

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
August 14, 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 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Ray Welter, Vice Chair Brenda Munoz, Boardmembers Brant Fetter; Robin Welter; Eileen Whitty, and Michael Woldemar

Absent: Boardmember Woodrow

Staff Present: Hector Rojas, Kieron Slaughter, Jonelyn Whales and James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 10, 2013:

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 10, second to the last paragraph, and said it states that 3 are needed for a quorum and the subcommittee needs to be 2 people. He said in fact, 4 members are needed for a quorum and 3 members for a subcommittee” and asked that this be revised.

ACTION: It was M/S (Fetter/Robin Welter) to approve the minutes of April 10, 2013, as amended; unanimously approved (Woodrow absent).

Public Forum - Brown Act - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Ray Welter noted the agenda consists of eight (8) Consent Calendar items. . He asked if any members of the Board, staff, or audience wished to remove an item.

Boardmember Whitty requested to remove Items 1 and 2, 4, 7 and 8. She asked who was in the audience for removed items, and Ms. Whales requested hearing Item 7 after Item 1.

Boardmember Woldemar reported that Chair Ray Welter and he met as a subcommittee on Item 3 and the applicant was receptive to making some changes. This is the reason for it being held over. For Item 5, he noted that this project is one of the first to go through under the form based code and specific plan for corridors. He would like to eventually see staff getting comments from the consultant on that project. Boardmember Fetter said he would still like to discuss with staff the difficulty in enforcement and asked that this be discussed.

Chair Ray Welter announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, August 26, 2013 by 5:00 p.m.

ACTION: It was M/S (Fetter/Ray Welter) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 3, 5, and 6; unanimously approved (Woodrow absent).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Items Approved on the Consent Calendar:

CC 3. PLN13-122 GREGORY GARAGE AND GREENHOUSE

Description *(Held Over from 7/24/2013)* PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TWO-STORY DETACHED STRUCTURE FOR A GARAGE AND A GREENHOUSE.

Location 5403 HEAVENLY RIDGE LANE

APN 433-371-004

Zoning SFR-1 (SINGLE-FAMILY RURAL RESIDENTIAL)

Applicant GREGORY KWAME K & RYONA L (OWNERS)

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 8/28/2013**

CC 5. PLN12-287 GONZALES NEW MIXED-USE BUILDING

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONSTRUCTION OF A ±4,968 SQUARE FOOT MIXED-USE BUILDING WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE ON THE GROUND FLOOR AND RESIDENTIAL USE ON THE SECOND FLOOR.

Location 761 - 23RD STREET

APN 529-180-006 & -007

Zoning C-2 (GENERAL COMMERCIAL)

Owner ROBERTO GONZALEZ

Applicant DAVID KESLER

Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

CC 6. PLN13-076 MARITIME SAFETY & SECURITY CENTER (MSSC) MASTER SIGN PROGRAM & LANDSCAPE AGREEMENT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A MASTER SIGN PROGRAM AND LANDSCAPE AGREEMENT FOR THE MARITIME SAFETY & SECURITY CENTER (MSSC).

Location 841 CHEVRON WAY

APN 561-080-006 & 561-110-041

Zoning M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL) & M-4 (MARINE INDUSTRIAL)

Owner CHEVRON PRODUCTS COMPANY

Applicant MARK PIERSANTE, CHEVRON PRODUCTS COMPANY

Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **APPROVE MASTER SIGN PROGRAM & LANDSCAPE AGREEMENT**

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 1. PLN13-104 AVILA NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE
 Description *(Held Over from 7/24/2013)* PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ±2,881 SF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A ±484 SF GARAGE TOTALING ±3,365 SF WITHIN THE POINT RICHMOND HISTORIC DISTRICT. *(THIS ITEM WAS HEARD BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE ON 6/19/2013).*
 Location MONTANA STREET, BETWEEN NEVADA & BUENA VISTA AVENUE
 APN 556-141-002
 Zoning SFR-2 (SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
 Applicant ENRIQUE AVILA (OWNER)
 Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER - Recommendation: **RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Associate Planner Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and a description of the request, and he pointed out that the matter was heard by the HPDRC on June 19, 2013 and they voted to recommend approval with the following comments: The applicant met several times with staff to discuss 8 recommendations and the applicant has addressed or incorporated many of these 8 items, most notably:

1. The rotation of the roof 90 degrees to reduce the visual impact and match the 3 rooflines to the south of the proposed site;
2. Reduced the front yard setback from 10 feet to 16'6" which will accommodate two compact parking spaces.

The Point Richmond Neighborhood Council Land Use Development Committee recommended approval, although the overall neighborhood council did not approve it by a vote of 14-11. Staff received emails from nearby residents who expressed concern about scale, orientation of the front door, color palette and two additional emails were received voicing concern that the residence may turn into a multi-family dwelling unit.

In conclusion, staff feels the project will replace a vacant lot with a new residence that will aesthetically improve the property by creating a high quality residence that compliments the adjacent residents; that the size and mass is appropriate for the neighborhood; and staff recommends the Board recommend approval to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 2 of the report and asked why the applicant did not agree to install wood windows on the rear, but agreed with installment of wood windows on the left, right and front. Mr. Slaughter said it was a compromise; they were not proposing to install wood windows and it was recommended that those visually seen should be made of wood. However, the rear elevation faces a hill, and Boardmember Woldemar pointed out those up above look down at the house.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to condition no. 4 relating to skylights and confirmed this came from discussions with the applicant to provide for more light in the common areas in the second floor. He then referred to page 2 in the analysis, paragraph regarding one meeting versus one hearing and asked for clarification. Mr. Slaughter noted that this requires Planning Commission review to be heard in one meeting but this can be continued over the course of several meetings while leaving the public hearing open.

Boardmember Whitty asked if the applicant considered digging the 30% driveway to a flat surface. Mr. Slaughter referred to the cross section and said staff tried to minimize as much grading as possible and digging into the hillside, and did not see the slope as being extreme compared to the surrounding neighborhood. There will be some significant grading for the project which is typical of a hillside development, but they have tried to minimize it as much as possible, while providing light, circulation and visibility.

