

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
December 8, 2010
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Andrew Butt, Chair
Otheree Christian
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Eileen Whitty
Don Woodrow

Vice Chair Welter called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Andrew Butt, Vice Chair Welter, and Boardmembers Whitty and Woldemar

Absent: Boardmember Christian and Woodrow

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Richard Mitchell, Kieron Slaughter and Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 13, 2010:

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the minutes of October 13, 2010; approved by voice vote (Butt abstained).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Boardmember Whitty reported that Item 3's recommendation should be revised to reflect conditional approval to the Planning Commission.

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

Public Forum – No speakers.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Butt reported the Consent Calendar consisted of Items 1, 2 3 and 4. He questioned whether a member of the public or Commissioners wished to remove the item. Item 3 was requested to be removed by a member of the public. Boardmember Woldemar requested removal of Items 1, 2 and 4.

Chair Butt 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, December 20, 2010 by 5:00 p.m. and, as needed, read the appeal procedure after the affected item.

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

1. **PLN10-157 GONZALES SECOND-STORY ADDITION ON COLUMBIA AVENUE**
 Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±977 SQUARE FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
 Location 5120 COLUMBIA AVENUE
 APN 510-081-005
 Zoning MFR-3 (MULTI-FAMILY HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
 Owner PEDRO GONZALES
 Applicant ROBERTO PENA
 Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and a description of the request to construct a second-story addition and remodeling of the front porch. He reviewed zoning requirements, said staff worked with the applicant to revise drawings to incorporate suggestions to add three windows, and plans were submitted to Boardmember Woldemar for comments and suggestions which are recommended to be incorporated into the project. Staff recommends conditional approval.

Chair Butt opened the public hearing.

Boardmember Woldemar noted there were no changes reflected that he had made comments about, yet staff is still recommending approval of the original design. Mr. Slaughter stated that while staff agreed with the suggestions; the application was still deemed complete and he wanted to allow other Board members to review the project proposed by the applicant.

Roberto Pena, Applicant, stated he spoke with the owner who did not agree with the proposed revisions by Boardmember Woldemar. He provided an explanation regarding the owner's preference for approval of his original proposal for the roof, porch and setback.

Boardmember Woldemar said his comments served as a solution to the front setback; he suggested uncovered balconies or a cover over the entry to achieve relief from the front elevation. Overall, he felt it seemed fairly flat and the Board usually looks for more offset in the overall design. Mr. Slaughter indicated that subsequent to completion of the staff report, the applicant agreed to modify one of the exterior materials from wood siding to stucco.

Vice Chair Welter referred to the right elevation, the three smaller windows and two other windows, and requested the applicant show the moutons to match the rest of the windows. The applicant agreed.

Vice Chair Welter referred to the front elevation and suggested a simpler solution to the 4 different roof projections. Mr. Pena indicated that the owner wants to have the home look like he originally proposed.

Boardmember Whitty referred to the octagon window on the second floor, and questioned and confirmed that the same window would also be placed on the first floor. She referred to the right elevation and lower windows along the stairway on the right side, and questioned and confirmed with Mr. Pena that the two windows would be removed, put in the center, and remove the far left bottom window which would solve the stair problem and align with the bay window above.

Boardmember Whitty also confirmed that three windows would be placed in the left elevation. She asked if the brick along the front elevation bottom would wrap all around the building. Mr. Pena replied they will wrap it around 4 feet on the right to align with the existing window.

Vice Chair Welter pointed out a site plan error to change from "Evelyn Avenue" to read, "Columbia". He also recommended adding elevation keys which would refer back to the items on the floor plans.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the new floor plan, line D, and questioned an illegal window which is installed on the property line. Mr. Pena said the window currently exists and will be filled in or removed per Sheet A-1.

Chair Butt referred to Sheet A-3, and said there is one note on the front elevation that refers to removing siding and replacing with stucco. There is another area on the second floor balcony that looks like it is showing wood siding. Mr. Pena noted this is a drafting mistake.

Chair Butt referred to Note 7 in the legend and he confirmed that the applicant would use "ledge" stone. He then referred to the front elevation and asked why the picture window was not centered in the archway. Mr. Pena noted the picture window currently exists, and new windows will only be installed on the second floor.

