

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
May 14, 2014
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Brant Fetter, Chair
Robin Welter
Eileen Whitty

Brenda Munoz, Vice Chair
Ray Welter
Mike Woldemar

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

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Boardmember Ray Welter

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Kieron Slaughter, Hector Lopez, and Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Boardmember Woldemar requested the Board move up items 4 and 5 because of the need for Jonelyn Whales to leave early.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to approve the agenda, as amended to move items 4 and 5 up on the agenda; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Ray Welter).

City Council Liaison Report - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Fetter noted there are five items on the Consent Calendar. He asked if Boardmembers wished to remove an item from Consent. Boardmember Woldemar noted that on Item 5, he had seen this project several weeks ago from the point of view as to whether or not the Board should consider it as a subcommittee item. Most comments he made are now reflected in the drawings this evening and staff discussed the changes, which he presumed are agreeable to the applicant. He suggested keeping Items 4 and 5 on the Consent Calendar, but asked that items 1, 2 and 3 be removed from the Consent Calendar.

Chair Fetter announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Tuesday, May 27, 2014 by 5:00 p.m.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve Consent Calendar Items 4 and 5; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Ray Welter).

Items Approved on the Consent Calendar:

Public Hearing(s)

- CC 4. PLN14-077 MORTEZA SECOND DWELLING UNIT IN REAR**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±640 SQUARE FOOT SECOND DWELLING UNIT IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
Location 969 MCLAUGHLIN STREET
APN 523-021-004
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
Applicant KERAMATI MORTEZA & SINIAN X (OWNER)
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**
- CC 5. PLN14-083 BEERYHILL WAREHOUSE ADDITION**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±68,300 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING 4,470 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE IN THE REAR OF THE BUILDING.
Location 2600 GOODRICK AVENUE
APN 408-082-006
Zoning M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT)
Owner SCANNELL PROPERTIES
Applicant TODD BERRYHILL, SCANNELL PROPERTIES
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

- CC 1. PLN14-068 HILLTOP DRIVE PAVILION**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,800 SQUARE FOOT PICNIC PAVILION STRUCTURE.
Location 4351 HILLTOP DRIVE
APN 426-330-006
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner CHURCH OF LATTER DAY SAINTS
Applicant KYLE HARRIS
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave a brief staff report and description of the request for a design review permit.

Boardmember Whitty stated the pavilion will be used with outdoor music for parties and weddings, noting that it is next to a residential area. She asked if the applicant considered moving it to the east corner instead of on the west corner. Mr. Lopez stated the applicant will follow the noise ordinance and does not wish to locate it to the east side.

Boardmember Whitty asked if the parking lot is used for parties, and Mr. Lopez suggested asking the applicant. She asked if there was a plan that showed a straight on view of the overall

plan. Mr. Lopez said staff has provided a photograph as an example of the actual building which is only 14 feet high and far away from the front property line.

Chair Fetter asked and confirmed with Mr. Lopez that there was no requirements landscaping in the request and there is a fence at the end of the parking lot.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Condition No. 2 which addresses amplified music and confirmed the limit was 60 dBA during the day and 50 dBA at night which is contained in the zoning ordinance.

Chair Fetter called upon the applicant.

Kyle Harris, Architect/Applicant, referred to the plan showing the proposed pavilion location, stating it is away from the church, close to the existing storage facility and trash receptacle location. He said the area was master planned 15 years ago when the building was constructed specifically for this type of facility. They have access to electricity and water and they have done hundreds of these types of buildings. Small compact lights are placed high in the rafters so as not to spill out onto the area. He said very rarely will they have amplified music and events will be more like scouting events, youth group activities, 4th of July picnic which they have had in the past, and he said there have not been any problems with noise or lights.

Boardmember Whitty said it would be nice if there was a designated pathway connecting the pavilion to the church building. Mr. Harris stated there is concrete around the pavilion but no dedicated walkway. There is, however, a hard surface concrete sidewalk that comes from the church, across the parking lot, and uses the handicap curb cut to access the pavilion.

