

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
April 10, 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 (arrived 6:35 p.m.), Robin Welter, Eileen Whitty, Michael Woldemar, and Don Woodrow

Absent: None

Staff Present: Hector Lopez and Jonelyn Whales

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Public Forum - Brown Act - None

CONSENT CALENDAR: Chair Ray Welter noted the agenda consists of three Consent Calendar items. He asked if any members of the Board, staff, or audience wished to remove an item. Boardmember Whitty requested removal of Item 3.

Boardmember Woldemar commented that Item 2 is very well presented and very well designed, asked staff to pass on comments, and Boardmembers agreed. Boardmember Woodrow noted that the project backs up onto a failed Tony Murphy project, which was the concrete frame and slit windows, which has been sitting there for 4 years.

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

Chair Ray Welter announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, April 22, 2013 by 5:00 p.m.

Items Approved on the Consent Calendar:

CC 1. PLN12-214 FILBERT TOWNHOMES DEVELOPMENT

Description **(HELD OVER FROM 3/27/2013)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO DEVELOP A 43-UNIT INFILL HOUSING PROJECT CONSISTING OF SPANISH COLONIAL TOWNHOMES ON A ±51,000 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL.

Location 1300 FILBERT STREET

APN 561-192-029

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

Owner & Applicant COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES **Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO 4/24/2013**

CC 2. PLN13-060 COLLINS RESIDENTIAL ADDITION

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±420 SQUARE-FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE, A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE TO THE POINT RICHMOND HISTORIC DISTRICT.

Location 518 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE

APN 558-251-011

Zoning MFR-1 (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)

Owner MCCASKEY TERRY & BEVERLY

Applicant DAVID COLLINS

Staff Contact HECTOR ROJAS **Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Item Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 3. PLN13-063 62-UNIT SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Description: REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A 4-STORY ±42,000 SQUARE FOOT BUILDING CONSISTING OF 62 LOW INCOME SENIOR HOUSING UNITS ON A 40,000 SQUARE FOOT LOT. THE PROJECT WOULD ALSO REQUIRE DENSITY BONUS INCENTIVES AND PARKING CONCESSIONS.

Location: 20 & 25 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH

APN: 538-430-014 AND 538-430-019

Zoning: C-2 (GENERAL COMMERCIAL) AND MFR-1 (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS)

Owner: ANDRE PESSIS

Applicant: GENE BROUSSARD, AMG & ASSOCIATES, LLC

Staff Contact: HECTOR LOPEZ **Recommendation: APPROVAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION WITH THE INCLUSION OF FINDINGS**

Hector Lopez the staff report and provided a description of the project, its location, and proposed request for design review approval. He noted the project will be subject to the Planning Commission for density bonus and two variances, one of them being open space and the other, parking. Staff's decision is that the project can be redesigned and returned to the DRB for final approval to forward to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that the Planning Commission will need to make findings in order to grant the variances along with the density bonus. He noted there was one subcommittee meeting and many of the comments were responded to in the revised plan, but not all. It seemed appropriate to move forward and he thinks the staff report covers things well if the DRB concurs with the recommendation. One of the principle conditions is for it to return to

the DRB and he suggested providing a list of suggestions so when the applicant returns, assuming the variance and density bonus are approved, they have something to work with for the design.

Boardmember Woodrow said he thought that the subcommittee would be named along with the names and dates, and Mr. Lopez said staff will identify this in the future and confirmed it was Boardmember Woldemar and Fetter. Boardmember Woodrow asked that this be reflected in the minutes and thanked them for the work.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked who owns and maintains the Greenway Trail, and Mr. Lopez said this is the City's right-of-way.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to the Greenway Trail and noted it carries off to the south and swings close to Ohio. Several times over the past year, people with homes on Ohio have complained about people hopping the fence, kicking in doors and stealing things from homes. He asked if the applicant thought about this group of citizens being put at risk, as citizens will have to go a long way to get services.

Alexis Gevorgian, AMG Associates, from Los Angeles, said they began the design process 5-6 months ago as a different concept. They focused more on the security issues wherein they had a courtyard interior and had less exposure to the exterior, recognizing that seniors should be protected from potential bad elements. The subcommittee indicated they wanted some connectivity between the open spaces and the greenbelt. They were not pleased with this concept and we spent a lot of money redesigning it to address these comments as best we could. Overall, we believe it will be one of the nicest looking senior communities in the Richmond area. We also take a lot of pride in the management of the project, as it will be privately funded and invested. We have community space and a courtyard to address security through fencing, cameras, and an onsite manager. We have never had a project fail. There will also be a regulatory agreement imposed on the project through the State and we hope for clear guidance on what the DRB wants, as time is of the essence. We also hope all discretionary actions of this elected body can be completed.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that the applicant read through the conditions of approval and agreed with them.