Vice Chair Welter referred to stucco texture and asked that a smoother texture be done, such as a regular dashed stucco. He highly recommended a different finish on the trim instead of using the same stucco texture over everything.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the stone on the two story element on the right of the front elevation, and said there is a set of columns underneath it on the second floor portion. From a historic point of view, this is somewhat unnatural. One would not normally see stone cantilevered within some wood columns underneath it. He also noted that the front door does not center on the opening as the window in the living room is off center from the arch. He did not think the idea of moving a couple of windows or doors to get the front elevation to work better is unreasonable.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the notes which state there are gutters, but nothing reflects the type of gutters, where the downspouts are, the shape or how they are coming out. He acknowledged that the owner wants the proposal a certain way, but this is why the DRB reviews projects and makes them work better.

He referred to the belly band #2 or foam band which is on the front elevation but it does not show how far it projects out or where it continues around the building. He questioned whether it lines up with the beam of the carport and questioned how the two windows relate to the carport, as this is not shown in the elevation.

Vice Chair Welter agrees with the attic vents and asked that they all be the same. Regarding the gutter, the plans should also show the downspouts, the material and color used, and how are they coming down.

Chair Butt confirmed there were no public speakers.

Boardmember Woldemar asked the applicant whether he would be finished with the construction drawings and will have submitted them to the Building Department by January 1, 2011 if the application were approved tonight. Mr. Pena said the owner wishes to wait a couple of months, and he will need time to make changes to the plans because of the other project on the agenda.

Boardmember Woldemar explained that as of January 1, 2011, the State will enact a new Building Code which relates to a residential code. While this is not a new structure, the code will require all new single family houses be fire-sprinklered. He suggested the Board summarize comments and ask that the applicant return at a future date with responses.

Chair Butt confirmed the public hearing would be left open and the matter continued to review corrections after a summary is provided.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to continue PLN10-157 to January 12, 2011; unanimously approved.

2. **PLN10-193 AYALA NEW TWO-STORY RESIDENCE ON HELLINGS AVENUE**
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,891 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.
Location 1800 HELLINGS AVENUE
APN 530-230-025
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner MANUEL AYALA
Applicant ROBERTO PENA
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and a description of the project to construct a new single family residence. He noted the former residence on the property was demolished after a significant fire. The proposal meets development standards and staff recommends conditional approval.

Vice Chair Welter questioned and confirmed that the majority of homes in the neighborhood are one-story; however, there is a scattering of two-story residences.

Chair Butt opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

A.J. Jelani, Belding Woods Neighborhood Council, said their council meets every fourth Tuesday and clarified with Vice Chair Welter that they received notice of the project on December 2, 2010. They seek comments from those living around the residence and noted there has not been time for the item to be commented on. Their neighborhood council is out of session until January.

Mr. Pena, Applicant, noted when he attended the meeting and presented the plans, he was told the project was okay from all sides of the property. Chair Butt questioned Mr. Jelani about whether or not the project was heard by the neighborhood council. Mr. Jelani voiced the need for more time and said issues were brought up about the bus stop on the corner of 18th and

Hellings, egress and ingress, when the project would start, the number of people living in the home, the number of cars, and he described their process of having the neighbors apprised of the proposal by the applicant.

Boardmember Whitty referred to the gable roof garage and questioned why the house had a shallow gable. Mr. Pena said it is 27 feet and he did not want to make the house's pitch very high for the neighborhood. Boardmember Whitty stated there are hips and gables, square windows and arched windows, and she questioned and confirmed that the applicant was amenable to putting square windows in the garage wall and not the arch windows on the rear elevation. She questioned and voiced concern with whether or not the garage should be left gabled or hipped.

Vice Chair Welter noted his comments were similar to the last project. He asked that all attic vents be made the same. Mr. Pena said in his opinion, the homes are almost exactly the same, but he was amenable to changing them. He also confirmed the materials used would be stone as opposed to brick. Mr. Pena then discussed the arched windows for the 18th Street view versus the square windows views for Hellings Avenue. Vice Chair Welter noted that the arches are completely different from the other windows and he suggested they match.

