

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
November 10, 2010
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Andrew Butt, Chair
Diane Bloom
Otheree Christian
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Andrew Butt
Eileen Whitty
Don Woodrow

Vice Chair Welter called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Vice Chair Welter, and Boardmembers Christian, Woldemar, and Woodrow

Absent: Chair Butt and Boardmember Whitty

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Lamont Thompson, Kieron Slaughter and Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 22, 2010:

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to approve the minutes of September 22, 2010; unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Public Forum – No speakers.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Vice Chair Welter reported that there is one item on the Consent Calendar and questioned whether the public or Commissioners wished to remove the item. A member of the public requested removal of Item 1.

Vice Chair Welter reviewed the procedure for public speakers. He noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, November 22, 2010 by 5:00 p.m. and, as needed, read the appeal procedure after the affected item.

Item Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 1. PLN10-188 CHIE & CHIAM RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AND NEW GARAGE ON GAYNOR AVENUE

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±525 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AND A NEW ±600 SQUARE FOOT DETACHED GARAGE.

Location 2525 GAYNOR AVENUE

APN 528-180-018

Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)

Owner SAETERN KHAE CHIAM & CHIE GHIAM

Applicant NORTHCAL CONSTRUCTION

Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Assistant Planner, Kieron Slaughter, gave the staff report and a brief description of the request for construction of a one-story addition and addition of a new, detached garage. He said staff received no comments from residents; however, a request was made to review the staff report. The proposed project meets all setback and zoning and staff recommends conditional approval.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed that notices were mailed out 10 days prior to the meeting, staff provides a monthly update to the Richmond Neighborhood Council of all projects, staff reports are made public on Friday, and the applicant is encouraged to contact their neighborhood council; however, this is not a requirement. He also confirmed that Mr. Rasmussen visited the City and obtained a copy of the staff report on Monday, and knew of the project the previous Friday.

Boardmember Woodrow said he drove by the site on Monday and he thought he saw another building in the rear of the lot. He confirmed with Mr. Slaughter that there is a small storage shed behind the home, but nothing other than this shed. He noted that the applicant plans to remove it to accommodate the addition and new detached garage.

Vice Chair Welter confirmed the applicant was not present.

The public hearing was opened.

Public Comments:

Janice Mignone, Richmond, requested the item be pushed to the next meeting in order to hold a planning and zoning neighborhood council meeting. She said they received information about the project at the end of October, but it was not in time to schedule their meeting which is held the 4th Monday of the month after their regular meeting on the 3rd Thursday of the month.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned if the applicant made any attempt to contact the neighborhood council. Ms. Mignone stated she did and left a message, with no response back. She also drove by the project, but did not feel there is a problem; however, there are members of the committee that want to review the project.

Vice Chair Welter noted there were no other speakers.

Boardmember Woldemar stated the applicant attempted to make contact with the neighborhood council. He thinks the project was straight-forward and wished the applicant was present to answer questions. From the neighborhood council's point of view, they have questions on the

project and the City has made many efforts to ask that neighborhood councils track projects via the website, and he is somewhat torn between approving the project and holding it over.

Boardmember Woodrow said he did not see anything that would draw the time and efforts in getting the planning and zoning committee involved and did not support continuance of the item.

Vice Chair Welter agreed.

Boardmember Woldemar alerted Mr. Slaughter that there was a doubling of conditions in the staff report and asked that these be corrected in the final set of conditions.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Welter) to approve PLN 10-188, with the four findings and thirteen staff recommendations; unanimously approved.

PRESENTATION:

2. DR1104726 MARINA BAY PARKWAY GRADE SEPARATION BETWEEN MEEKER AVENUE AND REGATTA BLVD.

Description PRESENTATION ON THE MARINA BAY PARKWAY GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT. WHEN CONSTRUCTED ON MARINA BAY PARKWAY, THE BRADLEY A. MOODY UNDERPASS WILL BEGIN JUST SOUTH OF MEEKER AVENUE AND END NORTH OF REGATTA BOULEVARD. COMPLETION OF THE UNDERPASS WILL ALLOW TRAFFIC TO FLOW FREELY ON MARINA BAY PARKWAY WITHOUT BEING STOPPED BY TRAIN TRAFFIC TRAVELING THROUGH THE SOUTH RICHMOND SHORELINE AREA.

