

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

October 14, 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, and Jessica Fine

Absent: Vice Chair Michael Hannah, and Boardmembers Macy Leung and Karlyn Neel

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Hector Lopez, Roberta Feliciano, and Jonelyn Whales, and City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 23, 2020

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Butt) to approve the minutes of the September 23, 2020 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah, Leung, and Neel).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was unanimously approved as submitted.

Roberta Feliciano 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 NOVEMBER 18, 2020

CORDELL HINDLER: *Good evening, Chair Livingston, Board members and city staff, I have a couple of comments to go into the record. 1. The Fairmede Hilltop Council was very unhappy that the applicant did not communicate with the group about their concerns regarding the Aspire Academy Project. 2. In regarding the Val Mar project, I had spoken with Mr. Oakley as well the owner and they expressed their concerns in regarding the accidents along 37th and Barrett. My recommendation is that projects being considered should be put on hold until the 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 Monday, October 26, 2020 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. PLN17-029 | ZHAO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE |
| Description | (HELD OVER FROM SEPTEMBER 23, 2020) 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 |

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated October 14, 2020, for a 2,800 square foot three-story single-family residence on a vacant lot on Barth Avenue within the Hasford Heights neighborhood. She reported that during the review process the applicant had received comments from staff as well as from Chair Livingston, which comments had been incorporated into the plans. She added that two letters received from the public had been included in the staff report.

Ms. Feliciano responded to comments and clarified that while the application had been submitted in 2017, it had not yet been considered by the DRB.

ZHIHUI HUANG, the architect, explained that the project had been submitted in 2017 and the primary issue at that time was the driveway. He referred to the plans to show how the issues related to the driveway had been addressed to meet code requirements. He pointed out how each of the three stories and each roof had been set back to address the massing of the structure. He stated the intention of the design was for the height of the home to be below the height of the second story of the uphill home and for the width of the proposed home to be narrower than that of the uphill home. He also pointed out a concealed gutter on the north edge of the balcony and the deck to collect all stormwater and the V-ditch around the back of the home and associated systems that would be used to control drainage. He also described the five big coastal oaks on the north side of the property line that would, with the other identified measures, help with erosion control. For landscaping, he proposed to hydroseed the property after construction.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

Mr. Huang responded to comments from the DRB and verified with respect to materials that horizontal Hardie siding had been proposed at the third level, with stucco at the second level, and stone with stucco at the first level.

Boardmember Carter suggested the transition between the materials was weak at this point and recommended a belly band element to make the transition from the stucco to the Hardie lap siding. He recommended the use of a cedar siding since it would go well with the earth tone colors of the proposed home. Given the large swath of stucco that was prone to cracking, he explained that control joints would have to be considered along with other elements to offer a tighter composition to the overall design. He verified with Mr. Huang that powder coated metal railings had been proposed and the intermediate rails could be stainless cable, although Boardmember Carter recommended the use of cedar siding horizontal plank rather than a steel cable for the intermediate railings.

Boardmember Fine also noted the mix of materials and spoke to the extension of the overhang over the entry porch which appeared to be top heavy and bulky compared to the porch itself. She was concerned with the transition and circulation to the front porch and sought more hardscape in the site plan to identify the transition, how it would be illuminated, whether it would be safe, and requested details of the overall site lighting and screening. She agreed that the proportions of the materials needed to be discerned better.

Boardmember Butt asked about the trim around the windows, the window color, and the roofing which the plans showed as asphalt shingle. She also noted that the gable end walls on the west elevation had vertical boards which introduced a new aesthetic. She commented that the material palette and execution was not organized.

Mr. Huang explained that the windows would be white and the trim would be a standard trim. The referenced vertical boards at the west elevation were decorated vents.

Boardmember Carter had a concern with a drainage trench right up against the foundation of the home and asked the applicant to consider some terracing or bio-swale drainage area to avoid flooding.

Chair Livingston sketched a landscape plan to address the drainage and proposed a path to maintain the back of the hill, the V-ditch, planting and erosion control. He sought more clarity on some of the details.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

There was no one to speak to the item.

