

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 23, 2021

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

June 9, 2021
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

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Jonathan Livingston

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Jessica Fine, and Michelle Hook

Absent: Boardmember Macy Leung

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Emily Carroll, Jonelyn Whales, and Hector Lopez, and City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

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

The following email was received for public comment:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond: "Good evening Chair Livingston, Boardmembers and City staff, I have a couple of comments for the record. 1. Anytime when projects are being considered, the applicants must communicate with the appropriate neighborhood council. 2. I think that the public should return to the meetings. Sincerely, Cordell."

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 23, 2021

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE:

Any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, June 21, 2021 by 5:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. PLN21-063 LOWERY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,200 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A VACANT PARCEL.
Location YORK STREET (BETWEEN SANFORD AND WILLARD AVENUES)
APN 561-151-021
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant DENISE LOWERY (OWNER)
Staff Contact: EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: **CONTINUE TO JUNE 23, 2021**

The application was continued to the meeting scheduled for June 23, 2021.

- 2. PLN20-278 NEW 1,750 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A THIRD-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING.
Location 1376 SOUTH 50TH STREET
APN 560-033-048
Specific Plan RICHMOND BAY SPECIFIC PLAN, T5 MAIN STREET OPEN (T5MS-0)
Owner STEVE OLIVER AND JOSH OLIVER
Applicant KAVA MASSIH ARCHITECTS
Staff Contact: JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated June 9, 2021, and stated the DRB had previously considered the item at its February 2, 2021 meeting when a number of recommendations and suggestions had been offered to improve the proposed third floor addition. Specifically, the DRB had recommended the integration of the massing of the deck more in line with the existing entryway; the reduction of the deck to allow it to balance with the entryway; fenestration for the blank wall on the east elevation; four or five trees in the proposed landscaping design pursuant to City ordinance; enhancing the chain link fence shown on the elevations; enhancing the overall design of the building by adding site furnishings to create a more inviting frontage; the specification of lighting fixtures and LED lighting to no more than 3,000K; and the screening of the rooftop equipment. She reported the applicant had revised the plans to incorporate the majority of the recommendations with the exception of the site furnishings since the area in question was isolated at night and security was a concern.

In response to Boardmember Fine as to whether a materials board or landscape plan had been submitted, Ms. Whales referred to Sheet A1.1 which included an outline of the trees that had been proposed but stated that no separate landscape plan had been submitted, and reported the materials had been shown on Sheet A4.1.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 23, 2021

Ms. Whales clarified for the Chair that the applicant had proposed enhancements to the chain link fence by replacing the existing slats so that all slats would be of the same quality and all would be installed at the same time.

KAVA MASSIH, Kava Massih Architects, verified that Steve Oliver and Josh Oliver, the property owners, were also present to respond to questions related to the application for a new third floor to expand the existing office space.

Mr. Massih spoke to the DRB's recommendations and explained how those recommendations had been incorporated into the plan, particularly with respect to the deck which had now been expanded to the entire length of the building. He presented the original views compared with the revised plans to show the expansion of the deck in response to the DRB's comments; pointed out the changes that had been made to the east elevation using some of the same materials that had been proposed for the south elevation to break up the mass on the east elevation; described how the mechanical systems would be enclosed to screen the equipment on the rooftop; and explained that the light fixtures on the building would serve a security and visibility function and an additional exterior light would be added over the new entry. The remaining issues had to do with the site such as the fence around the parking area where the original slats in the fence had been damaged over the years and would all be replaced, potentially with green slats and plantings to camouflage the fence. He highlighted the trees proposed in the bulb-out on South 50th Street and stated that he would work with the City to determine the appropriate trees to be planted. With respect to the recommended site furnishings, he and the Olivers reiterated that the addition of site furnishings at the location in question would be inappropriate and invite unwanted attention to an area that was isolated and not well lit.

Boardmember Hook supported the improvements but expressed concern for the edges of the building with respect to fencing, site furnishings, and landscaping materials. She referenced the original idea for an area with site furnishings to provide an area of respite and a seating place but understood the concern with respect to security. As to the trees, she recommended use of the City of Richmond Urban Greening Master Plan for the tree selection and suggested the proposed trees could be spaced out more. She recommended the selection of a specimen tree to anchor the corner where other plantings and irrigation should be added. She agreed with the need to maintain the slats in the fencing.

Vice Chair Carter agreed with the intent to expand the balcony fully across the entryway. With respect to the lighting over the entryway, he asked how it would interact with the awning over the door and whether it would need to be raised to avoid conflicting with the canopy.

Mr. Massih noted that the canopy was a leftover from the original smaller deck. He recommended a less deep awning to avoid conflicts with the lighting.

