

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plazas, Richmond, CA
September 14, 2011
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Andrew Butt, Chair
Otheree Christian
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Eileen Whitty
Don Woodrow

Chair Butt called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Boardmember Christian

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Carlos Privat, and Kieron Slaughter

Others Present: City Council Liaison to the DRB, Tom Butt

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 13, 2011:

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the minutes of July 13, 2011; motion carried 4-0-1-1 (Christian absent; Woodrow abstained).

August 10, 2011:

Boardmember Woldemar noted that the Commission received only odd numbered pages of these minutes, and asked that approval of these minutes be deferred.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Boardmember Woldemar requested adding Items 1 and 2 to the Consent Calendar.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to add Items 1 and 2 to the Consent Calendar and approved the Agenda; unanimously approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Butt stated Items 1 and 2 were moved to the Consent Calendar which now consists of Items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. He asked if the Board or public wished to remove any item.

Boardmember Woldemar requested Items 3 and 4 be removed from the Consent Calendar, noting that both are recommendations to the Planning Commission and not approvals.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 1, 2, and 5; unanimously approved.

Chair Butt noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, September 26, 2011 by 5:00 p.m.

Items Approved:

1. PLN11-252 MODIFICATIONS TO E. SCENIC AVENUE RESIDENCE REHABILITATION

Description **(Held Over from 8/10/2011)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO MODIFY AN APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE OF THE POINT RICHMOND NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT TO ALLOW THE ADDITION OF ONE NEW SKYLIGHT AND REMOVAL OF AN EXISTING WINDOW ON REAR ELEVATION AND REPLACING IT WITH NEW FRENCH DOORS.

Location 221 E. SCENIC AVENUE
 APN 556-134-031
 Zoning SFR-2 (SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
 Owner THOMAS & SHIRLEY BUTT
 Applicant DANIEL BUTT
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

2. PLN11-091 WESTERN DRIVE PLANNED RESIDENTIAL GROUP FOR TWO SINGLE-FAMILY UNITS

Description **(Held Over from 7/13/2011)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL GROUP CONSISTING OF TWO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCES, ±2,015 SQUARE FEET AND ±3,892 SQUARE FEET, ON A PROPERTY PREVIOUSLY SUBDIVIDED INTO THREE PARCELS.

Location 125-127 WESTERN DRIVE
 APN 558-020-016-9, 558-020-017-7, & 558-020-018-5
 Zoning SFR-2 (SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
 Owner JOHN KNOX
 Applicant KELTON DISSEL-JOHN MANISCALCO ARCHITECTS
 Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 9/28/2011 TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

5. PLN11-518 AKANNI RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AND REMODEL ON BAYVIEW AVENUE

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±452 SQUARE FOOT REAR ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.

Location 5819 BAYVIEW AVENUE
 APN 509-130-014
 Zoning MFR-1 (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)
 Owner ADEDIGBA AKANNI
 Applicant ROGER BOYER, ARCHITECT
 Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

The Board welcomed DRB Liaison, Councilmember Tom Butt.

Boardmember Woldemar asked for the status of the DRB Retreat and whether the City Council liaison has been invited. Ms. Whales said they are hoping to hold a retreat in early December, with HPAC members. She said the Planning Commission just held its Retreat on September 13, 2011.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if Councilmember Butt has been involved in the rewriting of the Zoning Ordinance or has it been discussed at the City Council level. Councilmember Butt said no. He stated the City received a grant and is working on a form based code for the 23rd Street corridor, but the Council has held no discussion about the Zoning Ordinance.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed that Councilmember Butt has heard no progress being made on the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Councilmember Butt noted there is very little building going on and he has received no comments or complaints about the Planning Commission, Design Review Board, or the Historical Preservation Commission because there are no controversial projects. He noted there is a current lawsuit to which Mr. Privat commented that the City had prevailed.

DRB Chair Butt questioned Mira Flores and Pt. Molate, and Councilmember Butt stated there is demolition and hazardous materials clean up occurring at Mira Flores.

Boardmember Woldemar said his point about bringing up the Retreat is that it has been slow over the last couple of years for the DRB. Every other meeting gets canceled, and he thinks there is time to look forward and asked that the Zoning Ordinance be started and that the DRB has some involvement in that. Councilmember Butt agreed it was a good time to work on the Design Review ordinance or other things. Mr. Privat noted that any amendment to the Zoning code must follow the General Plan, and Boardmember Woldemar cited other items to be addressed such as landscape bonds, and this was his reasoning for bringing up the subject.