Chair Livingston recommended the application be continued with recommendations to address the following:

- Use Hardie board siding and Hardie details for the window trim;
- Identify transitions from the stone to the stucco and from the stucco to the Hardie siding;
- Use stainless steel cable rails;
- Consider the use of an Eagle product, a 40-year composition shingle roof, in a darker color with the gable ends to be detailed, and with the material to be called out;
- Address the extension of the overhang on the entry;
- Include path lighting to the front door;
- Identify control joints; and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

- Provide details for the garage door.

Chair Livingston stated his sketch of a landscape plan would be provided to the applicant to address erosion control with mulching, netting, and planting.

2. PLN19-038	NAVARRO NEW MIXED USE BUILDING
Description	(HELD OVER FROM SEPTEMBER 23, 2020) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A MIXED-USE BUILDING CONSISTING OF GROUND FLOOR COMMERCIAL WITH THREE RESIDENTIAL LIVING UNITS ON A +4,800 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL.
Location	761 23 RD STREET
APN	529-180-007
Zoning	CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED USE, COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
Owner	JOSE AND ANA NAVARRO
Applicant	RICHARD TAPP (ARCHITECT)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated October 14, 2020 for a project that had earlier been considered in study session. She explained that the project involved two comparable parcels that would be merged prior to the pursuit of the mixed-use development with commercial activity on the ground floor and with three condominium units on the upper floor. She identified the exterior materials and a composition roof, and explained that the project met the development guidelines as well as the parking requirements only because the site was located on a transportation line within close proximity to the BART station and to several different transit stops. There would be one Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) space in the front of the building with three spaces for the residential properties in the rear, along with bicycle parking.

Ms. Whales explained that the DRB had requested that the entryway be recessed, balconies be provided on the residential units, and the driveway be made more open and appealing, with additional street trees to be provided.

Chair Livingston commended the changes to the design. He had recently spoken with the project architect and had requested additional items on the exterior elevation, which request would be made available to the DRB.

RICHARD TAPP, the architect, described the revisions to the design to address the issue with respect to the balconies and the driveway to the rear of the property. He explained that the driveway was now more open with landscaping and had been set back from the adjacent building on the north which had mitigated some of the massing of the three-story building, and which would allow light and ventilation to the north elevation. He noted that the owner of the building wanted to build his own restaurant on the first floor, which would involve a later application after the approval of the current project.

Mr. Tapp described the residential units with balconies on the east and west side, noted the second floor units were mirror-reversed, and stated that the third floor unit was very large and would be the owner's unit. The structure had been set back from the street to allow increased sidewalk seating, and the rear yard had been set back 33 feet instead of the 10-foot minimum to respect the residential housing to the rear. The project would be zero lot line on the south side. A light well would break up the elevation and there would be a raised parapet in the front with a stucco design element and stucco control joints throughout the building to break up the stucco façade on the south side.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

Mr. Tapp described the proposed materials and colors throughout with stucco, decorative artistic tile, a curved metal entry above the commercial entry, and a tile panel on the third floor to provide decoration and life to the building, along with a bronze aluminum storefront, and a dark terra cotta tile at the front first floor that would wrap around to the wood trellis. The material at the residential entry would transfer from the porcelain tile to a stucco painted similar to the porcelain tile. The balconies would be horizontal metal bars with an Epay wood cap on top, if possible, and two to three open bars and a perforated metal mesh that would be 70 to 75 percent open, in a rust color to provide privacy from the street to the residents but also provide more of an open feeling to the top. The underside of the balconies and overhanging roof eave would be Epay, if possible, or a horizontal Hardie board that would be brown in nature similar to the Epay wood color, with venting, as required. The trellises and sunshades over the windows would be aluminum tubes painted similar to a wood color.

There would be a recess with the stairs with some planting and some decorative element to provide relief. There would be one street tree at the front with the handicap parking in the front for either patrons of the restaurant or for the residential units. Landscaping would incorporate drought-tolerant plants with some color in the rear. The design and materials for the south elevation was also provided. A concealed gutter would be on each side of the deck that would be run back into the building wall, if possible, and drained down to the stucco on the left side of the storefront. The lot sloped from rear to front from the northwest corner to the southeast corner and there would be no surface water drained towards the rear.

