

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
April 13, 2011
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Andrew Butt, Chair
Otheree Christian
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Eileen Whitty
Don Woodrow

Boardmember Woldemar called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Boardmembers Christian, Whitty, Woldemar and Woodrow

Absent: Chair Andrew Butt and Vice Chair Welter

Staff Present: Carlos Privat, Lina Velasco, and Jonelyn Whales

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 9, 2011:

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to approve the minutes of February 9, 2011; unanimously approved.

March 9, 2011:

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to approve the minutes of March 9, 2011; unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA:

Boardmember Woldemar indicated there were two agenda items; Item 1, the Miraflores Senior Housing, and Item 3, the Nevin Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements. Item 2 will be held over to the April 27, 2011 meeting as a Study Session. Boardmember Woldemar also stated that there would be no City Council Liaison Report, as there was no City Council liaison in attendance.

Public Forum – No speakers.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Boardmember Woldemar reported the Consent Calendar consisted of Item 1. He questioned whether a member of the public or Commissioners wished to remove that item. Boardmember Woodrow requested removal of Item 1.

Boardmember Woldemar any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, April 25, 2011 by 5:00 p.m. and, as needed, read the appeal procedure after the affected item.

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

1. PLN10-128	MIRAFLORES SENIOR HOUSING ON FLORIDA AVENUE & S. 45th STREET
Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY, 80 UNIT AFFORDABLE SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT.
Location	CORNER OF FLORIDA AVENUE AND SOUTH 45TH STREET
APN	513-321-001
Zoning	PA (PLANNED AREA DISTRICT)
Owner	RICHMOND COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
Applicant	COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION/EDEN HOUSING
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Lina Velasco gave the staff report, stating that the item is part of a larger development that was approved as part of a rezoning to a Planned Area District (PAD) by the City Council in January 2010. Since that time, staff has been working with the applicants and the DRB subcommittee to fine-tune the design.

After the PAD approval, former Boardmember Bloom and Consultant Jonathan Livingston provided guidance to the project landscape architect, resulting in design change recommendations. The current design under review reflects responses to those change recommendations. Staff met with the Board in September of 2010 to review the final draft and since that time, has been working with Engineering to fine-tune the off-site improvements shown on the plans along with Engineering and Fire Department comments.

There are extensive conditions of approval, but staff feels that overall the project reflects the intent of the PAD and that the project has incorporated the comments of the Board. Staff recommends approval. Ms. Velasco also stated that the project architect was present to discuss the major project changes that have occurred based on the subcommittee and architect consultant comments.

Boardmember Woodrow asked Ms. Velasco to provide a brief summary of the types of issues that were raised by the subcommittee to determine how those issues/changes were met, as this is the second time this plan has come before the Board and the plan is now smaller and greatly improved.

Ms. Velasco indicated that the planned presentation by Rich Caldwell and Paul McElwee, the project architects, would answer questions regarding the before and after of the incorporated specific changes. She said overall, the original comments of blending different architectural styles such as Spanish Revival and Japanese into a blended style to pay homage to the history of the site were addressed. There were also issues such as security with respect to landscaping and the parking lot layout, C3 Storm Water quality standards, rooflines, entry tower, the rear elevation with respect to Rose Avenue, the greenbelt, and offsite improvements that were also addressed.

Boardmember Whitty questioned Ms. Velasco and confirmed that the City Council granted an exception to private open space so there is none per unit because there is a planned community garden, albeit small.

Ms. Velasco responded that overall there would be approximately four acres of the site would be dedicated to open space.

Boardmember Whitty again questioned the amount allocated to gardening space. Ms Velasco said the City received a Strategic Growth Council Greening Grant of over \$1 million to daylight Baxter Creek and to do greenbelt improvements having an agricultural use with a non-profit, business, and community usage. In order to maximize the amount of green space through the green belt the City Council elected to not require as much common private open space on the site, but to encourage green belt use.

Boardmember Whitty then stated she would wait for clarification from the project architects regarding the Japanese character of the plans, as they did not look Japanese to her. Boardmember Whitty also noted that she did not see anything regarding noise and shaking from BART or Highway 80 under the engineering comments and questioned whether those issues were going to be dealt with. Ms. Velasco stated that noise and shaking was part of the environmental review and the project area is not subject to BART ground vibrations, and that the soils report if required, would address this issue.

Boardmember Whitty again questioned the highway noise and Ms. Velasco stated that noise issues were addressed in the environmental report and that although there are operable windows, there is also ventilation provided so that if noise becomes an issue residents can close their windows.

Boardmember Whitty stated that she felt that although they were not supposed to look at floor plans, she felt there was inadequate closet space, and that seniors not having space for personal items was a terrible situation.

Boardmember Whitty asked Ms. Velasco if information was going to be provided regarding permeable pavement on walkways and parking areas. Ms. Velasco replied that there was a small portion of the parking lot that would have permeable paving where drainage was an issue, but that it was an original idea that has been for the most part minimized due to maintenance considerations versus cost benefits. She stated that bioswails were preferred to permeable paving, reducing some of the parking area to incorporate the finger islands for runoff treatment.

Boardmember Whitty asked about the entrance along South 45th Street being designated for resident pickup and drop off, wondering why there were only two benches to accommodate the elderly. She also thought that many of the elderly would want to walk to local places such as McDonald's or BART and that the entrance should be more usable for people to sit and rest, something the architects should revisit.

Boardmember Whitty also questioned the lighting plan, stating that she did not see plans for LED lighting. Ms. Velasco answered that if there is a condition from engineering that at least off-street lighting have LED and that there must be a certain amount of green measures, the project will comply. Boardmember Whitty restated that there should be LED exterior lighting standards, and Ms. Velasco answered that the on-street lighting will be LED consistent with the cobra heads that Public Works are currently replacing with LED's. Ms. Velasco also indicated that if not already called out, the parking lighting can be specified as LED.

Boardmember Woodrow and Boardmember Christian wanted to follow-up with questions for the project architects regarding noise concerns.