Boardmember Whitty asked and confirmed that Mr. Harris would agree with striping or a walkway so people know it is a walkway access. Boardmember Whitty confirmed that the main back door will be used by people to go from the church to the pavilion. She said there needs to be a connector so as to make it more harmonious, and Mr. Harris said they could stripe the concrete so people would know this is a walkway access to get to the pavilion. Mr. Harris commented that the anticipated use of the pavilion is at most, once a month.

Vice Chair Munoz asked and confirmed that the roof has asphalt composite shingles on the main building. The interior of the pavilion is all naturally finished tongue and groove wood and very attractive.

Boardmember Woldemar said he agrees with the need for a formal connection from the back door of the church to the pavilion and would request it be more than striping. To the west is a residential project which is lower than the finished floor of the pavilion and to the north is the main street leading to the Hilltop housing area which is significantly lower. He is concerned about the light fixtures and his views looking up. He suggested indirect lighting which would provide softening. He said no landscaping is proposed and he thinks when improvements are made, landscaping should be included. While there are existing trees in the northwest corner, there is nothing to the direct west or north. Additionally, the south end of the pavilion needs to be landscaped with trees. He said on the eastern side the pavilion concrete walkway is right up against the curb of the parking which is awkward functionally. He suggested no parking here and instead, providing groundcover and shrubs all the way around the pavilion. He also said he does not see anything having to do with drainage.

Mr. Harris said he agrees they should do something on the northerly and westerly side with landscaping. There are two existing large redwood trees, an oak tree and a grove of poplar trees. He said landscaping and sod could be done here and around the two edges. He is hesitant with putting anything between the pavilion and the parking lot because of the pedestrian traffic flow back and forth. They typically will walk through the bushes and over the grass. Boardmember Woldemar asked if it were lawn and tree wells, people could walk across the lawn to the sidewalk and in. Mr. Harris said there is only 8 feet from the edge of the canopy to the edge of the parking lot. He would think they will not be using those parking stalls for parking but more for dropping people off. He agreed some landscaping could be done on the north and west sides.

Regarding light fixtures, Mr. Harris said they could propose some indirect fixtures. The current fixture is a compact fluorescent; about 9 inches square and fairly small and there is one in every other bay. Chair Fetter noted it is not a lot for such a large area, and Mr. Harris agreed and said they do not want it lit up at night because it is a daylight use facility. They specifically install a photo meter on the light and a time clock and at 10PM power goes off.

Chair Fetter returned to the site plan and asked if there is an issue with having the accessible parking placed at northeastern spots and have this landscaped or have hardscape to connect it. It is still ADA appropriate. Mr. Harris noted it is sloped a bit, and it would simply mean a slightly longer area to haul or drop off things which could be done. Chair Fetter said he does like softer materials and by having a pedestrian permeable landscape is a good thing. A few more trees would be appropriate to buffer it from the roadway and east side.

Boardmember Robin Welter pointed out where she would like to see landscaping and asked to have a couple of more paths so people are not walking over the area. Mr. Harris said moving the handicapped space out would be no problem, but it would then allow more access to the pavilion structure. It was noted that there is currently a security fence that goes across and a gate that closes across the parking lot. The gate is closed most of the time and locked, and it would be easy to have that locked during an activity. They can open up the opposite side gate or walk along the sidewalk.

Boardmember Woldemar said there is no reason the accessible parking space couldn't be along the northern side with straight in path and access. Immediately adjoining it could be another space for loading/unloading. The eastern strip on the side of the building shown as parking could be landscaped with a curb and be protected from auto traffic. He suggested that instead of just striping across there, that there be a raised section of pavement. Mr. Harris noted that if the gate is closed, this eliminates the issue and he pointed out where people would travel. Boardmember Woldemar suggested that pavement material be placed just behind the gate which would provide for a place for people to cross. Mr. Harris said there is no need to protect people there if the gate is closed, but they are supportive of striping but he did not believe it was necessary to have a raised surface.

