

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
July 14, 2010
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Michael Woldemar, Chair	Eileen Whitty, Vice Chair
Diane Bloom	Andrew Butt
Otheree Christian	Raymond Welter
Don Woodrow	

The meeting was called to order at 6:09 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Woldemar, Vice Chair Whitty and Boardmembers Bloom, Butt, Christian, Welter and Woodrow (arrived at 7:05 p.m.)

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales and Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 26, 2010

Vice Chair Whitty noted the word “plaque” was misspelled on page 6.

ACTION: It was M/S (Welter/Butt) to approve the minutes of May 26, 2010, as amended; unanimously approved.

June 9, 2010

Vice Chair Whitty referred to page 4, middle paragraph; “Mr. Carson said he feels a little blindsided by this.” And, “if the other improvements will cause rancor ~~ranger~~ in the neighborhood.”

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Welter) to approve the minutes of June 9, 2010, as amended; unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S (Bloom/Butt) to approve the agenda; unanimously approved.

Public Forum – No speakers.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Woldemar reviewed the procedure for speakers and noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, July 26, 2010 by 5:00 p.m. and he read the appeal procedure after each affected item.

Chair Woldemar noted there was only one item under the Consent Calendar; Item 2. Boardmember Welter requested removal of the item from the Consent Calendar. Mr. Privat suggested Item 1 be moved to the Consent Calendar, as it is a hold over item, and the Board agreed.

Public Hearings

- 1. PLN10-090 KUHN RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS ON SAN JOSE AVENUE**
Description **(Held Over from 6/9/2010)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR A ±286 SQUARE FOOT REAR ADDITION AND DECK.
Location 5647 SAN JOSE AVENUE
APN 510-041-009
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner KUHN IRENE
Applicant ARIANA DRONEY
Staff Contact LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 7/28/2010**

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Butt) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Item 1; unanimously approved.

Removed from the Consent Calendar:

- CC 2. PLN09-133 SUPREMA MEAT COMPANY NEW COMMERCIAL OFFICES AND WAREHOUSE ON HENSLEY AND 7TH STREET**
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW WAREHOUSE AND OFFICE FOR SUPREMA MEAT COMPANY CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY ±22,724 SQUARE FEET ON 1.5 ACRES.
Location 1080 HENSLEY STREET
APN 561-319-008 AND 009
Zoning M-2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL)
Owner MICHAEL JARA
Applicant JOHN NEWTON
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Ms. Whales referred to a few typographical errors in the staff report on page 6, design review findings, number 2, the last sentence; should read, “such as significant impacts on views and privacy.” Number 3 under the statement; it should read “satisfied conditionally”. In the last sentence; “conditions of approval are satisfied” and other miscellaneous, minor corrections.

Ms. Whales noted that the architect is present and will be discussing the interior and exterior of the building. The Board did approve a project on this site for commercial offices as well as a warehouse in 2005; however, that approval did lapse over the period of time. It was extended once by the Planning and Building Director. The new applicant purchased the site and plans to move forward with a similar proposal; however, it will be for a wholesale meat distribution company. She noted the site is located on 1.5 acres and is currently vacant. Staff has determined the site meets all of the development standards for the zoning district.

The public hearing was opened.

John Newton, project manager, stated that Suprema is an existing meat company in Oakland and the owner is currently renting an old military meat processing facility. The owner wanted a much better office environment because his business is expanding. The design is straight-forward in that there is a main block of the building as the warehouse. The corner lot is a visible and attractive office setting, and they expended more effort into articulation and more natural light. The needs of trucking access are what drove the design, and he presented the main loading dock ground floor element. He then briefly described truck circulation in and out of the site and said they tried to do a good job with the landscaping. He noted there is a residential neighborhood on one side of the train tracks and for security reasons, they did not want to have an open end to the building. He said the landscape architect tried to highlight street entries.

Chair Woldemar asked Mr. Newton to review the grades, and confirmed with Mr. Newton that he had a photographic color board.

Mr. Newton referred to grading and said their civil engineer is Mark Wallman. There is not a lot of grading to be done, and he confirmed with staff that all of the engineering did not need to be done prior to this hearing. However, in making sure the basic drainage worked he had the engineer run all of the calculations for the bio swale.

Chair Woldemar questioned the height of the loading docks relative to everything else, questioned the finished floor and Mr. Newton said the loading docks go down 4 feet, there will be drainage, and referred to the A.2 section for the relationship of the railing.