Boardmember Woldemar had questions for the staff regarding the suggested conditions of approval. He noted that condition 2 regarding the three year expiration of the design approval should be clarified to be in line with the ordinance that states there is a two year expiration with an additional one year extension upon formal request. Ms. Velasco clarified that the ordinance actually states, "or as approved by condition of approval" and because the funding cycle for the HUD tax credits that the developer will be requesting requires the additional year up front.

Boardmember Woldemar requested that Mr. Privat check to make sure that the Board was not changing the ordinance. Mr. Privat stated that he would look at the exact wording and get back to the Board during the course of this hearing.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned condition 12; along 45th Street there are a series of power poles. He wondered if the power poles themselves (not just the service) are undergrounded.

Ms. Velasco answered that along the project frontage the poles were undergrounded. Boardmember Woldemar stated that the lines on the other side of the street would have to be dropped underground as well. Ms. Velasco answered yes; staff was working on figuring out how that would happen. Boardmember Woldemar reiterated that it needed to be not just the connections but the utility service, as well.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that in the packet, Item No. 20 specifies that the Engineering Department indicated that the lights for the streets be LED, conflicting with the drawings in the back of the packet which indicate traditional cobra head with high pressure sodium. More importantly, Boardmember Woldemar asked if rather than standard cobra type street lighting with a slightly different head, there should not be a different thematic approach to the street lighting as has been done along Macdonald Avenue and Nevin Avenue.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that condition 28 is moot, as there are no outside dumpsters and recycling containers. He questioned how recycling will be handled from the second floor.

Boardmember Woldemar commended the conditions of approval on this project, feeling that for the first time in a long time the Board was getting the entire picture. He questioned with respect to Condition 45 whether the TRC was being reinitiated. Ms. Velasco answered that the TRC has not convened in the way they had hoped, but through their work around the Health and Wellness Element implementation they have been able to get the Police Department to provide reviews. The Engineering Department has a land use engineer that provides conditions for most projects. Boardmember Woldemar indicated that he thought this was a good model and that this is the type of information that should be included, particularly on projects of this scale.

Boardmember Woldemar restated that specific to condition 45, he wanted to ask for the record for someone to define that "lighting should be high resolution and cast a wide pool". He understood that this requirement probably came from the Police Department for security concerns but felt it was vague and needed to be specifically defined.

Boardmember Woldemar said it was important to redefine some of the conditions already noted and asked about. Carlos Privat said he had an answer regarding the previous question from Boardmember Woldemar regarding the lapse of the permit, stating that Ms. Velasco was correct -- you can have an alternate time as specified in the conditions of approval. Reading from the Zoning Ordinance Section 1504.930, "The approval of the design review application shall lapse two years after its date of approval or at an alternate time as specified as a condition of approval".

Boardmember Woldemar said further down under paragraph E, it specifically talks about an extension. Mr. Privat stated that was correct; you could have a one year extension and technically, the way it was currently stated, it could go for four years. Boardmember Woldemar indicated that was a point that required clarification. Ms. Velasco stated she would revise it.

The public hearing was opened.

Rich Caldwell; Principle of HKIT Architects stated that as Ms. Velasco pointed out, the review process has been going on for quite some time, with DRB subcommittees for the better part of over a year. He thought it best to go back over the history of where the proposed plan started a year ago, the high points of the interim discussions and planning, how the character of things have changed and their responses to DRB, engineering, and staff comments and concerns. He believes that throughout this process the project has become much better.

Mr. Caldwell referred to the three-D model and an aerial view today and proposed review of the project by stepping back in time to where they started one year ago. He felt that this process would allow the Board to understand the large issues regarding the project and provide a catch up for everyone regarding the path the project took to get to its current state.

Paul McElwee; Project Designer with HKIT Architects, stated that he was showing what was presented at the January 26, 2010 Subcommittee meeting, with the model reviewed again in February and September of 2010. He indicated there were many refinements as a result of comments and that he would be giving an overview of the development and major improvements.

Mr. Caldwell clarified that the background shows the master plan community as it is known today, stating that it may change slightly, but that the major elements will remain intact. He noted that in the center is the relocated house and water tower structure from the nursery and the restored greenhouse. The other housing units are shown more as massing elements from Gonzales's last master plan. Mr. Caldwell hoped that this clarification would allow the Board to have context related to how the project was designed and what it is trying to accomplish from the inboard neighborhood location.

Mr. McElwee described the structure is a two story, roughly symmetrical H shaped plan with parking off the north and south and the main entrance off South 45th Street. It also includes a drop off area, an elevator tower, a balcony, and a lobby inside the lounge area for seniors. The apartments are in the wings that flank either side of the parking area along the street. In the initial presentation there were a variety of treatments; different colors of stucco that are offset in the vertical plane, bay elements, built-in concrete planters set near the walls at the base of the building; all this comprises the bulk of the wings. At the ends of the buildings are the entrances to the parking lot, with the driveway entrance mid block and the gate element, low fence and trellises at the exit near the end of the wings. Proceeding around the building, there is a courtyard in the center, vegetable gardens, a gate that faces at the end of Rose Court, and an area meant to be a pedestrian entrance.

Mr. McElwee stated that some of the comments they received when they presented the model back in January 2010 included: looking at increasing the variety and further staggering the roof line; concern about the shapes of the bays, specifically roof termination areas; discussion regarding making the entry more prominent with regard to the lobby and elevator tower functions, with elements being more expressive of the function and more substantial; making

the portico share more substantial, with the drop off wider; working with the geometry to correct the axes, making the axis continuous throughout and more symmetrical; refining the initial too commercial window design to reflect more residential looking inset windows; refining the site plan by adding bulb-outs at the corners and driveways, landscape and storm water treatment features, and the drop off area; and improving the parking lot area with expansion of the trellis element from the entrance to the driveway to make it continuous, including Japanese type wood screening elements, and softening up the parking lot with landscaping and bioswails.

Mr. McElwee fast-forwarded to the current plan resulting from three 2010 subcommittee meetings, the resultant work with the subcommittee, and Jonathan Livingston's (consultant) design comments.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned whether this conveyed a sense of where the project had been and where it is going. Mr. McElwee answered that he did not begin at where the project was, as in the 2008 & 2009 timeframe and then it ceased for awhile. Neither the January 2010 plan nor the current plan looks like the original, and that progress was a good thing. He also stated that the plan at first was comprehensive with a lot of trouble and it is wonderful to see the progressive changes in the plan.

