

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL**  
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA  
April 23, 2008  
6:00 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Robert Avellar, Chair	Vacant, Vice Chair
Ted J. Smith	Don Woodrow
Diane Bloom	Vacant

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Avellar and Boardmembers Bloom, Smith and Woodrow

**Absent:** None

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Jonelyn Whales, Lina Velasco and Assistant City Attorney Mary Renfro

**Chair Avellar** gave an overview of the procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. He noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, May 5, 2008 by 5:00 p.m. and repeated the appeal period after each affected item.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**January 31, 2008, March 12, 2008:**

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Smith/Woodrow) to approve the minutes of January 31 and March 12, 2008; unanimously approved.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to approve the agenda; unanimously approved.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Chair Avellar** noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of Items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 10 and 11. The Board requested Item 1 be moved to the Consent Calendar due to it being a hold over item to June 11, 2008 and Items 9 and 10 were removed for discussion (Woodrow).

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Woodrow/Smith) to approve the Consent Calendar as Items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11; unanimously approved.

**Consent Items Approved:**

1. **DR 1103130 – Construct Two-Story Single-Family Residence on Tremont Avenue -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±2,400 square foot two-story residence located on Tremont Avenue between Contra Costa Avenue and California Street in the Tiscornia Estates planning area (APN: 558-282-020). SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential) Zoning District and General Plan Designation. Robert Clear, owner; Stuart Littell of Stuart Construction, applicant; L2 Studio of San Francisco, architect. *Staff Contact: Janet Harbin.* Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To June 11, 2008.
4. **DR 1104607 – Construct Deck at the Rear of Residence on Heavenly Ridge Lane -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±760 square foot two-level deck at the rear of the residence located at 5342 Heavenly Ridge Road (APN: 433-362-010). SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Richard Dare, owner/applicant. *Staff Contact: Hector Lopez.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
5. **DR 1103830 – Construct Mixed-Use Development on Colusa Ave. -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a mixed-use development consisting of an assembly building for a church and 23 multi-family residential apartments located at San Joaquin Street between Colusa and Modoc Avenue (APNs: 507-262-010, -011, -012,-013, 014 and 507-262-030). Knox Freeway Cutting Specific Plan Mixed-Use Zoning District. Tom Vaughn, owner; Jeffrey Supran (Architect), applicant. *Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
6. **DR 1104474 – Construct New Gas Station on Barrett Avenue -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to demolish the AM/PM Gas Station and construct a ±2,400 square foot Arco facility with a 24-hour convenience store located at 2230 Barrett Avenue (APNs: 514-100-022 and -023). MFR-3 (High Density Residential and C-2 (General Commercial) Zoning Districts. BP West Coast Products, LLC, owners; WD Partners, applicant. *Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
7. **DR 1104636 – Making Waves Academy Landscape Improvements on Lakeside Drive -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval of a proposed landscaping plan for the Making Waves Academy located at 4123 and 4131 Lakeside Drive (APN: 405-371-012). M-1 (Light Industrial) Zoning District. Making Waves Foundation, owner; Tad Sekino of Hardison Komatsu Ivelich & Tucker, applicant. *Staff Contact: Hector Rojas.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
8. **DR 1104591 – Addition to Existing Structure on Nevin Avenue -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval for a ±820 square foot single-story addition to the existing structure located at 3215 & 3221 Nevin Avenue (APNs: 516-130-010 & -009). MFR-3 (Multi-Family High Density Residential) Zoning District. Anka Behavioral Health, Inc., owner/applicant. *Staff Contact: Hector Rojas.* Tentative Recommendation: Withdrawal.
11. **DR 1104670 – Construct Two-Story Addition and Carport on South 19<sup>th</sup> Street -** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±45 square-foot two-story addition for an ADA compliant elevator and to construct a carport to an existing ±2,667 square-foot single-family dwelling located at 131 South 19th Street (APN: 544-042-010). SFR-3 (Single Family Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Olga Eaglin, owner; Mark Thomsson, applicant. *Staff Contact: Kieron Slaughter.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

## Items Heard:

- DR 1103662 – Construct New Single-Family Residence on Terrace and Vine Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±2,607 square foot single-family residence on the vacant lot located at the southwest corner of Terrace Avenue and Vine Avenue (APN: 558-082-001). SFR-2 (Very Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Firas & Amina Jandali, owners/applicants. *Staff Contact: Lina Velaso*. Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Approval to the Planning Commission.

