

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
February 27, 2013
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Ray Welter, Chair	Brenda Munoz, Vice Chair
Robin Welter	Eileen Whitty
Mike Woldemar	Don Woodrow
Brant Fetter	

Chair Ray Welter called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Ray Welter, Vice Chair Brenda Munoz, Boardmembers Brant Fetter, Robin Welter, Eileen Whitty, Mike Woldemar and Don Woodrow

Absent: None

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Hector Lopez, Hector Rojas, and James Atencio
APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Public Forum - Brown Act - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Ray Welter noted the agenda consists of five Consent Calendar items and Item 1 is a hold over. He asked if any members of the Board, staff, or audience wished to remove an item. Boardmember Woldemar requested removal of Items 2 and 4. Commissioner Whitty referred to Item 3 and asked and confirmed that while the existing structure has a garage door, it is a garage sized shed for storage. She requested removal of Item 5.

He announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, March 11, 2013 by 5:00 p.m.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Fetter) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 1 (hold over) and 3; unanimously approved.

Items Approved on the Consent Calendar:

Public Hearing(s)

CC 1. PLN11-010 AT&T WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITY
Description **(HELD OVER FROM 2/13/2013)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO INSTALL A NEW WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION

FACILITY CONSISTING OF A 64-FOOT FAUX EUCALYPTUS MONOPOLE TREE AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT.

Location 4075 LAKESIDE DRIVE
 APN 405-371-010
 Zoning M-1 (INDUSTRIAL/OFFICE FLEX DISTRICT)
 Owner CALIFORNIA AUTISM FOUNDATION
 Applicant TRILLIUM CONSULTING ON BEHALF OF AT&T
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ **Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO 3/13/2013**

CC 3. PLN13-024 EVANS RESIDENCE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±400 SQUARE FOOT DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.

Location 5007 RAIN CLOUD DRIVE
 APN 433-432-004
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
 Owner AGNO SHEILA KAY H
 Applicant WILLIAM EVANS
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ **Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Presentation JUDY BACA MURAL ON SENIOR CENTER WALL

(15 MINUTES) ARTS & CULTURE PRESENTATION OF THE UPCOMING INSTALLATION OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD PUBLIC ART MURAL BY ARTIST, JUDY BACA, USING A METHOD CALLED MAROUFLAGE. THE INSTALLATION LOCATION WILL BE ON THE CURVED WALL OF THE SENIOR CENTER ON MACDONALD AVENUE NEAR THE CIVIC CENTER.

Michelle Seville, Arts and Culture Manager, introduced Kate Sibley from the Public Art Advisory Committee and said she will discuss the Neighborhood Public Art project which began almost three years ago. It began as a mural concept. The artist, Judy Baca, is with SPARC which is a non-profit from UCLA. She came to Richmond and visited many neighborhoods where community meetings were held. People submitted photographs, drawings, and stories about their life in Richmond and the process involved gathering of information from diverse cultures. As Ms. Baca began to collect the information, she got the idea of identity cards because several people brought them in. She presented two examples; one a shipyard worker and a Laotian military service member. She combined the images being submitted and their stories with the ID cards.

She pointed to the left side of the mural which is Richmond's beginnings which speaks to the Native Americans and villages. Further into the mural, they talk about the Latino population, the Pullman cars, Standard Oil, the Japanese American greenhouses, the Ford Plant, and old photographs of what Richmond used to look like. They then moved into WWII and she presented an ID card of the mother of a staff member at the Richmond Art Center, pictures of the shipyards and life around them, housing, cafes and clubs which were part of Richmond at that time. They then move forward and talk about the Laotian, Southeast Asian and Hmong population of Richmond. She pointed to a man who was in the military in Laos, lost a leg and she presented a drawing is of his village in Laos which he brought to the meeting. There are many Hmong active in the performing arts and dance in Richmond. The last panel talks about the environmental issues in Richmond, green businesses and organizations like Urban Tilt which get people interested in urban agriculture. She displayed active participants in the shoreline and environmental issues and the mural combines stories about the land and

shoreline. The mural will be 60 feet wide and will wrap around the curved exterior wall of the senior center on Macdonald and in the hand-out is a mock-up. She said the mural will be in 5 pieces as opposed to one continuous image. It has already been painted on canvas and has been digitally reproduced onto a very heavy vinyl that can thrive outdoors and does not need replacement for 10 years. It is coated with a wax coating to deter graffiti and weathering, and the coating can be removed and replaced, washed with soap and water and it will be 116" off of the ground and hard to reach. She said the beauty of it is after 10 years, it can be reprinted and re-installed. The technique has been used in other places and has proven to work very well.