Mr. Caldwell interjected that they picked a snapshot in time to give everyone a bearing and that they feel the project has been enhanced quite a bit as a result of these meetings. He recapped the following points: They spent a lot of time on the roof lines, made changes to the bays, there is now a lot more variety and interest in the roof, some of the detailing has been flushed out, the windows are a lot more residential looking keeping an open façade approach, the tower element has been made stronger and wider, there is some Japanese detailing at the entrance, the entrance has been made more gracious by pulling out the drop off area to the side, there is a larger portico share with outdoor seating, a lounge area within the lobby, an accessible balcony on the second floor, balconies at the courtyard entrance and breezeway, seating areas, community gardens, and patio off the community room.

Regarding the parking areas, he indicated that it reflects the enhancement comments and that a lot of green areas, trees, and pavers have been added to make it look less like a parking lot. He stated that the fence element has been enhanced a great deal from the initial design with wood screen elements reminiscent of traditional Japanese architecture, trellises with detail that brings it down to human scale, an added gate in the parking area, trellises at the entrances, more detail at the termination of Rose Court gate and more detail at the bridge element along the back. He believed that those were the major elements summarizing the major points of concern.

Mr. McElwee stated that they took the Board comments to heart with respect to the crossings and other discussions with traffic and engineering, allowing them to extract from their standards and bulb-out the drop off in the front entry in order to create the public sidewalk going straight through, and on the back side to create the bulb-out that shortens the crossing over Endo Way down to the greenway. He said traffic and engineering did not want to do corners and that wherever they could cross over at the two pieces of Endo Way they allowed bulb-outs to shorten the distance.

He indicated that he hoped when they do the second part of the master plan that it would all come together. Mr. McElwee stated there was also some discussion with traffic and engineering regarding tabling the crosswalks but that the side drainage for that whole area is in the public street so it could not be interrupted.

Boardmember Woldemar determined there were no further comments from Mr. Caldwell and Mr. McElwee and asked Boardmember Christian if he had questions and comments for the architect.

Boardmember Christian referred back to security, questioning whether there were surveillance cameras in different areas. Mr. McElwee said the last senior project of the firm that opened about six months ago utilized a series of security cameras that were embedded in the project and he thought staffing was usually on site 24 hours.

Katie Lamont; Associate Director of Real Estate Development for Eden Housing, responded that they generally handled security by two major methods. First, the building is designed to guide people to one central entry point. In this case it is at 45th Street. They locate their manager offices near the central entry point in a location where they can monitor people coming in and out of the building. This is also why the elevator tower is located in the central entry point location and that they rely on the manager's active surveillance of the site mostly during the daylight hours. There is also an on-site residential manager.

They wire for cameras and she briefly described their locations and where they are tied into monitors. She said security measures she described have really become the standard for Eden Housing and they also have secured entry systems with FOB's instead of keys so specific tenant ingress and egress can be monitored.

Ms. Lamont said Eden Housing jointly manages two developments in the north Richmond area, an area that is a tougher neighborhood than the proposed project. By using the described methods they have been able to keep the properties secure. She also said that they focus a lot on the first floor area exterior units to ensure security and tenant's safety and they have actually done things like raising window sill heights, planting "uncomfortable" plants near windows, planter boxes that serve a dual purpose of storm water filtration and a physical barrier, and ensuring that there are no places near first floor windows where someone could hide.

Ms. Lamont also indicated they supported active neighborhood watch programs and have been very engaged with the neighborhood community for the last eight years or so. It was an important part of the property manager's job to be active in the community.

Boardmember Christian questioned whether there was any thought put into the location of the laundry room, as some seniors might not be able to carry their laundry down to the room. Mr. Caldwell answered that typically the senior communities they have developed over the years have had centralized laundry. There is on-site staff if they need assistance and it is also an opportunity for socializing and getting a person out of their room.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to the noise from BART, stating that the worst noise from BART comes at the curves in the track and this planned project was only 250 feet away from a big curve where they are slowing coming into a stop. He stated the local homeowners are probably very happy there is now a sound wall in place. He questioned whether they planned for triple glazed windows or putting something in the walls to deaden sound.

Mr. Caldwell answered that there will eventually be an acoustical site study to set the parameters for the actual construction detailing to address the sound issues. Give that sound waves travel in straight lines the best way to deal with sound is to not be in a straight line to the sound and that the orientation of the building consisted of no units facing directly into the BART sound line.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Ms. Velasco to read what the mitigation measure stated. Ms. Velasco read that a project-specific acoustic analysis where exterior levels exceed dBA, Ldn shall be conducted, and that would provide the mechanisms for the building that would be reflected in the construction. This is part of the mitigation and instead of listing every mitigation that would apply, staff has covered this under Condition 9.

Boardmember Woldemar also noted that the building code requires very specific interior sound levels that dictate measures such as triple glazing or wall channels, but that first the base data must be obtained to drive the design specifics.

Boardmember Woodrow stated that the other sound source is the road at height of about 20 feet which would put it in line with the second floor so he hopes that the sound study is thoroughly done at several times of the day like was done in the Port of Richmond to provide a comprehensive view. He also questioned how the roof was drained, as there are panels sitting down inside a well space.

Mr. Caldwell answered that the roof drains that are in the well are piped out to the outside wall and into the filtration systems.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned that if someone rents unit 148 which is as far as you can go at the northeast corner, and they want to get down to the first floor, they only have two options. First a stairway, but if they are infirm they have a football field walk in order to get to the elevator. He wondered whether other banks of elevators had been considered for that northeast area of the building, noting that is not an exterior plan but perhaps in terms of space may impact the exterior.

Mr. Caldwell answered that they have been doing senior communities for nearly thirty years and that type of distance is admittedly not ideal, but they are independent seniors and this is not an assisted living facility. Residents cook their own meals and are ambulatory. With this type of fully functioning seniors, typically they have provided in this type of community two elevators for two floors. They also locate the stairs in a manner that invites use for fitness considerations.

Boardmember Woodrow also stated that seniors living in the extremes have the same long walk when they want to use the community room or the front door.