Boardmember Woldemar noted the Public Works Department has a standard detail that describes the minimums and maximums for the approach, slope and landing of driveways. Mr. Slaughter commented that the applicant will meet the standard. Boardmember Woldemar asked what the square footages of adjacent homes were and Mr. Slaughter said he did not, but the applicant provided a massing study comparing the homes in the neighborhood. He clarified that the most recent home was 2300 square feet.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked if there is a maximum height for landscape retaining walls. Mr. Slaughter replied 6 feet and a variance would be needed for anything higher. Boardmember Robin Welter asked how many trees would be removed, and Mr. Slaughter noted the applicant could reply.

Chair Ray Welter asked for clarification of the location of the home, and Mr. Slaughter presented a street view showing the back of the house's location and noted it is set back from Montana and off of Buena Vista, as well as other views.

Chair Ray Welter called upon the applicant.

Carla and Enrique Avila, owners of the lot, introduced themselves. Mr. Enrique described the single family 3 bedroom home, noted most homes have more bedrooms and are larger, said they have been through the process for a long time, and has addressed all conditions. They cannot push the house back any further and noted that as it is, they have no windows in the kitchen or media area and he discussed changes made to the garage, windows, and said most houses do not have wooden windows. They made many changes to make the house fit in the area and has addressed all requests to seek approval.

Boardmember Whitty asked if the windows in the kitchen and media area's right side view could be enlarged to provide more light. Mr. Avila said they will receive complaints if they enlarge the side windows and they could not lower the building any further. She then referred to the front elevation on Page A.3 stating there are nice square windows and a rounded front door. She asked and confirmed this is a double door. There is no other arch in the front of the building and she asked if the owner considered making this to be square to be succinct with the rest of the design. She also asked that the curved windows be changed to be all square, and Mr. Avila said this is not a problem.

Boardmember Whitty referred to the front and rear elevations with balconies made of wood slat and the gate and stairway incorporates ornate metal grill work and suggested they be matched with the wood. Mr. Avila noted these are painted metal iron. Boardmember Whitty suggested the designs be made to match to eliminate the fancy ornate metal and make all of the metal consistent in a California style.

Boardmember Robin Welter recognized the owner pushed back the house which serves as a nicer buffer and nicer landscaping area. Overall, the owner addressed most concerns and the entry makes a huge difference. With that steep of a slope in the driveway they will probably

scrape. Mr. Avila said the code indicates that you must have 10% in the first 10 feet and then they can go up 20%. Their current house does not scrap and they have this much slope.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked about the 9'8" and 8'6" retaining walls in the back which is very expensive and suggested pushing the lower wall back and getting more room. Mr. Avila said they needed the second wall when they dropped down the house, and they have a rear door in the back from the kitchen area. This is the only way they can access the deck and if pushed back more, they will have to do more excavation. Boardmember Welter suggested removing one of the retaining walls and to incorporate a nice patio access off of the master bedroom. Mr. Avila said they would rather have access from the kitchen.

Boardmember Robin Welter said she does not understand the retaining wall on the one side and questioned where the water from the water barrel is going. She recommended it be re-used for landscaping, but there is no point to have them if the water is not re-used. She asked that they be sized correctly given the roof area to be drained. She noted the plans are difficult to understand and said the trees should have been tagged so the city knows how many are proposed.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that Mr. Avila met with the Pt. Richmond Neighborhood subcommittee and got approved. They attended the second meeting which was the full council, as well as Historic Preservation Design Review Committee. He said he thinks the house has problems but the solutions are relatively easy and he believes the item should be continued. He suggested a subcommittee meeting with the DRB before a recommendation is made by the Planning Commission and work things out so it is acceptable to most but not all individuals. There is a mass and bulk design issue which could be fixed by making the front and rear roofline hips instead of gable ends. The deck on the first floor could be changed to create an emphasis of horizontality and not verticality. There is an issue of consistency on items that were responded to where some windows are arched and some are not. He questioned the type of horizontal siding, asked what the colors are and their compatibility to the neighborhood. He does not see this as an issue of too big of a house but visually bulky which can be addressed.

Boardmember Fetter said he had no comments or questions for the applicant.

Vice Chair Munoz questioned the retaining wall and she suggested talking to the soils engineer which will help with landscaping. She said she is confused with the balcony because the elevations state something different. Chair Ray Welter agreed and said there is something odd about the front elevation and said it is not drawn right. There are inconsistencies with this and the floor plan.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the floor plan and in the section it shows a 9'8" high retaining wall in the back, but there is no correlation between this elevation and the section. Boardmember Munoz also asked that the applicant put vines on the trellis.

Chair Ray Welter referred to the rear elevation and said the kitchen window should align with the window above it. They may have to change the layout a bit. He agrees with the arched windows and he asked to be consistent with them. He had concerns with the blank wall at the front elevation up near the ridge and supported Boardmember Woldemar's suggestion for a hip roof. He also thinks the front porch, if shown per the plan, will give more horizontal feel to it which will reduce the height to the eye as well.

Public Comments:

Maureen Decombe said she lives immediately opposite the lot and asked staff to display a graphic of the elevation of the proposed structure. She said the height of the structure against a highly sloped lot will be much taller. The staff report does not show views of the entrances of some of the houses but rather shows homes upslope. The effect on the neighborhood on the massive structure looming over historic cottages cannot be understated. Moving the structure back is helpful but it should be moved back even further. She recognized changes in the roofline, is happy it is changed from 3 master bedrooms with on suite baths to something more closely resembles a family home. She is concerned now with a 4th bathroom added, and said a stairwell was to be a sheer wall in previous drawings. They have strongly recommended the stairwell and garage be switched to create a larger space for landscaping between the two homes. Lastly, window boxes will need irrigation or everything will die.

Jean-Marie Decombe said he lives across the street and thanked the applicant for making some of the revisions. His main concern is that the house is still very large. The house next door is 2300 square feet and this is more than 1,000 square feet larger. It is not in line with the neighborhood, is too big, and potentially would be occupied by multiple families.

