

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA
May 23, 2007
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Ted J. Smith
Diane Bloom

Jonathan Livingston
Don Woodrow
Robert Avellar

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Whitty, Vice Chair Avellar, Boardmembers Bloom, Livingston, Smith, and Woodrow

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Mary Renfro, Lina Velasco and Lamont Thompson

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Boardmember Woodrow requested adding Item 2 to the Consent Calendar. **Boardmember Livingston** requested adding Item 3 to the Consent Calendar.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to approve the agenda, as amended by adding Items 2 and 3 to the Consent Calendar; unanimously approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Whitty gave an overview of the Consent Calendar, procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. She said any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, June 4, 2007 by 5:00 p.m.

Chair Whitty noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of all items on the agenda; Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Item 7 was requested for removal by a member of the public. Item 6 was requested for removal (Bloom).

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to approve the Consent Calendar Items 2, 3, 4 and 5; unanimously approved.

Consent Items Approved:

2. DR 1102710 – Construct Single-Family Dwelling on Montana Street - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new ±3,167 square foot single-family dwelling on a vacant lot located on Montana Street between Buena Vista and Nevada Avenue (APN: 556-141-002). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Residential Zoning District. Bulmare Gonzales, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 6/27/2007.
3. DR 1103829 – Addition to Manufacturing Building on Potrero Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±6,000 square foot addition to an existing ±10,000 square foot manufacturing building located at 1130 Potrero Avenue (APN: 544-351-004, 005, and 026), and to consider a ±1,440 square foot office building on a 35,700 square foot site. M-2, Light Industrial Zoning District. Bill Cygan, owner; Eric L. Cox, RSE c/o Kembcon Corp., applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
4. DR 1103906 – Addition to the United Parcel Service (UPS) Building on Atlas Road - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±7,452 square foot addition to an existing ±131,648 square foot industrial building located at 1601 Atlas Road (APN 405-270-011). M-2, Light Industrial Zoning District. United Parcel Service, owner; Associated Builders of Fresno, Inc., Susan Bane, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
5. DR 1103976 – Addition to Single-Family Residence on Tunnel Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±120 square foot addition to an existing single-family residence located at 311 Tunnel Avenue (APN: 558-110-019). The existing house is a contributing structure to the Point Richmond Historic District. MFR-1, Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. Glenna Mote-Yates, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Items Discussed:

1. **DR 1103246 – 16 Building Trade Studio Live/Work Units on Ohio Avenue** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval of 16 live/work units, 27 parking spaces, a driveway, and landscaping on five parcels (Parcels A through E) totaling ±46,250 square feet. Parcel A is located on the northwest corner of Ohio Avenue and Eighth Street (APN: 538-410-021), and the contiguous Parcels B, C, D, and E are located on the north side of Ohio Avenue between Eighth Street and Harbour Way South (APNs: 538-420-004, 538-420-022, 538-420-001, and 538-430-018). Light Industrial (Knox Cutting Specific Plan) Zoning District. Raymond Knox, Helga Gruber, Kathy Rogers, Alexa Wilkie, Beth Gerstein, Karen Bowen, Tom Lawrence, Karen Sprague, and Kyle and Natalia Reicher, owners; Kathryn A. Rogers, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Conditional Approval To Planning Commission.

Chair Whitty gave a brief description of the project, said the project must be heard by the Planning Commission due to an FAR setback issue and a conditional use permit issuance, and noted the Board's task was to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Lina Velasco noted that the project description had since been scaled down and the Board would be looking at a smaller version. Originally the project came forward as a 5-parcel development. Currently, there is only consideration for one parcel and therefore, the owner/applicant is Kyle Reicher and the address for consideration is 909 Ohio Avenue, and 6 live/work units and associated improvements. The other owners have since dropped interest from the project and so the concept has been provided for one parcel with three buildings in three phases. She noted the FAR and CUP still needed to be addressed.

Boardmember Livingston noted he had previously contacted Ms. Velasco with questions regarding landscaping. Ms. Velasco said the actual landscaping shown was 2,013 square feet which is 11.5%, so it falls short from the 15% required. However, she said the owners felt they could make enough amendments to the landscape plan to meet that requirement and would return with a revised version to meet the 15%.

Chair Whitty noted the neighborhood councils both were supportive of the project, confirmed there was no signage associated with the project at this time, and Ms. Velasco noted signage would be approved by the zoning administrator per a condition in the staff report.