Staff Contact ALAN WOLKEN Recommendation: **NO ACTION**

Alan Wolken, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), introduced Chad Spaulding, Madeline Bernardi with BPF Engineers, and David Gates with David Gates & Associates. He provided background and history on the Marina Bay Parkway Grade Separation Project, stating the CRA conducted a grade separation feasibility study and looked at 7 locations throughout Marina Bay for potential grade separations. There was no funding at the time for it, but the outcome of the study identified preferred locations to be on the Marina Bay Parkway and the preferred design type to be an undercrossing. This was supported by the City Council who directed CRA staff to search for funding.

He said in the fall of 2008 the CRA was successful in putting together a funding plan using Measure J funds, as well as Proposition 1b funding, Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) funding, and the funding program was approved by the CRA and Council, and then taken to the California Transportation Commission which allocated \$19 million of \$37.5 million program which was approved. Following this approval, the CRA solicited design firms through an RFP process, and the Council/CRA approved moving forward with the design work for grade separation.

Mr. Wolken discussed the design process undertaken with the Marina Bay community where four design alternatives were presented and voted on in April. The list was shortened to two alternatives, which were reviewed in June, and the community chose a preferred alternative presented to them in August. In August, another community-wide meeting which was widely noticed and directly mailed to the Marina Bay community was held at City Hall, to obtain more information about the design.

They also conducted a mailing, an advisory poll circulated to Marina Bay property owners and occupants to see which two alternatives they would support, which he explained involved additional funds if the construction period was shortened through closure of Marina Bay

Parkway for the duration of the project. Closing would mean the construction would be reduced to 20 months versus a 36 month period if kept open. The cost savings could be applied to enhanced replacement landscaping and enhanced bridge design, which he presented, and explained that Marina Bay Parkway will be closed south of Meeker and north of Regatta.

Mr. Wolken reported that in 2008 Officer Bradley A. Moody was killed on Marina Bay Parkway responding to an emergency call. The Police Chief suggested honoring the fallen officer and during the January meeting of the Parks and Recreation Commission, they supported naming the grade separation in honor of Bradley A. Moody. At the Council's February 16, 2010 meeting, support was given for the naming and incorporation into the design. Staff also held additional meetings with the community, railroads, utility companies, adjacent property owners, and the Department of Health Services.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the alternatives slide and number 7 by UC Berkeley, and asked if this was still moving forward. Mr. Wolken said yes, this is going forward and actually moving ahead of the project which will be available when streets close.

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that all property used to construct the project is owned by the City, and no building permit is required. He asked why there is no design review for the project. Mr. Wolken said it is a public works project and he gave examples of other project enhancements brought before the DRB, stating this project deals with improvements to a public right-of-way. He noted staff appreciates the Board's input and incorporates comments into designs.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned why the City puts private projects through review and not all public projects, and he said he would propose changing the ordinance at some time to require public works and public projects be subject to design review due to the significant visual environment of the City. Mr. Woken noted that most projects are brought before the Board, although he agreed not all were subject to the Board's discretion. Mr. Wolken then introduced David Gates, who would present the design elements of the project.

David Gates, David Gates & Associates, described gateway design features of the project and the incorporation of City owned facilities into the design. He presented the road grade design, properties not originally part of the design, the opportunity for a statement and arrival in an area for the Police Department to honor the department and fallen officers, laser cut and metal patterns of railings, historic memorial characters, light fixtures, portals, visual elements on the sides of the road, noted there is an art component not yet determined, the bridge which became a community icon through creation of elements on both sides, a separated pedestrian bike road lane, structural rail treatments, landscaping, LED lights throughout the project, street trees, planting areas, and tree species proposed.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned and confirmed the City is the owner of the bridge. He questioned where the entry portal will be, and Mr. Gates pointed it out on the presentation, noting it is at the point where the railing will end. He said compromise was reached on both designs and identified the location of "Richmond" as well as the area where "Marina Bay" would be identified on the elevations.

Boardmember Woodrow pointed out the issue is significant because one of the largest sale-points for homes is that they are not part of the City, and property owners are constantly fighting the issue. He said if something is put up to imply one is coming out of Marina Bay and coming into the City, the idea is completely defeated. He thinks the portal should have something else on it, but was not certain what it should be. He also questioned if this would be the only print on the bridge or would street signage be added. Mr. Wolken stated there would be no signage on the bridge, but 8 inch letters would be placed for the officer being honored.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned if the wall of the tunnel will be textured, and Mr. Gates said yes, noting there will be a texture, a form liner and a band. Boardmember Woodrow suggested something with more flowing lines to imply there is a bay. Mr. Gates stated there are some groupings of sails, but he was not sure they were showing up in the construction drawings.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if painting the underpass was considered to include a mural of some sort, and Mr. Gates said this was considered, but a more simplistic design was preferred.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to storm water management and questioned what happens when the power goes down, and he confirmed with Madeline Bernardi with BPF Engineers there is a back-up generator which was pointed out on the plans and further described.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned if everything in green was “new” or was anything existing, as well as property lines and existing landscaping, such as the Crossings. He referred to the section at the Anchorage at Marina Bay and said he can see the landscaping but not the right-of-way on the plan. In moving further to the south, the right-of-way line is back of sidewalk and there are trees shown, and Ms. Madeline Bernardi described the proposed plan for new landscaping and existing landscaping.