June Hight said she lives one street over from the application and said she would like everybody to be happy on both sides and loves the idea of hip roofs. At previous meetings, she spoke about the window issues and asked that they be consistent on all four sides. There is an error on page 3 of the staff report that states they only be on the front, and she asked to ensure that they at least be on all three sides which was mentioned. She was unable to find images of wood clad windows and was not sure what they look like and hope they do not have tape on dividers or plastic dividers on a cream-colored window which would ruin the effect. She appreciates the applicant's willingness to work on the window issue, but it is a bit large and was unhappy with the third bath on the second floor go back in which is above the stairwell. They had some problems in the neighborhood of multiple families moving in and running illegal businesses out of homes, so it seems like 3 separate master bedroom suites would be inviting this problem to the neighborhood. She is also concerned about the garage doors right on the street and asked to move the front door down to be more welcoming.

Colleen Murtha said she is the tenant who lives next door to the property and they will be impacted by the project. There are privacy problems, given that the entrance of her landlord's home at 23 Montana Street is off the street and on the other side of the house. What the Avila's are proposing is that the walkway go right back to the patio area which is their only outdoor area. They did not change this recommendation from the last meeting of flipping the stairway to the other side which would have no privacy problems. She presented pictures of their patio area and the proposed stairway and door which is very close, said the owner of the home agrees with her comments, and said they personally do not hold anything against the applicant.

Fabian Sanchez said he is the owner of 23 Montana and welcomed the Avila's to the neighborhood. The only problem as stated by his tenant is where the front door will be located which will cause privacy issues. They do not have any windows on the side of his home except for a small kitchen window and he asked to flip the stairways to the other side for privacy.

Howard Lacheen said he lives at 31 Idaho Street, one street over, and said from his point of view, the report provide omissions and misrepresentations. One of the letters implied that the neighbors do not want any development. He has attended every meeting and he has not heard a single person who had indicated the lot should not be developed. Many residents in the

neighborhood have had projects reviewed by the DRB and the idea they are against development is not warranted. Also, there was a statement about HPCDRC stating that many of the audience members complimented the design. He was at that meeting and no one spoke in favor of the design, except possibly one person who also had many concerns about the project. Major concerns were materials of the project. They want to be sure materials are consistent with what is found in a historic district, such as wood windows. Also, the size and scale of the house were a problem voiced as it is twice as big as homes on the opposite side of the street.

Boardmember Woldemar asked where Mr. Lacheen was with the project. Mr. Lacheen said as compared to other homes on the street which is in a historic district consisting of single story cottages from 1,000 to 1,500 square feet, the house appears to be quite large. It is also up on the hill which makes it appear even larger.

Boardmember Woldemar said the Point is also full of uphill houses that are frankly very large. There is one uphill that overpowers that street right now. The house immediately downhill from the proposed home is 2,300 square feet, and the proposal is 2,800 square feet, and 3,300 square feet with the garage. Garages do not count as livable area. He asked how the Board is to deal with this, and he questioned whether or not it was a bulk, scale and mass issue and not a square footage issue. Mr. Lacheen said the owner could shrink the house and keep the front the same, which is not a desirable outcome. But, the houses up the hill are larger and they are on a different street. One recommendation made at a previous meeting is that they build the house up the hill which would fit in with those homes. The house next door is fairly old and the district was not historic at the time, but now they are in a historic district. He lives in a historic home and follows the rules, and if the owner wants to build a huge house on a slope in a historic district, it will be expensive and there is no way around that. He does not see why that should prevent someone from using quality materials. Boardmember Woldemar said he and the Board continue to support that idea.

Boardmembers Woldemar and Whitty suggested keeping the public hearing open. Boardmember Woldemar said he passed around a sketch and said he thinks it is possible to come up with a solution for this property that might be 2,600 square feet, and that those few hundred square feet less will still solve the owner's program. He believes the Board can find solutions that can reduce the visual appearance in terms of the house's mass, height and character, he thinks there are some consistency issues that need to be worked out having to do with materials, and all of those things are still within the economics of the project proposed. He suggested the hearing be continued, hold a subcommittee meeting on it, that they should give the owner an opportunity to respond to comments.

City Attorney Atencio suggested next steps would be to allow the applicant to rebut, although it is also appropriate to discuss the merits of continuing the hearing and how it would proceed and when it would be continued.

Boardmember Whitty said if people keep saying there is an empty lot next door to the new home being proposed, it will not stay empty. She said the Board should keep in mind that any of the adjacent homes might have a building next to it in the future.

Boardmember Fetter said a simple, logical way is to push the house further into the hill which would require more grading and the retaining walls would get deeper in the back, or the house would move up and then there would be a large driveway going up and the garage would become more dominant. He has dealt with this and it is a fight between the two elements. He was not sure people realize the consequence of pushing it back further unless the program of the house changes and it is shrunk further, which is not easy to do.

Chair Ray Welter asked if the applicant would like to respond at all tonight. He questioned if Mr. Avila understood what the Board is proposing. Mr. Avila said they understand, said it is a tough situation. Chair Welter asked if Mr. Avila would agree to meet with a subcommittee of the Board to discuss design issues. Mr. Avila said they will address these comments as they addressed the other comments. Chair Welter said the benefit of meeting with the subcommittee of the DRB is that they are mainly concerned with the design of the building so some of the issues can be addressed. They can also help address some fairly easy design solutions that will visually help with shrinking the building impact to the neighborhood. Mr. Avila said they are complying with the codes of the City, with the setbacks and have complied with all comments voiced at meetings. Mrs. Avila commented that they have gone to many meetings and each time they have changed items.

Boardmember Whitty asked Mr. Slaughter to address the issue of the public meeting requirement of design in Richmond and how it works so the Avila's understand that everybody must meet with neighbors, the Board and neighborhood councils. Mr. Slaughter said the owners do understand the process and know it is within everybody's rights to make suggestions. He asked that because this requires Planning Commission approval, he asked if there would be an option to move forward with a condition that the final design return to the DRB similar to the project on 23rd Street. Boardmember Woldemar said the issue with the Planning Commission will only deal with the substandard lot, and he would want to know what kind of house will go on the substandard lot, and he believes the plan needs a lot of work. He also noted the public would have to go through an entire review on the substandard lot size and then return to the DRB for the design review. Mr. Slaughter noted it has been done both ways, and it was up to the Board.

City Attorney Atencio said if the consensus of the Board was to continue the public hearing, he suggested discussing specific dates for the matter returning to the Board.