Boardmember Livingston questioned if the tree and parking requirement from the Knox Cutting Specific Plan had been addressed, and Ms. Velasco said she would ask that condition 15 could be amended to meet the requirement. She said the requirement is for one tree to be provided for every 4 parking spaces, as well as converting some of the patio areas into landscaping, which would increase the landscaping from 11% to 15%.

Chair Whitty opened the public hearing.

Kyle Reicher, owner, said they addressed many initial issues, said they were open to whatever changes staff and the Board recommended regarding the trellis and/or future solar, said he is an artist and sculptor, said originally three owners purchased the five parcels and discussed developing a campus type project, said he would be occupying the building, said he was committed to the project, presented a schematic of the project to the Board, and envisioned the project to incorporate an artisan's community.

Boardmember Woodrow requested the color and materials board be passed around to the Board. He confirmed that the fence heights were 6 feet and Ms. Velasco noted a 6 foot high fence was permitted because the parcels are zoned industrial and 4 foot fences only apply to residentially zoned properties.

Boardmember Woodrow felt the street could benefit from the project, was pleased with Mr. Reicher's plan for the area, but he voiced concerns with crime in the area. Mr. Reicher said with a live/work approach, there should be more eyes on the neighborhood and as an artist, he has always lived in transitioning neighborhoods, felt it would not keep him from developing the property, and he also acknowledged safety was a huge concern.

Boardmember Bloom confirmed landscaping would change somewhat, suggested the Pistache trees be replaced due to poor drainage and said she would provide him with suggested replacement. She asked about how the bio swale looked, and Mr. Reicher said it would contain water that percolates into the soil and he did not think it had a sump pump. She asked about how the Board would see the amended landscape plan, and Mr. Reicher felt comments of the Board could be incorporated into the conditions and asked if the Board could move the project forward.

Upon request by **Boardmember Woodrow**, Mr. Reicher described the model of the project, noted a green and iron fence were problematic, so he was amenable to installing a 6 foot chain link fence with wooden slats in it, but felt the current 8 foot tall fence with billboards was structurally sound, and he could convert it to a 6 foot fence by not destroying it. Ms. Velasco said the existing fence would either need to be removed or remodeled to conform to regulations. The owner has talked about doing a combination iron fence with recycled wood pieces, which was being brought forward to the Board for consideration. Fencing is also not a requirement in the City, so she asked that the Board either eliminate the fence requirement or have a fence be subject to review by the Planning Director, or the Board could approve what was being proposed.

Boardmember Avellar said he liked the project the way it is presented.

Boardmember Livingston said this was the first time the Board has seen the project, said he had many small design issues, complimented the applicant and owner, and asked to have the opportunity to work through some of the items with the architect, as he could not formulate some of the items into conditions. The items range from the gate location so trucks are out of the right-of-way, landscaping design ideas, there are no ways to walk around certain stairs because cars will hit pedestrians, but he really liked the project. He was amenable to meeting with the owner and applicant separately. Ms. Renfro questioned if the items could be addressed prior to the project being heard by the Planning Commission in order for the project to move forward.

Mr. Reicher felt that if items could be addressed regarding the landscaping and not the structure of the building would be ideal. **Chair Whitty** felt the items could be drawn on the plans for the record. **Boardmember Livingston** agreed and said the items could be easily addressed.

Ms. Renfro noted the development was going to the Planning Commission for a conditional use permit to occupy the building and the first development was only 3 buildings and the plans were not finalized. Ms. Velasco said the project is scaled down and only the plans before the Board was anticipated to be built. Staff has not heard back from any of the other adjoining property owners and they are not sure if the final product would ever be built. **Chair Whitty** noted phase I building would be built which is the one, two-unit building and she asked if the remaining area would be used for staging or landscaping. Mr. Reicher said the development is a phased approach; it would meet all of the light industrial requirements, and because the other phases would be done in the future, he would agree to seed that area.

Mr. Reicher noted there was an existing gate, all planting areas will be done per the Board's request, and he would start Phase I, occupy it, hopefully market it to investors, and then take that money to build Phase II and III.

Chair Whitty suggested continuing the item, and Ms. Renfro noted the Municipal Code stated applications requiring Planning Commission and Design Review Board approval shall be reviewed in one meeting for recommendation to the Planning Commission. She felt a recommendation should be fashioned that will permit the applicant to move forward in July to the Planning Commission and details of design review could be worked out through a subcommittee action following the Planning Commission's approval.