Boardmember Whitty said she likes the trail access which interfaces with the building. She referred to the awnings and commented that they are a very nice treatment. She asked the applicant to reconsider the striped metal ones in the center area and perhaps consider matching them. The area will be popular and she suggested more groundcover. She asked and confirmed that small pets are allowed less than 30 pounds with an extra charge, and suggested the applicant think about an area where they can go so as to be ostracized by residents. She asked if the applicant thought about a roof garden of any kind, which will initially increase the cost of the building but keep utility bills down. She said she likes the bright colors and various textures and materials; however, she is surprised with the verticality and suggested going more with a horizontal design, like George Christopher in Albany who did the striped horizontal house which would be interesting with little cost. Mr. Gevorgian said the reason for the verticality is they have a lot of balconies which drives the vertical versus horizontal. He said they do have this in some areas where it caps the top, and they can continue it more through other areas.

Boardmember Whitty said throughout the design she sees white columns with mansard roofs, with balconies inside and a storage unit type door. She asked to change the white, as it does not fit the design. She asked and confirmed they are all structural and said if they are kept, they should match the rest of the building such as adding glass block interest, and asked to remove the top curve. Mr. Gevorgian said they could be toned down. He asked the Board to make a list

of what they want removed, changed as well as maintained, and he could provide this to their architect.

Boardmember Whitty said lastly, they have beige and cream colors. If they drop out of the bright colors, she asked to emphasize the building material itself and textures. Mr. Gevorgian said he thinks the electronic printing does not do its justice for the white, which is not truly as white as shown on the drawings. Boardmember Whitty said it still needs some sort of treatment other than what it is shown. She likes the window designs, the front door, and especially the dark accents which she asked not be removed. Boardmember Woldemar suggested bringing color samples to the next DRB meeting.

Chair Raymond Welter reiterated the need for staff to provide the applicant with details on preferences of the DRB.

Boardmember Fetter said he and Boardmember Woldemar met in the subcommittee and discussed breaking up the massing in several different ways. Part of their discussions was consolidating the green space, putting it out towards the Greenway, to provide eyes on the street. He asked where the balcony idea came from, and Mr. Gevorgian said balconies are expensive to build and they generally do not like to do them but it helps break up the building, it is a nice amenity for seniors and there is a more articulation and shade, and it is also required by the City. Mr. Lopez added that there are two requirements for open space; one is the communal and the other is the private. Boardmember Fetter asked if communal areas outside every level are required, and he said how it expresses itself on the outside corner is a bit awkward. He asked what the applicant was trying to achieve. Mr. Gevorgian said he frankly questioned that as well from a management standpoint, but the architect did think it would break up the building more. If the DRB wants it removed, he will remove it. It is actually unique to any building they have designed. He questioned it, but the architect wanted to add it. Boardmember Fetter said he could understand it from a traffic path location, but as far as views are concerned, he asked for the logic. Mr. Gevorgian said it faces the green and he thinks it also would hopefully promote recreational activities, like riding bikes and walking. Mr. Lopez said in their meeting, they discussed the southeast corner and this is a response to that comment. Mr. Gevorgian said he had no objection to redesigning this and making it more interesting.

Boardmember Fetter said the balcony areas have white pillars on each side and he is intrigued by the design process, hoping to break up massing, and Mr. Gevorgian said they have noted this issue which will be addressed.

Boardmember Fetter referred to open balconies and the railing and asked if there is a reason behind it. Mr. Gevorgian said they propose railing because if they still sit in their chairs, they can still see out, and it also allows management to monitor them such that they are not allowed to store bicycles or planters outside.

Boardmember Whitty asked where bikes are stored, and Mr. Woldemar noted there are storage lockers on each level.