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that maintenance of landscaping would be taken care of through upgrade of installation of controller systems which is computer activated from weather stations. They are removing all California native trees and the planting plan similar to Marina Bay.

Boardmember Woldemar said Marina Bay is one of the nicest landscaping in the City, but it is starting to deteriorate, and he hoped that landscaping would be maintained for the project. The Board has asked staff to look into the creation of a landscape bond to assure landscaping is maintained. Mr. Wolken responded that the area is within a landscaping and lighting maintenance district which will address funds for landscape maintenance.

Boardmember Woldemar said he saw three different types of railings in the plan and he did not understand their locations. He questioned what would prevent someone from walking on the railroad tracks from an area in the Crossings. Mr. Gates said the three types of railing address the pedestrian sidewalk, a variation of the same railing up on the ridge, and railing 3 is on top of the wall, which is a cable rail system which will prevent people from getting on the tracks. It will be disappear with landscaping over time. He also described the median rail which is in the middle of the median, and is mean to be purely visual.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned if there was anything that approaches 6 feet high such as fences or railings, and Mr. Gates stated all were 42 inches tall.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to grades and said it appears the northbound traffic dives off quickly, and the southbound is much less of a slope, and asked that longitudinal elevations be prepared. Ms. Bernardi said the northbound and southbound are symmetrical and it is a K rail design. Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that the current color palette consists of cream/beige/buff and metal is straight galvanized in a matt grey. Mr. Gates discussed their interest in stainless, but they did research and found that it would rust and corrode, and the only way to keep metal lasting in the area is galvanizing.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to horizontal brown lines and confirmed with Mr. Gates that they were walls which work with the memorial zone for the police department. They vary in height in 6 feet down to 3’6”. The intent is to create an area for plaques to be etched in the

granite or a bronze plaque placed on them. Boardmember Woldemar suggested longitudinal elevations be prepared as well to see how it fits in the overall rhythm.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to the bridge and he asked what one would see on the base of the bridge structure. Mr. Gates said there will be a flat surface plane with some down lights. Boardmember Woldemar suggested drip edges be included, as well to prevent rainwater from accumulating on it.

Vice Chair Welter confirmed that two colors would be used on the concrete; one basic and different textures. Regarding the separation from the bike lanes and cars, he confirmed there were rows of columns with low railings in-between them, and that all metal would be galvanized. He clarified that mechanical fastenings would be dowel them and recess them. He also discussed local artists work, and Mr. Gates reviewed his experience working with artists and said he thinks there will be many opportunities for a strong statement and many pocket areas for some rich detail in art elements.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to a drawing of some texture shown on the street surface and he confirmed it was a three-dimensional announcement to the bridge. He suggested it not be done unless on both sides of the bridge, and he felt funds could rather be used for something like special paving under the bridge. Mr. Gates said there was a discussion about safety and how to get people to pause and feel like they are coming from something and into something, which they believed it might help calm cars for pedestrians in the area. Boardmember Woldemar felt this problem might be addressed through pavement paint.

The Board thanked Mr. Wolken, David Gates, and his team.

Ted Smith briefly relayed personal comments on the project from the audience.

Boardmember Woodrow added that granite slabs have been used in a variety of ways, are very simple to move and incredibly durable.

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the status of the landscape bond ordinance, and Mr. Privat said the Attorney's office had not yet reviewed it.

Boardmember Woldemar asked to agendaize a discussion at the next meeting about the process of what is needed to change the enabling ordinance to include all public projects for DRB review. Boardmember Woldemar also asked for a discussion at a future meeting on an ordinance that would clarify fencing and sharp objects.

Boardmember Woodrow said staff was to find out whether the Carlson fence was built on private or public land, and Mr. Privat said Lena Velasco would be questioned and staff would follow-up on this.

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m. to the next meeting on December 8, 2010.