Chair Livingston asked about the deck fascia material, reported by Mr. Tapp to be a bronze aluminum similar to the fascia on the roof eave and the cap fascia on the roof parapet. With respect to the underside of the decks, the Chair referred to Trespa, a manufactured durable pre-finished product in multiple colors that he suggested would be good for that area.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

There was no one to speak to the item.

Boardmember Carter liked the variation of the dark bronze with the warm wood colors along with the pastel stucco. As to the planter box on the north side adjacent to the stairwell to the residential units he asked how access for maintenance purposes would be provided, to which Mr. Tapp stated there would be access from the landing where there would be an operable window. The building would be fully sprinkled. If the Fire Department would not allow an operable window, an artificial planting or something of color would be provided in that area.

Mr. Tapp explained that a 42-inch gate had been envisioned to be operated by tenants when accessing the trash and allow security for the parking area. He stated the gate would be six feet high, similar to the railing materials, with perforated metal at the bottom. He also explained that the exterior light fixtures would be generic, shielded, although up and down lights were preferred at the stucco on either side of the commercial entry to allow an illumination of the building, the stucco and the tile. The lights on the residential floors would be baffled to avoid glare. He stated that a lighting plan would be submitted to staff for approval.

Boardmember Fine recommended that the gate be moved a bit to the east for residential convenience, although Mr. Tapp stated that the gate had to be recessed so that cars would not block the sidewalk or the street, although it might be possible to have the gate at the pathway leading to the residential entry which could tie in with the car gate to allow open access. The DRB asked that that element be included in the renderings. Boardmember Fine also asked about the amount of outdoor seating and Mr. Tapp explained that he had yet to design the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

restaurant when those details would be better defined.

Boardmember Fine commented that Epay was not terribly robust and some of the proposed materials would age differently. With respect to planting, she asked how the planting would be protected in the driveway to prevent drive overs and she recommended robust planting, to which Mr. Tapp stated that groundcover would be planted as would clumped durable varieties, with potentially bollards at the corner of the building and at some points along the driveway. The details would be provided in the plans.

Boardmember Butt asked about the cap at the roof eave and Mr. Tapp stated that the cap would be dark bronze aluminum similar to the cap on the parapet although the underside of the eave would have the warm wood look.

Boardmember Butt liked the color, the warmth and the richness to the building that would fit into the context of 23rd Street. She asked the architect to consider a way to extend the outdoor seating opportunities, particularly since the climate allowed extended outdoor seating.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to approve PLN19-038, Navarro New Mixed-Use Building, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 12) Add Trespa or equal for underside of eave; 13) Decks shall have concealed gutter and downspouts; 14) Cap and parapet shall be dark bronze aluminum; 15) Metal security gate shall move toward 23rd Street with an additional gate for the residential door; 16) Consider multi-slide front door and window for transparency; 17) Commercial light fixtures shall be up and down and residential shall be down only; residential light shall be differentiated from the commercial and no more than 3,000 k color, and shielded; 18) Control joints per Richard Tapp revised drawings as submitted; 19) Add curb at the back to protect planting areas; 20) Gate design shall match the railings on the residential decks, maximum six feet in height; and 21) Materials in the arbor shall be redwood and stained; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah, Leung, and Neel).

A five-minute break was taken at this time.

3. PLN19-421	SECOND STORY ADDITION AND NEW ADU
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY ±525 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE AND A ±450 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ABOVE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED DETACHED GARAGE.
Location	6000 FRESNO AVENUE
APN	510-112-025
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	ANGELA XU AND NORM FONG
Applicant	STEFAN MENZI (ARCHITECT)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated October 14, 2020, for a project to construct a two-story 525 square foot addition to an existing residence and a 450 square foot accessory dwelling unit above the newly constructed detached garage previously considered by the DRB in study session, at which time a discussion related to the staircase to the ADU on the eastern

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

property line. The applicant preferred that location as opposed to relocating the staircase to the backyard as recommended.

Discussions had ensued with the Chair and Vice Chair, the plan checkers and the Fire Marshal, and the applicant had been directed by the DRB to communicate with the adjacent property owners, who had indicated no concern with the staircase at the eastern property line. The other concerns related to reducing the projection of the bay window on the main dwelling, providing more landscaping with two street trees, eliminating the corbels and brackets on the drawing, addressing the color scheme, and providing obscure glass on the bathroom window had all been addressed by the revised drawings.

