

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
October 23, 2013
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

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

Vice Chair Fetter called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Brant Fetter; Boardmembers Robin Welter; Eileen Whitty, Ray Welter, and Don Woodrow

Absent: Vice Chair Munoz and Boardmember Woldemar

Staff Present: Hector Lopez, Jonelyn Whales, Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 24, 2013:

Boardmember Ray Welter referred to page 3, second paragraph, and asked that it be amended to read: "Chair Welter confirmed that modifications state that major alterations would not go to the DRB".

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Robin Welter) to approve the minutes of July 24, 2013, as amended; unanimously approved (Munoz and Woldemar absent).

August 14, 2013:

Boardmember Ray Welter referred to page 5, last paragraph, second sentence, and asked that it be amended to read: "He agrees with Boardmember Whitty's comment regarding the arched windows."

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Robin Welter) to approve the minutes of August 14, 2013, as amended; unanimously approved (Munoz and Woldemar absent).

Public Forum - Brown Act - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Robin Welter) to approve the Agenda; unanimously approved (Munoz and Woldemar absent).

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Fetter noted the agenda consists of two (2) Consent Calendar items. He asked if any members of the Board, staff, or audience wished to remove an item. Chair Fetter requested removal of Item 1. Item 2 is a presentation by the architect, who was not yet present.

Chair Fetter announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, November 4, 2013 by 5:00 p.m.

ACTION: It was M/S (Fetter/Whitty) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Item 3; unanimously approved (Ray Welter absent).

Items Approved on the Consent Calendar:

Study Session

3. PLN13-092 COSTA DE ORO NEW MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Description: STUDY SESSION TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT 72 DETACHED SINGLE-FAMILY AND 41 SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON A 10 ACRE LOT. AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BEING PREPARED TO EVALUATE ALL POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS THAT COULD RESULT FROM THE DEVELOPMENT.

Location: 830 MARINA WAY SOUTH

APN: 560-190-007

Zoning: R&D/BUSINESS; KCSP (KNOX-CUTTING BOULEVARD SPECIFIC PLAN)

Owner: STEPHENS & STEPHENS XII LLC

Applicant: THE RIDING COMPANY

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **PROVIDE STAFF DIRECTION**

BREAK

Chair Fetter called for a 5 minute break in order for the presentation to be set up, and thereafter reconvened the regular meeting.

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 1. PLN13-256 WEST CONTRA COSTA FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR FAÇADE AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE WEST CONTRA COSTA FAMILY JUSTICE CENTER. MAJOR EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDE A NEW BUILDING ENTRY CANOPY, NEW MARQUEE WALL, PARKING LOT PAVING AND RESTRIPIING, NEW STOREFRONT AND DOOR ASSEMBLIES, AND LANDSCAPING IMPROVEMENTS.

Location 256 - 24TH STREET

APN 515-291-017, 515-291-014, & 515-291-013

Zoning C-2 (GENERAL COMMERCIAL)

Applicant CITY OF RICHMOND (OWNER)

Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave a description of the request for design review permit approval. He described the property which was transferred from the County to the City in April 2013 for the purpose of renovating the site into a family justice center. Staff recommends the proposal as it will enhance the building. He noted that the architect will continue with the presentation.

Mark Albertson, architect, said the center is located a couple of blocks away and was used for several years as the County's health department facility. It was originally built in 1946 as retail space and it has three retail bays that line up and at some point, had several remodels. An adjacent parking lot was then constructed and in 1989 was remodeled to serve as a health facility for the health department. The City in conjunction with the County has received a grant to renovate the building into the family justice center, to allow City's police department staff with county staff to be at the building. The exterior of the building is run down, boarded up, it has been vandalized and they will appropriate funds to do an exterior renovation of the building. Architecturally, one of the challenges is that it has one façade that faces towards 24th Street. The Health Department had the entrance on the south side facing onto the parking lot. The goal was how to get the building or façade to turn the corner so that the parking lot and the front façade had some relationship so when one arrives, they know where the entrance is. This drove the design solution seen on the building by a marquee wall, which is a framed wall assembly. He explained the wood panel system used and he passed around the material board.

Mr. Albertson said as part of the façade improvements, they are also doing a sunscreen device across the front and corner, utilizing a variety of means to tie the existing brick around and on a low planter area to create a courtyard effect. The client wanted a semi-public/private place where they could have a memorial garden to visit with families or victims.