Boardmember Woldemar asked for the applicant to come to the dais and said there are several options. The Board has an obligation to listen to all parties to find the right balance point. Because they are obligated to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission, the Board could move it to the Commission and indicate it cannot determine the design yet and ask them to determine whether or not the substandard lot is appropriate, and then return it to the DRB. Alternatively, the meeting could be continued, the applicant could meet with the DRB Subcommittee and they would try and work through the design to bring it back to the DRB and hopefully forward it along with a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission. The third alternative is to move it onto the Planning Commission and indicate the house is not appropriate for the site and let them make the decision. He said perhaps they are not far from the solution and he distributed the sketch drawn which attempts to make the house appear smaller, with a roofline change, railings along the front with a balcony, walls in front on either side, and other items that will help to make the house appear smaller and more compatible with the adjoining uphill houses. Mr. Avila said he understands this and said they would agree to revise the roofs, railing, and walls, but they would like to move forward with the project.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that the next meeting the applicant could be heard by the Planning Commission is the first meeting in October, and with a subcommittee process, it would be more like November.

Boardmember Fetter supported it move to the Planning Commission and schedule to meet with the applicants in the meantime with the subcommittee, and that it not be contingent. Chair Welter concurred and said a condition could be added that the design return for a final review.

Boardmember Woldemar said if he were sitting on the Planning Commission, he would want to know more information before making a decision on it. Boardmember Whitty agreed and said it would be better to meet as a subcommittee and sent it onto the Planning Commission.

Mr. Atencio said according to the interpretation of the Code, the DRB has one hearing, makes a recommendation and it goes to the Planning Commission who acts. To expedite matters, they have conditionally recommended it to the Planning Commission and condition it to return to the DRB. Mr. Slaughter suggested passing around the sketch, close the public hearing, make a recommendation, and the applicant return to the DRB after the Planning Commission's decision or, the DRB can continue it and return with a new design. Mr. Atencio suggested the Board take a straw poll prior to closing the public hearing to provide all options.

After taking a straw vote, Boardmembers recommended the applicant meet with a subcommittee of the DRB, return the project to the DRB prior to it moving onto the Planning Commission. Mr. Slaughter confirmed there was no noticing requirement and that he would schedule a subcommittee meeting very quickly.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Fetter) to continue the public hearing to the DRB Meeting of September 11, 2013 and that the applicant meet with a subcommittee of the DRB to arrive at an acceptable solution, which would be returned to the DRB; which carried unanimously (Woodrow absent).

CC 4. PLN13-008 ATCHISON VILLAGE MASTER DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A MASTER DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF NON-HISTORIC AND SECURITY DOORS, SECURITY BARS, WATER HEATER BLISTERS, FENCES, AND PORCH LIGHTING AT ATCHISON VILLAGE.	
Location	GARRARD BLVD	
APN	538-012-004	
Zoning	MFR-1 (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)	
Applicant	ATCHISON VILLAGE MUTUAL HOMES (OWNER)	
Staff Contact	HECTOR ROJAS	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Rojas referred to Item 4 and said staff received a letter from the applicant; Mutual Homes Corporation requesting the item be continued until staff resolves the fence issue, as well as other issues related to the recommendation in the staff report. Staff is supportive of this request and he suggested continuance to a date uncertain.

Boardmember Whitty asked that the doors and grills be narrowed down to three colors. Boardmember Woldemar noted that Mr. Slaughter provided a photo exhibit of a nearby a park by the Target Store and he asked Mr. Rojas to view the fence in the photo, which he recommended.

Mr. Rojas suggested a subcommittee be scheduled for this item so the Atchison Village can hear comments. Boardmember Fetter said the HPC is also reviewing the door selection as well, and he did not support the scheduling of a subcommittee meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S (Fetter/Whitty) to hold over PLN13-008 to a date uncertain; which carried unanimously (Woodrow absent).

CC 7. PLN13-126 HILLTOP PLAZA MASTER SIGN PROGRAM AMENDMENT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO AN EXISTING MASTER SIGN PROGRAM AT THE HILLTOP PLAZA SHOPPING CENTER.

Location 3401 BLUME DRIVE
APN 405-290-064, -062, -061, -034
Zoning C-3 (REGIONAL COMMERCIAL)
Owner DDRM HILLTOP PLAZA, LP
Applicant ARROW SIGN COMPANY
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER

Recommendation: **APPROVE MASTER SIGN PROGRAM**

Mr. Slaughter gave the staff report, stated the purpose of the master sign program for the Hilltop Plaza retail center. At the July 10, 2013 DRB meeting, the Board approved two additional monument signs on Blume Drive as well as the modification to tenant signage on the rooftop. In addition, the DRB requested the applicant return with additional language and a master sign program that can be evaluated separately from the previous proposals for the new monument signs. The applicant has provided the draft amendments for the Board's review and approval. He noted vagueness in the program and said the Board indicated that the program should return to the DRB; however, staff supports and the Board may consider, administrative review by the Zoning Administrator, as appropriate. Staff recommends approval with modification to the existing sign program and the applicant is present.

Boardmember Whitty asked staff to point to the two monument signs and the history of what initiated the proposal, which Mr. Slaughter explained. Boardmember Whitty pointed to a bus stop at the drive and asked staff to keep this in mind.

Boardmember Woldemar noted staff sent the Board a copy of the original sign program and noted the differences between the original and the newly proposed, stating at the end of the existing plan there is a paragraph D (exceptions) and E (design/submittals) that are listed in the new but are not in the old plan. Mr. Slaughter checked the file and confirmed that they were truncated in the new plan.

Boardmember Woldemar said with respect to the original master plan and asked if there were any exhibits that go with it, or pictures of what the signs looked like when proposed as part of this master plan. Mr. Slaughter said the original file was lost years ago. Boardmember Woldemar asked if new exhibits would show what the master plan would look like, and he confirmed that they only received a hand-drawn sketch on the two monument signs and the cans on the larger sign on top of the building. Boardmember Woldemar said there are many changes to the proposed graphics that have significant visual implications to the building. Mr. Slaughter said they did not receive the concept drawings. Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 2, Item A.1; Major Tenants; the first line is "the maximum height shall be 48 inches" and this has been changed in the new plan to 78 inches. One secondary height is to be 24 and this has been changed to 48 inches. This is a significant change in words and the Board ought to know what visually that means. Without exhibits, he did not believe the Board could consider the plan tonight. He noted there are also other changes like this, as well and only he and Boardmember Whitty were on the Board during original review of the signage program. He noted the original architect was Dave Johnson of Johnson Linden. Boardmember Whitty suggested doing a mock-up of the new signs, and Mr. Slaughter noted it was odd that many of the City's sign programs do not have exhibits, which is not helpful. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the freeway facing sign was done by variance, but it is now allowed in the new sign

ordinance. Also, he noted there is discussion of the pylon size and a particular size. He has no problem with a pylon sign but he would like to know what its design looks like, as well as its location. Boardmember Robin Welter asked that a location map or area should be provided to clarify it better.