Ms. Seville said the handouts explain some of the issues. One talks about the placement of the signage that is already on the senior center. Page 2 shows the positioning of the signage as it would be if the mural was placed at the location where the artist wants to place it. The proposal is to move the current signage, place it above the door and under the arch so that it would not interfere with the location of the mural. The second issue is the drain pipe. The drain pipe currently would go down through one of the panels. The other item that will need to be done is for the texture of the wall to be smoothed for the mural to adhere to the wall. The City must prove there is no asbestos or lead contained in the wall or the paints on the wall, and they are in the process of determining who will do this. SPARC has offered to send a representative to accomplish this and the City agrees as long as the testing is certified. They would grind the surface, clean it, use gel and adhere it to the wall. The beauty of it being in five pieces is that each piece will be framed. The installation process is called marouflage which has been used often over the years and it is now being used for acrylic material to adhere to walls. The mural will look like it has actually been painted.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the building and said the mural appears to start on Macdonald Avenue at a tangent point where the curve goes to straight wall. He asked if it turns all the way around on the north side to exactly the same place. Ms. Seville was unsure and said when on Macdonald, one cannot see all the way around, and Boardmember Woldemar said one will be able to see it when on the lawn at the Library and on Nevin looking down the alley that leads to the building. He questioned its symmetry, stating it should start and end at the same two points. Ms. Seville said she was not sure this would be possible because of the way the images are being positioned. Boardmember Woldemar said if there is a center panel, he suggested centering that one on the centerline of the curve and let it work its way around in both directions. Ms. Seville presented the vantage point most desired, while driving down Macdonald Avenue.

Boardmember Woldemar asked how the subjects or topics were selected. Ms. Seville said they invited the community, neighborhood councils and the public to attend meetings. There were 4-5 people who attended who brought their photos and stories. They were asked to spread the word and invite others who could do the same thing. Boardmember Woldemar said he is somewhat surprised that there is not a stronger representation of African Americans and also of the Japanese Americans. Ms. Seville pointed to the Japanese American community included on the murals who are family members from the nurseries. The African American population is very strong and is representative in another panel. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the ID cards and the faces on those are the prominent pictures one will see. Ms. Seville said it is an interesting issue raised and one that has been spoken about over the 3 year period.

Kate Sibley, Public Art Advisory Committee, said she was only in a small part of the process and stated this question has been raised for specifically those two groups. Her feeling is that one of the strongest panels is the final panel which is all African American. This is also meant to be an ID card for many citizens. Boardmember Woldemar suggested placing this one first because it is the most visible from the street. Ms. Seville said it is placed according to historical sequence and pointed to a few other panels in the beginning where African American women are shown and the many people who participated in the workshops were African American.

They brought dozens of images of pastors and churches and early stories. They developed an equal call and the participation was also very equal. How an artist ends up processing and using the information that is collected of a project of this kind is really in the artist's purview, and this gets into imagery, content, and the initial and end concept. Boardmember Woldemar concurred. Regarding technical information, it sounds as if someone will have to smooth out the existing stucco and his recollection is that it is a very coarse pattern. He also read that as this deteriorates, it can easily be removed with a hot water power wash, but he questioned what the building would look like after it is removed. Ms. Seville said it would only be removed to be replaced and 10 years from now, their capital improvement is budgeted for maintenance for public art so there will be funds for this.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that the smoothing of the stucco would be limited to just where the mural is located.

Boardmember Whitty asked and confirmed that each of the photo montages is 10'x12'. She said she strongly dislikes the use of ID cards. She finds them demeaning and an invasion of privacy. She questioned why the Native Americans aren't using some of their rugs and early flags. Ms. Seville said this speaks to the content of the murals that was brought in by participants. Interestingly, the ID cards are something that these people treasure.

Kate Sibley added that this mural is being created at the time the City was discussing and creating an ID card for Richmond residents. So it is all tied into this as well. Ms. Seville said Boardmember Whitty's comment is interesting and not the only time she has heard this; however, these people treasure the ID cards. It is something of the past that says they exist. For women who worked in the shipyards, this was the first time they ever worked outside the home. She said she works for Rosie the Riveter as well and the treasured items were the pay stubs and the ID cards. Boardmember Whitty noted the Laotians have fabulous costumes and she asked why they are not on the mural, and Ms. Sibley said they are.

Ms. Seville said she appreciates Boardmember Whitty's comments and feelings about the ID card. The project has gone on for a long time and it is the compilation of what the community contributed to it. The artist felt that she could not second guess the content that was presented to her and she used it all. When they receive another \$50,000 to do another project, we can keep this in mind and thanked Boardmember Whitty for her comments.

Boardmember Fetter said from his design background, art is a big part of architecture. Artists can be asked about why they actually do something in a particular way and there is a whole body of work you can base architecture on. Regarding the civic design and planning and buildings, he referred to Learning from Las Vegas book, which is the scale of how architects relate to signage and other elements in our environment. In driving, he asked if they want everybody driving 35 mph past the mural or do they want them to interact with it. He gets the feeling that there is a lot of detail in the mural and he asked if people in the cars could see it, or was the idea to interact with it as a person together with it. He felt there was an odd sense of scale with this piece of artwork, and he questioned if they were trying to evade vandalism.

Ms. Seville said vandalism is a huge part of it. Many of the murals that exist in Richmond that have been placed on San Pablo Avenue near the Barrett Avenue on-ramp to I-80 which is in bad shape and needs to be remediated. It does get tagged a lot which is a cost to the City and work for the artist who must go out and fix it. The mural is in a civic center area where there is a lot of activity, so the thought by the artist was to place it up higher, to make it big enough to be seen and she guarantees that people will be able to see it at the current proposed height. When driving, it will be engaging. She expects that many people will stop their cars in the parking lot and get out and look at it. It is nice to be able to see something from a distance and to see it

well. Boardmember Fetter voiced concern that there is a mismatch between level detail, scale and approachability, and Ms. Seville stated this has much to do with vandalism.

