

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL**
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA
November 12, 2008
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Robert Avellar, Chair
Ted J. Smith
Diane Bloom

Don Woodrow, Vice Chair
Vacant
Vacant

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Avellar, Boardmember Bloom and Smith

Absent: Vice Chair Woodrow

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Joe Light, Hector Lopez, Jonelyn Whales, Janet Harbin, Richard Mitchell and Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 27, 2008

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to approve the minutes of February 27, 2008; unanimously approved.

October 8, 2008

Boardmember Bloom noted that she was not present at the February 27, 2008 and could not vote. Therefore, the minutes were held over due to lack of a quorum.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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, November 24, 2008 by 5:00 p.m. and he repeated the appeal period after each affected item.

Boardmember Smith requested hearing Item 2 and moving it to be heard at the end of the meeting.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Avellar noted Consent Calendar Items consisted of Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The following items were removed from the Consent Calendar: Item 1 (public), Item 5 (Smith), Item 2 (Avellar). Ms. Whales asked to modify the conditions for Item 6, stating Condition 13 should read, "The applicant shall install a cool roof or photovoltaic panels on all four buildings to ensure that green building practices are implemented in the business park to coincide with the City of Richmond's Sustainability Program."

ACTION: It was M/S (Smith/Bloom) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 3, 4, and 7; unanimously approved.

Items Heard:

- 1. PLN 08-022 – Alter Siding & Add Deck Railings & Trellises to Residence on Western Drive** - The Design Review Board will continue the public hearing to consider a request for Design Review Permit approval to alter the siding on the east wing of the single-family residence located at 8 Western Drive (APN: 558-012-010) and add deck railings and trellises to the north and south sides plus miscellaneous alterations. SFR-2 (Single-Family, Very Low Density Residential) zoning district. Margo Peters, owner/applicant. *Staff Contact: Joe Light. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.*

It was reported that the applicant was not present. Mr. Privat said the Board could consider the item, confer with staff and refer to the staff report.

Public Comments:

Richard Katz said it was previously identified that there had been no survey of the property available; however, a survey was completed. All four corners were appropriately staked and he asked the Board to take action to remove the open wire fence encroaching on the railroad land to the east of the property.

Chair Avellar confirmed with Mr. Light that the survey was not part of the application. He also said the Board requested more technical drawings, and Mr. Light said the architectural drawings were prepared as well as before and after photographs which show changes from the previous submittal and which he believed would allow the Board to make an informed decision on the proposal.

Boardmember Smith questioned if staff sent someone out to the site, and Mr. Light said he and the Building Official visited the site and viewed what was being done. The application at this time is the sum total of the work that has been done or started. They have been advised by the Attorney's office that the fence is not part of the project and not the purview of the Board. The City will deal with it separately through the normal abatement process.

Chair Avellar noted the Board would consider the deck, railing, trellis, sides and windows.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to approve PLN 08-022 with the staff's four findings and four recommendations; unanimously approved.

- 5. PLN 08-017 – Exterior Signs at Kaiser Permanente Medical Complex on Nevin Avenue** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review Permit approval for an exterior sign program refurbishment with new signs for the Kaiser Permanente Medical Complex located at 901 Nevin Avenue (APN: 538-111-001). C-B (Central Business) zoning district. Kaiser Permanente, owner; Victor Vitale of GNU Group, applicant. *Staff Contact: Hector Lopez. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.*

Mr. Lopez noted the applicant was not present and there were no public speakers on the item. He described the location of the signs.

Boardmember Bloom referred to location 12 and said they were removing a sign that is in the middle of the planting bed, which is one of the entrances to the facility. She asked that there be attention paid to adding and improving landscaping. Mr. Mitchell recommended conditional approval for the signs and have the applicant return to the Board with a plan to update their landscaping. Mr. Lopez agreed that landscaping to be added would be limited to that removed as a result of sign installation.

Boardmember Bloom voiced concern with the size of the letters on the signs, and believed they were somewhat small. She asked that some attention be given to enlarge the lettering. She believed the outside signs were inconsistent, felt the sign on Sheet 13.1 was nice and big, but the other signs are much different in size. She also requested the applicant reinstall landscaping on all outside island parking areas. She suggested continuing the item in order for the applicant to be present and be able to present the item and asked that staff forward concerns onto the applicant.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to continue PLN 08-017 to December 10, 2008; unanimously approved.