Boardmember Fetter said they had quite a list of concerns about the fence, the traffic pattern, ingress and egress and he asked staff how this was addressed in this design. Mr. Lopez said staff was concerned with the driveway on Harbour Way and the parking lot and it will be an exit-only which takes care of this. Regarding fencing, staff has a concern with fences with spikes and would like to replace this with something else.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the mansard roof and he was not sure about the scale of them, along with the brackets shown and some of the other accompanying elements. They are a bit mismatched. Typically brackets are larger in comparison to the distance of the extension of the

roof or overhang. Chair Raymond Welter noted this can be included in the list of specific items. Mr. Gevorgian asked what Boardmember Fetter wished to replace them with, and Mr. Fetter said in the previous design there were no mansard roofs and he asked why they were changed. Mr. Gevorgian said he was not sure why the architect changed it and he will address this and noted he could not be at this meeting because he is out of the state. Mr. Gevorgian noted that he has an architectural and planning background and is the one driving the design.

Vice Chair Munoz said there is a shaded area on the ground level where benches should be used, and Mr. Gevorgian said they could add benches in the common area and will add this to the list.

Boardmember Woldemar said because staff is recommending this go to the Planning Commission and presumably the DRB will recommend this, it behooves them to express all concerns so the Planning Commission has benefit of those and also when the applicant returns to the DRB.

Boardmember Woodrow asked why four floors are proposed, and Mr. Gevorgian said this is the critical mass to make the project successful and service oriented to create a socially successful community. Boardmember Woodrow said the City is often trying to meet demand for housing and he asked if the demand has come from the City or from the project applicant. Mr. Gevorgian said this is actually one of the smallest projects done, but this is the maximum number of permitted units unless they ask for additional discretionary action. Also, four stories allow them to do Type 3 without a modified structure. Boardmember Woodrow said this is the tallest building between Macdonald Avenue and Cutting Boulevard and will be visible from blocks away. He likes all of the red colors, but perhaps someone will prefer brown to reduce its effect because there will be nothing similar nearby for a long time. He said on the Ohio Street, there is one of the worst fences in the City; however, on the Greenway side, it has been painted with a mural, so citizens have a view of this which is a good thing. Secondly, there are gardens along the Greenway. The concerns he had with this fronting on the Greenway might be cut back by the fact that there are some of these things going on. He would hope that the project color scheme is bright because the wall is bright. He voiced concern about the height which drives a lot of the comments regarding verticality, and he asked if there was something that could be done to start over in this regard. He thinks it borders on the point of being too high. Mr. Gevorgian said the comment regarding having more horizontal elements and not emphasizing the vertical elements are well-taken and possibly the mansards are part of this redesign effort. In terms of the bold color the director specified, once he did the rendering he saw it as too much. So this is why he leaned more toward the earth tone; however, he is not opposed to putting a more bold color, recognizing that the mural is very bold. Boardmember Fetter agreed that he likes more color, as well.

The Board discussed the need to write down all comments and provide them to staff, and acknowledged that the meeting was also being recorded. Mr. Gevorgian said thus far, he has not seen any conflicts in terms of guidance, which is positive, and he suggested having all comments at the end and if there are any conflicts, they should be resolved if possible.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the height and said the applicant will not hear anything about density and numbers of dwelling units because it is not their purview. What they can talk about at length is mass and bulk. If the northerly top floor two, two-bedroom units were taken and turned into two studio units, the top floor on that end of the building would back step and would read three stories high. This would relate better to the one-story single family houses to the north. He asked for ways to do this so as not to mess up the project's density. While he does not particularly care for the several stories of open balconies, it represents what happens when one story is cut off of the corner, which reduces the scale. This trick could be used to help reduce the mass and bulk. Mr. Gevorgian said studios are prohibited under their financing and

they are only allowed to do 20% two bedrooms and 80% one bedrooms. However, he will work with the architect to see if the units could be moved around.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the south side, Greenway and cooperation with the City, and asked to get the landscaping from this project across the fence into the immediate area to the south to read as one and becomes part of the neighborhood. Boardmember Robin Welter agreed that this should be captured across the walkway, as well.

Boardmember Woldemar said the particular landscape drawing in the packet is unreadable. He said there needs to be street trees in the plan, said it appears as if there are double sidewalks; one public and one private, and there is a lot more landscaping in front on both street frontages than is represented by the drawings. He asked and confirmed that the number of trees in a parking lot does not apply to a residential project. Street trees are required; however, Park and Brake have said they prefer the trees be provided on private property.