Boardmember Fetter stated because of the complexity of each particular piece, he thinks it deserves a larger border, just from an artistic standpoint. He suggested not crowding the images to give it more space. Ms. Seville said this is the rendering which has been submitted. They will come back in March to do the installation and she said she will pass on comments to the artist and thanked the Board for their comments. She said she felt this way about a piece of public art installed on Marina Way between Macdonald and Barrett at the end of the housing project. It is metal fencing with cut outs of different images with very strong colors. She thinks there should have been a down space in between each of the images to make them pop more and give them the respect they deserve.

Boardmember Woodrow asked what color is the framing and Ms. Seville noted it is brown paint on the wall. Boardmember Woodrow said this seems to go against the other idea that something will be put up that is not paint because this should endure. Ms. Seville stated this is a minimal maintenance issue and something they could do themselves.

Boardmember Woodrow said he does not have much experience with these types of public drawings but he thought that since the huge wall cries out for something on it, he thought they would see something similar to what is on Chavez Avenue in San Francisco such as schools, churches, walls painted with a huge, wonderfully florid painting. Instead, there are photographs, one of which is simply not going to be seen. He asked whether the images could be re-arranged other than all in a line. Ms. Seville said this is the artist's thought. One of the contributing factors to the type of mural to be installed is a budget which is \$40,000. The murals he referred to in San Francisco had a much larger budget. To do this kind of painting, the surface of the wall would be extremely difficult to paint on and some sort of reduction of texturing would have had to be done on the entire wall and much more money to do it. Boardmember Woodrow said while he hopes it gets done, he is somewhat disappointed because he thought there would be more and something that grabs your eye while driving. He referred to the Dornan Avenue Tunnel which is simple, large, easily understood paintings as contrasted to things that are very detailed and require someone to stand there to see them. He asked what the artist thought about this. Ms. Seville said this is a project that is a reflection of the community. It is a very daring undertaking to reflect any community because there will always be comments as to why certain things are or are not included. The theme came from the community so the artist was not going to argue with the contributions. She felt compelled to give equal representation to what was given to her and to merge it in a way that made sense and reflected Richmond's history. She looks forward to the installation and she hopes that it will be beautiful and may change the Design Review Board's minds.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if this is the only hearing on this. Ms. Seville said it has had public hearings before the Public Art Advisory Committee and the Richmond Arts and Culture Commission, and with other groups that participated in contributions. She said the public generally; however, have not seen these, but all of these meetings were public. Boardmember Woodrow suggested that to avoid hearing more comments, he suggested involving the public at another meeting. Ms. Seville said these opportunities have come and gone. Criticisms and changes have been made from these contributions. The murals have been painted, digitally reproduced, they are out of money and now they cannot afford to pay for installation.

Kate Sibley added that the public meetings were broadcast and anybody was welcome to attend those meetings. Those interested came and there are always going to be people who do not attend and participate in advance and who will come in and say it is wrong because it does not represent them or their neighbor. She recognized that the Board's comments was in concert when they removed the spirit poles and she remembers the discussion about people saying no

one was ever notified, but the process is there. Either people participate as it goes along or they do not. Ms. Seville said this is true of public art no matter what it is or where it is.

Boardmember Woldemar apologized and said on the northeast quadrant of the radius, there are windows all around, but it would be very appropriate if the artist would give the Board a proper illustration of where the mural is going, such as a site plan. He questioned why the Board is only seeing this now, and Ms. Seville said it is an informational presentation. They follow the City's policies and procedures for the review process of public art. Boardmember Woldemar referred to the BART public art structure where the Board saw it late, tried to make some changes to the art that affected the architecture, and this is the same type of discussion. Ms. Seville said they share agendas and the Board is always invited to attend the Public Art Advisory Committee meetings or the Art Commission meetings. They meet on the fourth Thursday of the month for the Commission and the second Wednesday of the month for the Committee. Ms. Seville noted there is going to be a new public art project for the Port of Richmond and it has a budget of \$225,000. The location will be determined through a process between the artist submitting ideas and the project manager who is very experienced and is doing site review. She will let the Board know when the call for artists goes out to invite the Board to attend the presentations. If anyone would like to sit on the selection panel, she would love to have any member from the DRB.

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 2. PLN13-021 BEIJING RESTAURANT WINDOW INSTALLATION

Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO INSTALL TWO NEW WINDOWS FOR THE BEIJING RESTAURANT, A LOCALLY LISTED HISTORIC RESOURCE.
Location	199 PARK PLACE
APN	558-122-023 AND 558-122-024
Zoning	C-1 (NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT)
Owner	ZHOU XIAO FENG TRE
Applicant	JONATHAN WU
Staff Contact	HECTOR ROJAS

Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Rojas gave the staff report and a description of the request for design review approval. The property is a contributing structure to the Pt. Richmond Historic District which means that it must under Historic Preservation Commission review. Staff took the project to the HPC Subcommittee and the project requires a historic preservation evaluation which amounts to having the project evaluated against the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The evaluation was done by Kimberly Butt of Interactive Resources. Staff reviewed the evaluation and concurs with the determination that because the storefront windows would be placed on the non-historic side of the building, it would not impact the historical defining characteristics of the building. He referred to pictures contained in the staff report and said the necessity for windows stems from the darkness inside the building.