Chair Fetter noted that he had removed the item from the Consent Calendar and he said the Board simply has a few questions. He referred to the crown edge on the street side and said for the style of the building, he thinks it is a very modern element, but the crown is a 1990's sort of element and disrupts the style.

Mr. Albertson said the crown element exists now and he noted that the existing building has 12 foot high, wood windows, which were once very elegant. Above that, the building has a curved crown or pediment there but the problem is that it stopped at each edge of the building and had one direction. When the County acquired the parking lot, the building had a second elevation to it and it had just been painted out and awnings removed. They are proposing to take the original element and turn the corner where currently it stops. He explained that it stops at the point it does because the existing wall takes a step down in elevation. Chair Fetter noted this is not shown on the rendering. Mr. Albertson displayed the graphic and said they have looked at the building from a 3D perspective. He presented the original building elevation and said on one side of the building is at a zero property line and a wall that steps down in each of the 3 bays across the building. They added the element right to where the wall steps down as a means to assist how to get the building to turn the corner and face the parking lot.

Chair Fetter stated that people on the street level will not see the walls on top so he questioned the logic behind having it stop at the zero lot line. Mr. Albertson said the Family Justice Center received a grant and it must be spread throughout the interior of the building and cleaning up the exterior. As the architect, he was never given direction on how much to spend on the exterior versus the interior, but he is sure they are hitting the threshold with the interior renovation and they are doing the best they can with the exterior. He suggested having to add an option in the contract documents to determine what it would cost to bring the cornice element all the way back. Boardmember Ray Welter asked if it would make sense to have a mitered corner and have it return. Mr. Albertson noted an issue for the client was privacy and noted that there are two sunscreen elements that do the same thing. One sunscreen element is at a

certain elevation because it exists; however, recently, they have talked about taking this element and dropping it down to the same elevation as the other one and treating it as a light shelf for the tall windows. They are proposing acid edged glass on the lower panes of the windows and leaving them clear low E glass on the upper windows. He said the other important issue for the client was to create a warm and inviting space from the street and parking lot, and he talked about the finish paneling system as cherry wood. It is installed as a rain screen and it has a small gap. It can be done as an exposed fastener or a concealed fastener with a thicker panel and he is proposing the latter.

Chair Fetter questioned and confirmed refuse containers must be screened and it will have a locking system. He asked about visibility of the roof mechanical equipment and Mr. Albertson discussed the great architectural character of the building. The building was originally built with 12 skylights and there are 4 per bay which is an existing condition. In the 1989 remodel, some skylights were removed and they installed 5 HVAC systems. One important consideration is to keep as much load off of the building because once they exceed 10% load on an existing building, a seismic analysis and upgrade is triggered which could consume most of the budget. They have opted to go to a split system. The HVAC system is zoned out and there is a packaged unit in the tenant improvement space with a condensing unit on the roof. The condensing units will have a maximum of 6-8 zones which are shown in the middle of the space. They are about 32-36 inches high, and in talking with Ms. Velasco, she indicated that screening of the units would not be necessary because they cannot be seen from the sidewalk, which he displayed. When going to the property across the street 50 feet away, they also cannot be seen. Therefore, based on the code, mechanical screening would not be required.

Boardmember Robin Welter said from the client's point of view of the plaza in the front and patio area, she asked if there is a worry about security if clients are outside. Mr. Albertson said one concern of a victim is that their perpetrator could be laying in wait. They have worked on a design that allows them to have a 24 inch high seat wall with feather grass growing on it that provides a semi-visual, semi-permeable space, but no one can sit there and lay in wait. When they first proposed a marquee wall, they were very concerned that a person could lay in wait in the back behind any kind of wall. Anything that is fenced must be designed in a way which precludes someone from stalking their victim, and this met the client's test for that.

Boardmember Robin Welter likes the idea of the feather grass but noted it gets very, very large, and Mr. Albertson agreed and said it would need to be cut back. He needs to discuss spacing of this, and agreed it will get big. She suggested choosing a different, smaller grass, and Mr. Albertson suggested putting the feather grass in front of the planter and putting something smaller in the planter itself. Boardmember Robin Welter said she really likes the wood of the marquee wall, and suggested seating might be pulled towards the street a couple of feet in the courtyard area. A memorial garden could be provided in the center with seating around the brick wall. Mr. Albertson said the paneled wood is very expensive and he has to use it in focused doses. This is why they picked the proposed furniture package, which is a form and service furniture package that has the wood slats they can match up to the panel, which pulls out the warmth and richness. Boardmember Welter said he could maximize seating by integrating it into the brick wall also on the left side. Mr. Albertson clarified that Boardmember Welter wanted to pull the element towards the street, add a bench system all along the brick wall all the way around instead of sitting on the pre-cast concrete seat, but he said his intent was for people to sit on the concrete seating, but he said they could revise the plan per her comments, depending on cost.

