the north and south elevations be aligned to the larger three window panes next to it.

Boardmember Butt commented that she would have liked input from the neighbors given that the proposal would be vertically larger than adjacent units. She referred to the extensive paving and recommended that some of the concrete be reduced. In terms of elevations she stated the garage doors were prominent and she noted there was nothing similar to the arched element. She also questioned the in-ground spotlight and stated the roof appeared to be complicated for a simple building. She added that a new fence would be needed on the sides of the property adjacent to the neighbors.

When asked, Hector Lopez verified that the accessory structure could be placed at the property line in conformance with Building Code as long as it was no higher than 14 feet and was fire rated.

MOHAMED ELSHAFEI, the Project Architect who previously had difficulty accessing the Zoom meeting and who was now available by telephone, verified that the distance of the main structure to the rear setback was 29 feet 11 inches while the distance from the main structure to the storage shed was 17 feet 11 inches. The setback from the rear property line to the storage shed wall was zero feet in that it was located on the property line.

Chair Livingston clarified that the storage shed would have to be moved in at least one foot to accommodate the one-foot roof overhang, and Mr. Elshafei stated that he would move the accessory building over more than one foot.

In response to questions, Mr. Elshafei stated that there was no existing survey for the building although a survey could be submitted to the Building Department and any deviation between the survey and actual conditions would be confirmed. He stated he would build over the existing foundation and he believed that the existing condition would match the survey 90 to 95 percent. He added that only the garage would have a slab on grade foundation while the rest of the house would have a raised foundation. He also reported that most of the driveway would be concrete with some open area for planting. The concrete flooring would continue to about 50 percent of the side yard and the rest would be permeable decomposed granite.

Chair Livingston asked if the front driveway could be permeable pavers and Mr. Elshafei agreed with that recommendation.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Mr. Elshafei clarified that the material for the whole house would be two-color stucco; off-white for the stucco and dark grey for the shingles, with white windows and window frames, and the fascia color would be white. The gate in the front would be redwood.

With respect to the window in the side elevation, Mr. Elshafei agreed to make it as wide as possible to get light into that portion of the unit, which included the kitchen. As to the in-ground spotlight on the plans and a recess in the south elevation, he stated that light would be accent lighting for the planting in the front. Front yard lighting and lighting for the garage would be LED solar-charged, as shown on Sheet A-4, and the outdoor lighting would be flush-mounted above the entry area.

Boardmember Carter urged some modification to the proposed lighting to avoid glare onto adjacent properties.

Mr. Elshafei clarified that the rectangular “grooves” in the wall were intended for some drought-tolerant accent planting, and the grooves might also include some rough texture. He noted that the grooves in the north and south elevations would result from overhanging the second floor by one foot. When advised of the need to accent those grooves even more with dry-stacked stone or other treatment and with strip lighting at the top to wash the wall downward, he was amenable to that recommendation. With respect to the stucco control joints to prevent cracking, he expressed a willingness to do that and identified some areas where that could occur.

Chair Livingston presented a sketch to the applicant for an alternative way to treat the groove areas.

Boardmember Butt asked about the entry, which she suggested looked tight, but questioned whether it worked with the stair next to the front door. A discussion developed on whether a light was needed at that location and Mr. Elshafei suggested the grooves could be closed.

Boardmember Leung supported the recommended pavers of permeable pavement for the entire area, and verified with Mr. Elshafei that the windows could be aligned as recommended for both the first and second floors.

Mr. Elshafei also agreed to change the arched entry door to be straight, and in response to a concern for the front stairs that appeared to run into a wall and post and whether handrails would be provided, he agreed to make the adjustments as recommended. He also agreed to a fine sand finish on the stucco and to muted tones as recommended by the DRB with the retention of the white windows.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to approve PLN20-008, Ramirez New Duplex, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 10 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 11) Move the storage shed back two feet from the rear property line; 12) Furr out the 12-inch thick entry columns in the second floor pursuant to an exhibit provided to staff by Chair Livingston; 13) Align the window headers on the south and center the windows over the garage doors; 14) Add control joints to help break up the large blank stucco walls, which should align with window headers and sills or logical locations; 15) No arched window at entry; 16) Need survey upon submittal for building permit; 17) Exterior color shall be a taupe beige, either a Benjamin Moore *Barren Plain* or Benjamin Moore *Cedar Key*; 18) Add good-neighbor fence if no wooden fence is provided; 19) All driveway and entry aprons shall be pavers

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

in lieu of board and place concrete; and 20) There shall be no uplights; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Leung, Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah and Neel).