The application was also reviewed by the Pt. Richmond Neighborhood Council Land Use Subcommittee. There was some concern about the windows; however, the applicant received unanimous support with the condition that they recommend to the DRB that there be a mural placed on the building elevation that faces Washington Avenue. On page A4.1 of the plans, the detail for number 5, Ms. Butt attended the Pt. Richmond Historical Museum and there were several pictures of what the Pt. Theatre used to look like and the idea here was to take advantage of the wall and recreate what it used to look like. The applicant can speak on the application and is in agreement with the condition which would be to have either the Pt. Richmond Gateway Foundation or another local group to be allowed to put the mural on the

applicant's property. The specific condition does not require the applicant to fund and install the mural itself.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to condition number 2, suggesting that the new windows will be like the existing commercial storefront window system which is very commercial. When looking at the mural and the historic aspects of the old building it had fairly narrow and expressive single or double hung windows. The windows illustrated on the west elevation proposed as new do not look like that at all and in fact, if the windows were done in the shape and size that they are with commercial storefront-like windows, he does not think it would look very good and fit even though that side has no historic character. He suggested the Board discuss more than just the window and window treatments. He thinks the mural idea is great and would love to see false buildings and people painted on real buildings, but he thinks they should not leave the discussion. Murals affect the architecture of the building and he asked that the mural design should go back to the HPC design subcommittee and suggested revising Conditions 2 and 3.

Mr. Rojas referred to the window locations, the types and their number according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards and he said this is intentionally done not to recreate the historic look, specifically the type of windows or materials. The standards call for a distinct architecture so when a person walks by, they can tell what is the new versus the old and what is and is not historic. Boardmember Woldemar said this could be done with aluminum or vinyl frames that are clearly not wooden sash.

Boardmember Fetter said he has done historic preservation in his work and they have hired very well-paid preservationists and while opinions vary, it comes down to the fact that less experienced preservationists will tend to shy away from getting too close to a historic look, but under strict scrutiny of the standard, you can get a lot closer and well outside of imitating or confusing the end result. He loves modernism and thinks it is a good approach to dealing with real old buildings in urban cores. In this case because of the context, there is no modernism in that neighborhood and Boardmember Woldemar's suggestion about having a different window treatment might be more appropriate. Unfortunately, there is a conflict between the window and the entry but he thinks that once more is learned about the purpose and intent, it is better understood and more can be done. He encouraged the Board to not be so fearful about what the style of the original building was.

Boardmember Whitty referred to A3-1 in the proposed west elevation; number 2, it states "new awning over fixed windows" and she asked what the awnings would look like. Mr. Rojas said he was also confused about this and the applicant clarified it is the type of window; it just opens up. There is no awning covering like a canvass, but a push out window hinged at the top.

Boardmember Whitty said they are supposed to be removing portions of the brick wall and she asked if there was a plan to renew the brick in some way that would be nice for the building. Mr. Rojas said there is not a use stated, and Boardmember Whitty asked that this happen. Regarding the mural, it will be done by someone and while she likes the idea, she would put in possibly three figures so it looks like they are going to the theater rather than someone just standing there. Boardmember Whitty also noted the existing entrance could use some redesign; however, it is not being requested.

Boardmember Fetter thanked the applicant for locating a restaurant at the property. It is a key piece of property and it is great location for a restaurant.

Chair Ray Welter commented that if the walls are brick veneer or brick and are thick the Board should encourage pushing the windows back in to provide some relief and not have them flush. The applicant can purchase he supported the suggestion to add thin line storefront windows that

do not have a big profile. In lieu of anything else, he felt this should be part of the window conversation.

Boardmember Woodrow said he has been kept out of a vote on the Plunge and on the Up and Under restaurant because his house is on a street not far from here. He asked whether or not he can vote tonight on this matter. Mr. Rojas said this property is up the street from the Plunge and a few doors away from the Up and Under, and the rule is 300 feet.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to the mural and confirmed there are no drawings of the mural. He noted that Michelle Seville will tell the DRB that they are the ones that govern murals. He has experience with her on this. Secondly, there is one on the wall directly across the street from this site and this mural was not approved but rather done by a group of people who simply started painting it. There is good experience with murals in the Point and he suggested it go to someone with a sense of plan and art. Mr. Rojas said the concept is that it looks like something that was historically there. He thinks Boardmember Woldemar's suggestion about conditioning it to return to the DRB or HPC is a good one and he recommended including this as a condition. He clarified that this building is not owned by the City of Richmond and Ms. Seville's group would not necessarily be involved. Staff would need to contact her to obtain a list of artists she has worked with in the past who know this particular trade, but it would be something that should return to the DRB. Staff met with the HPC last week and they mentioned the need for review by someone with an eye for detail.

The applicant waived his presentation and was available for questions.

Boardmember Woodrow said he thinks it is a great concept and hopes it gets going soon. Mr. Rojas noted that a condition has been developed regarding the mural and its final design shall be reviewed by the DRB prior to installation.

