

# MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 25, 2021

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

August 11, 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.

**The recording of the meeting was incomplete, it started at approximately 6:30 P.M. in the middle of the discussion for Item PLN21-147.**

### ROLL CALL

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

**Absent:** Boardmembers Jessica Fine and Macy Leung

### INTRODUCTIONS

**Staff Present:** Planners Emily Carroll, and Jonelyn Whales, and City Attorney Heather McLaughlin

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** July 28, 2021

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Hook) to approve the minutes of the July 28, 2021 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Fine and Leung.)**

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

#### Public Forum

The format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting was presented.

# MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 25, 2021

The following email was received for public comment:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, had submitted the following email into the public record: “Good evening Chair Livingston, Boardmembers and City staff, I have some comments for the record. 1. I must remind the Board that any project pending on approval, the applicant must communicate with the applicable Neighborhood Council. 2. For E.G., if you recall when the applicant came to talk about the Aspire Academy Project, Fairmede Hilltop was not aware of the project. Sincerely, Cordell.”

**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, August 23, 2021 by 5:00 P.M.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>1. PLN21-147</b><br>Description | <b>NEW SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING</b><br><b>(CONTINUED FROM JULY 28, 2021)</b> PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 2,200 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A VACANT PARCEL 100 FEET NORTH FROM THE ORCHARD AVENUE AND SOUTH 59 <sup>TH</sup> STREETS. |
| Location                           | SOUTH 59 <sup>TH</sup> STREET  |
| APN                                | 508-371-016  |
| Zoning                             | RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT   |
| Owner                              | PRABHJOT SINGH   |
| Applicant                          | ROBERT AVELLAR   |
| Staff Contact:                     | JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>   |

[Note: The recording of the meeting started in the middle of the discussion for PLN21-147.]

With respect to the request for a Design Review Permit to construct a 2,200 square foot two-story single-family dwelling on a vacant parcel at south 59<sup>th</sup> Street, Vice Chair Carter commented that the columns were a great addition into the entry vestibule but he questioned the appropriate form or detail of those columns. He suggested the columns appeared to be neo-classical and suggested something more streamlined. He noted that they read as round and he suggested rectilinear columns would be more appropriate. He supported something more contemporary.

Chair Livingston noted that the columns were off-the-square 7x7 painted columns that could be purchased from Home Depot.

Vice Chair Carter referred to the rear canopy over the exit of the patio door and asked how that element would be supported. He recommended a Craftsman style knee brace.

PRABHJOT SINGH, the applicant, stated that would have to be left to the engineer, Robert Avellar, who was listening in but who could not respond via Zoom.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 25, 2021**

Boardmember Butt recommended that the metal canopy be the same burnt orange color as had been recommended for the front door as opposed to the apple green that had been called out in the plans. Further with respect to the colors that had been presented, she suggested the Southwest Pottery (similar to Bric-a-brac) and the Texas Sage appeared to be appropriate colors.

Chair Livingston agreed with the Board on the columns and wanted to see the columns in the rear be a simple 6x6, Western Red Cedar, with a simple trim at the top and a simple base to cover up the attachment. He supported a streamlined effect for those columns as well as the columns on the deck next to the entry. To make those columns special, he recommended they be reduced to a Western Red Cedar, smooth painted column with a simple capital and an even simpler base. He also suggested that those columns needed to be in line.

Boardmember Hook stated with respect to the street tree that there appeared to be little room to plan a large street tree. As a result, she recommended a smaller tree such as a crepe myrtle.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Butt supported the 6x6 redwood posts on the upper deck of the front and on the back to make the front entry porch stand out as the design element feature. She also agreed with a red front door and the simplification of the posts for the handrails on the back. She referred to the big expanse of stucco on the side elevations and recommended that the joints align with the decks or the floor lines.

Vice Chair Carter agreed that the expansion joints at the floor line could provide some relief and help with the composition and break up the mass with some vertical control joints as well to be lined up with the window jambs and the like.

Chair Livingston referred to the flashing and a gutter associated with the decks, as drawn, and noted that there would be a flashing line, a fascia, and a gutter which could become the band that broke the building up on the top level and provide some relief, with a similar control joint at the main floor level.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN21-147, New Single Family Dwelling; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 7 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 8) Add a horizontal fascia at the second floor deck level all the way around that would correspond with the fascia of the deck and the deck drainage gutter thereof, combined with a control joint at the main floor level all the way around to help mitigate the mass of the sidewall stucco; 9) Delete street tree shown on site plan; 10) Simplify the column design with only the entry columns being the elaborate classical columns and the rest to be less elaborate, painted 6x6 Western Red Cedar with a simple capital and simpler base; 11) Colors to be red entry door and red garage door, gutters to be white to match the windows and window trim, and delete the apple green; 12) Delete wood siding on the front elevation; 13) Trim around windows to be glass fiber reinforced concrete (GFRC) smooth stucco or similar with matching window color; and 14) Rear canopy shall not be green; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Fine and Leung.)**

### **Board Business**

#### **A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:**

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 25, 2021**

City Attorney Heather McLaughlin updated the DRB on the 500-foot rule relative to Boardmember conflicts of interest. She explained that the current rule was 500 feet or less from the property unless there was clear and convincing evidence there would be no financial impact. If between 500 and less than 1,000 feet, there would have to be a determination whether the project would change the parcel's development potential, income producing potential, highest and best use, or character by substantially altering traffic levels, intensity of use, parking, views, noise, privacy, air quality or market value. If over a thousand feet away, there was likely no material problem unless there was clear and convincing evidence there would be a substantial effect on a Boardmember's property.

In the case of an office complex, Chair Livingston asked where the measurement would occur, from the property line or from the location of the office.

Ms. McLaughlin stated there would be a number of factors to consider such as the individual's right to use all the property, a month-to-month lease, or a long-term lease. She advised that she would return with a determination.

Chair Livingston noted the potential for a sewer moratorium on the west side of the City of Richmond, potentially from Pacific Avenue down to Western Drive, and Ms. McLaughlin advised she would check out the situation and report back.

### **B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:**

Chair Livingston spoke to the changes in retail use and development and noted that the City's Zoning Code and General Plan had not been able to keep up with those changes.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, August 25, 2021.