Robert Thompson, Applicant, gave a brief description of the property, described exterior materials and colors, said the lower portion of the property is elevated by retaining walls and the design complies with all City standards. He said Rod Satre of the PRNC, has consistently demanded concessions from the owner which are not found in any City ordinances or law, and most recently requested they reduce the home by 800 square feet which is the entire ground floor, half of which is under grade. The PRNC needs to be reminded that they are not allowed or authorized to re-write City ordinances, and their goal is to make the design sensitive to the neighbors, respective of Richmond history and asked the Board to approve the project.

Firas Jandali, owner, reiterated that the coverage is 43% and he said the lot coverage next door is 47%, the two across the street are 45% and 46% and he asked that the project be approved.

**Boardmember Woodrow** said the PRNC provides advice only, they are free to comment on the design and if someone were to see the current plan along Terrace Avenue, it would be a formidable wall and bigger than anything on the street, which is one of the big issues. He believed their concerns have to do with massing and size. In addition, the comments received from the PRNC are almost exactly what came from the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee, who also said the building size and mass should be reduced. He acknowledged the owner was coming in last and the lot is oddly shaped, but the issue is not with the patterning, character of siding or color, but of size.

**Boardmember Woodrow** confirmed the home will be built for the owner and his family. Mr. Jandali said they began with 3,400 square feet, went down to plan B of 3,027 square feet, and down again to plan C to 2,843 square feet, and then plan D at 2,700 square feet and he believed they acted in compromise. He said they could only cut the lower floor which would not affect the mass of the building.

**Boardmember Woodrow** noted the proposed design was reviewed on January 4, 2008 by the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee and that its mass and volume have been reduced according to meetings and it is currently designed as 2,700 square feet.

**Boardmember Bloom** referred to landscaping, said it is unusual to see so many different hardscape materials around one house, said there is a Stone crest float stone and there is no elevations to see how the landscape looks against the house. The applicant referred to the materials and colors, there are 18 inch high retaining walls and brick on sand paving. **Boardmember Bloom** said she did not see any brick indicated, but flagstone, apian stone, and western sunset, and Mr. Thompson said the City requested changes and they were made

Ms. Velasco said originally the item was scheduled before the Board for an earlier meeting this year and staff received comments from the Board which were provided to the applicants on the landscape plan such as planting size, materials and this is what was submitted in response; however, there was no requirement for them to provide all of the different types of hardscapes and this was one of the comments from the neighborhood council.

**Boardmember Bloom** said it is atypical for the neighborhood to have this type of hardscape and to have so much and she did not understand why the stone crest float area exists and believed that more balance was needed with plantings.

The applicant said they have been working on the plan for a long time and are willing to do whatever the Board wants, they do need some courtyards outside of the glass doors on the ground floor and the owners do need some area for outdoor furniture, and they have provided those areas. The retaining walls are minimal; are 18 inches and he feels the native landscape is appropriate for the area. **Boardmember Bloom** said none of the plants are natives and the plants shown do not reflect their name, and she believed there were ways of additional plantings and recommended this be done.

**Chair Avellar** confirmed there were no public comments. He referred to the elevations, confirmed the garage door would be white and he suggested it be made of wood or painted with one of the accent colors. He confirmed there was no trim around the windows and the finish was bronze. Regarding the north elevation and downspout, he confirmed it would be an earth color, there were gutters all along the perimeter of the building and all runoff will be carried down to a drainage system on site.

**Boardmember Woodrow** questioned and confirmed with the applicant that the view one would get from Terrace is the view from downhill looking up and the north face of the building. He confirmed that the owner would need to have an area for patio furniture on the east side of the building.

The public hearing was closed.

**Boardmember Bloom** asked that the owner be presented with alternatives for paving and suggested doing individual flagstone leading up to and connecting the stairways with groundcover or plantings coming up to them except for the areas needed for the tables and chairs. She suggested reducing the types of plant patterns and use native plants, and the applicant agreed to resubmit a revised landscaping plan, agreed to resubmit a revised landscaping plan, they will reduce the amount of hardscape and use decomposed granite or a permeable material for the area around the house except for the courtyards where there would be furniture.

Ms. Velasco said the applicant is required to go to the Planning Commission because of the minimum lot size on May 15, 2008 and could resubmit the plan just prior to the meeting. Staff recommended the applicant also eliminate or reduce the deck area on the east side because it does not meet the setback. They could still have the paved area on the ground, but not the balcony. **Boardmember Bloom** believed it would be better if the Board saw the landscaping plan with an elevation, but would not require them to return to the Board.