Chair Ray Welter referred to the windows and he thinks if they get a low profile storefront window, push it back into the opening, it will never been seen. On the other end of that, there are storefront companies that sell an OG trim. Boardmember Fetter said the proposal is not to redo the entire entry and the problem is that it is more fitting to have that whole side to have one consistent methodology. Chair Ray Welter said he could not tell from the pictures the entry is and Mr. Rojas said it is a copper brown or dark bronze and this would be the suggestion for the new windows, as well. He said the condition reads, "to match existing finish and material."

MOTION: Boardmember Woldemar made a motion to approve PLN13-021 subject to the Historic Structures Code findings as recommended by staff, with the following changes to Condition No. 2; that "All new windows be recessed and shall be of a design, color and finish to recall but not match the historic character of Pt. Richmond subject to review and approval of the Director Planning and Building Services." Secondly, that Condition No. 3 has an additional sentence added to it, that "The muralist shall return to the HPC and the DRB with a final design for review and approval."

Mr. Rojas clarified that the Board does not want the windows to match the actual finishes of the existing storefront, and Chair Ray Welter suggested flexibility. Boardmember Woldemar distributed a sketch of the windows.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Fetter) to approve PLN13-021 subject to the Historic Structures Code findings as recommended by staff, with the following changes to Condition No. 2; that "All new windows be recessed and shall be of a design, color and finish to recall but not match the historic character of Pt. Richmond subject to review and approval of the Director Planning and Building Services." Secondly, that Condition No. 3 have an additional sentence added to it, that "The muralist shall return to the HPC and the DRB with a final design for review and approval"

which carried by the following vote: 6-0-1: (Ayes: Welter, Munoz, Fetter, Welter, Whitty, Woldemar. Noes: None; Recuse: Woodrow).

CC 4. PLN13-036 POTTERY LAND WAREHOUSE BUILDING

Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±60,000 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE BUILDING AT A ±9-ACRE SITE.
Location	1170 HENSLEY STREET
APN	561-280-010
Zoning	M-2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL)
Owner	HEARST CORPORATION
Applicant	POTTERY LAND USA
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and a description of the request for design review, its location and zoning, the proposed new use for a warehouse, landscaping, lighting, and other site improvements. Staff recommends that the building façade incorporate additional architectural features such as a trellis, canopy, or other elements and recommends approval subject to revised conditions.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to Sheet A, and said the parking behind the warehouse seems to impinge on the turning area for trucks or that trucks will drive into parked cars. He believes something is wrong with the drawings. Mr. Lopez said there is a truck loading area with a 50 foot turning radius. Boardmember Woodrow said if extending the 50 feet, it goes right through 20 parking spaces labeled “7 spaces” and “10 spaces”. Mr. Lopez suggested the architect provide an answer. Boardmember Woodrow said he also said no drainage plan has been submitted. He asked what would go into the bio swale. Mr. Lopez said the runoff from the building will go there and it will be designed at a later date. The plan is conceptual at the current time and this is to get an idea as to whether the property’s contingencies can be removed.

Boardmember Woldemar asked what kind of fencing surrounds the property and whether any of it has barbed wire, which he said could be asked of the applicant. He said in the staff report there is landscaping relating with parking and numbers of trees per parking space. Because the rear parking area is for employees, it does not meet the requirement for trees per the number of parking space. He asked how this can be approved without asking the applicant to file for a variance because it is an ordinance requirement. However, several years ago there was a finding made by the City Attorney’s Office that a particular statement in the zoning ordinance reflected the development review organization being able to make exceptions for landscaping. It was determined at that time that the DRB could make an exception. If the Board does this, language will need to be included in the motion that makes this exception. Otherwise, there is one tree for every 4 parking spaces that is needed in the back parking lot. The reason he asked that the item be removed is to clarify this, as well as fencing and barbed wire.

Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed with Mr. Lopez that landscaping was not requested. The applicant provides the number of trees in the front but not in the rear parking lot. The zoning code does not specifically state they have to be evenly distributed. For this reason, it is somewhat discretionary by staff.

Boardmember Whitty questioned the circulation in the lot by trucks to the existing warehouse. Mr. Lopez said if a truck goes to the loading dock there will be no cars parked in that area, and he noted the applicant would address this question. Boardmember Whitty questioned where

ADA parking is on the lot, and Mr. Lopez said it is not yet designated but can be worked out during the Title 24 process.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked how wide the road along the bottom was and questioned whether it is required for secondary access.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Wang said he is the owner and purchaser of the building. Currently the lot is all paved as well as the landscaping area. He wants to use the existing warehouse and will build 60,000 square feet of building on the empty lot. Regarding rear parking, in the future there will be additional parking for trucks but the majority is for truck parking right now. Boardmember Woodrow asked and confirmed that no parking is needed or planned in the rear, and employee parking will be in the front area.

Dennis Fox, Architect, said the ADA parking spaces are not labeled. They have 112 parking spaces and his calculation states they need 65 cars on the site, so they are well in excess of the front area. The back is all turning radius. The new trucks will go back into that area and that is all it is used for and not turning radiuses.