Boardmember Whitty said whenever there is an 1800 square foot structure being located somewhere it needs to have some sort of softening, connection to the main building, which the applicant has not provided. Mr. Harris said they appreciate this, but their concern is that by adding a raised pathway, they are adding significant cost. Boardmember Woldemar said instead of a raised pathway, he asked the applicant to simply use a different texture or surface that alerts people that something is going on. Mr. Harris also reminded the Board that this is a very limited use area. He said they have three different congregations that meet in the building and typical attendance ranges on Sunday from about 90 people to up to 150 or so. Boardmember

Whitty said the Board's suggestions will make this a more inviting area to hang out, walk back and forth and provide a better connection. Mr. Harris said they planned on landscaping around three sides already to add to the existing landscaping and would agree with striping with paint.

Boardmember Woldemar asked where drainage would be placed. Mr. Harris pointed out where the slab breaks and anything that hits on the westerly half will drain and continue into the existing site drains for the church. The other side will perk off using LID drainage methods; they will roll it off into the planting area and let it perk in.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Mr. Lopez if this was subject to C3 requirements. Mr. Lopez said it is too small, and water will go to a planting area. Boardmember Woldemar voiced concern on the western side because there is a slope. Mr. Lopez noted there is a 30 foot setback there. Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that drainage will be reviewed by the Building Department and require approval.

Chair Fetter suggested the Board discuss conditions that would require removal of some parking spots, possibly moving the ADA parking, add trees and appropriate landscaping.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Munoz) to approve PLN 14-068 with staff's recommended 4 findings, recommended 7 conditions, with the addition of Condition No. 8 that a full and complete landscaping plan be returned to the DRB prior to the issuance of building permits for review and approval. Such landscape plan shall include additional landscaping on all 4 sides of the pavilion and may likely delete the parking spaces on the eastern side of the building; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Ray Welter).

Public Forum - Brown Act

Chair Fetter recognized that he omitted time for public comment, and there were no public speakers.

Mr. Harris commented that in the spirit of this project, this is something that enriches the lives of people and they are appreciative of the opportunity to do something valuable with the patch of dirt. He is confident that the end result will be very pleasing to the eye and productive for human traffic use. He thanked the Board for their time.

Mr. Slaughter asked if Item 3 could be moved up on the agenda, and the Board concurred.

CC 3. PLN14-038 FLORES RESIDENTIAL ADDITION

| | |
|-------------|---|
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±872 SQUARE FOOT, TWO-STORY ADDITION TO THE REAR OF A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE. |
| Location | 821 33RD STREET |
| APN | 524-140-012 |
| Zoning | SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY: LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT) |
| Owner | OSCAR ADRIAN & ERIC ALEXANDER FLORES |
| Applicant | HENRY RULLIER |

Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER
Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and a brief description of the request for a design review permit. He corrected one item in the staff report, stating the existing house is a 2 bedroom/1 bath and not a 3 bedroom/2 bath. The application meets all setbacks, development standards, exceeds the interior yard space requirement, and meets the parking requirement. The project is located in the North and East Neighborhood Council area. Staff received no correspondence from the neighborhood council or any public comments and recommends approval of the project.

Chair Fetter clarified that staff received no correspondence from the public or neighborhood council. Mr. Slaughter called attention to the floor plan on Sheet A.2 and said this is the existing floor plan. Boardmember Whitty noted that on Sheet A.3, the porch is not existing, but new, and Mr. Slaughter confirmed.

Boardmember Woldemar stated he requested removal of the item to remind the Board that one of the reasons they are reviewing this kind of addition has to do with privacy intrusion. He asked to get agreement to change the western window on the upstairs bedroom to match the bathroom window which is tall and high so it does not look down into the backyard of the neighbors. Otherwise, he believed the project was an excellent addition to the house.

Boardmember Whitty commented that all of the vents on the building are different, and she would like them to match. She also stated it was too bad they could not place an upper deck off of the bedroom.

Chair Fetter questioned landscaping, and Boardmember Robin Welter stated they are requesting one new tree in the front yard. Mr. Slaughter stated additional landscaping is not required for an addition.

Chair Fetter called upon the applicant.

Henry Ruly, designer, referred to Condition No. 3 which involves installation of skylights over the stairs, bathroom and closet and said they have three windows on the stairway so there will be plenty of natural light. There is also a window facing the rear and he did not believe there needed to be a skylight there. He said on the second floor walk-in closet also has a window facing to the east and having a skylight there might damage clothes. In the bathroom there are two windows facing the street for plenty of light and another window on the west.