2. PLN20-035	HILLTOP MALL SIGNS
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO REPLACE AN EXISTING OFF-PREMISE FREESTANDING SIGN FOR HILLTOP MALL AND A VARIANCE TO INCREASE THE HEIGHT FROM 65 FEET TO 85 FEET. THE PROPOSAL WOULD ALSO INCLUDE FIVE NEW 12-FOOT HIGH FREESTANDING SIGNS AT HILLTOP MALL PARKING LOT.
Location	3189 GARRITY WAY
APN	405-290-068
Zoning	CR, REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
Owner	BRE PIPER MF TIDES CA LLC
Applicant	DOUG BEISWENGER, LGB
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated August 26, 2020, for the replacement of an existing freestanding sign located at the Tides Apartments in the Hilltop District at 3189 Garrity Way. The illuminated freeway sign of approximately 65 feet was recommended to be increased to 85 feet. The project would also include five new 12-foot high freestanding signs in the parking lot of Hilltop Mall. The project required a variance from the maximum height of 10 feet. Approval was recommended since there were signs that were similar or higher than the subject sign, such as those for Pacific East Mall and Target. He noted some issues related to the need to address sign problems in Hilltop Mall given the challenging times and other issues related to the amount and intensity of light from the sign.

Mr. Lopez responded to comments and explained that the Pacific East Mall sign, an electronic sign, was taller than what had been proposed by Hilltop Mall and the sign would only be visible from the bridge. He reported that the Hilltop District Neighborhood Council had offered a letter in support of the project.

DOUGLAS BEISWENGER, LGB, stated the project had continued to evolve in terms of the make-up of what the uses of the property would be, particularly the uses of the existing mall improvements, which had initially had a greater retail component that had since been focused on office and bio-tech. The plan was to use existing improvements and add development in the parking lot that would include residential, including a hotel, which would be in addition to a fairly large retail component of 300,000 square feet. At this point, the retail was viewed as an amenity to the project in a high-density community. The freeway pylon sign along with the wayfinding signs would be used by the retailers, the hotel, and by the office users for wayfinding purposes.

Mr. Beiswenger stated with respect to the proposed freeway pylon sign that it would replace the 65 foot pylon sign which was set back from the freeway and which had become obscured by maturing landscaping, the driving force behind the need to increase the height of that sign to 85 feet. He stated the size of the sign was not overly large given the size of the Hilltop site, and the design was to provide a slender, light and airy appearance. The sign would have to be illuminated on the surface as opposed to being illuminated from below by floodlights. As a result, the ambient light would not impact the Tides Apartments. The internal lighting would not cast ambient light but would make the letters on the sign glow, cutting down on light emission,

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

and the new sign would be located where the existing sign was located and no new impacts would be created. He responded to comments and noted that the logo would be illuminated the same as the tenant signs, and the *Shops at Hilltop* sign used letters that were internally illuminated where at Hilltop they were backlit. For the benefit of the DRB, he described the meaning of the tree logo. He added that the desire was that the lights would be illuminated all night.

Chair Livingston referred to the International Sign Association (ISA) which recommended a dimmer to regulate light glare in residential neighborhoods, and he asked the applicant if he was open to installing a dimmer, which Mr. Beiswenger expressed a willingness to consider. He also referred to the LED lights in the sign of 7,000 to 9,000K of light color where the City of Richmond supported nothing more than 3,000K and asked that the application be modified to the lower range.

Mr. Beiswenger stated with respect to lowering the lights to 3,000K that he would have to verify that there was an effective output or that it did not turn the white face yellow. If the sign company advised that a yellow would not be created or that the tenant brand colors would be modified he would be amenable to a reduction. He wanted to make sure the lighting was effective, did not require more energy, or discolor the tenant brand colors.