Vice Chair Welter questioned the four elements above the garage. Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that all materials noted were stucco; the plans are incorrect and the garage element should be lowered and is tall compared to everything else. The eave line is higher and the garage line therefore is out of proportion. Mr. Pena noted he would change the plans and remove the four elements. He will find a way to lower the eave line and bring the roof lower, making the proportion better, and pointed out that the bedroom ceiling height is only 7.5 feet high. Boardmember Woldemar indicated that the new code allows for 7 feet for bedrooms.

Vice Chair Welter asked the applicant to either wrap the trim around the building or to include a vertical piece on the side of the building to end the stone, such as the eave line once the garage is lowered down, or at the downspout if it works there. The same comment applies to the stone at the rear and left elevation, which wraps four feet and stops. Mr. Slaughter explained that Condition 3 addresses this; "The stone veneer shall wrap around the corner of the left elevation and continue for no less than 12 feet from the front of the building." Vice Chair Welter suggested ending the stone at the sliding glass door on the left or at the gate post on the side of the house, with the same applying to the garage end.

Vice Chair Welter said he likes the nice flowering trees proposed, and while he is not a landscape architect, he suggested reconsidering the two Mexican palm trees proposed which are out of place.

Boardmember Woldemar said once the house is built, it will make a marvelous contribution to the neighborhood. However, he thinks the house is backwards and explained that when looking at the site photographs, the adjoining houses have their fronts to Hellings Avenue. He thinks 18th Street could be a front if the house were flipped end to end. He suggested putting the garage in on Hellings and garage doors facing Hellings, put the front door facing 18th Street, and relate the front door relating to the living room by rotating it 90 degrees. The shallower end of the building would relate better to the corner and better to the houses around the corner on Hellings, which are all one-story. With the height of the garage being so tall, if it were lowered it would make the whole corner more special. He suggested adjusting the landscape plan, replacing the palms, and further reinforcing the strength of the corner. He also noted there are no plant sizes but he felt it was senseless to talk about it until getting to what the site plan looks like. When flipping the plan, it also provides living space related to the larger rear yard, with the

living room and kitchen on the south side instead of having the garage separating the home from that.

Boardmember Woldemar commented on the left elevation from the adjacent neighbor which is a blank two-story wall. He suggested making the family room sliding glass door recessed, or putting a canopy or rain cover over it to break down the scale of the long wall.

Lastly, he suggested the site plan show fences, gates, and trash areas. The stone two-story element did not bother him on this house as much as it did on the other house maybe because it is a straight line or it is more natural that one could have built out of stone.

Boardmember Woldemar said he likes the use of wrought iron decoration which would be even better if the house were flipped on the corner. Mr. Pena responded to the garage, and said they put it in the same position as the existing driveway. Boardmember Woldemar pointed out a rule in the City that the Public Works Department and Engineer can require that curb cuts and/or driveways be replaced for overall scale and character effects, and this would be insignificant given the size and scope of the project.

Chair Butt said he had little to add, but said he is troubled by the overall mass of the home. The neighborhood is predominantly single story, wood siding homes, and given the size and materials selected the proposal dominates the character of the neighborhood. One approach would be to break up the mass such that where it borders the single story homes, it steps down. He thinks that instead of stone, horizontal wood siding could be used, as it significantly stands out based upon what exists in the neighborhood. Mr. Pena reviewed a few homes in the neighborhood that are stucco and two stories, and Chair Butt said more concerning to him is the stone veneer.

Chair Butt questioned and confirmed there is a nearby school, which is relatively new, and Boardmember Woldemar suggested utilizing some of the colors and shapes from it for context. He said this house has an opportunity to become something special to the neighborhood and needs good character. The stone is fake and he suggested finding a way to integrate it to make it look like it has always been there to depict some historic precedence.

Vice Chair Welter referred to the proposed front setback of 18 feet. There is a 15 foot setback to the front porch as shown on Sheet A-2, and he questioned whether it should be taken to the front porch. Mr. Slaughter noted that the front porch is an allowed projection. He therefore suggested the applicant not call the setback a 15 foot setback because it is not. He suggested removing the front setback out and on the plan, dimensioning the corner to 18 feet which is the front setback, and this coordinates with planning staff's chart.