Boardmember Bloom questioned whether the facility was a slaughter house and refrigeration units. Mr. Newton explained that refrigeration and distribution is the main purpose of the company. Meat is all in cardboard boxes, forklifts drive around inside the warehouse and trucks are loaded between 4:00 a.m. and 7:00 a.m. Receiving is from 7:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. He said most clients are restaurants. He has also designed the building to have as much solar as will fit on the roof top in order to save energy, given the significant refrigeration.

Boardmember Welter asked that the applicant create a physical material board. He referred to the north elevation and confirmed specific indoor and outdoor materials, that all metal panels will be a galvanized factory finish. He referred to all railing and fencing metals, and encouraged Mr. Newton to use powder coating. Mr. Newton noted the roll down doors may need to be a bare aluminum or natural metal because the blue color may not be able to be achieved. He noted that the blue color in the photos is not accurately reflected because of the software used for the color renderings.

Chair Woldemar asked Mr. Newton to identify fencing locations. Mr. Newton noted security is important for the owner, said they are proud not to have too much fencing, and he noted off of 7th Street will be 4-5 feet which will be concrete. The actual railing is just between the building and that area. Along Hensley there is no fencing at all, except way back at the face of the building, which is the other security point. He noted that landscaping will surround the site, and the fencing will be galvanized.

Boardmember Bloom questioned landscaping and drainage, said if the water table is high, the applicant should propose smaller sized plants. She felt the landscape plan was great, as botanical names were correctly spelled. She questioned and confirmed no employees of the company would be using the sidewalk, and Mr. Newton said there are some walkers but he was not sure where they come from.

Boardmember Bloom referred to the Strawberry tree and said it is a very messy tree and drops fruit, and she confirmed with Mr. Newton that the olive tree was fruitless. Chair Woldemar suggested a condition be considered for alternative tree species.

Vice Chair Whitty referred to the roof drainage down to the ground and out to the bio swale, and she said she did not see any pipes on the plans. Mr. Newton said the other benefit of this lot is that there is natural drainage which can drain right to the bio swale. Chair Woldemar said the Board has been requiring that C3 plans be part of the design review application. Ms. Whales said staff felt the applicant would be required to submit them at the building stage prior to obtaining building permits. Mr. Newton referred to drainage and said they designed the main roof to slope in the same direction. They are showing the gutter but not the roundabouts and they will be included.

Vice Chair Whitty said she noticed on the drawings there is an opaque strip and she could not tell if an entire window structure was going to be opaque. Mr. Newton said they have an opaque panel so that it looks like a window and aesthetically it appears as if it is one large window.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned if the entrance is sliding or swinging, and Mr. Newton said they are swinging. Hours of operation are quite long and they are not meant to open or close but once a day, and all trucks are parked within the locked portion.

Vice Chair Whitty referred to tables on the balcony for employees and she questioned if anything would be done on the ground level. Mr. Newton said the area is industrial with truck traffic, they debated doing something on the corner, but there is a second kitchen on the ground floor and a small dining area on the ground floor and this might be a place where people might sit.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned whether a trash container would be put on the corner at Hensley, and Mr. Newton noted the lower floor plan shows a trash and recycling area and the owner is aware of how trash is picked up. Boardmember Welter said most likely the trash would be brought out with a forklift out in the main area and they will most likely work with Richmond Sanitary Service.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned if there was odor controls necessary, and Mr. Newton replied that the receiving area is open air and it is a USDA-inspected facility. She confirmed that everything is refrigerated or frozen and boxed. There is not processing involved in the current business, but if he did want to do processing, it would require added review by the USDA and the City.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned if a business sign would be installed, and Mr. Newton said he had actually installed an oversized sign, which was removed because it did not conform to the sign ordinance. The owner likes the letters over the address and if a sign was done, it would have to be reviewed by the City. He said the business is not one to advertise to the public.

Boardmember Butt agreed with the design for the warehouse. He questioned what the lighting entailed, and Mr. Newton said what he did on the computer is very similar to what is proposed. They have a great lighting consultant, and he confirmed that there are two different versions which are similar to each other. The color of the fixture is a dark bronze. Chair Woldemar suggested using a galvanized or a powder blue, and Mr. Newton agreed to this suggestion. Boardmember Welter suggested platinum silver or light grey, as well. Chair Woldemar recommended a condition to be included for lighting to be compatible with the building.

Boardmember Butt referred to the edge of the building along the accessible path of travel, and he questioned if the plan showed columns or lights, which were small boxes on the plans. Mr. Newton said he added these to make clear they had taken into account site lighting.

Boardmember Butt questioned trash and refuse area, and recommended consulting with Richmond Sanitary who are now requiring dedicated outdoor areas for trash because they have

specific equipment. He also recommended the enclosure be compatible with the building. He asked if there was going to be a flagpole anywhere and suggested installing one. Mr. Newton said they were willing to consider a flagpole.