Boardmember Robin Welter said she also likes the permeable pavement and said she would even like to see it jump the DG strip and come across and pull it into the entry. Mr. Albertson said they could look at this, and pointed out the existing concrete walk and proposed new pavement. Boardmember Robin Welter suggested reducing from 5 to 3 western red bud trees

and let them have some room to grow. Mr. Albertson said the architectural rendering showed 5, but there are actually 4 proposed, equally spaced.

Mr. Albertson returned to the trash enclosure screening and he presented the material proposed to be used. They will use it on the front at a human scale at about 7 feet high. There are also two bicycle components; bike lockers and public bike rack which is another form and service package. Lastly, he said they are going to do a good faith effort to achieve 50 green points, which would be LEED Silver, and they have identified on documents where they can achieve this which will be enforced in the field during construction.

ACTION: It was M/S (Ray Welter/Robin Welter) to approve PLN 13-256 including the staff's 4 design findings and the 11 staff recommendations; unanimously approved (Munoz and Woldemar absent).

Public Hearing(s)

CC 2. PLN13-192 RICHMOND MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM ADA UPGRADES

Description *(Held Over from 10/9/2013)* PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR ADA UPGRADES AT THE RICHMOND MEMORIAL AUDITORIUM, A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE TO THE CIVIC CENTER HISTORIC DISTRICT. *(THIS ITEM WAS RECOMMENDED FOR CONDITIONAL APPROVAL BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE ON 8/29/2013).*

Location 403 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA

APN 515-210-001

Zoning PC (PUBLIC & CIVIC USES)

Owner CITY OF RICHMOND

Applicant MARK ALBERTSON, AIA/CITY OF RICHMOND PUBLIC WORKS

Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **PROVIDE STAFF DIRECTION**

Mark Albertson, Architect, referred to the drawings provided to the Board, stating it is a voluntary project to do Priority 1 and Priority 2 ADA upgrades, and the inside of the building is the way it was from 1952 when it was first opened. All multi-accommodation restrooms are on the second floor so they must have the elevator to satisfy ADA access.

As the architect, Mr. Albertson can say that the only place the elevator can go is in the lobby, and the lobby is 35 feet high. He said he would present a slide show to show the methodology and schemes, said he would like the Board to provide direction on which scheme they like the best and they could return in a couple of weeks focused on that scheme for approval. Because the building does have a lot of sensitivity to it given the fact that it is a historic building and it means a lot to the City, it is not for one person to decide but there is no other place to put the elevator other than the lobby. He said originally, they were studying replacing all handrails and guardrails because they also are not ADA compliant but they are an historical element of the lobby. When they went to the DRHP subcommittee, they asked whether they could pull the California Historical Code into play and avoid upgrading the handrails and guardrails in this space. Subsequent meetings were held with Councilmember Butts and Risk Management and after considering other options, the City has elected to use the provision of the code as an exception and not upgrade the handrails and guardrails in the lobby. Therefore, at this time, they are working on the elevator which can be anywhere across the front of the lobby area. It makes sense to place it to the left of the main entrance. He presented the basic shape and massing of the elevator core and said they carry it up 35 feet and tie it off to the roof assembly. Structurally it cannot just run halfway up. He presented what it would look like it all in brick. They

also started looking where they can take glass, aluminum mullions, brick and gypsum board which are prevalent materials in the existing building.

After a meeting he had with Councilmember Butt, he suggested the possibility of a mirror system. He conducted research and found this might be one of the more viable options. He would take mirror as a piece of etched glass where it would only silhouette what is around it. After further architectural study, they found there is a manufactured product to put this system in place. It would have the same dimensions and spacing as the existing lobby features and what occurs in the front of the building.

They also looked at Option 3 where they can take art glass which is already used in the civic center in the lobby. They can do something in art glass in a similar look or in a completely (Option 4) different look where it becomes more of a waterfall glass. As an architect, they would deliver the building complete, ready to receive the art glass that would then be commissioned through the City by an artist. That is what option 3 and 4 is, which creates a blank canvass for an artist to take over as a separate, commissioned project, where options 1 and 2 would be part of the architectural package he would put together and build.