Vice Chair Carter commented that he was not wed to the bell light and suggested that something concealed by the shallower canopy could be considered, although he understood that would not fit the goal of illuminating the ground. He recommended a fixture that would both illuminate the ground and work as an architectural feature. With respect to the metal cladding on the addition, he verified with Mr. Massih the intent for a fairly common clear anodized aluminum. He also verified that the fins for the sun shading could be powder coated steel and be a darker gray.

Mr. Massih explained that he wanted to get a structural engineer involved to ensure the right weight for that element.

Vice Chair Carter referred to the upper elevation and wrapping the wall with the ribbon windows that resulted in the appearance of boarded up windows. He asked how that would be finished

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 23, 2021

and the Olivers explained that they wanted to see something off-white or beige but not something that would stand out and be reflective. Their desire was to have architectural symmetry around the building in something that was appropriate and sympathetic to all three sides of the building.

Chair Livingston suggested that spandrel glass would work in that area as long as it was not a window, and both the Chair and Vice Chair Carter discussed options with the property owners to ensure their intent that the east wall looked and blended in with what was happening on the south and west elevations.

Boardmember Fine emphasized the need for a complete package including existing and new species of trees and she supported Boardmember Hook's species recommendations. In terms of colors, she needed to see a materials board and wanted to be apprised of what would be powder coated and what would be anodized, whether the green tones of the CMU would be matched, the materials for the deck, how the existing CMU would be protected, and how the addition would react to the existing structure in terms of finish. She suggested the garage doors could be anodized or be powder coated to match some of the other materials in the project.

Boardmember Fine referred to the west elevation, saw a lot of different rhythms and wanted to see more cohesion in that elevation. She noted there was a lot going on from mullions to panel dividers to posts, and the railing to mullions above, along with the storefront, suggested it could be carried through more thoughtfully and it would be helpful to see actual materials and how they carried through the whole project. With respect to the fin at the sills dying into the cable railing, she characterized that as precarious and difficult to detail and suggested the fin might want to terminate sooner at the other elevations. She suggested there would be some tricky issues dealing with existing conditions and bringing in a sleek new decking system. She also wanted to see something of a more modern crisp light fixture.

Boardmember Butt stated the entry was working much better now, she liked that the material was being brought down, and that the deck would be extended. She agreed with the need to tie the garage door into the material and was glad to see that the east elevation had been articulated and the lines had been pulled around. She agreed with the need to avoid the look of boarded up windows and agreed that spandrel glass might offer an appropriate solution. She also supported a darker color in that case.

Chair Livingston agreed with the need for a more modern light fixture above the door. With respect to the deck, he did not believe that a structural engineer would be able to detail the deck the way it looked in the renderings, and Mr. Massih clarified that a structural engineer had not evaluated that element at this point.

Chair Livingston recommended a 10-inch C-channel with a plate on the wall to take the load. He also suggested there was a way to integrate holding the deck up while helping to bring some of the contemporary architecture down over the entry to the human touch on the bottom and solving the structural problem. He presented a sketch identified as Exhibit A to represent his recommendations.

Both Steve and Josh Oliver expressed support for the additional recommendations.

No written comments were submitted or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Fine reiterated the need for a complete package, the designation of trees existing and new, a materials board with colors, and requested that the application return with that additional information.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 23, 2021

Vice Chair Carter suggested the application could be approved subject to conditions including continuing the glass look with the spandrel glass on the east side, some consistency in the garage door treatment, a more contemporary light fixture, and a deeper structure of the deck. He stated it would be nice to avoid having a post coming all the way to the ground since it would look spindly with the overall massing, and still retain a cantilevered deck, if possible.

Boardmember Hook supported the application subject to conditions and advised that she could review the planting plan, tree species, and irrigation plan.

Boardmember Butt suggested the application could be conditioned for approval subject to Boardmember Hook's disposition of the landscape plan.

With respect to the post for the deck, Mr. Massih displayed a sketch to address that element and the Olivers expressed a willingness for a compromise in that case. The Board and the applicants discussed potential materials for that element. On the suggestion for use of a fine hollow structural steel, Mr. Massih stated he was not a fan of steel tubes but would support an I-beam.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to approve PLN20-278, New 1,750 Square Foot Addition; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 7 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 8) The slats in the fence shall be replaced; 9) Light fixtures to be more consistent with the contemporary upper floor; 10) Spandrel glass to return on upper floor; 11) Top deck to be designed per Exhibit A, Exhibit A1 and Exhibit A2, with the final design to be articulated by the architect; 12) Insert a specimen tree at the corner and redesign the corner without the boxwood hedges, celebrate the corner more with landscaping, the final design to be reviewed by staff and staff shall review the final design with the City arborist and a subcommittee of the DRB; 13) Garage door shall be finished in such a way to be more consistent with the cladding of the addition; and 14) The architect shall clarify the exact materials on all pages in the plans for exterior materials, finishes, colors, and the like; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

- City Attorney's Report on Nexus and Proportionality

The item was continued to a future meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, June 23, 2021.