Mr. Caldwell confirmed that everything is in the core and those units at the extremes are farther away from the center of the building.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned how the trash worked on the second floor, whether there were chutes.

Mr. Caldwell answered that there are chutes that go down to the first floor to a receptacle and that there are two first floor trash rooms, one in each wing facing the street on the back side. The recycling is done in the room itself in portable containers that staff takes to recycling.

Boardmember Woldemar also questioned that if one was living on the second floor and would like to keep recycling separate from garbage, how that worked. He asked if the person would walk down the hallway to the trash room with both trash and recycle containers.

Mr. Caldwell answered that only the trash goes down the chute, the recycling is placed in a recycle container in the second floor chute room.

Boardmember Woldemar said he thought it could have a design for separate trash and recycle chutes, but as long as second floor residents can place their recycle in a container on the second floor that was good.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned how many feet above sea level the site was with respect to drainage considerations.

Mr. Caldwell answered that the finished first floor was at 59 feet; it slopes towards the creek.

Boardmember Woodrow asked what the elevation of the creek was.

Mr. Caldwell answered that it was underground now and that the elevation would have to be reset later, but confirmed that there was a good slope there. He stated that the master plan takes into account the drainage for the entire site and there had been discussions regarding crossovers, specifically at Endo, and perhaps tabling the crosswalks. However, the site drainage for the entire master plan is done in the street itself so the flow could not be interrupted.

Boardmember Woodrow said he did not recall, and questioned how 0.3 or 0.7 points are obtained on the green point scale. Referring to the green summary, he said there were tenths of points for line items such as finishes and durable cabinets, and wondered how tenths of points are obtained. Mr. Caldwell answered that there are certain areas where partial credit is given. Boardmember Woodrow asked if staff assigned these points. Mr. Caldwell answered that the points came from an active Building Green spreadsheet from Alameda County that assigns points.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned staff as to who is responsible for reviewing the green side of the project and whether that fits the current ordinance and state building codes.

Ms. Velasco answered that the CALGreen Code is part of the Building Code and this requirement went into effect on January 1, 2011. The Building Division is reviewing this and the checklists are also reviewed under the plan check process. She added that the ordinance does not require it to be a certified or registered project through the program, but through this program they are serving as a pilot project for LEED so it will be certified.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if a staff member in the Building Division is certified or qualified to properly review this information.

Ms. Velasco answered that the plan checker has been going through Green Point Rated and LEED training and the City is also hiring a new Plan Checker. Ms. Velasco added that the applicant will be going for the Green Point rating, as it was important to them and good for all concerned. She indicated that for the rating process a third party reviewer will be hired to review all plans and perform actual building inspections throughout the building process. Additionally, the City has its own ordinance that requires assisted projects get 50, 60, or 75 points. Staff expects to get 130 points. For assisted projects, it has become a threshold to get over 100 points.

She commented that over time in the field things might happen that require material replacement between now and the time that they apply for building permits and building completion. However they are committed to obtaining the Green Point number, even if they have to make material trade-offs.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the meaning of the phrase “cost decision” as it applied to the Green Point rating.

Ms. Lamont answered that upon review of the checklist, items are coded red, yellow or green. Green coded items are high value items that will be automatically done. Yellow coded items are higher level investments that they would like to make, but must be evaluated for cost viability and effectiveness. Red coded items are high end items that may be great but not feasible. She cited the following example: A current Fremont project that has commuter and freight rails which go through the city required much noise and vibration assessment, whereas the Miraflores project is far enough back where vibrations are not an issue. She said many affordable housing projects are built on busy roads so they are very used to STC rated windows and doors and the other ventilation systems required for high STC ratings. In the Fremont instance, they had to go with higher cost ventilation aspects because standard lower cost ventilation would not have addressed the required noise damping issues. She indicated this was an example where if there is funding, they desire to use the newer and greener technologies, even though there might be some unfamiliarity.

Boardmember Whitty questioned the storage in the 560 square feet apartments, noting that she only saw one closet in the bedroom and wondered what was the industry standard.

Ms. Lamont admitted this issue was something they struggled with from frequent management company comments in that they would appreciate more storage space. They recognize that, for seniors, they are often downsizing from a house and as such, have storage needs.

Mr. McElwee said it was hard to see from the small plan, but there is a large bi-fold door bedroom closet and a linen closet in the bathroom.

Boardmember Whitty asked if he has specific area numbers. Mr. McElwee answered that the linen closet is 16 inches wide; the bedroom closet is approximately 6-7 feet wide, and a standard 2 feet deep. He also stated there is an entry closet about 3 feet wide by 2 feet deep, and a full height pantry in the kitchen.

At approximately 7:15 p.m. the meeting was suspended due to lack of a quorum. The meeting was resumed at approximately 7:17 p.m.

Boardmember Woldemar stated that based on the drawings, he was having a hard time understanding the extent of the street improvements. He asked if both sides of the street on Endo Way or Sake Avenue were being improved as part of this project.

Ms. Velasco answered that the subdivision ordinance requires that one side adjacent to the property be improved from the center line to the street. She indicated that given there is a larger development they will likely be working with Redevelopment to match the other side. There is a lot line adjustment that is being approved as part of this project that will likely have those conditions, but for the purposes of the project plan approval it is from the center line to around the side.

Boardmember Woldemar stated this was not clear from any of the drawings or conditions and should be so the developer and the City know what their obligations are.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned what specifically the dashed lines in the plan on Sheet C-2 along Endo Way referred to; whether they were crosswalks, whether they are being put in now, and also who was paying for what half based on what Ms. Velasco answered to his previous question.

Ms. Velasco answered that this should be clarified in a condition and, although the developer is obligated for costs associated from the center line to the project, they usually perform the improvement, which is in this case, the entire crosswalk. The City reimburses them at a later date.

Boardmember Woldemar reiterated that the documents need to spell out the specifics regarding responsibility. He, again, referring to Sheet C-2, why are there no bulb-outs at the intersections of 45th and Ohio and 45th and Sakai. He referred the staff to the Nevin Avenue plan where there are bulb-outs at every intersection and said they were not being consistent. He also thought that sometimes Public Works should come to a DRB meeting to explain these inconsistencies.