Mark Gaston, Arrow Sign Company, said he would like to explain this process. At the last meeting the master sign criteria was supplied to the City and they were told they had to do a master sign amendment which was in the package. He noted he does this all over the country and to design signs ahead of time for tenants not in place cannot be done. The Board allowed at 400 square feet but did an extra height of lettering. The center was failing. They tried to bring in larger tenants and while he could draw squares in the building spaces to depict what the lettering might look like.

Boardmember Woldemar said this is a design review body and they need to know what the graphic images will be. He asked which criteria Mr. Gaston would follow, for example, for the new Dee Dee's sign. Mr. Gaston said right now, those signs are meant to go up to 78 inch height letters at 400 square feet. Boardmember Woldemar said this is a new, unapproved proposal and he asked for graphics to show what the sign would look like. Mr. Gaston said the sign contractor would have to submit it. Boardmember Woldemar said the Board needs design drawings and not technical drawings. He noted the signs were submitted to staff and Boardmember Woldemar said the Board did not receive them. Mr. Gaston said he had designs of signs they have not talked to the customer about, but who are not ready to make the investment, and they will still have to go back and submit for permits.

Boardmember Fetter said the Board simply wants something that represents lettering heights and not exact logos. Boardmember Woldemar referred to the Target Stores pylon sign and the only one they knew was coming to the center was Target. All other spaces were allocated for tenants and the Board approved that. Mr. Gaston said they do general descriptions and does not finalize designs until they are directed by the developer to do so. They do not even know how much square footage a developer will take, except for Dee Dee's.

Boardmember Woldemar said they are proposing to change a sign from 48 inches to 72 inches with the same square footages. The Circuit City sign was done at 48 inches. He asked what will the new tenant would look like at 78 inches, for example, if it were Sears or some other store and he asked Mr. Gaston to invent something to show the Board where it will go and what it will look like. The wall signs on the ends of the center also need to provide the Board with what they will look like and what size. Boardmember Fetter said the drawing does not need to commit to a particular logo, as well.

Mr. Slaughter noted in attendance was a manager from DDR who manages the site and would like to provide comments.

Michelle Koss, General Manager, DDR, said she has managed the center for the last 11 years since purchasing it. One thing they do not like to do is have drawings that give tenants a false impression. What has happened with the 99 Cent Store is that their letters are very small. If they show a tenant a sign that has a long name with small letters, and they are shown a design that has 78 inch letters, they will get a false impression and that it will work on the building. This is why a maximum size letter is needed. It will vary depending on the tenant's name. There are so many variables and if a drawing is done, it leads tenants on to something that is not real. Once they submit for building permit, at that time staff can approve it or send it to the DRB, and staff should have that discretion as experts, as well as them. Providing a sample could be a double edged sword.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Pet Smart and the Party Store, in the sign program the maximum letter height is 78 inches and in the next line down it states "not to exceed 400 square feet." He suggested simply providing two illustrations of 78 inches spread out to equal 400 square feet or 36 inches spread out so far equals 400 square feet, and show where the sign will go, and then the real design comes to staff which fits the criteria and they approve it.

Boardmember Whitty said the problem with the sign program over the last 80 years is that it has been undefined and it has caused huge arguments at Board/Commission meetings. It is better for everyone and defining 400 square feet is easy to present. She simply asks that the applicant show what a 78 inch Arrow sign looks like within 400 square feet. Mr. Gaston said he can do this but it will not provide what the Board wants and he has never done it. The problem most likely is that he is coming in with a master sign program to a DRB who wants to look at design.

Boardmember Whitty asked if a logo was considered part of the 400 square feet and Mr. Gaston said it could be. She noted therefore, it must be within the 400 square feet. Mr. Slaughter said the way staff has dealt with this is if it is a logo that does not incorporate lettering, it is separate and not counted as part of the 400 square feet. It can be tricky because some business's logos are their lettering. They go to the City Attorney's office for an opinion. The applicant is saying it is impossible to represent all the various ways to get to 400 square feet and up to 78 inches and once they put it on paper, it becomes part of the public record and an applicant may come in and disagree. He thinks the applicant is correct in the way the sign code is written. There is only lettering and no graphics whatsoever. The City is moving away from this in its form based code, but that is different from the existing zoning ordinance.

Chair Ray Welter said much of the discussion relates to building signs, and he asked about monument signs on Blume Drive. He will not approve anything until he sees what those are, and Mr. Slaughter reminded the Board that it already approved these at the last meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar said the Board is being asked to change the master sign program which includes a series of notes that need to be reviewed. He asked if the Board was willing to change the master sign program or are they willing to leave it as it is.

Chair Ray Welter asked how this differs if there is a store where an applicant came in, did not have a tenant and wanted to develop it on a spec basis, and the Board asked for an idea of where signs would be located and how big they would be. They put a dashed rectangle on the building where signage would be suggested. He does not see how this is any different. Mr. Slaughter said in that case, the applicant was reluctant to include it, but once pressured they did. However, that is a more fixed criteria already in the City's sign ordinance which is 30% of the street frontage or not to exceed a certain square footage.

Mr. Gaston said by approving what the Board did last time, it changed the master sign criteria. It was in there with those changes. They submitted an amendment to a master sign criteria with the signs. The DRB approved designs and not the master sign criteria. Now they hear they do not have to approve it. They have already approved the signs which are outside the master sign criteria. It does not make any sense to him. Chair Ray Welter said he understands that since it is piecemeal it is not the same package and it is hard to relate to something the Board no longer has in front of them. He thinks that is part of the problem here.