Mr. Albertson distributed a sample system for Option 2 and described it, stating it comes to the field already fabricated and assembled. It is back-painted glass or in lieu of it, they could use mirror for the solution. Boardmember Robin Welter asked and confirmed it does not have any lighting to it, although Mr. Albertson said this crossed their minds. They talked about the possibility of using the elevator as another marquee element so when an event is going on it would be back lit with color lighting.

Boardmember Whitty asked about what the doors will look like and Mr. Albertson said most likely it will be a stainless steel frame and door, given the amount of traffic. He said the building has also been identified as an evacuation site during a catastrophic event. Paramedics will be able to use gurneys in the elevator system. He noted that the building will be rented out for modern day functions and it will get used a lot by people for events. Boardmember Whitty said she likes the mirroring of the size of the panels to the front window structure, which she thinks is a good architectural device.

Boardmember Ray Welter stated with the art glass option, the funding for that is separate and he asked how that plays into the schedule. He asked if funds are guaranteed to hire the artist. Ms. Whales said that will be part of the Public Art Commission's responsibility and possibility part of their budget for public art, but she was not sure if allocated funds are available for this project. Mr. Albertson said he would be nervous about committing to that option not knowing how much funding is available. Ms. Whales said there are also grants to make it happen but Mr. Albertson said he favored the first two options where materials are specified and the building can be built and completed. However, he likes the idea of having artwork there, but is nervous about available funding. Boardmember Ray Welter said he likes the idea of back lighting it and said it is a missed opportunity if not done. Mr. Albertson said he was hoping the Board would go with the option of using the high quality, fabricated system. It has a contemporary feel and they can still use the proportions of the glazing out front and any infill panel can be used. He does not think wood is appropriate, but other paneling can be used. He hoped that the Board would agree that Option 2 is the correct way to go and he can return in two weeks or one month and present the finished scheme. He said there are other options in terms of framing and said a double line could be done. The glass elevator option also came up by another third party. By the time that the structural frame is put in to support guide rails and seismic factors, it is an industrial look that requires a significant amount of maintenance. He spoke with an elevator fabricator and he said the problem with glass elevators is that they do not clean glass but an elevator inspector must be on site when cleaning the glass and it is very expensive per hour.

Chair Fetter said one option was brick, and he asked Mr. Albertson to present the rendering. Mr. Albertson presented it. He then discussed his desire to have a banner area but this was not chosen. Boardmember Robin Welter asked him to present it with brick, which he did and said he was worried about its height to scale. He received comments where people have said there is not enough brick. Boardmember Robin Welter said she likes the mirrored tile because it will pick up the surrounding colors, and Mr. Albertson agreed and again said he could return with this system for the Board's review and approval. He briefly discussed proportions of the wall, planter areas, and commented that this area might be a good tie-in.

Mr. Albertson concluded his presentation and the Board thanked him and confirmed the direction was to return with Option 2 details.

BREAK

The Board took a brief break and reconvened the regular meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Study Session

3. PLN13-092 COSTA DE ORO NEW MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Description: STUDY SESSION TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT 72 DETACHED SINGLE-FAMILY AND 41 SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON A 10 ACRE LOT. AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BEING PREPARED TO EVALUATE ALL POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS THAT COULD RESULT FROM THE DEVELOPMENT.

Location: 830 MARINA WAY SOUTH

APN: 560-190-007

Zoning: R&D/BUSINESS; KCSP (KNOX-CUTTING BOULEVARD SPECIFIC PLAN)

Owner: STEPHENS & STEPHENS XII LLC

Applicant: THE RIDING COMPANY

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **PROVIDE STAFF DIRECTION**

Ms. Whales said the item will be discussed under a study session, given the fact that staff does not have the environmental documentation complete at this time. She wanted to present the item to the Board because any changes in design might affect the environmental review.

She described the project as a 10-acre site, relatively flat and as proposed will consist of 72 single family units and 41 attached duet units, which she described. Three ordinances govern the site; the General Plan which currently has the land use designation for residential mixed use. Staff is encouraging proposals that are currently all residential and not commercial, so as to encourage more housing in the Marina Bay area. It is also governed by the Knox-Cutting Specific Plan which has a designation of Research and Development, Light Industrial. If it were given a similar zoning designation, it would be M-1 which is light industrial. The City's zoning ordinance also governs the property under the Office Flex land use designation. Between these governing ordinances, staff is leaning more towards the General Plan designation which would integrate the City's vision for 2030 build out. Therefore, when looking at the proposal, staff hopes the Board could consider the land use designation of Medium Density to coincide with the General Plan.