Ms. Velasco answered that the Nevin project leads to a transit corridor whereas the intersections in this project dead-end leading to the green way and stated that sometimes design features vary with varying typologies of streets.

Boardmember Woldemar explained that he was looking at not crossing 45th but walking along 45th and crossing Ohio and Sakai to get to the park that will be there and believes it comes back to people first and cars second. He felt that since this is probably one of the last big projects in the City, it needs to be well done. Bulb-outs are logical and he is prepared to add a condition for them unless he hears otherwise.

Mr. Caldwell requested clarification on procedures, indicating that as long as he has done this he has not been put in the position where there are two representatives of the City; in this case the DRB and the Engineering Department differ in requirements. He questioned how an architect and developer survive in-between where a group (the DRB) puts a requirement in the conditions that the staff department (Engineering) will not actually approve.

Boardmember Woldemar answered that the Board addresses the concern and writes it in such a way in the conditions so it provides "wobble room". It will end up being a recommendation for approval by the Public Works Department. Mr. Caldwell reiterated that it just puts his client in sort of a no-man's land when there are two City entities disagreeing over what is a City standard. Boardmember Woldemar stated that in defense of the Board, the issue has been raised on numerous occasions. They have asked for Public Work's comments and to date, have not received that support.

Natalia Lawrence representing the Redevelopment Agency, i.e.; the owner of the property, clarified that the condition will be written that ultimately Public Works will have the decision as to whether either they will comply or allow the client to comply with the Board suggestion. Mr. Privat indicated that City staff had the ultimate say so; someone else stated that it was the City Council, and Boardmember Woldemar reminded everyone that any DRB decision can be appealed to the City Council.

Boardmember Woldemar referring to page A-8, detail number 4 the balcony detail, stated that it shows the balconies are 2'4" deep from the wall to the railing, and he wondered if there was a way where they could become deeper, perhaps 4.5 feet deep. He said there was barely any room to even put a chair and felt they were almost decorative and not functional. He understood not every unit has a balcony and wondered if the cantilever could be achieved with a 3 or 4 foot deep balcony.

Mr. McElwee answered that they are only able to get about a 3 foot depth on a balcony that is essentially bolted on the face of the building. Boardmember Woldemar asked whether they have ever tried bracing back the diagonal brace and cantilevering beyond the brace. He stated he believes that the units which have balconies will be nicer units and he did not know if rents reflected differences in units. Ms. Lamont stated that the rent structure did not correlate to location of specific units.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Detail 12 where there is a 6" separation between the building and the filtration planter. He asked what happens to those 6" and how is it maintained.

Mr. McElwee answered that it is not usually a problem that if the space is wider, it collects a lot of stuff, but if narrower, items get wedged in there for good. They investigated using flashing and closing them but determined it was not optimal as it makes nice detailing difficult.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page E-0.1 with a standard City lectroleer detail that is a standard street cobra head and is noted as high pressure sodium. Although already discussed he would like to include a condition that street lamps will be LED, that they be something other than the standard City street fixture, and that they might become a theme for the overall project.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page L-1 noting that both the parking lots are labeled entirely as permeable paver stone. Mr. McElwee stated this was incorrect. The paving stone is correct but the permeable aspect is not correct. The material will be unstamped concrete cobblestone style pavers.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned how the parking spaces would be striped when using the individual pavers, hoping that the solution would not be paint, but different colored pavers.

Boardmember Woldemar had a question of staff, asking who currently is reviewing the landscape plans, noting that Diane Bloom had earlier input. Ms. Velasco answered this was all being done through plan checking and the staff planner.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned staff capability and questioned whether or not this was the type of plan that necessitated outside peer review. He felt this project would set a precedent and it was important to define appropriate materials.

Ms. Velasco suggested that the new Parks Superintendent Chris Chamberlain be brought on line to assist in this area.

Boardmember Whitty confirmed that there are landscape architects on the project but that they were not present this evening.

Boardmember Woldemar referring to page L-3, noted that the fence and gate on the east side had mesh over it. He felt that someone with a coat hanger could reach through, pull on the panic bar and gain access. He wondered if there was a better way to prevent access.

Mr. McElwee answered that he did not know of anything other than something solid that would not become yellow and scratched over time.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested a material with small perforations but that would appear solid. If the intent is security, the current design fell short and may not be worth the trouble since they have the security cameras.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the gate on both parking lots, stating that there were inconsistencies in the drawings as to which direction the gates opened. He asked how he would gain access if he were a resident and wanted to park.

Mr. McElwee answered that residents would have a card. Boardmember Woldemar questioned where the card controller would be. Mr. McElwee answered that the controller would be located in the cueing area just as one turns in. Boardmember Woldemar felt that the cueing area is not long enough, that the drawings do not accurately reflect this issue, and he wondered if they intended to have it motorized on both sides. Mr. McElwee stated it should be only one direction with one gear drive off to one side that runs along parallel to the wall.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that by his measurement, if he has to stop and use a card to gain access, the car would be sticking out into the street because the depth is too short there. Mr. McElwee indicated ingress access could be done with radio controlled boxes. Ms. Lamont stated that their Richmond property uses clickers, with the downside being potential loss of the clickers. She said people can also lose cards as well. She indicated that given the issue with cars sticking out into the street they would be receptive to clickers.

Boardmember Woldemar commented that the process, though somewhat strung out, has worked really well. The owners have done well with their responses to comments and suggestions to date and staff has done really well pulling it all together. He felt that just a few things need to be added to move the project along.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that they did not discuss colors but that he felt they work really well, fitting very nicely into the residential side, and that it will be interesting to see how the colors relate in a context point of view to future projects in the area.

It was noted that there was some discussion during the following action regarding change 5/Condition 45. Boardmember Woldemar initially stated it should be rewritten to include a specific foot candle illumination level as required by the Police Department.

Ms. Velasco stated no one would understand the foot candle notation and that since there was no set standard she had to rework conditions to make it fit. She said they do not want to make it look like a dealership in terms of lighting.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if she edited the condition stating "foot-lighting and motion sensitive lighting especially along Endo Way should be considered as this area lacks eyes on

the street". He questioned what foot lighting was, thinking it meant foot candles. Ms. Velasco clarified that foot lighting referred to light at the side walk at foot level.