Chair Whitty requested discussing all items of concern for the record and be conditioned into the record.

Boardmember Livingston noted the following design items requiring attention:

- Fencing to be drawn and completed in the future;
- A permeable concrete sample should be provided, the one, 20x8 bio swale was located in the front and to be approved by the applicant's civil engineer;
- There was 2.5 foot distance between the sidewalk and top of slab and a 2 foot deep bio swale would be located here and the grades do not work;
- When driving into the project, there is a 3 foot grade differential between the driveway elevation and the front door, and there are no steps in the site plan;
- In the back of Phase I two-story building, there is a stairway going to the upper floor and there is not enough room to walk between the cars and the stairs, so the parking needs to move back about 3 feet. There would still be enough room for back-up requirements;

- Include a tree well in the parking area to conform to the Knox Cutting Specific Plan Section 6-4;
- Trees are missing on Phase II and III;
- Score patterns and how the applicant will treat permeable concrete needs to be identified;
- Regarding landscaping, when coming through the gate, the landscape area could be increased and conform to the Knox Cutting Specific Plan by adding planting areas; 6-8 feet on the west side and more street trees on the right side which would help conform to the requirement;
- The gate needs to be moved forward to allow for a full-sized pick-up to be off the street when the gate is opening;
- There is no fence referenced or gate design referenced;
- He confirmed with the owner he would install a nice looking auto gate with a steel frame around it as depicted in the drawings;
- The arbor/trellis should incorporate a roof hang out to break up the massing of the building and provide shade;
- All roll-up doors have the same element on them;
- Gable ends door recess on alleyway needs to be similar to Ohio on drawing A3.1, elevation 3 (west) and weave wooden door into the project;
- On the gable ends, the structure that holds the gable end up should be wood to create a residential scale/texture. Use a C-Channel or I-Beam to support the roof;
- Lighting needs to be indirect;
- Fence design and main gates #2 need detail work, (Sheet A4.1, detail number 2 was one example which should match the auto gate);
- Landscaping can be discussed, list of plants and trees to be provided.

Ms. Renfro noted the Board could provide the recommendation to the Planning Commission through Planning Department staff immediately following a single Design Review Board hearing. The Board tonight can recommend approval subject to the conditions in the staff report and other conditions that the subcommittee works out with staff prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Velasco noted the original back driveway was to do gravel, but given it was a driving surface and there were other dust and air quality issues, staff wanted it paved. However, it does not have to be asphalt.

Ms. Velasco referred to Attachment 3 of the staff report, and said it appears that the trees mentioned earlier may be existing street trees. The parking lot trees would still need to be added, but the street trees were not indicated on the plans.

Chair Whitty questioned the material of the walkway in the front, and Mr. Reichers said it was a meandering path made of decomposed granite. She confirmed the subcommittee could condition the landscaping which would be phased.

Boardmember Woodrow said he knew a bridge was proposed to be built over time, but asked how the building would reflect the fact that there will be something coming out of the wall that will indicate a bridge will be there. Mr. Reichers said it would be engineered separate from the building, said the bridge would be freestanding with its sheer and load within itself. He felt it would be a great place to incorporate solar panels and incorporate a bridge crane underneath it. He did not feel the deck should be covered, but he might integrate solar panels into the covering. **Chair Whitty** said the eaves extend in front of the balcony area and she confirmed they were 15 feet higher. **Boardmember Woodrow** asked what the deck was used for, and Mr. Reichers felt it was an area to get some fresh air and planter boxes could be placed in that area.

Chair Whitty noted the subcommittee would consist of Boardmembers Bloom, Avellar and Livingston who would work with Mr. Reichers.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to recommend approval of DR 1103246 to the Planning Commission with the staff's recommended 4 findings, with the staff's recommended 20 conditions, with the addition of Condition 21 that states the Subcommittee shall meet and establish further conditions as agreed upon by the Subcommittee and applicant; the guidelines leading to conditions were recorded and will be referred to from the minutes record; and amend condition 7 to read, "...trellis structures and flat shaped element shall be added above all roll-up doors...."; unanimously approved.