Ms. Whales said the architectural style is Spanish Mediterranean, with open space for pocket parks and paseos in front of the dwellings. The property has some physical constraints in that I-580 is currently in front of the site and a railroad yard is behind the site on 17th and 19th Streets.

Similar sites with these types of constraints include Anchor Cove and Anchorage at Marina Bay where the railroad is adjacent to the property site. There were reasons for sound walls and staff has heard from many businesses in the area that there is a policy which states there cannot be a gated community in Marina Bay. However, this project is not a gated community even though it has perimeter sound walls. There is no gate planned at the entrance or exits from the community.

She said the Board should consider all of the land use policies in the General Plan having to do with housing types so as to mix the project with higher density. The site lends itself to many variations and the applicant has been agreeable with staff. A DRB subcommittee meeting was held during the early stages of the project and at that time, the theme of Spanish Mediterranean was suggested and implemented. According to state law, the City's zoning ordinance should match its General Plan; however, the City is currently updating this document. Therefore, there is a grey area because staff is still working on it. Staff is leaning more towards a best-fit zone and discussions thus far with the developer is to proceed with a planned area district, where the applicant would have the option for exemptions from the Knox-Cutting plan and zoning ordinance for lot sizes and other development guidelines. She also noted that some ordinances do not allow single family residential; however, since duets have attached walls, staff is looking at those being at a higher density even though it is still a single family dwelling. Even though this will depend on how the homeowner association is set up to determine how these are viewed.

Ms. Whales said Director Mitchell also wanted her to suggest his preference for live/work on the site. There is currently a proposal of live/work under construction which is Artisan Cove at 901 Marina Way South.

Ms. Whales presented sketches by Boardmember Woldemar which showed different paths coming off of Wright Avenue to illustrate how this site can be integrated with high density. There are also photographs of Spanish Mediterranean high density dwellings in other communities with similar physical constraints. In sum, staff would welcome the Board's comments regarding the design of this project. She introduced the applicant, Ken Riding, of Riding Associates and he will introduce the rest of his team attending this meeting tonight.

Boardmember Whitty said the project is going to be a PA and asked if it is a conditionally permitted PA or will it be rezoned to a PA, and Ms. Whales said the City is going to rezone it to a PA so it will not be a conditional use.

Boardmember Whitty asked if there is a height limit on medium density. Ms. Whales stated the limit is 75 feet because staff will use development standards from the General Plan and the project is planned for roof heights up to 35 feet.

Boardmember Whitty asked if there was a limit on retail under medium density mixed use. Ms. Whales said staff is encouraging retail on the site because it is allowed; however, it is very difficult to do because of the physical constraints. She said while staff is working on the current update of the zoning ordinance, they are trying to find the best fit zone for this site because they do not want to discourage any development within the City.

Boardmember Whitty asked if this is a LEED project. Ms. Whales said it will be designed to meet Cal GREEN standards, which all new construction must comply with per State legislation. Ms. Whales then briefly discussed PA zoning and regulations controlling development under a planned area districts.

Ken Riding, President of the Riding Company, applicant, gave a brief background on his experience developing property as the former President of A.M. Homes. He introduced part of his team; Colin Nu from Robert Heidi Architects; Jason Neri from CBG Engineers; Melissa

Wellman from Van Dorn Abed Landscape Architects; Will Burns from David J. Powers who is represents the firm that is preparing the environmental study; and Nick Stevens, representing the property owner, as Mr. Riding does not yet own the land.

Mr. Riding said when they first enter into an agreement with property owners, they go through due diligence. The environmental study revealed some gas from a tank and arsenic, which will be cleaned up during the grading process. They conducted geotechnical work, received estimates for demolition work, and learned they must have a 12 foot wall on the south border of the property similar to what Pulte Homes had done for the railroad noise. They will have to construct an 8 foot wall along Wright Avenue, and they will try to take any negative aspects of the project and make them positive. He said they need to know whether there is a market for certain types of homes, determine pricing and put together pricing to make it work. He has worked with and hired a firm called Applied Research who have been accurate in their socio-economic planning and forecasting, which he briefly discussed.

Mr. Riding said they arrived at two product lines. Product 1 is the duet line and noted there are 15 duet buildings and 30 units, and another 11 units that are detached, which are a little higher in price. There will be other differences such as square footages. They start at 1,405 square feet and go up to 1,595 square feet in product one, not including garages. The least expensive housing they can build today is the single family detached home which he briefly explained and this will allow them to have some differentiation in pricing. They believe they can be successful in pricing these homes at between \$75-\$90/square feet including the garage.