Boardmember Woodrow stated he had a conversation with a 5-year HPAC member who thought the Point was zoned only to preserve the downtown part of the Point. This member did not know the boundaries of the area, and if anything else, the City could provide a map to members so they are aware. Mr. Privat noted that Lina Velasco is working actively on the Historic Preservation Code and modifications to it and the Planning Department is seeking funding for a forms based code outside of 23rd Street for the entire City to tier off the General Plan once that is adopted. He learned that the standard practice or time is 2-4 years from adoption of the General Plan to having a complete zoning code, so it takes time.

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that the General Plan is going to the Planning Commission for recommendation to Council on October 6, 2011.

Boardmember Whitty asked whether one piece was being pulled out of the General Plan, and Mr. Privat said yes; there is no Housing Element yet, which has been pulled out. He said the North Richmond shoreline and land uses there will be a recommendation by the Planning Commission to the Council just like any other designated area in the City. The Housing Element will follow within a certain timeframe from adoption of the General Plan.

Boardmember Woodrow noted there is a controversial project that has been red-tagged which will be coming up and involving the DRB and the HPAC.

Ms. Whales noted that the City's Community and Economic Development Director, Steve Duran, is now the City Manager for the City of Hercules.

Boardmembers thanked Councilmember Butt for his update.

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 3. PLN11-065 METRO PCS WIRELESS FACILITY AND MONOPINE ON VALLEY VIEW CT

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO INSTALL A NEW METRO PCS WIRELESS FACILITY AND MONOPINE ANTENNA IN THE EL SOBRANTE AREA OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND.

Location 5500 VALLEY VIEW COURT

APN 435-180-008

Zoning PA (PLANNED AREA)

Owner PANDAL, PERMINDER S

Applicant METRO PCS / MTT LLC C/O NETWORK DEVELOPMENT

Staff Contact LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Ms. Whales gave the staff report on behalf of Lamont Thompson. She confirmed there was no residence on the property and what Metro PCS is hoping to do is erect a 53 foot high monopine. She pointed out there were photo-simulations attached to the staff report as Attachment 1 which shows the proposed location. Mr. Thompson visited the site to determine whether the pole could be seen at 53 feet, and he was unable to locate it. Staff is asking that the Board provide a recommendation to the Planning Commission, and the applicant is present to address any questions regarding the site.

Boardmember Woldemar said he asked for removal of the item. He referred to the last photo-simulation and said the tree pole sticks up considerably on the skyline. Another photograph shows this, but on a different scale. His issue is that these fake trees are just that. There is a relatively new one on San Pablo Avenue in Pinole and they do look like fake trees, and antennas can be seen up inside them. While he particularly has no problem with fake trees in this location, he is concerned about how they seem to stick up. On page A-4, an exhibit indicates that this tree is to contain future antennas for other cell carriers. He noticed the ones proposed today only go up about half of the height of the false tree. He asked why is the tree built so high and he suggested building two trees that are 25 feet high instead of one at 53 feet.

In addition, because this is a horse ranch, he asked why not propose a fake or real windmill and hang the antennas on a windmill, which he felt would look more appropriate.

Paul Doubrava, Metro PCS said the way the technology works with cell phone antennas is that they cannot be on the same horizontal plane or else they interfere with each other. The directional antennas that shoot up towards the horizon are usually down-tilted slightly to create an umbrella effect. If there are two, 25-foot poles, there will be elevations hitting each other, and technologically, it will not work. They need to be vertically stacked or placed so far apart horizontally that they will not be able to hit their coverage objectives.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested they be placed at different elevations on a hillside site. He noted this site has a lot of elevation and one could overlook the other by vertical elevation. Mr. Doubrava said they could do this, but they still end up at the same above ground level height. He said cost is a factor, and it will technically work, as long as they are not at the same

elevation and they are still in the location where they can reach their coverage objective to San Pablo Dam Road.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that the application did not include a coverage map. He noted that the upper two sets of antennas are not yet designated. Mr. Doubrava said currently there is a cell site there. They are ground mounted antennas. The City favors co-location for cell sites, and the only way they could do this rather than scattering the hillside with many ground mounted antennas at different elevations is to vertically stack them on a pole. There are all sorts of things that can be done like windmills, but it comes at a cost and it could be economically infeasible, which means the company would not move forward. Secondly, two of the spots are designated; the current carrier T-Mobile, which would be obligated to move onto the pole and abandon their ground mounted antennas, and then Metro PSC, the applicant. The top spot is designated for AT&T Mobility, but obviously, it is preferable to locate all carriers on the pole instead of just making it the minimum height for two carriers.