Mr. Slaughter said the previous action was done, approved, and the appeal period passed. There is no reason for him to bring this back, and all that is before the Board tonight is an

amendment to the master sign program to a written document. Staff cannot locate the previous file and did not have exhibits to go off of. The Board is asking the applicant to speculate on what could be the dimensions, but it could be a million different ways.

Boardmember Fetter said he believes square footage and area can be expressed simply. Mr. Slaughter said there is letter height as well. He suggested two different versions of two possible ways to show the massing, whether it is a logo or lettering, which is not a commitment to tenants, but an expression of boundary graphically. He knows there are many ways of doing it, but the Board just wants an example. Mr. Gaston restated and further explained his position to the Board.

Boardmember Woldemar asked to see one end of the building and said the applicant is asking that end of building signs be allowed. He is asking where a sign would be put and how big, within the criteria, it would fit. One of the interesting things about the building is the architecture. It is not a big box strip mall but explicitly designed to have some character to it and the signage was meant to go with that. He asked that if this is an included item what does it look like and where will it be? And, he asked to make up a fictitious tenant, which is simple.

Boardmember Woldemar said he would like to ensure that there is provision in the ordinance specifically for master plans and signage, and that the Board can require that master sign program to be in compliance. Tonight's action is to approve the modification with changes. The Board could approve it with no changes except the two items approved the last time which are referenced in Exhibit A, Design Number 121154 and also two additional monument signs in Exhibit D, Number 2156. The Board asked if there were copies of these in the packet, and Mr. Slaughter said no, as these were a previous item he did not know the Board would discuss.

Boardmember Whitty said Ms. Whales remembers all projects in the past where the sign program took more time than the architecture because no one understood the sign program, and Ms. Whales agreed. She said asked that on Ms. Whales and Mr. Slaughter's experience, was this an improvement? Ms. Whales said not sure and was agreement with the Board that there should have been a sketch of some sort to show what a sign cabinet would have looked like. The applicants could have provided an example no matter who the tenant is, and the Board would at least know what they are approving without the tenant. She clarified with Boardmember Robin Welter that she has seen in other jurisdictions where the different shapes and sizes were presented as an example only without logos. The City required this for the Crossings, as they had no idea who would be occupying the tenant spaces, and they did develop a master sign program and they knew exactly what it was going to look like. She also confirmed the Commission can make changes to the language in the program as well.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked to explain what the difference is between the major, the store and the pad tenants, which Mr. Gaston said right now major tenants are defined by their square footage and those would be Ross, Dee Dee's and the remainder is by square footage per store or pad. Boardmember Robin Welter asked that all be done to show what size sign for the amount of square footage per space.

Boardmember Whitty said she understands retailers want a lot and they more or less push the building owner or manager to give them whatever they want. Ms. Koss said they will still come to the City with a drawing for approval, and these are just general guidelines. Mr. Gaston said he came to the City with an amendment to a written document and the Board can see clearly the need for the signs. Dee Dee's is ready to open and will not have signs when their store opens fairly quickly, which will be a major setback for their grand opening.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the corner tenant and said to the left, there used to be a large tenant; Circuit City. Within the context of what is being proposed, he asked if they would allow additional signage on the small one as part of an in-line tenant and they would allow 78" signage on what was the Circuit City. Mr. Gaston said it is not even close to it; one is primary signs (front) and one is secondary signage (side of the building). It also states anyone having end signage is the end tenant, so this would include that end tenant and whoever is on the side of the building.

Boardmember Woldemar asked why the 99 Cent store did not do some sort of background to stretch the image, like a neon. Mr. Gaston said it is not in the criteria. Ms. Ross said stores do not modify their brands. Mr. Slaughter said he found an illustration and presented it to the Board.

Ms. Ross said another factor to consider is that the landlord might not want a tenant on the end cap to have a secondary depending on who the tenant was. It gives a false impression. Boardmember Whitty said she believes it cannot be one way or the other, and Mr. Slaughter noted they have discretion. Mr. Slaughter also reiterated that he has never had problems implementing the sign program over the last 6 years without illustrations. He gave examples of the Subway, the Taqueria Maria, the 99 Cent Store expansion, and he pointed to them at the center. He stated the tenants are used to this and having a written sign program for them is the standard and what they do. It is nice to have graphical representation of what is a blade sign, what is an awning sign, what is a window sign, but this does not say how big it could be represented on the page.

Boardmember Whitty suggested the Board stop beating this thing to death and move on. It is always so confusing or subjective for everybody. Staff has lived through these, as well as the Board. Boardmember Fetter said outside the industry it is not as clear and this is probably one of the ones he objects to as far as language, i.e., 12 side's maximum. He would like to see this be written down and he would want to integrate it into a motion.

The owner of the building said not every sign fits into a rectangle. Throughout the country and in Contra Costa County there are 8 sided figures, box each word, box each letter on individual letter signs, and in working with Arrow Signs, given the many ways to configure, the sign site is dictated by the background and what is proportionate to that. Rather than putting a square around where this part of the copy might be narrow and this part wide and another part wider, rather than drawing a big square around that and indicating that is your sign area, there is a lot of area that is not sign area. Mr. Gaston reiterated that the industry standard is 12 lines and he explained the reason why they use it.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if Mr. Slaughter then will go around the letter forms and not around the box. Mr. Slaughter said yes and typically the sign company will submit it in that manner. Boardmember Woldemar asked if the box could be bigger, and Mr. Gaston said 78 square feet is for building letters and not for the sign on the tower. They would go around each word to show it is less than 78 inch, calculate square footage on each one to show they are within the square footage.

Boardmember Woldemar said suppose the box is one foot higher or longer, and Mr. Gaston said they cannot use a box because the building signs are individual letters and they cannot put a single face sign on there, so it will not be a box. All building letters on the façade are individual letters and there will be no background. The cans are called out as 4x19 and the Board approved them and all of them are the same. The exhibits were submitted to the City with the

redline drawings. Mr. Slaughter said it has already been approved and this was why he did not bring it back.

Chair Ray Welter said he was ready to make a motion. He wanted to change the language everywhere anywhere referring to "City approval" to change it to "City of Richmond Planning Department". He referred to examples: They "shall be submitted for review by the landlord and the City of Richmond Planning Department". On Item A, III, at the bottom of page 2 it talks about the level of illumination, and he asked to amend the statement; "...if determined necessary by the City Planning Department." He also asked to amend Item III.A.1; "all major tenant signs are to be reviewed by City Planning staff."