6. PLN 08-057 – Pinole Point Final Development Plan on Giant Road - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review Permit approval to construct four buildings (buildings one through four for a total of 646,000 square feet) for Phase II of a previously approved Master Development Plan located at 6501 Giant Road (APN 405-030-035) as part of the overall development plan approved for the Point Pinole Business Park. This 364 acre planned industrial business park was approved in 1996 by the City Council. The Council adopted development standards and design strategies for each phase of the business park construction and development. PA (Planned Area) zoning district and a General Plan designation of Light Industry/922. Patrick Russell, Sares-Regis Group, owner/applicant. *Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.*

Patrick Russell thanked staff for their assistance with the application and said he was available for questions.

Boardmember Bloom questioned why such a neutral color was chosen for the building, asked if the applicant would be amenable to another color, questioned why weren't more areas worn out around the entrances, asked the applicant to review the long, expansive areas with the Board to determine if any could be more appealing and changed, stating they were very flat and long.

Mr. Russell said the color scheme submitted was a printed copy which does not always represent the true color. The architect who did the design work will fine-tune the color program and ensure the City is agreeable. They are open to the use of color to create more dimension and interest in the project, as well.

Mr. Mitchell noted that this particular project and development area has its own design standards and may place some limits on design and color.

Mr. Russell noted they had tried to stay within context of the Phase I development which has a similar color palette and was built in 1999/2000 or 2001. He felt they were creating more distinction with the current palette which will add more spice to the design. The other three buildings are two colors and they are in the same family, but slightly different.

Boardmember Bloom also questioned if the reflective green glazing was something in the old design guidelines, and Mr. Mitchell said he was not sure. Mr. Russell said they had the guidelines with him and their architect has done a good job in working within constraints. He said they have had good success with using earth tones and complimentary colors. He said the green is actually very subtle and soothing. She questioned if he considered using more saturated colors that are in the same family and Mr. Russell said they would certainly consider this.

Boardmember Smith questioned where trash receptacles would be located and roof screening, and Mr. Russell pointed them out on the plan.

Gary Rierson, Architect, said the roof screening will be done via the building parapet and they provided cross sections in the plan that shows they have enough parapet to screen the units versus building a supplemental roof screen.

Chair Avellar questioned why there were so few windows on the south elevation of buildings one and two, and Ms. Whales noted this was a loading dock side. Mr. Rierson said they will have high windows in the warehouse area which are portal type windows. They also have sky lighting and vertical windows that break up both color and the offset from the roofline.

Mr. Russell said he wanted to remind everyone that these are industrial warehouse distribution buildings and the primary concern is for an efficient use of space, they do not place windows in the back loading area because the roll-up doors block the windows, but they have a very high level of ambient natural lighting in the buildings through the use of skylights. Also, the tenants who typically occupy the space do not want windows.

Chair Avellar questioned exterior lighting for the building, and Mr. Russell said this is dictated in the design guidelines and a photometric plan and light fixture sample was submitted. In response to a question regarding fencing, Mr. Russell said if fencing were proposed which would be driven by the tenant's needs, they would use wrought iron material along the railroad right-of-way and in other areas, propose chain link fencing.

Boardmember Bloom referred to the south elevation of Building 4, stating the distances between the horizontal panels were all different, and she questioned if this was an accurate depiction. Mr. Russell said it varies by the way they line up with the top of the windows. She also questioned the change in the scoring around the main entrance on the west elevation, and Mr. Russell came to the dais and resolved her question by pointing out items on the plans. Mr. Russell also discussed the second floor office area and said they wanted to add office space and this was dependent upon the number of tenants in each building.

Boardmember Bloom questioned whether the applicant was amenable to minimize the fortress-like look by changing the shape and size of the small windows on the upper area. Mr. Russell said the windows were installed to break up the shape of the building and provide natural light into the warehouse and he noted that the buildings can run light-free during the daytime. Mr. Rierson said they could make them larger but they may have to use a different design feature and he described what they were trying to achieve with natural light. They are also trying to compliment phase 1 and use the type of windows to break up the building.