In response to Boardmember Woldemar, Mr. Doubrava agreed this is an economic argument, but they could return with another carrier to request extending the pole, and they would then have to review their foundation. When co-location is favored, they plan for the future and it also works for the landlord as well. Boardmember Woldemar said this is a perfectly good argument to make with the Planning Commission, and the DRB is trying to address the visual aspects.

Mr. Doubrava said the monopine is over 900 feet from the residence, and at times when driving by the street, from this distance with the canyon as a background, he believes the design is harmonious with the surrounding area.

Boardmember Woodrow agreed the design is harmonious and he asked how far from San Pablo Dam Road is the structure. Boardmember Woldemar noted it was a good half mile away and well up on the hill. Boardmember Woodrow noted someone would have to stop their car, look up the hill and search for the pole, and he did not see a single thing wrong with the pole being up there made to appear as a tree.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to Map A-2, and asked if the map shows all things intending to be done at the site. Mr. Doubrava said the map shows proposed and existing equipment. Boardmember Woodrow questioned and confirmed that the applicant was not proposing to do anything with the horse barn. He asked if power would be placed in the barn. Mr. Doubrava said electrical service to the property comes into the barn location, and a subpanel can be taken from that.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned what is done for backup power, given a storm. Mr. Doubrava said this is becoming more of an issue given storms, but he noted there is backup power that lasts 4-8 hours depending on the use. Some companies are larger than Metro PCS and they will plan for diesel backup generators. Boardmember Woodrow questioned what goes into the three items that are shown just in front of the stable, which is T-Mobile equipment. Mr. Doubrava said the T-Mobile equipment exists which are radio cabinets or channels that can handle phone calls. He did not believe it was currently fences, but simply sits on a cement pad. Boardmember Woodrow asked if the applicant plans to have some of the equipment fenced off for their own equipment. Mr. Doubrava referred to the right half of Map A-3; he noted that proposed is a six (6) foot high CMU retaining wall, which is concrete block. Boardmember Woodrow said this is a 3-sided wall and he asked what is on the 4th side. Mr. Doubrava said the 4th side or open side faces the horse stable area. Boardmember Woodrow said if it is to be fenced, it should be shown on the map, and if it is something that can be seen that is 6 feet high, he suggested it be painted to blend into the hill. Mr. Doubrava said in looking at the elevation, this is behind a 25-foot berm and it is absolutely impossible to see these locations

because of the topography. He referred to Map A-4, stating the tree is up in the elevation, and the public cannot see the equipment, which he said is completely shielded.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned how many homes were located down on the hill and said it would seem to him that it would be in Metro PCS's interests to fence the equipment. If not, at least finish off the wall so that kids could not get to what is inside. Mr. Doubrava said the cabinets lock and is meant to stand alone on a cement pad. They still get spray painted in certain locations, but besides that, they are meant to stand alone. Putting a fourth side is not a big deal, but it is also not a big deal for kids to hop the fence and it puts a barrier there. Boardmember Woodrow said he was more concerned with kids getting hurt in some way because there is power feeding the equipment. Mr. Doubrava said there is nothing different than what is found at a home. It runs on 110 volt and it is all in conduit with nothing exposed.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if signage was proposed. Mr. Doubrava said yes; the FCC regulates signage at the sites. They are placed onto the cabinet, fence, door, or wherever is most visible to someone at the site. Boardmember Woodrow questioned if a sign should be placed where the road comes out to the home sites at the bottom of the hill. Boardmember Woldemar noted there is a gate there and one sign indicating that facilities are located up the hill. However, right at the site, signs must mark the network operator's 800 number in case of emergencies. Boardmember Woodrow suggested the 800 number be posted at the gate, and Mr. Doubrava noted this point.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Boardmember Woodrow's question on location and said the smallest scale site plan shows that it is 1300 feet to Valley View Road. Boardmember Woodrow also noted that the facility's proximity to the homes is 900 feet. Mr. Doubrava also noted that the access gate is pointed out on Map A-2.

Mr. Doubrava also noted that copper theft is another problem they have faced, and grounding bars and other copper was taken.