STEFAN MENZI, the architect, concurred with the revisions that had been incorporated into the plans, and explained that the stairway had been retained at the eastern property line given that the privacy issue to the adjacent neighbor was minimal. He had confirmed in writing that the Fire Marshal and building permit plan checker had indicated that the solid one-hour railing wall at the stair would be sufficient.

Boardmember Butt characterized the revised plans as a great improvement to what had earlier been submitted. She liked the natural wood railing. With respect to the north front elevation, she verified with Mr. Menzi that the existing siding would be repainted only.

Boardmember Fine thanked the applicant for the due diligence with the neighbors. With respect to the fascia of the ADU she asked if it would be similar to the body color of the main home, and Mr. Menzi stated that had not yet been defined in detail but a warm gray was being considered. He noted that the ADU would have a slightly different warm earth tone color scheme and be distinct from the main home.

Boardmember Carter verified with Mr. Menzi that the existing double-pane windows were mostly vinyl and new aluminum clad wood windows had been proposed to match the off-white color of the main home. The garage/ADU windows in the new construction would be bronze.

Mr. Menzi clarified that the garage door at the ADU would have an etched glass panel with an aluminum matching color frame for the door.

Chair Livingston liked the home, the ADU, and the differentiation between the two.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

There was no one to speak to the item.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Livingston) to approve PLN19-421, Second Story Addition and New ADU; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 7 Conditions of Approval; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hannah, Leung, and Neel).

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 4. PLN20-043 | GARBELMANN NEW RESIDENCE |
| Description | STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN OF A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A 6,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL. |
| Location | 357 WESTERN DRIVE |

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

APN	558-185-006
Zoning	RL-1, SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant	BRAD GUNKEL (ARCHITECT)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated October 14, 2020 for a study session to consider a new two-story single-family dwelling on a 6,000 square foot vacant parcel on Western Drive between Santa Fe Avenue and Casey Drive in Port Richmond. The property had been created out of the abutting parcel to the north and was characterized by a unique configuration with a wide frontage and a narrow width in the rear. The City Council had approved the creation of the parcel in 2009 subject to providing two corridors to protect views and by mandating height and placement of window restrictions, which had resulted in a compact buildable area bound by view corridors on both sides.

Mr. Lopez described the two-story structure of 2,800 square feet and noted that landscaping would be provided on the northern portion of the site with a path to the rear. There would be a non-reflective metal roof, wood and a stucco exterior, stainless steel rails and posts, and a garage door with obscure glass.

Given that the project was located within the Shoreline Overlay District, approval of a conditional use permit by the Planning Commission was required. The design was required to be compatible with existing buildings, and staff was concerned that the proposed design did not appear to be compatible with existing buildings given that the proposed design included two different roof forms that competed with each other and did not meet that design review finding. The design was also not to overwhelm or adversely affect the adjoining property and a roof deck in the rear of the property would likely affect the privacy of the adjoining neighbor. In addition, the building entry should be more prominent and more inviting.

Mr. Lopez sought suggestions in regard to the findings and the mandate by the Planning Commission to ensure compatibility with the existing properties to the left and to the right.

Mr. Lopez responded to questions as to a definition of visual compatibility and explained that would relate to conformance with the mass and the form, height of the structure, materials, and the location of the building in relation to the property lines. In this case, there were two view corridors. The primary concern was the roof forms that deviated from the adjacent properties located in the Shoreline Overlay District. He also clarified with respect to allowable height that the basic height requirement in the zoning district allowed up to 35 feet, and given the Shoreline Overlay District that could be an issue with the Planning Commission. He added that the Point Richmond Neighborhood Council (PRNC) had reviewed the project and had made a positive recommendation.

Chair Livingston verified that there were other properties with the same type of butterfly roof design but none in the immediate area of the subject site, and that the PRNC had not reviewed the project in light of the Shoreline Overlay District.