With respect to the wayfinding signs, Mr. Beiswenger stated there had always been a lack of wayfinding signage around the property, which had caused accidents in the past. The intention was to place the five signs at the five inlet roads on the outside of the loop so that when cars pulled up to the T-intersection there would be a sign to identify the location of the destination. The wayfinding signs that had been designed were consistent with the branding of the freeway pylon sign and would provide simple effective signs that produced very low ambient light. Landscaping would be planted around the bottom of the signs.

Chair Livingston highlighted the Hilltop Mall application in 2018 when the exterior renovations had been approved for the property and which had set the stage for the clean, contemporary look of the signage, although he suggested the sign had not been reduced to the simplest component as the architecture had and was not as sophisticated as the architecture.

Mr. Beiswenger responded to questions and explained that the painted wood grain finish for the poles were to provide a finished painted look and avoid corrosion; the *Shops at Hilltop* sign could be enlarged a few inches but there was no desire to make the sign look like a "V"; and the freeway structure would not be used for antennas.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Ms. Carroll described the public's ability to speak during the meeting, and reported that a letter of opposition to the application had been received from the following:

EMILY LEIGHTON: I am a Hilltop resident and strongly oppose the variance for the Hilltop Mall sign. Increasing the height to 85' is unnecessary and an eyesore. The development of this city should reflect in its design the core values of its citizens, not commercial interests. Please do not approve the variance for this sign. Thank you, Emily Leighton

When asked if there was any other jurisdiction that had authority over the freeway sign application, Mr. Beiswenger was unaware of any other authorization required given that the sign was over 100 feet from Caltrans property.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN20-035, Hilltop Mall Signs, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 9 Conditions of Approval with a portion of Condition 5 requiring a maximum 3,000K LED to be stricken, and additional DRB conditions as follows: 10) The sign shall be wired on a separate rheostat control in order to conform to Section 15.04.609-090 A4 in the Lighting Ordinance which has to do with adjacent housing; or 11) Pursuant to International Sign Association (ISA) recommended standards the sign light shall be measured at .03 foot candles over ambient light when measured at the recommended distance per ISA standards (standards to be presented to staff by Chair Livingston); approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Leung, Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah and Neel).

A recess was taken at this time. The meeting reconvened at 8:30 P.M. with all DRB members initially shown as present.

- 3. PLN17-029 ZHAO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE**
- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 2,800 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A ±6,795 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL. |
| Location | BARTH AVENUE |
| APN | 419-192-020 |
| Zoning | RH, SINGLE-FAMILY HILLSIDE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT |
| Applicant | MIN YU ZHAO (OWNER) |
| Staff Contact | ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Chair Livingston advised that the design of the Zhao single-family residence had to be modified and the item would be continued to the meeting scheduled for September 23, 2020.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to continue PLN17-029, Zhao Single-Family Residence, to the DRB meeting on September 23, 2020; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Leung, Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah and Neel).

- 4. PLN19-264 RICHMOND COUNTRY CLUB RESIDENTIAL PROJECT**
- | | |
|---------------|--|
| Description | STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN OF 94 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES ON A 25.5-ACRE PARCEL. THE PROJECT INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, RE-ZONING, PLANNED AREA DISTRICT, AND VESTING TENTATIVE MAP. |
| Location | MARKOVICH LANE |
| APN | 405-050-006 AND 405-050-019 |
| Zoning | PR, PARKS AND RECREATION DISTRICT |
| Owner | RICHMOND COUNTRY CLUB |
| Applicant | MLC HOLDINGS |
| Staff Contact | EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS |

Ms. Carroll presented the staff report dated August 26, 2020 for the study session to provide comments to the applicant on the proposed design of 94 single-family homes on a 25.5-acre parcel with a rezoning from Parks and Recreation District to a Low Density Residential Planned Area District. The site was located off the Giant Highway adjacent to a branch of the AT&SF

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Railroad on a portion of the existing Richmond Country Club, an undeveloped area vegetated with eucalyptus trees and a practice area of the golf course. The site would be subdivided with lots ranging from 4,700 to 7,000 square feet and proposed a mix of one- and two-story homes between 1,500 and 2,300 square feet with a range of related subdivision improvements and landscaping. Three main styles of homes had been proposed in three salary ranges and four floor plan types along with a range of colors.