Boardmember Woodrow asked how close to the Wildcat Canyon Park line does the tower come. Mr. Doubrava said it is 14 feet and they were noticed but have not commented. Much of it has to do with the fact that a facility already exists on the site.

Chair Butt said he will be happy when something else is developed to replace the monopines, as he feels they stick out a bit. Mr. Doubrava said they do need a background. Chair Butt questioned if fast growing trees could be planted around them, and Mr. Doubrava said leaves need to be away from the antennas, as they kill the signal pretty quickly.

Mr. Doubrava referred to windmills and said Napa Valley has tried these and has done these successfully in the middles of wineries.

Boardmember Woldemar thanked Mr. Doubrava for the photo-simulations and wished there had been a simulation from the end of Valley View. If he is reading the topography correctly, he will be able to see right up the driveway. He has no way to prove that because there is no topographic map or photo-simulation, but he said it would be useful that this be added when being considered by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Doubrava said without vertical stacking and if another carrier was interested in obtaining the same coverage objectives, one could imagine seeing a tree pop up on the hillside, and a bunch of ground mounted antennas. Boardmember Woldemar said he does not see the ground-mounted antennas because they are low and they do blend in with the background. His objection is the fact that the monopine sticks up on the hillside off the ridge, and there are all

kinds of other ordinances that talk about ridgeline construction and houses on ridges, and he questioned what makes these different.

Mr. Privat noted that one thing different is that the City Council, as a policy, has directed staff to require monopoles or monopines to co-locate so there is no proliferation of individual antennas throughout a hillside. They want one where all carriers can go to for one visual obstruction. Boardmember Woldemar questioned whether the policy allows for any exceptions. Mr. Privat noted it is in the ordinance. When creating a monopole, they must be available for co-location and the goal is to have monopoles instead of individual sites. He said there can be individual sites on existing structures but the goal is to have monopoles and co-located sites.

Boardmember Woldemar said the part he is struggling with is the visual impact of this particular set because by their evidence, it sticks up on the ridgeline, and a tree does not grow this way on a ridge. He suggested that perhaps Metro PCS should provide another photo-simulation from the gate at the Valley View intersection to prove that it does or does not show up. He said he is amazed that the May Valley homeowners have not shown up on this.

Boardmember Woodrow noted they are aware of the project, but do not see it as something that would intrude on the site. He said he drives up and down San Pablo Dam Road often and he looks up and sees scattered big trees and some of them are dead and brown, and so this will not stand out.

Chair Butt disagreed and said he feels they stick out quite a bit, but he was not sure there was a better alternative.

Mr. Privat said there are findings the Board can make that co-location would have an adverse impact on aesthetics versus stand alone in a case-by-case situation if this is how collectively the Board feels.

Boardmember Woldemar said in this case, because it is going to the Planning Commission and he will vote no, at least one person's expression of this will go forward to them. From the applicant's point of view, he asked them to be prepared for it. Mr. Doubrava said he does feel this is putting the best foot forward and respects Boardmember Woldemar's opinion, as well.

Boardmember Woldemar asked that the color of the concrete block be compatible with hillside colors, or brown.

Chair Butt confirmed that the pole is 53 feet high and only half of it is being used. If it were half this height, and another half of the height placed on a different part of the hill, this is what Boardmember Woldemar had proposed. Mr. Doubrava noted that the bottom of the upper part of the pole would be at the top of the lower pole in order for coverage purposes. Boardmember Woldemar said this is what he is proposing; there is enough foliage such that a 25 foot high pole will not stick up as much as a 53 foot pole visually.

Boardmember Whitty said she would predict a second 53 foot pole would be received. Mr. Doubrava asked the Board to keep in mind that the last 8 feet of the pole is not usable for telecommunications. The pole that has structural strength will not look very attractive. It stops at 45 feet and then there is a cone with branches that takes the last 8 feet. Boardmember Whitty said she could not understand why there could not be better technology to replace the large antennas. Mr. Doubrava said the antennas are not that large, but there needs to be vertical separation between neighboring antennas. When placed on the façade of a building, it is a clean look; without any significant height on the hillside, it is truly a pole.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that the top of the auditorium has cell sites on it behind a fabric translucent fiberglass, with fake brick painted on it. So there is a technology to build a structure and put these things behind it. So, the windmill would not be that far off. Mr. Doubrava said it would be incredibly expensive. Anytime custom fiberglass is used it is expensive. Boardmember Whitty said, hence her statement that technology has not come that far in the antenna business, but in the camouflaging, it has come a long way.