Boardmember Butt noted that planning staff indicated the applicant submitted the building just in the nick of time before it would have been required to make it a LEED certified building, and he would like to see at least a bike rack for employees, which is a nice token green feature.

Boardmember Butt voiced concern with the design of the main entry. Looking at the elevation, it looks like it is to the right of the loading dock. It is totally obscured by the tree in front of it and there is nothing to indicate it is the entrance to a large building. He noted there is a canopy that covers the entry, and he suggested some down lighting for the entrance, signage, or paving, and he asked to play up the entry more. He noted there is handicapped parking near the main entry and questioned if there was a curb cut. Mr. Newton said they have not gotten into that detail, but it must have a ramp or cut. He referred to the entrance, and said he looked at doing different awnings and punch outs for the entry and it did not look very much different. Boardmember Butt suggested saving money on lighting and putting some sort of lighting mount into the overhangs, which would highlight the entire main façade, especially at night.

Chair Woldemar referred to Sheet A3-O, and said there is a long vertical window to the right of the canopy. He questioned what it was doing in the building façade and suggested the canopy extend to the right another 10 feet so there is more strength over the front door, or change materials. He suggested a condition that states, "Consider an alternate entry device to identify and strengthen the entry more visually." Mr. Newton said there might be a sign that could work for the entry, and he believed it is always a design challenge to keep the simplicity. He played with many window groupings at that spot, and part of the design of the railings and the trees pull attention to that spot, but he agreed to arrive at some sort of lighting or other element.

Boardmember Butt said there is a wide swath of asphalt due to semi-truck traffic coming into off of 7th Street which makes sense. There is 30 feet between parking by visitor parking on the north corner of the site. He thinks the City requires 25 and he suggested gaining more landscaping and getting it down to the minimum requirement. Mr. Newton said he believes there was an issue relating to trucks and he would need to check with the owner. Any maneuvering done must be kept on the lot, and if there was no viable justification, he would have no problem reducing it and adding more landscaping. Boardmember Butt suggested landscaping be up against the building and move the sidewalk out, moving the whole row out 5 feet. Mr. Newton felt this was an interesting idea and agreed it was legitimate.

Boardmember Butt referred to sections of the building and call-outs. He referred to 1.A-3.0 and 1.A-3.1, which has no section call-outs. Mr. Newton said it is a receiving area; one looking back at the office building and by nature, it inherently cuts through the smaller mechanical area. He said the one thing he changed in between submittals was to show condensers. The intent is that condensers would definitely be hidden. Boardmember Butt confirmed it would be adequately deep and will probably all be 12 feet shown in 1.A-3.1.

Chair Woldemar noted that the ordinance states, all mechanical equipment shall not be visible from the public side. He said the Target Store has it which can be seen from the freeway, and he felt that the applicant may have to resort to secondary screening because some of the structure may not work. He suggested a condition be added.

Boardmember Butt referred to 1.A.3.1.0, and he confirmed that the intent is a round light above the double door and that the applicant has not gotten to that level of detail. He said there will be natural daylight, except the hours of operation is not normal 9-5, but rather 4:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Boardmember Butt referred to building-mounted lighting, and said a column on the plan states 24 feet minimum mounted high. Mr. Newton stated they asked the lighting consultant to do the site lighting as part of the submittal, but they have not done any interior building lighting or the receiving area. Boardmember Butt felt it was somewhat high and bright, but in driving around the area, most other warehouses have lighting at that height.

Noted Absent/Noted Present

Boardmember Christian was noted absent and Boardmember Woodrow was noted present.

Boardmember Butt referred to the left, or north elevation, 2A.3.0, and there are no material call outs on the portion of the building with three windows on either side, and he confirmed the middle would be all concrete with an implied metal panel. The finish will be a metal band to match, cast in place, and the engineers are working that out. Boardmember Butt questioned why concrete is proposed versus stucco metal panels, and Mr. Newton said it started on the interior of the receiving area where there are forklifts, and they don't want to run into anything. Boardmember Butt said most warehouses employ stucco and panel, and Mr. Newton said the owner is not cheap and he wants to do a good job.

Boardmember Butt lastly suggested the horizontal canopy above the entrance and the main gate; he again would suggest having can down lights.

Chair Woldemar noted the Board talked about putting solar panels on the roof of the building. Someone put solar panels on the top of the East Bay Beverage Building along I-580 and in his mind, solar is the same as mechanical equipment, and it seems to him that the saw tooth is not very handsome. He wondered how the Board feels about panels in general and how they relate to this project. He questioned whether it related to the ordinance about mechanical screening.