Product 2 is all single family detached on small lots which start at 1,605 square feet up to 1,850, plus they can go to a 4-bedroom unit at about 1,929 square feet. They believe these can be brought in at prices that start around \$370,000 to about \$430,000. These are nice homes with high quality finishes and nice landscaping. If they go to all townhomes, the price will increase about 15% to 25% per unit. If they go to 3 and 4 stories stacked units, these will get up to about \$130/square feet and they will be smaller units. If they go to a podium, this will increase it about \$30,000 for every car parked. These will be in the \$150/square feet and a lot of the materials will have to be craned up. He said he built a San Francisco building which cost about \$400/square feet because of piling work. This is why they have chosen the product they have selected. He described the configuration of the plan, discussed the paseo's, front doors on the street, the project's entrance and exits, and he asked for comments or questions of the Board. He asked that the Board be frank in its comments about the design, noting that the application was filed in July and at that time, the DRB was looking for a lot of specificity and this is why he requested a study session.

Chair Fetter said he was surprised as to how much work was done prior to it coming before the Board. The DRB subcommittee had an in depth discussion the previous time it was reviewed and were clear about what they felt were important elements for making this work in the General Plan but not the current zoning. He thinks the sound wall is a bit tricky, but residents might like being separated from the freeway. He said he has the same concerns during the last DRB meeting, and asked what the ratio of duets and single family homes was previously. Mr. Riding said he did not believe it has changed significantly. Chair Fetter said the layout of buildings and the tightness is a challenge and the Board was having trouble with how it is arranged and the density as compared to the acreage.

Chair Fetter apologized for Boardmember Woldemar not being able to attend the meeting, but he said additionally, between him and Boardmember Woldemar, the elevation difference at the corner of Wright and Harbour Way between the developable space and street made for an interesting condition. If they had some commercial at that corner, there could be parking underneath the space, and he could provide amenities for the area. This is something the General Plan recommends especially for residential projects within commercial corridors. The

City is not accommodating needs of residential if there is not a mix of density level and a few amenities, along with one or more parks.

Mr. Riding said after the meeting, he spoke with several real estate brokers relative to retail on the site and they chuckled. There is not enough demand for it and noted that there is no one ever at the Burger King on Cutting Boulevard. He felt they were better off going across the street with retail, as there is a 5 foot elevation difference on that corner. He was not sure how cars would get in. He disclosed that if this is something the City wants, the Riding Company cannot do this.

Boardmember Whitty questioned the ability to develop live/work units. Mr. Riding said live/work is taken care of down the street and he would not develop this either, as he has never seen it work. He noted there are many live/work units along Delancey Street in San Francisco but no one works in the units. It is a nice planning concept, but he has never seen it truly work.

Chair Fetter said Burger King actually does a lot of business, as Sims Metal and other businesses patronize the restaurant. He said he can see that a lot of work has been done with the plans, but he is not seeing some of the major aspects discussed. Mr. Riding said they looked at alternatives, but he cannot build retail on the corner because it does not work.

Chair Fetter said he was not trying to tie the project to retail specifically, but is advocating for higher density on the corner. He presented a sketch which addresses the corner as a higher traffic area, and his sketch presents higher density by the corner and then moving back to lower density. This is something the Board has been dealing with on the form based code and design guidelines for the City. Mr. Riding said he understands the planning concept, but he looked at CVS which appears to be doing okay. He talked to the owner of Pascal's about how they are doing and when he learned they were proposing the number of units, he was happy and said there is not enough business where they are and they are even located within a shopping center right off the freeway. There is not yet a grocery store there, and if there was a demand for one, it would be there.

Boardmember Whitty suggested moving on to the design and suggested not discussing retail. She noted there is only one park and she would like to see more green space. She feels like the balancing of park amenities should be spread equally, and she pointed to a particular area on the plan where more green space was needed. The roof system is unbelievably complex and expensive, whereas a simpler roof design could be done and the money saved could go elsewhere in the plan, such as the park. She asked that the entrances along the paseo into the homes need to be more defined. She clarified that it should be something like a low wall or overhang. She said it seems to her that the loop road is a waste of vegetation and parkland, and Mr. Riding said this is the setback for the train whistle based on the noise study, and he agrees, as they lost about 11 houses here. The requirement is that they must be 100 feet from the centerline of the tracks at the first house. She asked if trees or a berm could be planted in this area.