Boardmember Woldemar said there is a small area of turf at the base of the open space balcony area and he asked if there could be more of it. There is a specific requirement that shrubs are a minimum of 5 gallon cans, and he asked to ensure the landscape architect knows what the City requirements are.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page A-1.1., off of 9th Street and into the parking lot, there is no gate. On the Harbour Way side there is an emergency gate or exit only. He noted that the address of this project is Harbour Way and he said he cannot come into the project by the Harbour Way side and there is something illogical about the gate. Also, all along the north sides adjacent to the property owners, there appears to be an iron picket fence with spears, and this should be a good neighbor fence because there are residential uses immediately to the north. Particularly as it relates to the south side of the project, he asked if it has to be a 6 foot high fence, and he asked if it could be a 42 inch or 4 foot high picket fence. He asked how the security is working and questioned if it was getting into the courtyard or into the building. He asked if there will be cameras, an on-site manager, and the architecture should respond to what the security methods will be which are absent here. Ultimately, the applicant should provide a specific design for the trash enclosure and noted that they be covered. Also, the trash area seems small for 67 units and he suggested getting a will-serve letter from Waste Management. Boardmember Woodrow also noted that the enclosure should also be screened.

Boardmember Woldemar said in the parking lot, the architect used a full standard size parking space of 18'6" to the curb face. If he did that, they would have bumper stops through the entire parking lot. He asked to move the curb 2 feet into the parking space, devote the space to landscape and the curb becomes the tire stop. This will reduce asphalt costs and increase greenery. He said this can apply to the standard sized spaces as well as the compact spaces. He also noted that the architect shows 26' driveways and the City only requires 25'.

Boardmember Woldemar said the entire ground floor unit patios are slightly less than 6' wide, all are enclosed with what appears to be a brick wall and it strikes him that there is an opportunity to add space to them, which he sketched out. Therefore, people on the ground floor will have 8' of open space which makes those units particularly desirable. They also talked at the subcommittee level about the privacy intrusion of ground floor units. This could be an excellent solution by putting this 4' high brick wall around it because it creates a separation.

He said a note at the bottom of the page indicates "Plaza courtyard to be integrated with the Greenway" and he asked what this means. There is a covered trellis and gate entry and there should ultimately be a specific design for this feature. They should also see site furniture for the courtyard, and there appears to be a dimension shown on the south side of 5' setback line from

a property line, yet there is a fence along the southern line set back 5' and he asked why it is not on the property line. This all ties back to how this relates to the Greenway.

Regarding practicality, the architect shows electrical and gas and some small rooms with doors leading into it, which appear to be 2'6" wide on the ground floor southeast, and he questioned if any of this fits in there. It seemed to be a funny place to be located at the entrance. He also questions whether PG&E will allow gas to be under that kind of roof cover. Wrought iron fence and gate should be redesigned, as well. Another note which is none of the Board's business is that there is a set of doors and a stairway. The code reads a dead-end corridor in a sprinklered building shall not be any greater than 50 feet. By his measurement, this is greater than 50'. Therefore, he is not sure this is right, and if not, it may mean the relocation of that stair into a different position which would then have a different architectural response on the exterior.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page A-3.2 and said on the north end there is an amazing 25' deep, four story high tunnel leading to a "x" door on the ground floor and a set of windows above. He asked to use this space somehow because otherwise they are paying for stucco walls all the way in and back out again four stories high. They only need the ground floor as the exit-way and he suggested turning it into a storage room or to take the unit, rotate it, change the entryway and carve the corner of the building. He asked to do the same in other areas where there is the same sort of tunnel. On the southeastern stair, it is different on the ground floor, but on the upper floor there is a vestibule that leads to the stairway which is a waste as well. Also, on the second floor unit next to the southeastern stair, there is a single story roof area covering the community area down below and it does not look like it is part of the user's space for the adjacent unit. The area could all be part of the patio of that unit, and therefore, the railing around it might be a different one.

He also asked why there are awnings in some places and why not in other areas; there is no logic to it. There is great eastern and western sun there and awnings might be useful in other elevations or none of the above.

From an exterior point of view, he concurs with what staff has recommended having to do with the cohesiveness of the overall patterns of the building. He suggested the applicant consider different railing treatments on different floors. For example, brick for the ground floor is nice, and he suggested carrying it all the way around the building to give it a base or a foot. For accent, take the brick up those red towers to produce a strong horizontal color. He suggested doing something at the top most floors to give it a "lid" and then work it with the roof solution. He said he counted four different roof heights and he questioned their logic. Mr. Gevorgian said there are two competing overall massing and style theories they are discussing; one is to break up a building by having lots of tiny buildings and this is what they do. By saying they will have brick and the same roof solution and even out the roofs, they are defeating that theory and unifying the whole thing, and also making it more monolithic in this method. He likes the idea of having divisions, but he wants to keep the variations of roof height. Their tendency was to scale it down because it is not a very high area and they did not want the building to stick out a lot. Boardmember Woldemar suggested the element might be too small. Historically one would never see a building of this size broken down this far and he spoke about a project he did in Pinole. There could be an eastern and western wing and separate them with the tower rising in the middle of it or the elevator.