Boardmember Woodrow stated he was more concerned that the term be in the condition, not a specified number. Ms. Velasco stated that the City has now adopted a Streetlight Master Plan that has alternative designs to the fixture which is being proposed and is consistent with the lighting levels identified in the Plan that could be a standard.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated this is appropriate, but suggested changing the wording of condition 45 to reflect the Streetlight Master Plan. He also requested that the Boardmembers received a copy of the Streetlight Master Plan.

A person in the audience asked whether now was the time for them to raise questions or objections if they had issues with the conditions.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that they had already closed the public hearing but could address reopening it after the motion.

Also during the action, Boardmember Christian requested clarification as to whether the action before them would change again, to which the answers were no.

MOTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Christian) to approve PLN10-128 design review findings 1-4 and the staff recommendations 1-57 with the following changes: 1) Condition 2 be amended to read that there be a three year approval along with a one year possible extension; 2) Condition 12 state "all existing joint poles and all new utility service connections, electrical", noting that this includes transformers; 3) Condition 20 be amended to include that the applicant and Redevelopment Agency staff explore the idea of using a thematic streetlight fixture that sets the character for the entire Miraflores project; 4) Condition 28 be deleted; 5) Condition 45 be rewritten to refer to the Streetlight Master Plan; 6) Condition 58 reflect that bulb-outs be added to the corner of 45th Street and Ohio Avenue and 45th Street and Sakai Avenue crossing in the north/south direction, that the bulb-outs be subject to review and approval of the Public Works Department, and that if they are not approved satisfactory evidence be provided by Public Works to the Design Review Board as to why they should not be approved; 7) The balcony detail on Sheet A-8, detail number 4 be increased to a minimum of 3.5 feet and that diagonal bracing could be used for support; 8) Sheet E-0.1 be amended to include the appropriate street lighting fixtures and that the street lighting not be high pressure sodium; 9) Sheet L-1 to reflect that the parking lot striping be achieved using alternate color pavers; 10) The Planting Plan be reviewed and approved by the Park Superintendent; 11) Sheet L-3 to reflect that the vehicular gate be amended to open from one side and not the center and that the gate opening mechanism shall not allow vehicles to extend out into the traffic way; and 12) A condition be added that there be a drawing included that specifically spells out what street and public improvements are being done as part of this specific project with defining the associated cost/construction responsible parties.

The public hearing was reopened.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the applicant as to whether they agreed with the proposed action before the Board voted on it. Ms. Lamont stated that after consulting with the architect regarding the proposed balcony changes in Change 7, the architect agreed to the changes. She also indicated that regarding Change 11, she would like to insure that there is enough room to have the gate open to one side.

With respect to Change 2 and undergrounding the transformer, Ms. Lamont wanted to know if they would consider screening the transformer instead of high cost undergrounding.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated he was sympathetic and that the drawing reflects no real screening potential due to the placement of the transformer. On a project such as this he would rather not see a large green transformer box, stating that he addressed the issue because it was already written into the plans.

Ms. Velasco said the drawing came from engineering. Ms. Lamont questioned the City ordinance with respect to above versus underground transformers and whether it was the ordinance or it was a preference driving it.

Boardmember Woldemar stated he would like to amend Change 2/Condition12 to read that the transformer may be above grade as long as it is not in violation of any specific ordinance and as long as it is completely screened from street and sidewalk view. He indicated that it may not be easy to accomplish.

Ms. Lamont agreed but thought they could work with PG&E on the specifics and potential relocation. Boardmember Woodrow expressed concern regarding a vaulted transformer and explosion/fire potential.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if there were any other comments regarding the motion.

Ms. Lawrence indicated that her concern had been addressed. She thanked the Board for their help in bringing the project to this level, appreciates the level of quality and design and commended everyone for their comments and attention to detail.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if she could give everyone a quick status report of this project.

Ms. Lawrence said the groundbreaking occurred about a week ago to celebrate the start of demolition and clean-up. She reminded everyone that this is a contaminated site and it has been a long road to get to this point. They have finally let contracts for abatement, remediation, and house moving of the historic structures. Generally speaking, they are still in a predevelopment phase in terms of the actual construction of housing and both going through the design review and lot line adjustment process to indicate the exact land area to accommodate this particular part of the project. They are working on disposition of development agreements with the non-profits and the for-profit developer. They received a \$1.6 million grant for the 4-acre swath of greenbelt included in this project, and completion of the project will require financing from the Redevelopment Agency that they have not been able to commit to yet but look forward to for a more secure future. They are also supporting the street development required for this project.

Mr. Privat referred to Condition 58, and said the Engineering Department actually reviews street conditions and bulb-outs, not Public Works.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Christian) to approve PLN10-128 design review findings 1-4 and the staff recommendations 1-57 with the following changes: 1) Condition 2 be

amended to read that there be a three year approval along with a one year possible extension; 2) Condition 12 state “all existing joint poles and all new utility service connections, electrical”, noting that the transformer may be above grade as long as it is not in violation of any specific ordinance and as long as it is completely screened from street and sidewalk view; 3) Condition 20 be amended to include that the applicant and Redevelopment Agency staff explore the idea of using a thematic streetlight fixture that sets the character for the entire Miraflores project; 4) Condition 28 be deleted; 5) Condition 45 be rewritten to refer to the Streetlight Master Plan; 6) Condition 58 reflect that bulb-outs be added to the corner of 45th Street and Ohio Avenue and 45th Street and Sakai Avenue crossing in the north/south direction, that the bulb-outs be subject to review and approval of the Engineering Department, and that if they are not approved satisfactory evidence be provided by Engineering to the Design Review Board as to why they should not be approved; 7) The balcony detail on Sheet A-8, detail number 4 be increased to a minimum of 3.5 feet and that diagonal bracing could be used for support; 8) Sheet E-0.1 be amended to include the appropriate street lighting fixtures and that the street lighting not be high pressure sodium; 9) Sheet L-1 to reflect that the parking lot striping be achieved using alternate color pavers; 10) The Planting Plan be reviewed and approved by the Park Superintendent; 11) Sheet L-3 to reflect that the vehicular gate be amended to open from one side and not the center and that the gate opening mechanism shall not allow vehicles to extend out into the traffic way; and 12) A condition be added that there be a drawing included that specifically spells out what street and public improvements are being done as part of this specific project with defining the associated cost/construction responsible parties; unanimously approved.