Chair Fetter asked if these were standard conditions, and Mr. Slaughter said these were recommendations by the Board about three meetings ago to generally add skylights and rain water barrels to projects for future projects. Boardmembers commented that the condition would apply as needed and suggested striking the condition.

Boardmember Whitty asked to maintain the added condition to change the western facing window in the bedroom to match the bathroom window of 3'x2'. Mr. Ruly stated they would like to increase the window facing the rear from 5'x4' to 6'x4'. To match that window they would like the same size on the lower floor to match. Chair Fetter did not see a problem with this, and said the bump out on the back should come out slightly more which would enhance the character of the overall structure.

The public hearing was opened, and there were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve PLN14-038 with the staff's 4 recommended findings and the staff's 16 recommended conditions with the following exception: Condition No. 3 shall say: "The applicant shall install an upper western window 3'x2' and a lower western window 6'x4';" All vents on the building shall be the same; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Ray Welter).

CC 2. PLN14-081 JACK IN THE BOX EATING ESTABLISHMENT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,662 SQUARE FOOT EATING ESTABLISHMENT (FAST FOOD).
Location 1100 MACDONALD AVE (RICHMOND SHOPPING CENTER)
APN 540-460-048
Zoning OFFICE/RETAIL and/or URBAN HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
Owner T & T RICHMOND LP
Applicant GREG BORCHARDT C/O PM DESIGN GROUP, INC.
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER
Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Kieron Slaughter noted that the applicant had a last minute conflict and he was not able to attend the meeting; however, the Board has processed applications in the past. He suggested taking up the item unless it needed to be continued by the Board. He then gave a brief staff report on the request for a design review permit, noting that the Burger King downtown had a similar remodel and upgrade. Many restaurants are upgrading to a new theme which has been seen around the region and the proposal matches this. He stated staff added a condition that the walkway be elevated and treated with a unique material which is important for pedestrian circulation. All development standards are met or exceeded, and staff recommends approval. Signage is also proposed, a sample of which was included in the staff report. Staff added another condition for added signage on the east facing wall.

Staff recommended that the applicant meet with the Iron Triangle Neighborhood Council and no correspondence was received and there were no public comments. In conclusion, staff believes the project meets several goals and objectives of the Richmond City Center Specific Plan, as well as the purpose of high intensity use in the General Plan and recommends approval.

Chair Fetter asked how the neighborhood council notification process executed by staff. Mr. Slaughter explained that staff provides the applicant with a contact list of the neighborhood council groups and encourages them to make contact. Most do and some neighborhood councils are not very active. The Iron Triangle is an active group and usually meet at the Nevin Center. While there is no requirement, staff follows a policy that notices the neighborhood council of any projects by sending them the staff report, which is sent 10 days before the meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar commented that agendas are also published in the newspaper and are available on the Internet. Mr. Slaughter noted that most neighborhood councils are silent if they are in agreement with projects.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page DD-4.0, which are colored elevations. Staff said a sign was missing on the eastern elevation. He said the drive-thru is on the interior of the property and not as on the sign program on the exterior, and Mr. Slaughter confirmed which elevation should have another sign on it.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if there was a formalized policy on the quantity of signs on fast food facilities and particularly referenced Barrett and San Pablo Avenue, which were Long John Silver's and KFC which do not have an over-abundance of signage. Mr. Slaughter said there has not been other than what the sign ordinance states. They can have one on every frontage and way-finding signage is encouraged. Boardmember Woldemar said his concern were marquee signs which are poster windows which clutter the building. Mr. Slaughter said staff is addressing this through its signage update. They are lowering the amount of signage covering a window from 25% of any individual window and 10% of the total windows to 5%. Enforcement is based on staff receiving complaints and planning staff are contacted by code enforcement.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet A-4.0, "western elevation", a drive-thru/open sign by the entry arcade structure with an arrow and asked what the sign pointed to. Mr. Slaughter said this was based on the previous orientation and clarified that it pointed people in the direction to where the drive-thru is when in the parking lot driving away from Walgreen's.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to the two ADA parking spaces and asked whether the path in-between should be a 9' path. Boardmember Woldemar noted it should be 8' and Boardmembers questioned the actual scale. Boardmember Robin Welter asked if the 12' radius would work when turning right. Mr. Slaughter said they can flatten this out, given large truck traffic.