He then referred to E-1.0 and he noted that ultimately the Board needs to see the lighting cut sheets and need to know they are dark sky fixtures. He also suspects there might be a transformer for this project but it does not show anywhere. If above grade, it needs to be properly screened and landscaped. He also noted that staff makes a condition to underground all utilities serving the site. Lastly, he referred to the storm water control plan on the last page. There are a number of boxes indicating areas, square footages, and some are labeled. BS-1 is

labeled vegetative swale #1. He asked what are the other numbers and symbols, and what is planned for the landscape relating to storm water management.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked for clarification on the landscape plan. She referred to A-1.1 and she does not see the space where the two trees are going in. She hoped that these two trees would not be left out. She pointed to the entry for the building lobby, and it seems somewhat drab and does not pop out much. Shrubs are actually blocking part of it and it seems that should be a stronger element so they know where to go. She likes the idea of connecting the green space to the open space and she asked who would maintain it, and felt this could be the dog park area. It would be nice to beef this up a lot and make it a nice extension coming across the pathway because it will feel roomier. The applicant is required to do 12,000 S.F. and there is only 3,500 S.F. so she suggested more be captured there. She questioned who maintains the drip system, the water, and she suggested working with the City to solve this problem. Boardmember Fetter agreed that having some irrigation to them will be incredibly important to survive.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked if residents in other projects have requested any outdoor amenities like raised vegetable gardens. Mr. Gevorgian said they like community rooms, open spaces that are fully enclosed, and this is why he is skeptical of the open courtyard and security. Residents can take advantage of the green space on the outside. Psychologically they would feel more secure. Boardmember Welter asked if the landscape designer could redo the spaces so they feel more enclosed. She suggested putting a pergola, tables and benches so they can utilize the space in different ways. Permeable pavers may end up being their C-3 requirement. Boardmember Woldemar brought up the fact that 95% of the site is impermeable and she asked where treatment areas would be placed and whether this space would be taken away from residents.

Boardmember Robin Welter said she is not a big fan of the balconies on the corner especially if plants cannot be put up there, and Mr. Gevorgian agreed. She said the roof garden could then be implemented and Boardmember Woldemar said the views would be magnificent. She acknowledged this would be an additional cost but it could be recouped later and could take care of the safety issue. Mr. Gevorgian said the safety issue on the roof will require a new stairwell. He could remove the four balconies and make one larger one, and Boardmember Welter agreed and suggested trees could then be put up there as well as a vegetable garden. Many people are also doing vertical vegetable gardens which are stepped or tiered.

She said she likes Boardmember Woldemar's idea of pulling the curb up to have more landscaping. Chair Welter agreed and said there have also been liability issues with bumpers and people tripping over them.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to plant material and suggested something more to trigger senses for seniors. She thinks the species are very durable but are bland, and she offered her help with a different planting palette. She said she would like to see a plan that covers all C-3 requirements because this will make a huge difference in the landscaping in what they will be able to plant and do.

Boardmember Woodrow said if gardening cannot be done on the roof, he suggested solar panels. Mr. Gevorgian said almost all of their projects have solar. A lot of the solar panels are part of funding cycles and they get certain incentives to do them. However, they will do solar if they are able to get the credits and he clarified that they do get utility allowances.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the conflict between the two theories and mass reduction. He thinks they can be brought together to identify the building as contiguous and a single building because large systems of elements are repeated. To articulate the solution would be to have

four different schemes but have them segregated into different areas of the building and not repeat them. He said a great example is that the balconies are treated the same way all the way around. He suggested having two different balcony schemes and to have the column next to it treated similarly as to proposing different ones. Mr. Gevorgian agreed and said they can create a sense where it is one building but two different styles.