**Boardmember Woodrow** said he would vote no on the project, stating that for the last four years he has served, there has been a constant struggle to ensure the Historic Zone is held to a high standard. This does not mean someone must copy something in the area, but whatever built should not stand out and not fit, and he believed the home does not fit. He acknowledged the applicant made efforts to reduce size, he believed it was still too large and he believed the City should put more teeth in the Historic Zone regulations. **Boardmember Bloom** said given many will be unhappy with the size, the landscaping should really reflect as much as it can with what is happening with the neighborhood, such as using native plants and she believed it could balance out some things.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to approve DR 1103662 with staff's four findings and fifteen recommendations, with the additional condition that the landscape plan be re-submitted for approval by the Planning Director; that the garage door and downspout be painted to match the building accent colors; Vote: 3-1 (Woodrow voted no).

- 3. DR 1103979 – Construct Three Dwellings on Espee Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct three proposed dwellings with reduced front setbacks because of an irregularly shaped lot located at 247 Espee Avenue (APN: 540-182-008). The project applicant has also applied for a variance to reduce the front setback to allow development of the dwellings within the City Center Specific Plan Area; Urban High Density Zoning District. Napoleon Diaz, owner; Bill Brobisky, applicant. *Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Bill Brobisky, applicant, said they have flipped the project per staff's request, said the total square footage is about 2,800 square feet for all three units, described the design, they located entrances using a single porch, said there a request for more information regarding details be provided on the plan, they prepared a new materials board, and he hoped the design meets with the Board's approval.

**Boardmember Smith** said the last time the applicant came before the Board, there were some neighbors in opposition to the project, and Mr. Brobisky said they did not object but did not know what the project was and the owners have since met with the neighbors and believed since no one was present, they are in agreement with the request.

**Boardmember Bloom** confirmed the applicant prepared the planting plan, she noted there was a lot of Jasmine and suggested also using a passion flower, and asked to add some salvia's and the applicant agreed to revise the plan according to comments. **Boardmember Woodrow** confirmed the plants proposed will not utilize much water and the plants were taken from the EBMUD book and noted that EBMUD would begin restricting the use of water in May.

**Boardmember Bloom** also suggested replacing massing of several plants with one plant that is going to get wide. She said some of the Manzanita's will creep out in areas, Sphaeralcea also spreads about two feet wide, and these could save a lot of water.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Woodrow/Smith) to approve DR 1103979 with staff's findings and recommendations, with additional planting comments as recommended by Boardmember Bloom; unanimously approved.

- 9. DR 1104565 – Addition to Single-Family Residence on Van Fleet - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval for a ±600 square foot two-story addition to the existing 1,100 square foot residence located at 5620 Van Fleet Avenue (APN: 510-041-022). SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Christian Storm, owner; Robert Thompson, applicant. *Staff Contact: Hector Lopez.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Robert Thompson, Applicant, described the request for a second story, two-bedroom and master bath addition.

**Boardmember Woodrow** referred to the photograph which shows the front of the building and the front door and steps to the house beside it. There is a blue box and he questioned if there was a plan to keep the garbage out of public view. The applicant said the steps will be brought

forward about 8 feet forward and a storage bin will be installed under the steps and screened. **Boardmember Woodrow** referred to the windows on the addition and confirmed they do not open up to any homes. He questioned the number of vehicles needing parking, and the applicant said there is parking for one car in the garage and one car outside.

**Chair Avellar** referred to Sheet A.5.; he confirmed with the applicant the overhang is reduced to 2 feet cantilever for the setback per revised plans. He also referred to Section 2 and said there is no offset on the second floor. Regarding exterior materials, there was no keynote to match existing, and the applicant said they are going to incorporate all new siding and confirmed it will be clapboard siding and it is stated on the plans. He also confirmed with the applicant that there will be a 30-year roof and gutter and downspouts because they are not noted, and the applicant said it would be a flat board, 4x4 corner boards, 4x4 trim fascia board, clapboard will be 5" to the weather, they will match the paint to what is existing and he presented the material and colors board.

Public Comments:

Rachel McMullin said she is a neighbor and is completely supportive of the applicant's proposal to meet the needs of their growing family. However, she was not sure what the Board is actually approving because the owner did not have a copy of the most up to date plans and her only concern is that the western wall would overlook her backyard. She suggested if windows are located on the wall, that they be placed higher on the elevation so as to provide better privacy.