Boardmember Butt said he believes state law says solar panels are not allowed to be scrutinized by Boards, and as much as he is supportive of local businesses, this roof might lend itself to a company that provides both integrated roofing and solar. He said flexible solar panels are only about 1/8th of an inch thick and it is a flat element. They would be less money, they would not be seen, and it would be highly appropriate for this roof type.

Chair Woldemar said alternatively, the parapet could stand higher so they are not seen, and while everyone is supportive of solar power, he thinks it is contrary to what the zoning ordinance states. He noted there is another warehouse building along the Parkway that has saw tooth clear story windows, which is an integrated design, but he believes there should be a condition to state they will not be visible as mechanical equipment from public view. Mr. Newton said he would have to go to the company and work it out and asked if they could raise the parapet as needed without having to return to the DRB, and Chair Woldemar agreed.

Chair Woldemar noted that when he was told about the Target mechanical equipment, he was told the ordinance does not include freeway visibility, and he has asked that this be modified. He noted also that the applicant will also be subject to the County Health Department, which may include visual implications, which would most likely need to return. He added that he likes this building a lot, and felt it was an example of a good warehouse solution design.

Boardmember Bloom discussed firefighters going through the roof during a fire with solar roofs, and this should be investigated prior to installation. She referred to garbage, and questioned what would be generated. Mr. Newton said they have had a consultant come in and the operation is put through a lot of regulations. The company takes a box of meat in, stores it and resells it to restaurants.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Woldemar read into the record his notes for additional conditions:

1. All HVAC mechanical equipment and solar equipment shall not be visible from the public view and that secondary screening may be necessary and required.
2. The applicant shall submit color samples for staff review of compatibility with the design documents.
3. All site metal work shall be powder coat finish except fencing.
4. Landscaping and plant materials may be reduced as follows: 24" and 36" inch box may be reduced to 15 gallon can size, and that 48" box trees be reduced to 24" box trees.
5. Consider alternative plant materials to the Strawberry and Olive trees due to droppings.
6. That there be a minimum of 48" high shrub surrounds for the surface-mounted transformer at the 7th Street entrance.
7. The exterior light fixture color be compatible with the building.
8. A bike rack be added on site.
9. The applicants consult with Richmond Sanitary Service for refuse collection criteria.
10. The applicant consider an alternative entry design to strengthen the entry image.
11. To consider a 25 foot wide drive aisle at the front corner parking area and that the additional land area be used for landscaping against the building façade.
12. Secure approval, if necessary, from the County Health Department, and if there are exterior changes required, review changes with staff and as necessary, return to the Board for revisions.
13. On the north elevation lower building, it be constructed all of concrete with a scored concrete pattern and alternate paint color.

ACTION: It was M/S (Bloom/Whitty) to approve PLN09-133, based on findings 1-4 and original staff conditions 1-12, with the added conditions as read into the record by the Chair; unanimously approved.

BOARD BUSINESS

A. Election for Design Review Board Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Boardmember Woodrow said he was sorry to be late; however, he arrived at 6:40 p.m. and could not enter the building because it was closed and locked, and Chair Woldemar asked staff to follow up on security and access.

Boardmember Woodrow noted he and Boardmember Welter arrived at a slate, and recommended that newer members to serve in leadership roles. They asked if Boardmember Butt would serve as Chair and he agreed, and Boardmember Welter agreed to serve as Vice Chair.

Chair Woldemar questioned and confirmed there were no other nominations.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to close the nomination period; unanimously approved.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Bloom) to elect Andrew Butt as Board Chair and Raymond Welter as Vice Chair; unanimously approved.

Boardmember Woodrow noted the nominating committee commended Chair Woldemar and Vice Chair Whitty for their service and thanked them for their hard work.

B. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

There were none.

C. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Boardmember Woldemar questioned if the landscape bond issue and other issues were being followed up on, and Ms. Whales believed a report could be ready by the 28th.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the Plunge and satisfying conditions. He understands the swim date is August 14th and briefly discussed handicapped access. Chair Butt believed the fountain was returning to the Board for review.

Boardmember Bloom announced her absence from the last meeting of the month. Boardmember Woldemar noted the house on San Jose is continued from tonight which may go to the next meeting, and Ms. Whales noted there is another item; West Contra Costa County Landfill equipment replacement.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the status of the General Plan. Ms. Whales said the contract will be before the City Council for the EIR consultant, and staff is working on editing it.

Chair Butt questioned why the Board did not have a completion checklist on the discussed project, and staff indicated they were working on a new list, and Ms. Whales said they hope to have this within the next 30 days. It will be brought before the Board.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m. to the next meeting on July 28, 2010.