Boardmember Whitty said if the applicant flipped the house and put the entrance where the garage is, she asked how the setbacks would work, stating she likes this idea. The use of the backyard would be beneficial, as well. Mr. Slaughter said due to the configuration of the lot, no matter which side the applicant puts the front door, the narrowest side of the lot will still be the front, and therefore, setbacks would remain as they are now.

Chair Butt suggested the matter also be continued.

Boardmember Whitty questioned what the applicant's opinion was about flipping the house. Mr. Pena said he looked at this in the past and had a slight problem with the entry, as the setback was tight and the porch was close to the sidewalk.

Boardmember Woldemar asked that the applicant tinker with the size of the house on the front corner and possibly not flip the entire house, but rather take the two-story portion, slide it over the garage, leave the garage where it is, and soften the corner.

Mr. Slaughter questioned the Board's feedback on overall massing issue, noting while there is allowable height up to 35 feet, there are many single story homes in the neighborhood. Vice Chair Welter felt it was the corner that is the issue; a two-story mass is right on the corner. He personally did not take issue with the height and said he would like to be more comfortable that the neighbors support this. He hoped that the applicant will have enough time to work on the proposal, be able to meet with the neighborhood council, and get buy in from immediate neighbors.

Boardmember Woldemar agreed, and said the roof pitch could be lowered down to 5:12 all over, and the overall visual height of the home would be less. He likes the trick of doing the flat roof because it brings down the mass. It may mean that the bedroom over the roof slope has to pop up like a dormer, and given different design tricks, it could work well while still keeping the scale down.

Mr. Pena said in this case, the lot is on a corner and there is only one wall that affects neighbors. For the rear elevation, there is 20-25 feet to the rear neighbor. Vice Chair Welter voiced discomfort that the neighbors have not reviewed the proposal and has not seen anything tonight that they support the proposal.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to continue PLN10-193 until January 26, 2011; unanimously approved.

- 3. PLN09-148 T-MOBILE WIRELESS FACILITY ON SAN PABLO AVENUE**
- Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO INSTALL A NEW WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION ANTENNA ON THE ROOF OF AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING.
- Location 12989 SAN PABLO AVENUE
- APN 526-040-003
- Zoning C-2 (GENERAL COMMERCIAL)
- Owner KIM SANG PIL & NAM IM
- Applicant T-MOBILE - JEFF LIENERT
- Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ
- Recommendation: **RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and a description of the request for installation of a new wireless telecommunication antenna, He said staff reviewed the project, requested the applicant reduce the height of the antenna, and recommends approval of the project given the fact that the application meets all standards.

Boardmember Woldemar said because the item is a recommendation to the Planning Commission, the DRB's decision is a recommendation. He questioned and confirmed that the DRB could only address the aesthetics of the project and not the technical aspects. He questioned what the painted materials will look like that is intended to match the existing building. Mr. Lopez replied that the box will be constructed, stucco in texture, and painted the same color of the existing building.

Vice Chair Welter confirmed that elevations show the structure in the middle of the building and centered.

Boardmember Whitty questioned and confirmed the neighborhood council received notice and provided comment. She questioned that the 350 square foot cement pad in back for equipment will be built right next to the shed, and requested more clarification on these details. Mr. Lopez referred to the south elevation; A-3, which shows the shed will be lower than the fence.

Vice Chair Welter referred to Sheet A-3; which states it is an "8 foot RF transparent screen wall painted to match existing building finish texture." He asked what the transparent material is, and confirmed that it is a stucco wall that the RF signals can go through.

Jeff Lienert, Contract Representative for T-Mobile, said the chimney is of fiberglass material to match the building, which is RF friendly and does not impede the signal.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the thickness of the material. Mr. Lienert said it is typical of a rooftop installation which has fiberglass pieces with foam in-between it, and is not a standard installation. The corners are squared, and it should look like what is shown in the photo-simulation.