**Boardmember Bloom** believed the Board could also recommend a tree and suggested a small leafed Avara, and Ms. McMullin said she already had landscaped screening by her hot tub, but simply asked that the windows be spaced respectfully at a height that minimizes intrusion of privacy.

D'Ouita Woods said she did not object to the proposal, but voiced concerns that their property is 2 feet from one another and the fact that she would lose light from the west side of her home.

**Chair Avellar** confirmed a shadow study was done by the Architect, confirmed the windows are sliders and consistent with other windows of the home but were not reflected on the elevation drawings. He said he did not want to approve the project based on incomplete plans and recommended the proposal be continued.

**Boardmember Bloom** asked that the applicant ensure placement of windows be shown on the plans. **Boardmember Woodrow** said the applicant also noted the front steps will be moved forward which is also not shown. Also, the steps are shown but no arch or opening under the steps to hold the trash containers and he asked for this to be completed.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Bloom) to hold over DR 1104565 to May 14, 2008 in order to revise elevations to accurately reflect what is proposed for the project; unanimously approved.**

**10. DR 1102707 – Construct Two-Story Warehouse & Office Building on Goodrick Avenue**  
- PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval for a proposed two-story ±58,000 square foot warehouse and office building located approximately 400 feet southwest of the intersection of Goodrick Avenue and Richmond Parkway (APN: 408-220-047). The project is located within the North Richmond Shoreline Specific Plan with a land use designation of Heavy Industrial and General Plan designation of Heavy Industrial/901. M-3 (Heavy Industrial) Zoning District. Goodrick Parkway Properties, LLC, owner; David

Popelka, applicant. *Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales.* Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

**Boardmember Woodrow** said the only concern he had was the pipeline at the back of the property because the City was finding more and more pipelines in the City and very few were paying taxes on them. The concern is a line carrying gasoline or hydrogen rupturing.

The applicant, David Popelka, said it is an active pipeline, they are in contact, and once construction is started, all work will be supervised. He said he is the manager of Goodrick Parkway Properties, LLC and also manage ATS Properties which is adjacent to the site, they developed a similar project 8 years ago and as part of that development, purchased this site. They have held the property undeveloped for some time and developed a joint venture with a Richmond company. He described the property as similar in character to the ATS property and believed the design to be handsome.

**Chair Avellar** said he likes the building; however, in Richmond, the City tries to achieve variations to roof lines and parapet lines and he asked if the applicant could break up the lines of the parapet.

Jonathan Pearlman, Architect, said the design particularly across the Richmond Parkway front, was done in such a way that it is modulated and in-between there are slightly inset glass panels, and then the portion to the point around the corner is all glass. The idea was that it would appear modular. Visually, it will appear to be a series of individual rhythms. He believed they could articulate or introduce another glass bay on the south elevation.

**Chair Avellar** also questioned and confirmed that downspouts and scuppers were all internal. He said there are no skylights in the new Tenant Space 1, and Mr. Pearlman said this has a window wall that wraps around and the tenant will have glass in the space. **Chair Avellar** questioned whether there was an exterior parking lighting plan, and Mr. Pearlman said this was done and will match the ATS property and briefly described the finishing of the bollards.

**Boardmember Woodrow** referred to page 15 of the Negative Declaration, said the consultant commented about soil types, and the applicant understood they were sitting on Bay muds and filled ground, with tilt-up walls which are vulnerable during an earthquake. He asked what the applicant has done to relieve this risk and whether it would show up in the exterior of the building. Mr. Pearlman said this is a structural engineering question about how the foundation and structure is done, it is not something that would structurally be revealed per se, on the exterior of the building, and one of their other buildings on Central Avenue has similar soils, he said the Code has gotten more stringent and he was sure the structural engineer will be required to meet requirements.

**Boardmember Woodrow** noted this building would be 500 yards from the Hayward fault, the one on Central is about 1.5 miles, and therefore, they may face a bigger threat.

**Chair Avellar** confirmed there were no public speakers.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Woodrow) to approve DR 1102707 with staff's four findings and staff's six recommendations, with additional recommendation that at the Architect's discretion, that the left side of the south wall either break up with parapet heights or glass elements into the facade; unanimously approved.**

## **BOARD BUSINESS**

**12. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff**

**A. May 28, 2008 Design Review Board Meeting-canceled**

**Public Forum - Brown Act - None**

---

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