BREAK

Chair Avellar called for a 5-minute break and thereafter reconvened the regular meeting.

Boardmember Bloom referred to landscaping, asked to use as many habitat plants as possible, asked to make sure the trees are 36-inch box to soften the building, and thinks there should be more mounding. She asked that landscape and irrigation maintenance guidelines were clear

and that they be addressed to ensure mature growth of landscaping. She also asked that the landscape representative be made to be present at the time of installation, and if drainage is not sufficient, the plant selection list should be amended.

Chair Avellar questioned if panels could punch out more than others so the project does not incorporate such elongated walls. Mr. Russell said the panels at the main entrances are planned to protrude about 3.5 to 4 inches beyond the building giving a shadow effect, making the arcade stand out, and this design element emanated from the Phase I building. The length of the building actually goes down a steep angle and they designed the building with multiple entrances for the benefit of the tenant(s). However, he agreed to pop the panels up.

Boardmember Bloom discussed the color and materials board and Mr. Rierson said the finished product has a lot more vibrancy in color that what the panel showed.

There were no public speakers.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to recommend conditional approval of PLN 08-057 to the Planning Commission with staff's five findings and 16 recommendations; with the additional condition that the elevation of Building 2 have the parapet raised or lowered to break up the walls; to ensure the height of the plants are tall enough which are set against the blank panels and consider a mounded planting underneath this area; unanimously approved.

2. EID/DR 1104442 – Multi-Family Residential Development on Garrity Way - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a recommendation to the Planning Commission on the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) and Design Review Permit for the construction of a ±200,000 square foot multi-family residential development located at 3151 Garrity Way (APN: 405-290-069) that would include a total of 127 dwelling units over a parking podium. C-3 (Regional Commercial) zoning district. Wasatch Advantage Group, owner; Tony Hladek, applicant. *Staff Contact: Hector Lopez. Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Conditional Approval to the Planning Commission.*

BREAK

Chair Avellar called for a brief break and thereafter reconvened the regular meeting at 7:40 p.m.

NOTED PRESENT

Boardmember Woodrow was noted present.

Boardmember Smith reported a conflict of interest and was excused from participating on the item.

Tony Hladek, Wasatch Advantage Group, applicant, said he and the development team were available for questions about the project. He said they had presented a slide presentation, which could not be shown due to technical problems.

Planning Director Richard Mitchell gave a brief background of the project, stating it had been proposed as an 88 unit condominium project originally. He described the architecture, the location of the project and said the applicant was encouraged to develop a Mediterranean or Spanish style building.

Boardmember Woodrow said he was pleased to see the applicant addressed removing and enhancing the soil which ensures those who rent the units will have a view, and he supported the project.

Boardmember Bloom questioned if there was any new landscaping other than trees, and Ms. Van Dorn of Van Dorn Landscape Architects gave a brief presentation and description of the landscape plan and plant list, which was comprehensive and green in nature. Because the page was omitted from the packet, Boardmember Bloom received a copy from Ms. Van Dorn for review.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned how planting is done on a slope prone to slides, and Ms. Van Dorn said the plan incorporates small terraces and they choose plants that spread and hold the slope.

Boardmember Bloom questioned how good or bad drainage was for the site, encouraged projects that include habitat sensitive plants and native plants which utilize little water, and confirmed with Ms. Van Dorn was amenable to tweaking the plan somewhat to accommodate Boardmember Bloom's suggestions.

Chair Avellar pointed out that conditions in the staff report were not in proper order, and Mr. Lopez said the numbering should total 30 conditions.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Woodrow) to recommend certification of the mitigated negative declaration and recommend approval of EID/DR 1104442 with staff's four findings and 30 recommendations to the Planning Commission, and for the applicant to meet with Boardmember Bloom to finalize the landscape plan; unanimously approved (Smith recused).

BOARD BUSINESS

8. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff

- a. November 26th DRB meeting is cancelled; Next DRB meeting will be held on December 10, 2008.**

In reply to questions of the Board, Mr. Mitchell reported that he would be meeting with the Council in December regarding the potential merger of the Planning Commission and Design Review Board.

BROWN ACT – Public Forum – No speakers.

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