Boardmember Woldemar noted there is an appeal period as described in the agenda and he commended everyone on the presentation, stating it was one of the best.

At approximately 8:04 p.m. the meeting was paused due to lack of a quorum. The meeting was resumed at approximately 8:06 p.m.

STUDY SESSION:

3. PLN11-048	NEVIN AVENUE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE IMPROVEMENTS
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS TO STAFF REGARDING THE NEVIN AVENUE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT.
Location	THE PROJECT SITE CONSISTS OF THE SEGMENT OF NEVIN AVENUE BETWEEN 19 TH STREET ON THE WEST AND 27 TH STREET ON THE EAST.
APN	N/A [the project is entirely within city right of way, thus no APN]
Zoning	VARIOUS
Owner	CITY OF RICHMOND
Applicant	RICHMOND COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO Recommendation: NO ACTION – COMMENTS ONLY

Chad Smalley; Project Manager, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency provided a brief overview of the project. He stated the project was born in 2008 out of a desire to connect two of the agencies highly significant investments, the \$110M Civic Center Revitalization project and the multi-million dollar/multi jurisdictional effort at the Richmond BART station. The idea is to improve existing walking and bicycling conditions between the two areas. It is about an 8-10 minute walk between the two sites, but very few people currently walk or cycle between the two areas.

Mr. Smalley stated the aim of the project is for the betterment of the neighborhood and to leverage the investments already made in those two areas. The search for project funding began in 2008 with many funding agencies favorably considering the project. In 2008, they received a grant from the Bay Quality Air District for design and construction of the project. In 2009, additional funding was awarded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) from their Safe 4 Us Transit Program using bridge toll funds.

Finally in 2010, MTC awarded a significant portion of the construction funding from the Transportation for Livable Communities program. They have put together a local design team led by Vallier Design and including BMS Group, PKF Engineers, and Fehr and Peers Transportation Engineers, to design the pedestrian and bike centric streetscape. They engaged the community through local workshops, had direct mail press releases and other outreach activities, and emailed City employees. Their aim is a simple, effective, and responsive way of encouraging bike and pedestrian use through the corridor. Mr. Smalley provided several photos of existing conditions.

Christian Deshaies; Vallier Design referred to the photos and a materials board to show details of the design, stating the project begins at the BART station and continues to the Civic Center. At the beginning of the project they looked at the surroundings. He indicated that the west part of the project is in a residential area and the east part is more institutional or commercial by the Civic Center.

They are improving hardscape and subscape. The hardscape is 6 feet wide with the street itself being replaced. He indicated that they were planning to redo most of the street with the drainage also being redone, except at Civic Center which has already been redone. He showed a typical west part street section between the BART station and 23rd Street, with the in-plan view showing the sidewalk enlarged to 6 feet wide with a planting strip and new canopy type trees.

He indicated the goal in the west section is to be more green and residential looking, softer, and less commercial. They were adding new striping, new crosswalk striping, and new bulb-outs. He also stated they are proposing that the traffic will be slower on Nevin Avenue. They plan to add some rain gardens designed to catch the rainwater as a green aspect to the project. All new lighting will be LED and they are proposing a lighting fixture already installed in Richmond, the acorn, a pedestrian light that will be closer together allowing for lighting of the pedestrian walk and the road on the other side. They are working with an arborist regarding the resistant/low irrigation requirement trees which have been chosen as the Brisbane Box and Chinese Elm. Other planting materials are hearty and drought resistant materials, such as native grasses and bulbs.

On the east side they are trying to extend what has already been done at the Civic Center with new striping, new crosswalk striping, and new bicycle areas. The trees will be planted in tree grates with the same species that are already there, except they would like to have evergreens instead of deciduous on the residential portion to create a different dynamic. There are bulb-outs, and across from the Senior Center on Nevin Avenue is a traffic circle to reduce traffic speeds. There are also rain gardens on the east side.

They would like to have an enlarged sidewalk across the Senior Center with benches. At 19th Street there will be signage to direct people to the Civic Center, and they will also use concrete pavers at the 19th Street intersection.

Mr. Smalley indicated that there was one other important project feature he wanted to highlight, the signal at 22nd Street and Nevin Avenue. This project will fix the current problems of a flashing yellow signal for southbound traffic, stating that it is very difficult to cross three lanes of one way traffic, and this project will fix that. He also wanted to point out that the City is going through the process of adopting a Pedestrian Master Plan and a Bike Master Plan that set forth policies that will create a more bike and pedestrian-friendly city. This project is significant in that it represents the first strong implementations of those master plans and improves an important pedestrian and bike corridor. He stated they are very proud of this project and hope to start construction in 2012.

Boardmember Woodrow said once the project is complete, he asked whether the City will have the current van traveling between BART and the Civic Center. Mr. Smalley replied that the project was actually started before the City had the van, and he was disconcerted to see the implementation of the van. However, since that time the funding for the van has ceased and it is not moving currently. Mr. Smalley indicated that this project is a more permanent transportation solution.

Boardmember Woodrow asked Mr. Smalley about what specifically is going to be done at the Civic Center itself under the plan, stating that the City is currently funding new benches.

Mr. Smalley replied that the plan implements the preliminary design that was done for the Civic Center and that work in this project is limited to the right-of-way. Currently, the north side of Nevin Avenue in the Civic Center frontage between 27th Street and 25th Street is approved with bulb-outs, tree grates, wide sidewalks, and rain gardens. They propose that they mirror that on the other side of the street. It makes a dramatic statement at the plaza with two large bulb-outs with trees. At the entrance to the auditorium a need has been identified to align the accessibility ramp so they propose to build a new curb ramp with a bulb-out. Boardmember Woodrow indicated he thought it was a great idea.