Staff had worked with the applicant to enhance the facades, de-emphasize the garages, and consider fencing and landscaping materials that had been proposed. The City had prepared an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the comment period was ongoing.

Ms. Carroll responded to questions and clarified the applicant would be responsible for designing the required sound walls with a six-foot sound wall along the west property line; the DRB would make recommendation to the Planning Commission on some of the required entitlements and the Planning Commission would make recommendation to the City Council on other entitlements; the project would be phased starting in October 2021, extend to 2023 and encompass site grading and construction; there would be one entrance on Markovich Lane; the property would not be gated; the project was a cul-de-sac; an emergency vehicle access (EVA) would be shown adjacent to the railway with a maintenance road adjacent to the golf course; the access had been reviewed by the fire department; there was a clear view fence abutting the golf course; and given the study session no findings or action would be taken at this meeting.

Chair Livingston noted with respect to the PA plan that the DRB would have to make required findings, one of which was that the proposed development would be demonstrably superior to the development that could occur under the established standards applicable to the underlying base district subject to a set of nine criteria. He had previously reviewed the plans and had made some landscaping suggestions.

PAUL MANYISHA, MLC Holdings, the developer, stated the 94-lot development would be situated inside the privately owned Richmond Country Club.

KEVIN CROOK, the Project Architect, identified the elevation styles and the general massing of the product with one single-story and three two-story plans with a variation of massing vertically and horizontally, three elevation styles in a combination of gable and hip roof forms, with elements of lap siding, two-tone stucco, concrete tile roofs, and three color schemes for each of the three styles, all to create as much variation as possible.

KATY GALLAGHER, vTA, the Landscape Architect, described the landscape plan for the bio-retention area, the entry pilasters, the relocated gate at the Country Club entrance, the streetscape, an inset of pavers into each driveway which would vary by plan type, and common space planting along the streetscape with buffer planting behind the homes along the golf course and along the EVA strip, along with different fencing types.

Given the long street and as recommended by Boardmember Leung, Chair Livingston asked if the area between Lots 85 and 86, and Lots 9 and 10 could be manipulated to allow a bulb turnaround to mitigate the long driveway even though it conformed with fire department regulations.

Boardmember Butt asked if there was a way to insert some tot lot, community space, neighborhood amenity or gathering space. She preferred that garages be situated in the rear to be able to provide front porches.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Mr. Manyisha stated that he would look into the recommendations for a bulb turnaround and a neighborhood amenity or gathering space. With respect to rear garages, he clarified that the lot backing the EVA held an active railroad track.

Boardmember Carter suggested there was a rolling topography to the site and asked if it would be graded, to which Ms. Gallagher stated it would not be graded flat any more than would be needed for the housing. He asked if there were opportunities for pedestrian connections to rights-of-way or outside the community.

Mr. Manyisha explained with respect to the maintenance road that it would maintain the slope between the community and the golf course and the landscaping. The community would have a homeowner's association. He added that they were seeing what they could do to connect the community to Giant Road and Markovich Lane.

Chair Livingston opened public comment at this time.

AMY DONDE, Richmond, stated her main concern was the one road going in and out. She was shocked the fire department would agree to that and asked how people would be able to evacuate in an emergency. Given the density, she asked if there would be street parking and commented that the proposal would be creating lots of housing but no community.

JAMES BREWER, Richmond, referred to the six-foot sound wall and asked if it would be effective given the adjacent railroad tracks.

Ms. Carroll referred to the noise study within the Mitigated Negative Declaration to respond to the concerns of the sound wall given that information had been provided in-depth and had included a before and after analysis of sound and noise exposure.

Mr. Brewer commented that he lived up the street from the proposed development and the noise from the railroad tracks was very loud. He was skeptical that those living in a two-story home would be protected from excessive noise of the railroad tracks by a six-foot sound wall.