Boardmember Fetter said the drawing shows parking and then there are curbed areas with the light standard, and that is what makes it look obstructed. Mr. Fox said they traced that off the original drawing and there is no curb there, as well as any parking. It is striped now and it will continue to be that way. He said the 11 spaces up against the warehouse could be used, will not be in the way, and that all employees will be at the top and this is where the handicapped parking is going. There are 9 ADA spaces which can be referenced on the plan.

Boardmember Fetter asked about the showroom and Mr. Fox said in the center of the existing building, it is not a public showroom per se, but for trade and used for pots coming in on pallets. They are dropped in the warehouse and shipped out to Wal-Mart, etc. He noted the trucks are large, they account for the 50 foot turning radius and the street is wider than they need. Boardmember Robin Welter pointed out that much is dependent on the size of the truck or fire truck.

Boardmember Fetter said his only other question would be the look of the building and warehouse. He suggested buffering of landscaping between the building and the street and better treatment of the entry. He is very positive on the overall plan. Mr. Fox said the existing buildings on site use very flush, flat insulated metal panels for all buildings. He wanted to duplicate that. To break it up a little, they added a band of contrasting material and this would add some color to the building. There are white awnings on those buildings. The added windows would break up the mass of it. The scale is a little different and the new building is very much lower than the existing building and longer. The question as to the street elevation is a valid one. He referred to the aerial photo and across the street is the parking lot for a building. When driving down Hensley, the street façade will not be seen at all when approaching the site. He did not want to attract attention to the front of the building to imply that was a public entry.

Boardmember Whitty asked about signage and questioned whether the railroad was in use. She said the site is interesting because there are curves and the existing building's awnings echo the parking lot, but this is not true of the new building. Mr. Fox said they have the same awning for the new building. They could not and did not want to put this on the face of the building

where the trucks are circulating. He confirmed that they will return with signage and as of now, there is signage at each gate and the idea is to reuse that and keep it low profile.

Boardmember Fetter said he assumes it will be a cool roof, and Mr. Fox said he anticipated that question. Boardmember Fetter noticed the exit points on the building and he is thinking about quality of life for those who work there and just having some green space. People will still be smoking and wanting to get out of the building. Mr. Fox said there is space behind the building 10x40 feet long. The zoning requires a 10 foot setback and this is a place to get rid of the 10 feet. Boardmember Fetter stated this is the fire department requirement and said he did not see it in the proposal. Mr. Fox agreed it was not included.

Boardmember Woodrow said could this be the place where the drainage plan is proposed. Mr. Fox agreed that drainage is an issue because they had one brief conversation with the civil engineers about this who gave them the area required and they will have to carry the roof water off. The nice thing is that they can collect the water and run it back into the swale, but not in grade but will have to bring a pipe above grade. They will have to look at this and they have included the storm water control engineer on their list of consultants to review this as the project develops over time.

Boardmember Fetter said, in response to comments by Boardmember Robin Welter, with an industrial application, there is a concern with permeable pavers that the trucks stay off of it as they are not rated for the weight of trucks. He added that pavers are put out along the edges to reduce the permeable area. Mr. Fox said what is important regarding the roof border is that we have ample space for it and how they get it back there is a technical problem.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to where the warehouse is placed and asked if it is in line with the other building next door. Mr. Fox said it feels like it. She asked if it was possible to get 20 more feet of landscaping which would complement and finish it off a bit, as well as highlight what the company is selling. Mr. Fox said they are not open to the public. The owner discussed the 10 foot setback and Boardmember Robin Welter suggested landscaping in the 10-foot setback area to make it more visible in the front if at all possible. Mr. Fox explained that for sustainable landscaping they need more xeroscape. He sees a lot of projects like this and it would be better just to put in low water plants and this way they survive and it is cosmetically better. He said the bulk of the site is already taken care of.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if Mr. Fox has read and agrees with the proposed 18 recommended conditions, specifically Condition 2 which states "The front façade of the new building shall incorporate an entry trellis, additional windows, a canopy and other features to enhance the appearance of the new building as seen from the street such as the entry element located on the front of the existing main structure, and that all modifications be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator who shall determine whether the modifications are appropriate." Boardmember Woldemar said based on Mr. Fox's comment on downplaying the front landscaping, this is opposite that. Mr. Fox said yes he would have an issue with this condition.

Boardmember Woldemar asked where new and existing fences are located on the plan. Mr. Fox said there is a note along the radius where there is a new wrought iron fence. They will have to clean up the existing chain link. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the barbed wire on the chain link fence is not allowed under the zoning ordinance. Mr. Fox said he was not sure whether there is any barbed wire and it is difficult to determine from the photos, but agreed to remove it. He said it is the intent of the owner to put up screen fencing along the back side which is depicted on the landscaping plan. It is a vinyl mat with a slot that can go into the existing chain link. There is solid fencing that is 8 feet in height on their neighbor's side.