Boardmember Whitty then referred to the Mediterranean style and she does not see any reference to water. Mr. Riding said it is Mediterranean because of the stucco which is the most maintenance-free, long-term application for siding, given the dampness and fog. She said the site is built densely, the buildings are dense and she commented that it is just has a very heavy feeling. She asked and confirmed there would not need to be an underground fan or pump system.

Boardmember Robin Welter reiterated that the layout could be much better to help break up things. She said if there is a 28 wide aisle and a 2 foot story house going east/west, it will be in shadows most of the day. This gives a more closed in compact feeling for residents.

Boardmember Woldemar had a good idea of pulling a main street through the middle and adding more open space. She clarified with Mr. Riding that 2.272 people would live in the homes. Boardmember Robin Welter said knowing Richmond, there will be 4-6 people at least living in each house. Kids will want to ride their bikes on the street and have much more open space. Mothers need a corner grocery store as well without going all the way to Safeway. Mr. Riding said if there is no one to operate the building it will simply sit there.

Boardmember Robin Welter said she thinks more open space and parks are needed. She does not mind the sound wall, but she suggested making it more of a green or usable space for people to use. She does not mind the loop road, and asked if a smaller loop could be done and a larger main road. She asked if they could be shrunk down to 24 or 27 feet. Mr. Riding said they must have parking on the roads as well as fire trucks, and they must also have guests parking spaces. They have 33 guests parking, and Boardmember Robin Welter pointed out that only 23 guest parking spaces are needed. She questioned C3 requirements, and was not sure if there is enough room for the bio swales. She asked if there is a tree alternative where water goes into the tree wells.

Jason Neri, CBG Engineers, said these Filterra or rain garden concepts are no longer supported by the Board. Boardmember Robin Welter suggested moving away from the impervious concrete because it will not be maintained enough to work and then there will be another runoff situation. Mr. Neri said they are seeing more of this in the south bay and it works well, and the HOA CC&CR's requires maintenance which could be implemented. One challenge of C3 is use of other materials and not everything can go through bio retention and other solutions must be implemented that integrate both bio retention and impervious surfaces, which is expensive.

Boardmember Robin Welter said the area is very flat and asked if they would have to deal with Bay mud. Mr. Riding said going down lower there is a 5 foot flat of mud about 3-4 feet thick. They have soil on site underneath the building that will be spread all around and it will raise the site by 2 feet. He said they will not have to cap anything and will dig it out and haul it away. He noted there is gasoline spills and arsenic used to kill weeds on the old railroad spur.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked and confirmed that the Negative Declaration is being done and he said there are no critical species identified.

Chair Fetter referred to trash collection and he said he did not see how this is handled, as well as hiding the trash containers and location of bins for pickup. Mr. Riding said residents must tote the cans to the street. Chair Fetter said if this is done, there will be no guest parking. Mr. Riding said he does not think it will take up that much space. Within each unit, there is a space for two bins and they would expect they will have to be taken out to the street. With such tight arrangements, this may become an issue. He suggested having a will serve letter from the trash company to ensure service is arranged.

Boardmember Ray Welter said he thinks the Spanish Mediterranean is fine. Some of the duplex elevations could use help as far as addressing large, blank walls above the garage, but his biggest concern is the site which is so static. He said with alleyways and paseos there will be valleys of houses. He suggested putting some bends and moving the houses around a bit. He asked that this feel more like a village. In plan-wise, it looks like military housing, and he just thinks the site needs help and more green space or something to make it look non-grid like. He asked to massage the houses a bit, get them off the grid and turn them a bit. They could still retain the serviceable paseos and alleys, but he asked to play with the house pads, as everything is on a 90 degree grid.

Boardmember Whitty noted on Wright, there is a secondary entry. She asked Mr. Riding to consider moving it back away from Marina Way a couple of quads towards the east. Mr. Neri

said another constraint is the street grid patterns that are already out there. He noted the secondary entry is narrower and they tried to reduce that down. Boardmember Robin Welter asked if there were any issues by coming out on 17th Street, even if they move the main street to the middle, keep Wright where it is and pull one off of 17th. Mr. Riding said the loop street was a request by the Planning Director, and Boardmember Whitty said loop streets are very 1970's and it does not necessarily have to be used. Mr. Riding said 17th Street is really a half street. The buildings are built to the centerline of the old street and there is only half a street left now. At the present time, it has a chain link gate with multiple padlocks so each of the neighbors have access to get back there.