Vice Chair Welter likened it to a fiberglass sandwich of foam and fiberglass. He confirmed the fiberglass is built so that it has the finish already on it. Mr. Lienert said the cabinets cannot be seen; the building from the front hides everything to the back. If a side view were present, it would be from the Burger King's 8 foot fence on the one side and they are not visible.

Boardmember Woldemar noted there is fascia trim on top, confirmed the trim matches the trim on the building and as a condition, and it could be the dimension of a 2x6 projected beyond the edge of the wall as a fascia. He questioned and confirmed with Mr. Lienert that he would have no objection if this was 6x6 instead of 3x3.

Mr. Lienert added that when he went to the North and East Neighborhood Council, they unanimously approved the project. At that time it was a much taller, 14-foot structure and design, and it is much lower today.

Chair Butt opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

Elsie Smerker, Richmond, said she has a rental which is to the south side of the proposal. When she went to the neighborhood council meeting a few months ago they recommended putting a sound wall to replace her fence because of the noise. She voiced concern that if not installed, her tenant may move.

Mr. Lienert noted sound was well below what the ordinance allows. The unit is surrounded by a standard cabinet and is an internal thermostat for heating and cooling. It stops and starts like an HVAC unit to keep the internal electrical equipment cooled. He said there is already a CMU wall running north and south near the property line.

Boardmember Woldemar noted there is a concrete, block building on the side of this which will help shield it, but there is also a wooden fence on the south side, the location where the

neighborhood council proposed a sound wall. He suggested replacing what is proposed as a chain link fence with a 6 foot high masonry wall according to Sheet A-1. The fence on the property line is the wood fence and another one on the inside is proposed as a security chain link fence.

Vice Chair Welter confirmed that the neighborhood council recommended the wooden fence be replaced with a sound wall, to which Ms. Smerker had agreed to.

Chair Butt questioned and confirmed the sound wall installation is amenable to T-Mobile.

John Smerker, Richmond, questioned the height of the unit that contains the guts of the system in the rear yard.

Mr. Lienert responded that the unit is ± 5.5 feet. He confirmed that the Planning Commission meeting will be held early January.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Mr. Lienert waived rebuttal unless there were additional questions of the Board and speakers.

Boardmember Woldemar said he would like to determine the shape of the mechanical equipment screen on the roof, and proposed that it be 6x6. He also wanted to specify as a condition that the fascia shown in the drawings be of a 2 inch by 6 inch fascia and that the wooden fence be replaced with a 6 foot high CMU wall.

Chair Butt questioned if proposing a 6x6 chimney might call more attention to it. He would like to see a sample of the material, but would take the applicant's word of what it looks like.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that they could add false windows in it to look like a top floor. What he objects to is fake trees, and this is a fake chimney. He suggested making it something real and this was the reason for making it larger. However, it is not visible at all and therefore would not matter one way or the other.

Chair Butt noted the chimney is proposed at 3x5 and not 3x3. Boardmember Woldemar apologized, and said he would therefore support 3x5.

Mr. Lienert confirmed the wall would be proposed on the south side between the two buildings only which separates the neighbor's yard, and not the entire wooden fence. It goes from the building, makes an angle, and is about 19-20 feet.

Chair Butt closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Welter) to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of PLN09-148 with the staff's four findings, staff's 25 conditions, with the additional one condition that the south side wooden fence be changed to a 6 foot high CMU wall, and the fiberglass sandwich material on the chimney have a 2 x 6 inch cap; unanimously approved.

4. PLN10-221 PORT OF RICHMOND INDUSTRIAL ADDITION ON HARBOUR WAY SOUTH

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±9,700 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO THE EXISTING PORT ADMINISTRATION BUILDING TO EXPAND OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE SPACE.

Location 1411 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH
 APN 560-270-060 & 560-270-059
 Zoning M-4 (MARINE INDUSTRIAL)
 Specific Plan KCSP (KNOX-CUTTING SPECIFIC PLAN)
 Owner CITY OF RICHMOND
 Applicant MICHAEL WILLIAMS
 Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

The Board waived the staff report, and Boardmember Woldemar noted that he and Vice Chair Welter reviewed this project on a study session basis.