Boardmember Woldemar said while the staff does not condition it, he asked if Mr. Fox was aware of C3 requirements and drainage, which means a survey and topography must be provided. He noticed on existing conditions of the old, original drawing indicates there is a fire hydrant sitting in the middle of the 50 foot maneuvering lane. Mr. Fox disagreed with this, and Boardmember Woldemar suggested checking on these types of things. He said it strikes him that there are some unresolved issues with staff's conditions. As these are written, it will have a great deal with what the front of the new building looks like. It appears as if there is a fence out in the front of the new building. By putting the new building in, it serves as a great wall and he asked why a fence was needed in front of a building that is 150 feet long. He questioned why spend the money on a wrought iron fence on the front of what is basically a parking area. He suggested putting a new gate in between the new building, a new fence in to close the new building to the existing building and put one more gate in and they can save a significant amount of money that could be spent in some other places like landscaping. The owner said they can beautify the building facing the street and make it look nicer. Mr. Fox said he disagrees with Mr. Lopez that the trellises and elements that would imply entry and public access to that point would be misleading.

Boardmember Woldemar agreed, and Boardmember Fetter said he did not feel they necessarily needed them unless there is a reason to beef up the entry to the building. He would like a covered entry to be accommodating to the employees. Boardmember Woldemar said there is not necessarily an entry at that side, but what it could mean is that this is a regular rhythmic steel frame building so it is not difficult to notch some corners and reduce the width of the 150 feet front façade to 100 feet with 2, 25-foot corners with landscaping or a version of this while still getting the amount of square footage. He feels this is one of the better industrial areas of the City, and 150 feet is half of a football field. Mr. Fox said he would be happy to return with that. As someone mentioned, their goal here is to get conditional approval on the use of this site so that purchase of the property can be attained.

Boardmember Woldemar said he could motion that the Board would approve something like this with further conditions to return at a future date. There is no issue about the use and Mr. Fox will have to work out the circulation and other things.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the issue of the solid fence along the rail line, and said along the property it is not a big deal for security, but he is also concerned about the opportunity for graffiti along there. He questioned if there is more to tag or were they actually trying to screen industrial from industrial. He questioned what other approach there may be to this. It plays into cost and he questioned Boardmember Woldemar's feelings. Boardmember Woldemar said it did not bother him at all; it is an industrial area. Mr. Fox said it is a nylon mesh. He appreciates the comments and they talked about doing it with vines or roses and things of that nature. This requires irrigation and maintenance and a series of other issues. The visibility into the site is a concern. There are pots and easy to carry away, so they must maintain some privacy from people. He noted someone cut through the metal siding in the back of the building along the fire road and people can get into the site, and they are essentially trying to hide what is going on.

Boardmember Woodrow said the Board is always pleased to see companies come into town. They are doubly pleased to see companies come into town from Berkeley and he thanked the owner and architect.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/ Woodrow) to approve PLN 13-036 based on the staff's recommended 4 findings, the staff's recommended 18 conditions with the following revisions to those conditions: that Condition No. 2 be struck in its entirety and substituted with: "The applicant shall return with the final design of the west façade of the new building and subsequent landscape treatment;" that Condition No. 19 be added to read: "An exception shall be made to the location (not quantity) of the ordinance-required trees and landscaping in the eastern site area;" to add a condition that, "If it is found that there is any barbed wire used on chain link fences, it shall be removed;" and he asked not to install the fence on the street side until the applicant returns; unanimously approved.

CC 5. PLN13-034 ST. JOHN APARTMENTS COMMUNITY BUILDING

Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,418 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING COMMUNITY BUILDING.
Location	121 MACDONALD AVENUE
APN	538-011-002
Zoning	MFR-3 (MULTI-FAMILY HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner	ST JOHNS LTD
Applicant	ST. JOHN'S PARTNERS
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES

Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales gave the staff report and brief description of the request for design review approval of an addition to an existing apartment building, which will require offices, media and equipment rooms and a computer lab for residents. She deferred to the architect who has prepared a presentation that will go into more detail on the project.

Boardmember Whitty referred to page 3 of 6 and parking. It states required covered parking is 187, 187 and 2 and proposed is 184, 184 and 4. Ms. Whales clarified they are losing 3 parking spaces because of the landscaping.

Tanya Stotsky, Weir/Andrewson Associates, introduced Don Blaney who is their landscape architect who will also provide an overview, as well as her associate, Eric Mauro who can also answer questions. She pointed out the location of the site, description of the site, stating they are requesting approval of an addition to the community building as well as landscape amenity space. They are adding approximately 1400 square feet to the existing building so it is just less than 5,000 total square feet. She presented the existing community building front entry, said they will install new doors with vision glass, are removing the small area on the back which is storage and restrooms and remodeling it into offices, taking out walkways around the building and adding it back to the amenity areas which can be seen in the landscape plan. She said a reception area is planned so that when applicants arrive, there is space for them to complete paperwork and to expand office space. They are creating a private meeting room as well. Restrooms were remodeled to be ADA compliant and they are also installing a new computer lab and social room for tenants. She described replacement of down lighting, additional lights around the perimeter and patio areas to enhance existing lighting. She presented fixtures and wall sconces, the new roof plan, and the new elevations with cement plaster building with matching vinyl windows. In the original submittal, the size of the windows that go into the restrooms have been reduced for code reasons due to their fire separation to the adjacent building. It was originally 1'6" x 3' and they are now 2' x 1'6" and will be closer to square. They do not need to be rated if they are smaller, so they are making them smaller to reduce the percentage of openings along the wall to the restrooms which are simply for light. She then presented the east elevation and color and materials color board.