Boardmember Fetter concurred, and noted that Santana Row was a good example of Bay Area architecture for large numbers of high density. This is high density and it has been successful because it represents housing and the nature of an urban environment as it is expressed in architecture. Breaking up the massing is one technique while still having a brick base, middle, and two or three different top treatments, and the mansard does not do this for this project. He suggested the previous roof treatments as successful and varying heights and expressions of them; parapets with corner details and a gabled end. He said this treatment could be used on one of the massing elements and it would break up the roofline suitably. He said there are two major corners on the building, both on Macdonald. He pointed to a neglected space which is a corner. They were thinking this could be an entry here and doors leading from the corner to the greenway. The building faces the Greenway and addresses it, and instead they got the balcony. This would make a great entry and he would strongly recommend it. A set of balconies could run along beside the entry volume off to the side and still look out to the Greenway and both could be accomplished. He thinks this would solve the problem and make the corner element unique to the whole building so it demarcates it. He likes the fact that the traffic comes out of there but does not enter, but he agrees with Boardmember Woldemar about the address being on Harbour Way. He said everyone is using way finding devices now and he thinks they need to figure out a way to resolve that logical problem. He thinks the corner of the building is very important and how it faces the Greenway, which will continue to improve and become a more desirable space. Also, having the building face the Greenway is a good idea for its asset value.

Boardmember Fetter also referred to double sidewalks, and he asked if there was a reason behind having the duality. Mr. Gevorgian agreed that extending it out and having just one is better.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the storm water control plan and he asked if there is a negotiation going on with the City as far as landscaping in the Greenway. Mr. Lopez said no, but staff will provide the name of the contact person from Parks and Recreation to work these issues out.

Boardmember Fetter referred to shading and the importance of being able to provide an arrangement for robust shading in the open area and Greenway side landscaping. He would also support changing out the fence design. They are trying to get rid of fences like this in Richmond and people need to accept that this makes it more secure and beautiful by using other security means. It improves the environment and property value.

Chair Raymond Welter said other board members covered his concerns, but he would like to talk about an effort to reduce the mass on the corners. One thing that stuck out is the Greenway is a great amenity for the project, not only for access but visually. What strikes him as odd is that on the south elevation which overlooks the Greenway, the units in the corners have tiny windows and big blank walls. It seems there is a better way to design the corner units. They should be flipped so the living space could be on the corner with wide open windows to provide for prime views. He thinks this could be easily achieved which would tie into the reduction of the mass. If a separate unit must be done just for the corners to reduce the mass and gather more light, it is well-worth the effort. These units will become prime units. Tenants will definitely benefit from it. Also, they could put the balcony in the corner which will carve more out of the corners. To him this is an effective way of reducing the mass, carving out the corners, and making the prime locations. All of his comments were covered and he liked the original roof a lot

better. He echoed Boardmember Whitty's comment about bolder colors which are great if done well. He said the Board will get all of their comments to staff for Mr. Gevorgian to implement in the new design.

Mr. Gevorgian said in terms of the process, it goes to the Planning Commission in May and hopefully they will approve the density bonus and other entitlements, and then they must return to the DRB. By this time we will perfect all the issues and then they would hopefully receive approval. He would want to do the design right. Boardmember Woldemar said the Planning Commission will have all comments in written form, and their approval of the density bonus and mass will be based upon the DRB's advice. Mr. Gevorgian said, therefore, the entitlement could be held back until the DRB approves it and the Board concurred.

Mr. Gevorgian said they have another larger project they are contemplating where Jonelyn Whales is the assigned project manager. He asked if it was possible to meet with staff and the subcommittee all at once to bring a couple of different design concepts to see what direction we should be moving in. Chair Raymond Welter said a study session would need to be held with three or more members for a quorum, but a subcommittee could be held with three members. He confirmed a study session could be noticed and held, and all agreed this could be done. Mr. Gevorgian thanked the Board for their time and input. He said they are taking a big risk, as nobody wanted the property and he thinks they are capable of doing something which he thinks will change the area. Seniors will make it a better place and they are excited about the Greenway being adjacent to the project. He was also excited about what the mural looks like. Mr. Lopez commented that the project is also very close to Kaiser Permanente which is important for the health of our elderly population.

Boardmember Fetter said as part of the negotiation with the Planning Commission, he asked if there is anything in the works as far as how the Greenway is maintained or landscaped. Mr. Lopez said he did not have information and he could follow-up with an answer at a later meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to recommend to the Planning Commission PLN13-063 based on the staff's suggested four findings with the inclusion of some language to ensure the findings are being made dependent upon the DRB's additional comments that are included within the context of the staff's recommended conditions of approval 1-18 plus all DRB's additional comments; and adding language to Condition #2's last sentence to encompass everything contained in the discussion; which carried unanimously.

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements – None
- B. Boardmember Reports, Requests, or Announcements – Boardmember Whitty said she may not be attending the next meeting on June 24, 2013.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m. The next meeting of the City of Richmond Design Review Board is scheduled on Wednesday, April 24, 2013.