Michael Williams, Port of Richmond, introduced Architect, Claudia Falconer, said they spent time getting drawings to the current stage through meeting with staff and a subcommittee of the Board. He noted the project is funded through a Homeland Security Grant and some funding had been withdrawn due to State issues earlier in the year which has now been reinstated with a tight timeline. They need to obtain DRB approval in order to work through the holidays, get the project out to bid and moving which will also affect additional projects that are tied into the same funding.

Claudia Falconer, Architect, noted the staff report includes the history of the existing tower built in 1978 and designed by the architectural firm of Jordan Woodman and Dodson, Frank Jordan was the architect, a mentor of hers, and the same firm is working on the addition. She said the existing vernacular is very industrial, there is no siding and deep fascias and she has opted to continue this look. The building is currently not ADA accessible; it has three stories and has no elevator. It was built in 1978 at which time Title 24 was in effect but some things do not meet this code or ADA. An elevator will be added, completely removing the existing restrooms and building new restrooms for the existing and new structure, expanding the office building and providing an Emergency Operations Center, completely replacing landscaping across the front per the landscape site plan, and providing parking both for public users of the Port facility and for Port staff.

She said the ground floor was previously used by a tenant who shipped cars to Hawaii. Currently it is vacant, but they are working on securing a tenant who would presumably continue to ship cars. There are truck scales currently between the building and the street, one of which will be eliminated and one moved to the other side of the building, which changes truck circulation and puts the building close to the street which is preferred for pedestrian access.

She said Port Director, Jim Matzorkis oversees administrative staff in offices in the third floor and his goal has been to create an upscale and professional office space to meet needs of the Port. The third floor is proposed to be maintained also as an observation deck with an amazing view of the entire Port. The existing building has wide canopies which are being eliminated, as inspectors used to go on the catwalks to look down onto trucks to be weighed. A canopy exists on the back side of the building. When shipping cars, there are Long shore workers that drive cars onto the ships and they need an area to meet outside. She introduced Robert Kennedy who helped prepare the planting plan.

Robert Kennedy described the planting plan and described the bio-swale in the front of the Port building. Drainage that comes from the parking lot and sidewalks will be graded toward the bio-swale. All plant material is low water requirements and they will meet LEED points, as well.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the depth of the bio-swale which he believes is required as part of the C-3 submittal. Mr. Kennedy noted this has not yet been determined. Ms. Falconer said she did not have the report, but it was in the submittal.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that based upon his review of the landscape plan, it is very well done.

Boardmember Whitty questioned water level. Ms. Falconer said she is not a hydrologist, but the bay is adjacent to the property. It is 10 feet below the pavement, the soil is not yet known and the soil engineer will be doing borings. Mr. Kennedy stated that all plant materials selected for the bioswale are actually water tolerant, so if there is a high water table, it will not be a problem.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned if a typical specification would include the requirement that there be a soils report. Mr. Kennedy said yes; a soil analysis is typically done as well as requirements of plant materials, which will accompany the material.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the brand new fence which looks like a wrought-iron picket fence, 8 feet high, running dead along the back of the new sidewalk. He questioned why it could not move a little bit, noting there is 12 feet from sidewalk to building. He knows a fence must be around it for security reasons, but likened it to the Carlson Boulevard fence. If it is backset, it could reflect some of the tree planting and the layout of which would be much more interesting. He noted if this was done anywhere else, it would not be allowed, and he felt Richmond could do better.

Also, regarding the design character of the fence, the iron picket is probably the cheapest material used. Ms. Falconer indicated that the fence is tube steel and not iron. The pickets are 1x1 square tubes, which is similar to the one at Marina Bay. Boardmember Woldemar described a fence he recently saw in Phoenix which was number 6 or 8 reinforcing bar, standing on end 4 inches on center with no top or bottom rail, as well as a faded black fence on San Pablo and Barrett surrounding a used car lot which has 1.5 inch round tube with about 4 inches on center with acorn caps on the top, which could also be considered. He knows there are ways to solve it, and he confirmed with Ms. Falconer that the fence design could be brought back to the DRB for approval in the future.