Don Blaney presented the landscape plan, stating one of the biggest changes are the serpentine walkway to the site. Currently there is no room for shrub or tree planting and they wanted to get walkways away from the building to achieve more buffering and screening between the sidewalks and buildings themselves. The owner has requested outdoor seating areas. He presented BBQ benches, grills, ADA approved tables, a community garden area with raised planting beds, and a 30 inch planting bed. They have removed a lot of grass, replaced paving with decomposed granite, the play area will remain, they will install an 18" curb seat onto the round planter, the oak tree has been changed out, given its closeness to the water, the large eucalyptus tree is slated for removal, they are suggesting parking lot modifications and adding trees, making compact spaces, while maintaining 4' of paving behind the areas for wheelchair access.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the interior of a room on drawing A-104, marked a computer lab/sitting area, and he asked what the applicant intends to occur in that room. Ms. Stotsky said their vision is to provide a space where tenants can have access to computers and there will be computers provided along the back wall. They have windows that look out to the playground and a picnic area, so if tenants have children, they will be able to be in the computer lab while keeping an eye on their children outside. The sitting area can be used for people congregating or socializing.

Boardmember Woodrow said he spent a fair amount of time in these types of rooms and said he did not believe a fireplace should be situated in the room. He was not sure if PC's would exist in 10 years and he suggested thinking this through. But if terminals and printers are located there, then a fireplace should not be included. He said the design does not require so many windows in such a room and if a parent is going to be in there trying to work on the computer, they cannot feasibly also watch their children. Therefore, the windows and fireplace do not seem to fit the purpose of what is within the room and he suggested talking with someone who has designed such rooms to find out what sorts of things they believe should go into them.

Boardmember Fetter said if this emulates a café setting where they have fireplace seating and people use seating where they use computers, he asked if this conflicts with this concept. Boardmember Woodrow said such things work only when they bring in their own laptops. They do not work in places where there is something permanent. He felt this would make a wonderful social room as it stands but does not make a good computer room. Ms. Stotsky said the client's intent is that it is a multi-use room so it could be for many things.

Boardmember Fetter clarified it will be a gas-fired insert, and he questioned what is the conflict. Boardmember Woodrow said a fireplace collects trash and whether logs are burned or gas, there will be trouble. Ms. Stotsky said it is a sealed front gas unit and it will not collect trash. Ms. Stotsky said the existing room is a very large vaulted ceiling space and very uncomfortable to have a small sitting area and gathering space. The client decided they cannot have these functions comfortably so they wanted to have this other space.

Boardmember Woldemar commented that the plans are well done, very clear, and secondly, he said he was sorry that the courtyard is as small as it is. He could have imagined a pattern where the two bathrooms were rotated 90 degrees so they were shallower. The hallway could have aligned and the building could have moved south 5 feet and left the courtyard bigger but taken away from landscaping slightly. Regardless, this is up to the client. Lastly, the roof of the new building is sloped to drain level. He asked and confirmed there was no mechanical equipment on the roof.

Vice Mayor Munoz had no comments.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to Area E where there is site water retention, and asked if the entire area was required for retention. Mr. Blaney said they were looking at keeping all the grass areas sunken so they can collect as much water as they can. She asked if the few mounds by the BBQ seating area would be made more useable in cooler or winter months, and Mr. Blaney said they would have to talk with the civil engineer. Mr. Mauro said they have had civil work and landscaping occurring simultaneously. The civil work is now completed, are well aware of C3 requirements and all of their work is crafted for the residents. They are reducing the amount of impervious surfaces overall by 50%. All walkways, except for the concrete area by the community center, everything else is pervious. Their intent is to manage all water and increase the water infiltration into the ground as much as possible throughout the site.

Boardmember Fetter asked how deep will be the gravel underlay for the pavers, and Mr. Mauro said the civil engineer is designing that right now. It is a condition of approval and will be on the plans. He agreed it is expensive, it has been engineered, and he said the client is very committed to providing two ADA units, with ADA access to parking lots.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked for more seating and a trellis around the existing play area. Mr. Blaney noted that they created a circular paving area that is 8 feet wide with a promenade and three benches under the trees. There is also a raised 18" planter around that circle that acts as a bench as well. Mr. Blaney said they tried to stay away from that specific area because it gets into existing irrigation. Boardmember Robin Welter asked if it could be done inside, and Mr. Blaney said he would have to look at the safe fall zone of the existing play structure. Mr. Mauro added that they would also most likely need to provide ADA access ramp in the area which is triggered. Boardmember Welter said she thinks the layout looks good.

Boardmember Fetter said trees are being put in the parking area where they may be dinged by cars, and he confirmed with Mr. Blaney that the treatment is such that the tree lines up with the striping. There is a 2 foot overhang which is minimal. It requires the space to be bigger but he has had success with this.

Boardmember Robin Welter questioned and confirmed that proposed plants would be low water and low maintenance, and there will be more variety.

Chair Ray Welter echoed Boardmember Woldemar's sentiments about the clear and concise presentation and plans and thanked the applicant.

ACTION: It was M/S (Fetter/Ray Welter) to approve PLN13-034 with the staff's 4 findings and 9 conditions of approval as recommended by staff; unanimously approved.
--

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned at 8:55 p.m. to the next meeting on February 27, 2013.