BRAD GUNKEL, the architect, clarified the site and the restrictions placed on the site by the Planning Commission during the creation of the lot, where a five-foot view corridor had been established along the outside of the lot, and a 10-foot view corridor had been established across and through the lot along with additional parameters related to height to protect the views of neighbors. He explained that there were not to be any balconies or second story windows 29 feet back from the front property line, and there were height limitations as well related to the front of the home. Past the 29-foot point, the height was allowed to extend up to 35 feet above

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

lowest existing grade, which was the base zoning. The Planning Commission had also determined that no portion of the home could be located within 17 feet of the top of slope at the rear of the property facing the Bay. In addition, the neighbors to the north who had previously owned the property had established, upon the sale of the property, an easement as a landscape buffer between their yard and the subject property. Given all the restrictions, the area of buildability on the site was limited.

Mr. Gunkel explained that as part of the design process he had looked at other buildings in the area, and the PRNC had referred to other buildings in the area with butterfly roofs to determine that the proposed butterfly roof was in context with the neighborhood. He also referred to other materials in the area such as the use of natural wood, the different roof forms, and the extensive use of glass as design inspiration for the proposal to be compatible with the eclectic neighborhood.

Mr. Gunkel described another challenge that the garage in the zoning was allowed to only account for 50 percent of the front façade, and as a result the front entry had to be 50 percent of the façade. The front entry had been pulled out slightly from the garage entry to get just over 50 percent while still maintaining the two-car garage. The front of the home had been brought down as much as possible. He described the evolution of the design subsequent to neighbor and PRNC comments when story poles had been installed. After further discussions with neighbors, the height of the home had been dropped another four feet, six feet below the allowed maximum height, by sinking the garage in and stepping the ground floor with the cross slope of the home. The story poles had been adjusted to identify the lower design of the home and the PRNC had again considered the proposal. While there had been a neighbor concern at the PRNC hearing for the roof forms, the PRNC had confirmed that the roof forms were compatible with the neighboring properties given the multitude of roof types and combinations, and had indicated that the material selection was compatible with the surrounding properties. The design had been kept as low as possible in the front to meet the guidelines established by the Planning Commission, and the slopes of the butterfly roof had been reduced. The PRNC had also requested a green wall at the entry stair and at a few locations along the façade. He noted that the existing tree on site would be removed for the building and the green wall would replace the canopy size of that tree. The home was substantially smaller than neighboring homes.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

SIMON WINER, Western Drive, Point Richmond, spoke on behalf of the most immediate neighbor and expressed concern for the design of the proposal that was required to be harmonious with the character of the surrounding environment and preserve and protect public views. He noted that the proposal was higher than its upslope neighbor and he described the height and style of surrounding properties in comparison. He suggested that the PRNC had failed to evaluate the development proposal under the requirements of the Shoreline Overlay District and its recommendation should be disregarded. He also noted that some of the location references used by Mr. Gunkel as compatible pre-dated the Shoreline Overlay District and should be disregarded as acceptable examples, and the height of the adjacent home was higher than allowed by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). He suggested that a less massive and lower height proposal that better preserved and protected public views, as required, should be submitted.

CLAIRE ARBOUR, Western Drive, Point Richmond, spoke to the amount of foot and bicycle traffic on Western Drive to access and appreciate the Bay. She referenced the challenges of the lot and emphasized the importance of compliance with the City's regulations for the site.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

MIKE BURNS, Point Richmond, the next door neighbor to the proposed home, pointed out that the story poles were at the top of the tree and were above the apex of the home, and the home to the north was about 29 feet higher. He suggested the proposal was a large home that sat on a small shoehorned lot. He had concerns with the home and wanted to see something more harmonious with Point Richmond.

In response to the comments, Mr. Gunkel explained that the referenced two-story homes that appeared to be one story from the street were on sites that dropped off at the Bay, which the subject lot did not, and the regulations prohibited any excavation of the hillside.

Boardmember Fine suggested that a useful graphic tool would be to model the topography and elevate it up to the maximum height limit to identify the situation in terms of grade and then zoom back to see where the building would sit in the context of the site and the neighborhood.

To provide clarification, Chair Livingston read the relevant sections of the Shoreline Overlay District, Section 15.04.306, specifically related to site planning and structure design.