Mr. Williams also asked the Board to take into consideration the fact that this is a Coast Guard Homeland Security facility that operates under a Homeland Security Plan which must be approved by the Coast Guard. There are line of sight issues that could be created, and while some compromise can be achieved, they must build in security issues and take into account some of these issues.

Ms. Falconer added that her preference is to understate the fence and this was the reason she chose the tube steel, as it is very quiet and does not call attention to itself. She does not feel the fence should be the showpiece of the project, but rather the landscaping and building, with the fence receding in the background.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested looking at the fence just south of the U.C. Berkeley field station, which is a triangular building which can be seen from the freeway. Zeneca is still there, but the fence is a series of stone pilasters, it has iron pickets, but also has hedge plantings in front of it as well as landscaping. It vanished because landscaping has grown, and Ms. Falconer said this would be the goal here, and she agreed it could be moved in and revised.

Mr. Kennedy noted the plant material in the bio-swale is also color-schemed and presented to compliment the building as well as the Ford Building.

Chair Butt referred to Sheet A-1, and pointed out minor errors under the "new landscape island". He also pointed out new bio-swale indications reflected on the plans, which Ms. Falconer corrected.

Chair Butt questioned why the trees on the end were shorter than others, and Mr. Kennedy said this is done for cars backing out and turning around. Chair Butt suggested making it narrower, and Mr. Kennedy questioned whether this was good for the tree which everyone agreed is more important.

Chair Butt referred to Boardmember Woldemar's fencing comments and said there is a similar fence at the Ford Building. He agreed that something that could be better designed to return to the Board. He questioned and confirmed there is existing site lighting and nothing different is proposed. There is also an existing lighting tower and street lights shining down on the entry.

Chair Butt referred to Sheet A-4; a new metal siding type A and type B, and he questioned what they looked like. Ms. Falconer said these were sent to staff; she presented examples of the insets under the windows which are smoother, as well as corrugated material in a 3x3 grid pattern. She clarified that all siding would be replaced.

Chair Butt referred to storefront windows everywhere, and he questioned whether this made sense. He confirmed the project would be LEED silver, and he noted the majority of the open office spaces in the middle have no views. Ms. Falconer said currently, it is projected there will be no staff in the Emergency Operations Center. On the ground floor, there will be a counter to greet the public. Those who sit in offices are located around the perimeter.

Chair Butt questioned requirements for day lighting and how one would achieve getting daylight into the space. Ms. Falconer noted there are windows on both east and west sides; it will be a deep building and in the middle of the ground floor, no daylight could be achieved in the center without a skylight shaft. For the permitted offices, they are putting locations along the windows.

Chair Butt said he does not want to hold this up, but to him the building is incredibly non-interesting. It seems there is an opportunity to do something with the design. He said LEED projects incorporate sun shades, horizontal projections over the windows which provide interesting detailing. He noted there is direct sun beating into the building and at the same time, he questioned how people would not get heated up if there are no glare issues. Ms. Falconer said she considered window fins and overhangs and to her, it did not go with the existing building. She studied the glass cover in front of City Hall and considered proposing that, but they went for a simpler industrial design. The building, while tall, really recedes into landscape more than anything else, and this is the decision that was made.

Vice Chair Welter suggested reviewing the colors to be used, which Ms. Falconer presented as soft earth tones which she presented.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned why the two entry canopies do not align, and Ms. Falconer felt it was more interesting to offset them. Vice Chair Welter noted that he had made this statement at the meeting and suggested it be made with signage and not necessarily with the canopy.

Chair Butt said he thinks the DRB is put in an awkward position because it is being asked to approve this tonight. If not approved tonight, the funding is affected. At the same time, some

issues need to be worked out, and he is troubled that he is being forced to approve it. The project has the potential of really being something very nice. The 50 foot building signifies the Port of Richmond and he thinks it is a missed opportunity due to the time crunch. He suggested looking at the U.C. Berkeley field station, which is a bold, red metal industrial building which is very nicely detailed; simple and strong.

Boardmember Woldemar agreed and said it is a simpler cladding of the building with all building materials in the same direction.