Boardmember Whitty referred to circulation and said she cannot determine how one would get from Macdonald Avenue to the drive thru and Mr. Slaughter explained that there are a couple of existing routes and provided an explanation. She clarified that there will be a monument sign 7' from the property line on Macdonald and the "drive-thru" directional, which was outlined on page 2 of 14 and clearly marked.

Mr. Slaughter said the other recommendation he was seeking from the Board is that staff asked that the applicant provide outdoor seating area with a hedge facing east. They were somewhat resistant to this given vandalism and loitering. He noted that other outdoor areas are not used much and he questioned whether the Board was amenable to having the applicant try it out for a year with the option to remove it later. Chair Fetter suggested moving to public comments first and return to the question.

Public Comments:

Amanda Elliott, Executive Director for the Richmond Main Street Initiative, said they are excited to see a new eating establishment coming to the downtown. They are hoping they offer healthier food options given the challenge with fast food restaurants. They are also somewhat concerned with traffic in the shopping center and wants to be sure there is enough space for drivers to flow in and out easily and adequate parking. She also tried to contact the applicant/developer and hoped to have direct contact with them.

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, said he spoke with the manager of Burger King about competition.

Chair Fetter returned to the question regarding outdoor seating and noted there really is no back to the building. Mr. Slaughter said in terms of adjacency to the actual door and being able to see something, they could notch the seating area within the landscaping and route the walkway around. He said there is room in the front of the building for seating. Boardmembers supported the amount of landscaping and species of trees and a seating area.

Boardmember Woldemar recommended continuing the item given the number of items which need to be resolved with the applicant which includes things like:

- The radiuses for turns at the drive-thru;
- The extension of the drive aisle on the western end in front of the trash area, and a suggestion to reduce the length of the drive-thru lane by one car and move the building west 15-20 feet so on the eastern end it can be properly landscaped with an outdoor seating area which would be nice on that corner.
- Colored elevations which reflect multiple colors on the stucco should be reconsidered;
- There are too many signs. While he likes the sign program he thinks the marquis signs detract from the rest of the architecture, did not like the illuminated red band around the three windows and would rather the façade be a continuous glass façade with the stripe in it as represented on the other elevations;
- He agrees with the need for a sign on the service or west end of the building and when the project returns, he would like that all of the orientations are properly depicted.

Chair Fetter asked and confirmed the trash dumpster was covered and Mr. Slaughter noted it is a trellis-like feature to match the drive-thru trellis and there is a condition to add a trellis on the walkway. Chair Fetter asked that this instead be a roof to shade the dumpsters which reduces odors. Boardmember Woldemar suggested moving the dumpster location, which would also serve to extend the parking spaces and Vice Chair Munoz noted there were certain distance restrictions for the garbage company and suggested checking with Public Works. Chair Fetter asked that its relocation be considered.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Whitty) to continue the public hearing for PLN 14-081 for a period of four weeks to the second Board meeting in June; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Ray Welter).

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements – Mr. Slaughter noted he had nothing to report other than he had attempted to Skype an applicant who was from out of the area and the Board supported this idea as a possible solution in the future.
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None

1. Discussion regarding submittal requirements, specifically for large projects.

Boardmember Woldemar requested this item and indicated he emailed a memo regarding complete applications and submittal requirements to Boardmembers and staff. He had expressed frustration over applicants ignoring what is specifically required by the zoning ordinance, by the City's checklist, and called attention to the section that talks about design

review applications. He read requirements from the ordinance and questioned the definition of a smaller scale project, which was not to be found. He would argue that most any project would not fall into this category, so while landscape plans are not required for additions and other projects, it should be removed, but not for all of the other projects. He noted the Pavilion project came forward and was approved but he asked why it did not include a landscape plan. He referred to a 60-unit project where partial landscaping was approved and the Board would not know the detail of that particular landscape plan. Vines were to hang down off of 16' high retaining walls or would grow up and the Board will not know this will be done.