NOTED ABSENT

Chair Whitty was noted absent at 7:20 p.m. **Vice Chair Avellar** acted as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

- 6. DR 1102861 – Construct new Single-Family Residence with Garage on East Scenic Avenue** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±3,554 square foot single-family residence with a ±567 square foot garage on the vacant lot located at 60 East Scenic Avenue (APN: 556-151-006). SFR-2, Very Low Density Single-Family Residential Zoning District. Michael O'Mahony, owner; David S. Vaughan, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Vice Chair Avellar gave a brief description of the project and asked if there were questions of staff.

Boardmember Livingston confirmed with staff there were site photographs provided.

The public hearing was opened.

David Vaughan, applicant, briefly discussed the project, said the property was a sloped site and the house was designed to fit into the existing neighborhood, the neighborhood council voiced concerns with parking along East Scenic and they agreed to provide some road widening for parking, they asked that the approach to the garage be curved which was also agreed upon. He said they supported the project, they asked to maximize the interior yard space and not fill up the entire site with building, and felt the project fit well in its scale and character.

Boardmember Livingston agreed with the need to widen the road and confirmed there was no guardrail proposed. Mr. Vaughan noted they would install a retaining wall, but would be amenable to installing a guard rail if requested. **Boardmember Livingston** said he had many design issues; as you get up to the top floor, you stop running out of room and the whole design starts to change. He found ways of dropping the two main floors two feet which provides more room in the roof and he felt it might be more useful to continue the item to discuss the design issues with Mr. Vaughan. The changes would involve massing and changing the floor plan slightly to mitigate some of the major architectural elements. He noted the house would be seen from town, as other homes have less mass and bulk and he had some simple ideas that would better layer the house and reduce the mass and bulk. He proposed a subcommittee meet and Mr. Vaughan was amenable to this.

Boardmember Bloom said she was concerned with the steepness of the slope and the notation on the plant layout on G3, and Mr. Vaughan confirmed the grasses were drought

resistant individual grasses. She said that because the house was at the top of the hill looking down, it might be better to have some taller native shrub material in part of the yard rather than grasses, which are mostly 1-2 feet, and also consider some new oak trees. She felt some grouping mixing of plants, shrubs and grasses be used. Regarding the plant selection, she suggested the applicant look at the color of the house and trim to enhance the entire plan and she made some suggestions, such as the California Coffee Berry which comes in different heights.

Boardmember Woodrow noted the PNRD reviewed the project on February 23, 2005 and confirmed the plans had not changed, except for some attention to massing, making the house lower in the site as much as possible, and changing the driveway to address their concerns. One thing that changed was the garage roof because of night limitations, they added a hip roof and most of the homes on the street were gabled. **Boardmember Woodrow** said since the two homes were not occupied, he confirmed with Mr. Vaughan that he did not discuss the plans with the two new families, but the lower level neighbors were part of the neighborhood council meeting. **Boardmember Woodrow** noted there older homes in the area and it was nice to see a new home in that area and liked the design. He asked not to cut down any more berry plants as people pick them, and Mr. Vaughan agreed.

Vice Chair Avellar referred to the north and south elevation and said the windows were lined up. On the east and west elevation, the windows were not lined up and he suggested Boardmember Livingston address this in his meeting with the applicant.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Livingston) to hold over DR 1102861 to June 27, 2007, with a subcommittee of Boardmember Livingston and Mr. Vaughan to meet to discuss design issues; unanimously approved.

7. DR 1103891 – Construct Detached Second Dwelling Unit on Humboldt Street - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±640 square foot detached second dwelling unit located at 977 Humboldt Street (APN: 523-024-006). MFR-1, Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. Candido and Paula Gutierrez, owners; Brenda Munoz, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 6/13/2007.

Vice Chair Avellar noted this was a hold-over item and the item was pulled due to public comment requested.

Public Comments:

Steve Cuevae, voiced concerns about approving an over 600 square foot second dwelling unit, cited significant traffic issues, and said many people already park too many cars in the area. He noted an adjacent neighbor had also built a triplex and duplex and felt it was a rental neighborhood area now with many cars and traffic impacts. He presented pictures of parked cars.

Vice Chair Avellar confirmed the project was not yet reviewed by the East Richmond Heights Neighborhood Council who was currently aware of the project and had concerns with parking.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to hold over DR 1103891 to June 13, 2007; unanimously approved.

BOARD BUSINESS

8. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff - None

Public Forum – Brown Act - None

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.