Boardmember Woldemar said he would vote "no" on the entire document because of not having supporting data, because there are certain sizes he does not agree with, does not agree with putting in a pylon sign that is 50 feet without actual illustrations to go with it and many other reasons he will be voting no.

Mr. Slaughter asked if Boardmember Robin Welter wished to add square footage to store tenants, like 17,999 and below. Boardmember Robin Welter asked staff to identify on the map which store tenants are which, by indicating the minimum square footage for each.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 1, and in red, it states "All future changes to the master sign criteria will be approved by the ZA, meaning that when it comes time to approve a 50 foot high, 400 square foot pylon sign it will be entirely up to the staff. Mr. Gaston noted it does not say 50 foot high, but "50 foot above freeway grade." Boardmember Woldemar said his point is that it is out of this Board's purview at that point because of the language.

Boardmember Whitty asked the applicant if this is more complicated in other jurisdictions, and Mr. Gaston said he thinks because he is doing general criteria, this is why he is not providing designs because this is not what the Board is approving. For specific things he knows that are happening like the tower and monument signs, he already provided designs and site plans. The other items are general criteria. He is doing this to the Planning Commission and staff which all needs to return to be permitted by the tenant after they receive landlord approval. This is the confusion where the Board is hesitant. If the Board went to 10 different centers, the document is very close to what he is presenting.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to page 6, number 4, for monument sign B and for C, the two additional signs. She asked to get a map of the general area where it could be located. Mr. Gaston said they did not ask for the pylon sign so they have not chosen a location. It depends on what happens. He did supply a site plan for the one monument sign on Blume. There is no room for two signs on Blume and, while the Board approved a second monument sign, they do not see where one would fit. However, they would hope that the pylon sign would be on the shelf towards the west side of the property which gives them the highest elevation, and they would need to get building permit approval.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the "Purpose Statement" which includes a directive for the ZA for alterations to the master sign program, and he requested striking that particular revision.

EXTEND MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Munoz) to extend the meeting to 10:00 p.m.; which carried unanimously (Woodrow absent).

MOTION: It was M/S (Ray Welter/Robin Welter) to approve PLN13-126 with the following revisions to the document; that in every case where it refers to approval by the City of Richmond or the "City", that it state "City of Richmond Planning Department"; that under "Purpose Statement", strike the last sentence with includes a directive for the Zoning Administration to approve alterations to the master sign program; that the in-line store tenants be defined which is 17,999 by the applicant; and all exhibits that are referred to in the plans be attached and become part of the document; and that the Board support language on page 6, number 4; A.1 and C.

DISCUSSION: Boardmember Woldemar said given the motion, some items as this document changes will return to this DRB by striking out the first line of the Purpose Statement. He said the Board was allowing a double faced, multi-tenant pylon sign at 400 square foot maximum, and 50 square feet above freeway grade perpendicular to I-80. He asked if the design for that pylon sign when ready will return to the Board, and how is the 400 square foot maximum determined. Ms. Whales said it will return to the Board and this will have to be determined by the applicant pursuing the pylon sign. Mr. Gaston said it is typically advertising area. He will name the center and tenants only and they do not count the pole covers and advertising. The 400 square feet will be split between Hilltop Center Plaza identification and those tenants.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Mr. Gaston for the illustration and he confirmed the areas to be added for square footage, and asked how the Board will know this is defined. Ms. Whales said an illustration will be provided and defined by the applicant. Mr. Gaston suggested adding the language: "Identification of Hilltop Plaza and the tenants will make up 400 square feet of advertising space on the sign, including cans."

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Ray Welter/Robin Welter) to approve PLN13-126 with the following revisions to the document; that in every case where it refers to approval by the City of Richmond or the "City", that it state "City of Richmond Planning Department"; that under "Purpose Statement", strike the last sentence with includes a directive for the Zoning Administration to approve alterations to the master sign program; that the in-line store tenants be defined which is 17,999 by the applicant; and all exhibits that are referred to in the plans be attached and become part of the document; that the Board support language on page 6, number 4; A.1 and C; and under 4D, that "The 400 square foot maximum includes tenant identification and advertising space for tenants including cans." The motion carried by the following voice vote: 3-1-1-2 (Ayes: Ray Welter, Robin Welter; and Whitty; Noes: Woldemar; Absent: Woodrow; Abstain: Munoz and Fetter).

CC 2. PLN13-119 AUTO DEALERSHIP REMODEL

Description **(Held Over from 7/24/2013)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE REMODELING AND EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING FACILITY FOR A NEW VOLKSWAGEN DEALERSHIP.

Location 3255 AUTO PLAZA

APN 405-330-006

Zoning C-3 (REGIONAL COMMERCIAL)

Owner LEE DONG KUK

Applicant ROBERT DAVIDSON

Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Ms. Whales gave the staff report and a comprehensive description of the request for remodeling and expansion of an existing facility for a new Volkswagen (VW) dealership and said staff recommends approval. She presented a materials board for the Board's review.

Boardmember Whitty asked to talk about landscaping on the street frontage. Ms. Whales said landscaping will be preserved along the street frontage, with additional groundcover, the addition of street trees, pavers in the front of the building adjacent to the pedestrian access ramp. Boardmember Whitty indicated that the only addition will be groundcover, and Ms. Whales said this is because it is adjacent to the Toyota dealership where the Board made exceptions to landscaping requirements for the site to allow groundcover.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to AS.3.1, it points to "existing concrete walk to remain" and she asked for its location. If it remains, the groundcover is going over the walkway. Ms. Whales deferred to the applicant. She clarified that the minimum amount is 10% for landscaping.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 3 of 7 and ending on 4 of 7, it talks about not being able to comply with landscape requirements because of the value of the building. He asked if this means they are pre-empted from talking about any additional new landscaping, irrespective of what the requirements are. Ms. Whales said that in taking this project with the Toyota dealership proposal, they comply with the total acreage when combined. Boardmember Woldemar said the drawings indicate that street trees are not in contract. There are missing street trees out there and he asked how they are going to get replaced. It indicates that the existing Toyota sign will go away and a new VW pylon sign, per VW standards, will go in there. He asked what it will look like, and he suggested seeing the graphics in the packet. Ms. Whales said she believes that the actual signage was not part of this application, and in the future it will return.