While no decisions will be made, he suggested staff hear from Boardmembers on their comments regarding submittal requirements. Chair Fetter suggested sending a directive on what the definition is of what small and large is.

Assistant City Attorney Atencio noted that the item is not an action item and therefore no action could be taken. Boardmember Woldemar simply asked that a checkbox be added to acknowledge the existence of proper submittal requirements.

Regarding submittal materials, Boardmember Woldemar said the reason the Board looks for detail is so they know what will be built exactly and for staff to verify what is included in approvals for processing. If there are items too onerous like photometric plans or simulations, he suggested changing the submittal requirements, but he believes this would require an ordinance amendment. He suggested making reference to a policy that goes to the checklist, which provides more flexibility in terms of future changes.

Mr. Atencio said he thinks this would entail recommendations and reasons to be forwarded to the Planning Director of what the Board envisions for changes to the zoning code. Boardmember Woldemar suggested the code refer to the checklist which can be updated. While he does not disagree there should be waivers or exceptions given the need, he would like to know about this information ahead of the meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar also noted that large projects have a specific design review fee whether it is an 11-unit project or 60-unit project. Additional fees feed into it with the trigger of environmental review. He strongly supported that when it comes time to review the fee schedule, the planning department consider proposing hourly rates for larger projects.

Lastly, Boardmember Woldemar said the ordinance specifically says that a project that has not yet been deemed complete by the planning department will not be processed. He asked staff to ensure the project is deemed complete prior to it coming to the Board.

Boardmember Whitty suggested staff include a paragraph about projects not having certain requirements such as landscaping plans. Chair Fetter reiterated that the Board is having difficulty in accomplishing their mission because staff at times deems requirements as not important, yet the Board is the decision-making body. He said he would rather improve the process and get results rather than having extra paperwork stating something did or did not happen.

Chair Fetter stated there are some jurisdictions, and not Richmond, where the planning staff has gotten into an interesting position where a non-complete application is essentially their methodology of gate-keeping and they will block it and indicate it is incomplete repeatedly which infuriates the taxpayers and applicants. He again reiterated the need to dispose of any bureaucracy. Mr. Slaughter said the only two things that may not be as heavily weighed is landscaping, which the applicant can remove and replace without a building permit with

something else, as well as paint colors. Boardmember Woldemar referred to the related topic of landscape bonds and said nothing has happened.

Boardmember Woldemar read into the record the list of requirements for detailed landscape plans, voiced the need for attention to detail for both small and large projects and commented that it is difficult to read legends, quantities, species and sizes of plants.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested the Chair assign each Boardmember to prepare a one-page position statement which would be reviewed and discussed for consensus at a future meeting.

Chair Fetter took a straw poll of Boardmembers and confirmed that the following items should be addressed: Additional supplemental requirements, the complete application and submittal materials, and clarification on what a small and large project is.

Mr. Atencio suggested re-agendizing the item in a similar manner where the Planning Director can hear comments which would be more efficient as to what recommendations the Board wishes to make. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the Board is due to hold a retreat with planning staff to talk through these items, and the Board concurred and voiced their support.

Chair Fetter asked that as a start, Boardmembers individually consider adjustments desired and that for each Boardmember to email Hector Lopez prior to the next meeting. Mr. Slaughter also suggested having designers and architects comment on their experiences and provide feedback. Staff will then coordinate a meeting to discuss the comments received and issues.

2. Update on progress of proposed policy resolution to require that “all projects funded by the City that affect the visual environment shall be brought before the Design Review Board for review and approval.”

Boardmember Woldemar stated he spoke with Ms. Whales who could not attend and asked that it be agendized for the next meeting. He noted it has been about 5 months since the Board raised the issue and Ms. Whales indicated to him that she ultimately intends to have the City Council adopt the resolution and that other City departments become apprised of the policy resolution upon its adoption.

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned at 8:45 p.m. to the next meeting on May 28, 2014.