Boardmember Whitty questioned and confirmed there is a spur that comes in off closer to 17th Street. There is an area off Meeker Avenue that is owned by the City of Richmond. Mr. Riding said they have held discussions about acquiring it and abandoning it, and in exchange, they would fill in the open ditch. Nobody is doing any abatement on this ditch and there are mosquitos in it. This is part of their proposal. The City can extend Meeker Avenue down so there is access for 17th Street because currently there is no access to 17th Street.

Chair Fetter asked if any part of 17th Street is a right-of-way. Mr. Riding said yes, it is a right-of-way and Mr. Neri said whenever they need access to it, they contact the residents and they unlock the gate to an overgrown area. Boardmember Whitty said the plans show two buildings in that area and Mr. Riding said these are right up against the right-of-way, which was the old centerline of the street. The original map going back to 1927 shows this. Boardmember Ray Welter confirmed that 17th Street is half the width it used to be or about 20 feet wide and not enough for two lanes.

Mr. Neri noted that the loop street on the south side is functioning as both their buffer and setback from the railroad. In addition, there are existing utilities that run down Meeker from the east and head westerly. There is storm drain line running along the south property line, so as it comes from 19th Street it runs westerly. There is a ditch and City storm drain line that runs along the southerly boundary. Mr. Riding said their idea is to connect all of this and coupling the road with utilities that have to be there provides better access, maintenance responsibilities, and having the road on the south side is another driving factor for utilities and storm drain line. It is a complicated edge and they also need circulation for the development, so putting the road there makes sense. Mr. Riding said they met with City engineering department and discussed how they would like to see all the storm drains function. They would like to get rid of the ditch and pick up the water.

Boardmember Robin Welter said they could also put an alleyway there that could serve the same purpose and flip the loop road to the middle. Mr. Riding said they could do this while keeping all utilities, but they could also put this as open space, but the road must still go somewhere. He recognized this would break up the area and said they would need a 15 foot easement and access to the storm drain. Boardmember Robin Welter said this could become a bike/pedestrian access lane and the Board simply wants to break off the trunk so the housing is not so military-housing-like.

Melissa Wellman, Van Dorn Abed Landscape, said they are providing a pedestrian connection and it is wider between homes where there is room for seating and benches, plantings and a shade tree. She said residents can walk through here and access the park, even though they are a distance. They do not have to go out on the street to get to the park and it is especially good for kids to ride their bikes. They might be able to expand the paving more. Boardmember Robin Welter stated what is needed is simply more park and open space area.

Mr. Neri said the area is only 800 feet in length across the right Marina frontage. The park is at the corner, so the residual distance to the east is about 500-600 feet. It is not very far away from

the park area to the other side. He was not sure neighborhoods have parks every 300 feet. Boardmember Robin Welter suggested a tot lot might be nice which could be an added amenity. Ms. Wellman said it is also nice that people have a private yard. Mr. Riding said they will review a secondary park, but he noted this will not be easy.

Boardmember Whitty asked and confirmed that there is an open walkway which runs through the central corridor from the park. It does not go all the way but goes between the 59 and 94 lots. Then one can go up or down on that paseo.

Boardmember Whitty encouraged people to get out and walk around and have something to look at rather than the same thing. Ms. Wellman said she thinks it is a nice alternative to have a pathway which is accessible, which will be nice for the homes. When going further, it becomes the rear yards to the homes, so this is still green space in the entire central corridor.

Chair Fetter asked why the pathway does not go all the way down to lot 71 or down to the end. Ms. Wellman said they were studying this, and Mr. Riding said it is because of the railroad setback. Mr. Neri noted that this information is on Sheet TM.2.

Owner Nick Stevens said about 6 years ago, the property was robbed of all metal inside and it has been very tough trying to find the interest. They have had to change brokers a couple of times. The current building on it is simply wood. They looked to industrial condo spaces, and this is the first thing they have seen interest in. From a property management standpoint, he deals with graffiti, weeds, and this is the first thing that has shown interest and it is an exciting process.

Mr. Riding said they will consider all comments and some they will be able to do and some not. He reiterated that they will not be able to do retail on the site. He said he met with some of the neighborhood councils out there and he had zero opposition for the development. He thinks what they have put together is a very good project from what he has seen in Richmond. He agreed it could be better and they will look at all comments.

Ms. Whales thanked the Board and Mr. Riding and his team, and noted that the minutes will be available for review in a couple of weeks.

- Board Business**
- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements – None.
 - B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned at 9:40 p.m. to the next meeting on November 13, 2013.