Boardmember Whitty asked if the color of the exterior rendering of "Richmond Volkswagen" true or not. Ms. Whales said this is the way it will look and the applicant can clarify.

Vice Chair Munoz noted that the numbering systems are incorrect, and Ms. Whales said this will be corrected.

The public hearing was opened.

Robert Davidson, Architect/Applicant, said he was before the Board a few years ago. The building is the existing Toyota building that is in operation. What was up on the screen was showing the old Chevrolet building before it was partially torn down and is now under reconstruction, which will be the new Toyota building. The goal is that once the new Toyota building is built, the Toyota franchise will move there and the existing Toyota building will be converted, redesigned and built true to the elevation for the VW franchise, owned by Hanley's. The scope of the work for the VW franchise is much less than what they proposed for the Toyota franchise on this building. At that time, they were trying to expand the Toyota building on the 3 acre lot. The needs for VW are much less than Toyota and he compared the two. Volkswagen does not have the requirements for all service bays that Toyota does, and what they wanted to do was bring their image to the building. The showroom footprint is proposed to be expanded 5 feet to the east, 5 feet to the south and going 25-30 feet to the west to create a new covered service drive area. The showroom is all going to be new. The footprint of the new showroom is within this footprint. The building will have an aluminum composite panel, panels are white, glass will be clear vision, and the landscaping is an issue.

Boardmember Woldemar asked what was done on the new Toyota as far as construction drawings. Mr. Davidson said they had to reconfigure the front parkway. They tore it out

everything in front of Chevrolet because of the way the drive access had to work in the new building. Because that site slopes to the street away, they could not put parking on there and accommodated the City with a lot of landscaping. For this project that was approved as a Toyota building in 2010, they were allowed to use the existing landscaping and added some shrubs. They have not changed it except to get a small pathway from the building to the public right-of-way. They took what was approved and left it.

Boardmember Woldemar said landscaping is his major concern and he asked if the plant materials being termed “new” consistent with what is being used in Toyota under construction. Mr. Davidson said he did not know. Boardmember Woldemar noted he had asked staff to pull the plans and said there is the opportunity to add in some groundcover.

Chair Ray Welter asked what the landscape plan of the new Toyota dealership. Mr. Davidson said the trees are within the public right-of-way and he said this is the City’s responsibility. They do not have a problem with the street trees, but they do have a problem with putting trees in the parking lot, as this will shield the inventory to be sold. In looking at the building they added onto the showroom, added an enclosed service canopy for presence, and going west, the entire wall will be refaced with new plaster and corrugated metal to comply with VW’s design. The design is very handsome, very German and very precise and it will look good.

Boardmember Woldemar said in looking at the two ends of the building, he asked if they will still have the same appearance around the corners. Mr. Davidson said there is an existing old car wash on the west side of the building facing Chevrolet which will be coming off. The old wood roof will also be torn off and removed. The block will then be painted to match the front of the building. On the east side looking at Nissan, the showroom continues around most of that side and from the north part around to the service access will be painted to match.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page A.5.0, at the bottom and confirmed the corrugated metal goes across the east side of the building. The west side of the building cannot be seen because of the grade distance at the street level.

Chair Ray Welter referred to the landscape plan for VW. The vegetated swales were located on the old plan and some are not labeled. Mr. Davidson said the reason is that the amount of site work disturbed mandated that they had to get in and handle the new SWP requirements and on this site there is little movement of dirt, so they modified it. The landscape pockets will all stay and they will be landscaped.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked about the circulation of cars driving in and going into the service area. Mr. Davidson pointed to the new canopy and cars will be brought in for service or be parked in the back. If a car needs something relating to a question, they can then exit out easily. Boardmember Robin Welter asked if they could add some area for exiting out to make a more formal area which would add to the look and feel for VW, versus landscape pockets. Mr. Davidson said this would be significant to move irrigation, landscaping pockets/wells, and noted there are a few unhealthy trees. She suggested a clean hedge that could be incorporated to get a greener area, and Mr. Davidson agreed this could be done by conditioning it.

Boardmember Woldemar asked there be a consistency and compatibility between the two projects, asked to put in additional trees along the frontage on the physical property on the opposite rhythm the City street trees are or will be replaced as. Groundcover is needed, as there is dirt. Mr. Davidson said this is a more residential application of landscaping to a very commercial project that needs visibility. Trees are used to block a view and this is what they will do. Boardmember Woldemar said when he drives by or walks by, he could see underneath and sees the cars, and suggested picking a good species to grow where cars can be seen

underneath. Mr. Davidson said trees are problems given sap, droppings and birds. A tree will also develop a 20 foot head which will cause a visibility problem with the cars.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve PLN13-119 with the staff's four findings and with staff's recommendations 1-14 with the additional conditions: 1) expand or modify the existing landscape strip by the service drive to a minimum of 5 feet wide by the length of all stalls with drought tolerant landscaping; 2) eliminate the two pockets near where the existing roof structure is going to be removed; 3) ensure there is consistent landscaping along Blume Drive by Toyota's frontage and Volkswagen's frontage; 4) add in tall, narrow street trees on Blume Drive using the City's tree palette; which carried unanimously (Woodrow absent).

CC 8. PLN12-214 FILBERT TOWNHOMES DEVELOPMENT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 43-UNIT INFILL HOUSING PROJECT ON A ±1.35 ACRE PARCEL.

Location 1300 FILBERT STREET

APN 561-192-029

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

Applicant COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT (OWNER)

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

TAPE ENDED HERE AT 3:09.

Ms. Whales gave the staff report and description of the project. Boardmember Whitty noted she removed the item and briefly described her concerns relating to _____.

ACTION: It was M/S (Fetter/Robin Welter) to recommend to the Planning Commission PLN12-214, with staff's four findings and staff's conditions; unanimously approved (Woodrow absent).

- Board Business**
 - A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements – None
 - B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements
 - 1. Elections of New Officers

The Board made nominations and suggested appointment of Brant Fetter as Chair and Brenda Munoz as Vice Chair.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to appoint Brant Fetter as Chair and Brenda Munoz as Vice Chair; unanimously approved (Woodrow absent).

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned at 10:15 p.m. to the next meeting on August 28, 2013.