Chair Butt said he saw one on the roof of a San Pablo Avenue laundry business. They made it look like a fake chimney, and he said it turned out very well.

Chair Butt called for public comment, and there were no speakers.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) that the Design Review Board recommends to the Planning Commission approval of the project as submitted, which includes the four findings and 27 staff recommendations; and that the color of the equipment will be tan and compatible with surrounding colors; and that the company's signage to be placed on the lower access gate listing the 800 network operations center; motion carried by a vote of 4-1-1 (Woldemar voted no; Christian absent).

Boardmember Woldemar asked that the minutes be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their upcoming meeting.

CC 4. PLN11-063 MODIFICATIONS TO AN AT&T WIRELESS FACILITY ON HARBOUR WAY

Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR A MODIFICATION TO AN EXISTING UNMANNED TELECOM FACILITY CONSISTING OF 3 NEW ANTENNAS AND 6 NEW REMOTE RADIOS, 1 GPS UNIT, AND OTHER SUPPORTING EQUIPMENT.
Location	400 HARBOUR WAY
APN	540-420-003
Zoning	CITY CENTER SPECIFIC PLAN
Owner	BRIDGE HOUSING CORP.
Applicant	AT&T
Staff Contact	LAMONT THOMPSON
Recommendation:	RECOMMEND APPROVAL

Boardmember Woldemar asked that this item be removed because he saw nothing in the staff report or application that talked about painting the material the same color as existing materials so they all match.

Ana Gomez, AT&T Mobility, directed the Board to page A-4 of the drawings, Attachment 1 and photo-simulations which all state the condition indicates: "paint to match existing..." Mr. Privat also referred to the last sentence on the first page, "Propose antennas, remote radios, GPS, and supporting equipment will be painted to match the existing building."

Boardmember Woodrow said this is a situation where screening could work. A fiberglass curtain would not interfere with the signal and it would hide it. The more there are, the worse they look. Ms. Gomez said they looked at this option. The problem is that the antennas are right around the corner. If they were to put the fiberglass around it, they would partially block Metro PCS's signal. In order for them to get their complete signal, they would have to separate the antenna from the penthouse further out. They want to co-locate harmoniously and do not want to block their signal and in order to do this; AT&T must ask them to move their equipment.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the screen could be built to be as tall as the existing Metro PCS antenna. He referred to page A-5. There is one antenna labeled "Metro PCS antenna" that sticks up taller than any of the others. Ms. Gomez acknowledged this, but said they cannot screen their equipment.

Boardmember Woldemar stated the antennas there are AT&T antennas, plus there are new antennas proposed as well. Ms. Gomez said if they were to screen their antennas, because of how close Metro PCS' antennas are, they would still block part of their signal because screening must extend further out than the proposed antennas. Boardmember Woldemar asked if they could build it as tall as the Metro PCS antennas is now. Ms. Gomez said they could, but it would serve no purpose to them because they cannot screen Metro, as they are not AT&T's antennas.

Boardmember Woodrow said one of the antennas proposed to be installed on View 1, top of the page, will be read towards Kaiser. He asked if AT&T spoke with them, as the health concern is an issue, regardless of whether it is or is not real. He asked if they had any comment on the application. Ms. Gomez said they have been noticed and often times, Kaiser is actually one of their biggest landlords, so they have always been receptive of becoming one.

Mr. Privat reminded the Board that they cannot regulate the matter based upon health or condition the project on health aspects.

Chair Butt clarified with Ms. Whales that the City now has an ordinance that restricts installations in new residential areas, and most favored are the civic park areas, industrial, and commercial, and then residential areas, and there are different levels of review for each.

<p>ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to recommend approval to the Planning Commission of PLN-11-063 based on the staff's recommended four findings and staff's recommended 27 conditions; unanimously approved.</p>

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

There were no staff reports, requests or announcements.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Butt noted six tentative dates for the Board's Retreat have been sent out in October and November.

Boardmember Woldemar announced an invitation to Boardmembers for the Bay Cruise put on by the Port Authority and Council of Industries, to be held on Wednesday, September 21, 2011. Staff indicated the Board should contact Katrina Ruk at the Council of Industries at 510-215-9325.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m. to the next meeting on September 28, 2011.