Boardmember Christian asked about the other side of BART and whether there is a continuation of this and what similarities there might be. Mr. Smalley answered that it is different in some ways. The theme extended from the BART station west in more of a hard, civic look meant to reinforce getting people to walk to Kaiser. The light fixture that is proposed on the westerly portion is actually the same light fixture used within the residential area. He indicated that they are trying to establish a visual connection, but it is not a straight line of sight issue like it was on the west side of the station. However, for redesigning the plaza there is a line of sight to Kaiser and the east side road bends at 23rd Street, so there would never be a full visual queue of seeing the Civic Center. Mr. Smalley stated it is a similar concept in that they are trying to get people to walk that path.

Boardmember Whitty expressed support for the project.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned whether the rain garden aspects were mostly at the corners. Mr. Christian Deshaies stated they are located at the intersections.

Boardmember Woldemar inquired whether all of this is compliant with the most up to date versions of C3, citing known drainage issues on San Pablo Avenue in El Cerrito. Mr. Christian Deshaies replied that the rain gardens are located at areas where the drainage supports them.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the intersection at 23rd Street ties in with the 23rd Street Specific Plan that Hector Rojas was involved in. Mr. Smalley replied yes; it does tie in with the

Streetscape Program for 23rd Street and involves a two-way conversion. He reiterated that they designed these improvements to be consistent with that plan, especially the hardscape improvements. It gets a little tricky with respect to the signals and they are in a position where they need to upgrade the signals so they have an eye on two way signal design for the future. He said the 23rd Street project is approximately a \$12 million job and, to date, they have nothing for it. This project is less in scope and with the transit access, was easier to build a funding plan which they are very near complete.

Boardmember Woldemar reiterated the consistency point regarding bulb-outs. He referred to a slide of the corner bulb-outs showing an illustration of two handicapped ramps on each of the four corners, stating that some jurisdictions allow one at a 45 degree angle with striping coming around the corner. One, versus two, made for a better visual design.

Mr. Smalley replied that what Boardmember Woldemar was referring to were called bi-directional curb ramps. When the sidewalk is bulb'd out to shorten the crossing distance and utilize a 45 degree angle, it becomes an accessibility concern as it leaves a wheelchair user out in the intersection because it is not aligned with the crosswalk. The bi-directional curb ramps shown in the project have been recommended by the Richmond Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (RBPAC) who has been heavily involved in the project design from the beginning. RBPAC has essentially mandated the use of the bidirectional curb ramps.

Boardmember Woldemar thought the design contributed to visual chaos. He questioned in the illustration between 24th Street and 25th Street on the north side, remembering that an earlier plan showed access to a proposed parking structure. He wondered whether there would continue to be an access plan. Mr. Smalley replied that the potential for the parking structure is not certain and that the plan reflects current design. They have referred to the Civic Center Master Plan and believe they are not unduly restricting the ability for the parking structure to be constructed at a later date.

Boardmember Woldemar agreed that the Board would probably not see the parking structure in its lifetime but wanted to make a pitch for many years from now, the City spend some money in that block to enhance the Farmer's Market, enhance the parking, comply with the City ordinance for trees per parking space, and to generally enhance parking in that area.

Tony Suseak, RBPAC Member and Richmond representative to the CCTA Citizen's Advisory Committee, stated that he was glad to have the opportunity to hear about the Miraflores project, as he has been hearing about it for a long time. He has done a lot of door knocking in those neighborhoods and people were very skeptical eight years ago that anything would ever happen there, and that the area would never be cleaned up. He is excited that something really good is going to happen in that area. He is a utilitarian bicyclist and referring to a slide, he said that in order to make bike lanes really effective, the center stripe must be removed. He also said bicyclists are in favor of bulb-outs, transportation was being eviscerated by MTC as they are car-centric, and he pointed out that visually impaired people use the bidirectional bulb-out curb cutouts to line up to the crosswalk.

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Ms. Velasco announced that the Historic Preservation Awards event will be held on May 9, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. Staff will be sending out email invitations. Boardmember Woldemar indicated it is

always a nice event and Boardmember Butt and his wife are recipients this year.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Boardmember Woldemar cited several items he wished to discuss:

1. Date of Retreat?
 - Ms. Whales indicated soon.
2. Status on the Landscape Bond Ordinance?
 - Ms. Whales indicated this item would be forthcoming. At the last meeting which Boardmember Woldemar was not in attendance, staff talked about the need for more information from the Board regarding what they wanted to see in the landscape bond.
 - There were notes about his request earlier having to do with wanting to clean-up the landscaping portion of the ordinance and that in both commercial and residential, all they require is one tree for 50 feet. He voiced opposition and suggested reworking sections that relate to both commercial and residential to be more specific about landscape requirements.
 - Boardmember Whitty asked if that referred to street trees, and Boardmember Woldemar confirmed it did.
 - Boardmember Woldemar said at one time the Board was to discuss a change in the ordinance that would call for formal design review of City-sponsored projects. Ms. Whales indicated this item was pending.
 - Boardmember Woldemar asked staff to go through the ordinance and make changes that eliminates DRO. Ms. Whales said that the general plan is moving forward. Staff can start all of these changes within the Zoning Ordinance. She assured Boardmember Woldemar that staff is closer to adoption which should occur before July.
3. Boardmember Woldemar said as an aside, he heard from the Mayor's staff person today that he has been re-appointed. Boardmember Whitty said she had been, as well.
4. Boardmember Woldemar stated that as a matter of reporting, one of the actions they took on the big house on Hellings Avenue a couple of meetings ago. They ended up resolving that to the satisfaction of the subcommittee and ended up being able to get them to do the one-story corner with the sloping roof up to the two-story to soften the corner. Boardmember Whitty asked if they removed the tower. Boardmember Woldemar said that they changed the tower entry but what really came out of that is that they need to work harder on reinforcing the idea of context.
5. Boardmember Woldemar stated that past member Jonathan Livingston asked about the BART garage and why has it changed so much from earlier discussions. He asked staff whether they have any evidence of what it is going to look like. Ms. Velasco indicated that it went both through Design Review Board and Planning Commission review and the only thing that Jonathan Livingston has not seen is the final artwork, but she agreed to follow-up.

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.