Boardmember Carter agreed with the need to conduct some section studies similar to what had been done for a previous nearby Gunkel project. He liked the horizontal wood and the contrast with the stucco but thought that the clear anodized aluminum fascia was a bit too reflective and suggested leaving that out. With respect to the rendering, it looked as if the fascia was curved. He had no problem with the butterfly roof and the dynamic forms, although the entryway had such a steep slope that it was somehow intimidating and should be broken up slightly. He suggested that two roof angles should be identified with all the other roofs working off of that angle to reduce the oppressiveness from the front. He asked how the roof would be drained and stated that and the overall drainage would have to be identified. Speaking to the green wall, he recommended that some way be considered to detail that wall with a climbing trellis, screen, or some underlying attractive framework even if nothing else was growing on the wall.

Boardmember Butt suggested that the applicant consider the angles and massing in relation to the constrained site, and while she liked the horizontal wood siding, the natural wood and the stucco, the entry was oppressive and she was very concerned with the reflectivity which could become a glare in the neighborhood. She was not a fan of the curved fascia. She commented that none of the angles seemed to match or harmonize, she agreed with the need for something sustainable for the living wall, and she did not think that camouflaging a piece of the building would work. She recommended a different entry sequence, a tone down, or other method to address the “puzzle of geometries.”

Chair Livingston agreed with all the comments and suggested that if considering an understated Worster kind of subtle entry, the Sea Ranch principles of making the structure disappear, the intent of the Shoreline Overlay District, the oppressive entry and the butterfly roof seemed arbitrary and non-functional. He supported a Worsterized subtlety to blend in with its environment, which the Shoreline Overlay District was attempting to do. He had made changes to the submitted drawing and displayed his sketch that eliminated the butterfly roof and had also reduced the 12-foot plate heights on the lower floor to 9 feet 9 inches to offer an idea of scale to show there were other ways that the home could be designed, retain views, and avoid imposition on the enjoyment of the waterfront. He suggested the design could continue from there. He also suggested that neither the DRB nor the Planning Commission would care about the 50/50 garage/entry rule if it helped to protect views and conform to the Shoreline Overlay District.

Boardmember Fine referred to the user experience along the green wall and suggested it was a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2020

skewed perspective that was actually blocking the view. She supported the Chair's suggestions to address the entry.

Mr. Gunkel commented that initially there had been a design with a more subtle entry and after meeting with planning staff he had been asked to provide a more significant entry given the 50/50 requirement. He could support a reduction of a 50/50 balance with a more subtle entry. Mr. Gunkel clarified that the fascia was not meant to be curved. He would modify the clear anodized fascia, and take to heart the placement of the home in the larger scheme and how it could fit to protect views. He wanted to avoid a boxy all flat roof home given that the charm of the area was the multiple roof styles and the natural wood that referenced the Sea Ranch style and other coastal styles. He added that the 12-foot plate height had been designed given the slope and cross slope of the site, since the garage had a relatively low ceiling, and stepping down to the floor to avoid a second story split level had been part of the effort to have a continuous plate height for the second story. He would look for ways to reduce that element. He recognized that the development of the property would block views of the across-the-street-neighbor and he would continue to respond to that situation.

Chair Livingston spoke to the comments with respect to providing cross sections to include across the street and the neighbors' homes, and agreed with the need to show the impact.

Chair Livingston stated he would summarize his list of comments and provide them to staff.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

Ms. Feliciano asked the DRB to consider a special meeting on November 18 as the only meeting in November given that the regular meeting would be on November 12, which would be Veterans Day, and the next meeting on November 26 would be the day before Thanksgiving. The DRB concurred and agreed to a special meeting on November 18, 2020.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

On the suggestion by Boardmember Fine that the DRB might want to consider a structure similar to other cities where applicants were allowed a limited time to make their presentations, Ms. Feliciano stated that there had always been a time limit at the discretion of the Chair.

Shannon Moore advised that the DRB's current procedures allowed five minutes for the applicant and two minutes for registered speakers, with time for the applicant to make rebuttal comments.

Chair Livingston suggested that the DRB discuss time limits at a future meeting. He also noted it had been determined that Terminal One could not be built, as designed, and there was an issue of whether to propose single-family or higher density residential development for the site.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:43 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, October 28, 2020.