Ms. Carroll explained that the sound wall would not mitigate the noise to zero but would reduce it to an acceptable level.

Chair Livingston asked if the developer or vTA had hired a golf course designer to analyze the impact zone from the 18th tee to the housing, with any analysis to be presented to the DRB.

KEVIN FRYER, MLC Holdings, explained that bringing in a golf course design expert had been discussed but impacts had not been expected given the existing trees between the golf course and the housing along with the proposed future landscape in that area. He would continue to look at that situation and noted that minor alterations to the 18th tee would be considered. He would demonstrate that there was adequate space to address that concern.

Chair Livingston stated with respect to the landscape plan and the hydroseed that in Richmond hydroseed gets sprayed on and washes off and he did not support hydroseed as a result. He encouraged an actual grown ground cover. He commented that low growing, drought-tolerant ground cover would be preferred, something that would offer more long-term sustainability of the hillside. He encouraged heavy mulching and also noted that the preferred plantings would be drought-tolerant species that were naturally growing on the hillsides.

Boardmember Fine commented that there were many missed opportunities not considered for the project such as more density to address the housing crises, pursuing accessory dwelling

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

units (ADUs) or two stories; missed environmental opportunities with stormwater irrigation and plantings working together in a less water intensive way; bicycle and pedestrian pathways to take advantage of the Bay Trail; the orientation in roof layouts to take advantage of solar gain; an interface between the Country Club and the backyards of the parcel to the east, and considering the homes as part of the golf course. She suggested the City was on the cusp of interesting, innovative, and challenging opportunities and stated there was an opportunity to do better, be smarter, and think more holistically about the project financially, environmentally, and humanly. She expressed concern that the proposal was not demonstrably superior and she wanted to see it become more livable and engage more with the community.

Boardmember Butt agreed there were also missed opportunities for community gathering spaces, and Lots 85 through 61 could be approached with a rear alley. She would love to see porches which did a lot for neighborhood engagement.

Boardmember Carter echoed the previous comments with respect to utilizing techniques to create more of a community feel. He supported a bulb closer to the entrance for a community space or tot lot within the larger development; asked if there was a way to activate some of the narrower portions of the site for community gathering or tot lot use; and with the EVA path on either side of the development questioned whether it might be possible to pull those away from the sound wall on the east side or on the west side away from the back fences of the properties and create a dog-walking trail or exercise path. He also sought a pedestrian or golf cart connection to the club. With respect to the individual housing types, he did not see the material types and recommended that the type of material to be used be identified and be illustrated. With respect to the architecture, he suggested the proportions were working well and the design of the garage doors had been integrated into the architecture but he urged any opportunity to move the garages to the rear and create a porch in the front. He also suggested that glazing could be added to the garage door panels to soften the appearance of the garages in the front.

Boardmember Leung asked if there was a better way to treat the access point since it did not offer the community an identity. She supported the inclusion of a small park to offer an identity and avoid the appearance of a row of houses. She asked if solar inside the building would be explored, referred to the sporadic streetlights and suggested that more lighting would be nice, particularly around the park area; and she sought a clearly identified pedestrian pathway either around or within the development. In terms of architectural style, she suggested the styles were similar and recommended a bit more character to define each housing type. She referred to the giant closets but noted no linen closet or mud room and suggested some reconsideration of those elements. She also suggested the inclusion of an indoor granny unit or some unit that could be rented out to help create some affordability in the proposal. Her main concerns were access and identity. She liked the landscape plan.

Chair Livingston noted the DRB's concern for missed opportunities in terms of product type, sense of community, tot lots; he agreed with all the comments and reiterated that the Board needed to make a finding for a superior development. He referred to the suggestions for porches and a sense of community, and suggested a community garden could be placed between Lots 85 and 86, and he commented that hip roofs did not work with solar panels.

Mr. Manyisha stated a solar layout for each plan would be identified and included in the next package. He also noted the golf course was 15 feet higher than the development and the 18th tee would look down onto the homes. There was also a slope down into the railroad tracks. With a 48 foot right-of-way, there would be street parking on one side of the street.

Everyone was thanked for all their hard work.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 23, 2020

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, September 23, 2020.