Jim Matzorkis, Executive Director, questioned if there was a way to hammer through some modifications they could agree upon now to make the Board more comfortable with the design without having to return or start from scratch.

Chair Butt and Boardmembers indicated agreement. Boardmember Woldemar said the vote could indicate that the entire recladding would be of the same material in the same direction (vertical versus horizontal), that it be all the same color, with a specialized color around the windows, and instead of window trim, window frames are the color. The trim would be the same as the body color and the window opening color would be another color. Then, they could talk about parapet cap fascias, a flat entry, signage could return as well as fencing, and the façade would be stepped.

Boardmember Woldemar noted the building is representative of the 1970's. It is wood framed with metal siding, and while he would prefer a new image, he thinks it is not a lot different from many projects that are rushed due to funding.

Vice Chair Welter said once the canopies are taken off, it is a hard form to do anything with. He agrees there are things that can be done with the finishing, cladding and colors, is not advocating redesigning it, and he thinks a solution with words can be reached to approve it with conditions.

Boardmember Woldemar took some time to sketch out some changes.

Vice Chair Welter questioned whether solar panels are mechanical equipment and need to be screened, which was discussed at the study session. Ms. Falconer said they would prefer to put them at an angle, which will be visible. Chair Butt suggested using solar panels like awnings on the south façade to show off the solar while providing shade. Mr. Slaughter noted solar panels are treated like mechanical equipment and the City typically wants them to be flush with the roof and screened from a public view from the street level. He said it did not need to be necessarily conditioned.

Ms. Falconer confirmed they would continue the entry canopy as one piece, with columns in front of it, with the expression vertically of the same material and same color; do window frames as one color; and lettering like the general warehouse which could be returned as a signage package.

Mr. Matzorkis stated while he does not necessarily think about design issues, he wants to ensure the design conforms to the Homeland Security requirements in order to utilize funds, upgrade offices, and end up with something that looks professional.

Boardmember Woldemar said what would work well and what fellow Boardmembers are getting at is the use of a marine blue industrial building color which is the same blue on the City's logo or a gun metal grey, all of which would work with a brighter blue window frame. Columns might be done with something special like a tile which would tie the project together. Of interest is that

it goes with the chain link fence, the warehouse to the north, and the white could be brought in from the towers. He questioned if this could work within the timeline.

Ms. Falconer said this would have no impact on the structure or design, and the other consultants can move ahead and she can bring back the fencing, finish, change hatch patterns and color, and the signage.

Chair Butt closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to approve PLN10-221 based on the staff's recommended 4 design review findings, on staff's recommended 14 conditions of approval, with the following additional conditions; 1) that the project design for the fence and its location integrated into the front landscape plan be returned to the DRB for approval at a future date; 2) that all signage be returned to the DRB for approval at a future date; 3) that based upon the sketch provided to the applicant, that all exterior siding be of the same vertical profile and same plane on all elevations; 4) that the entry canopy be one large horizontal element rather than 2 separate elements, perhaps supported with columns; 5) that consideration be given to adding horizontal solar sunscreen awnings on the south elevation; 6) that the vertical siding be of one color, window frames be an accent color, fascia panels be a third color and be done with a different smooth pattern or material with ribs; unanimously approved.

Mr. Slaughter confirmed that the fence and signage will return later for DRB approval as an item included in the project, but approved as a separate item. Mr. Privat confirmed the project could be presented to the Planning Commission, with the signage and fencing to return to the DRB.

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Mr. Slaughter reported that the department obtained an urban greening grant from the California Resources Board which will allow the City to hire a consultant to draw up an urban green master plan for the City.

The following items were continued for discussion at a future meeting:

1. Continue discussion on landscape bond procedures.
2. Review and discuss possible amendments to RMC 15.04.810.030 (Fencing and Landscaping Standards, Residential Properties) and RMC 15.04.820.010 (Fencing and Landscaping Standards, Commercial Properties).
3. Review and discuss possible amendments to RMC 15.04.930 (Design Review) to include DRB jurisdiction over City projects.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Boardmember Woldemar reminded Board members to complete mandatory AB 1234 ethics training.

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m. to the next meeting on January 12, 2011.