

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

July 8, 2015
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Brant Fetter
Ray Welter

Brenda Munoz, Vice Chair
Jonathan Livingston
Mike Woldemar

Chair Whitty called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Vice Chair Brenda Munoz, Boardmembers Brant Fetter (arrived late), Jonathan Livingston and Ray Welter

Absent: Boardmember Mike Woldemar

Staff Present: David Brosky, Jonelyn Whales and Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Whitty requested Item 5 to be heard first.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Welter) to approve the agenda as amended to hear Item 5 first; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Livingston, Munoz, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Woldemar.

Public Forum – Brown Act - None

City Council Liaison Report - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty stated Items 1, 2, 3 and 4 are items on the Consent Calendar. She said Item 3 has been requested to be continued to the next meeting by the applicant so this item will remain on the Consent Calendar.

She asked if Boardmembers or the public wished to remove any items from the Consent Calendar. Members of the public requested removal of Items 1, 2 and 4.

Noted Present:

Boardmember Fetter arrived at 6:05 p.m.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Fetter/Livingston) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Item 3; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Livingston, Munoz, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Woldemar).

Chair Whitty announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, July 20, 2015 by 5:00 p.m.

Item Approved on the Consent Calendar:

3. PLN15-283 AHMED 2ND UNIT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND DWELLING UNIT OF APPROXIMATELY ±640 SQUARE FEET IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE.

Location 335 39TH STREET

APN 517-202-005

Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL)

Applicant AHMED A. AHMED (OWNER)

Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **HOLD OVER to July 22, 2015**

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

Public Hearings:

5. PLN14-119 ATLAS ROAD INDUSTRIAL BUILDING

Descriptions PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR A NEW ±772,000 SF INDUSTRIAL BUILDING ON THE FORMER STEELSCAPE BUILDING SITE; AND A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE PROJECT.

Location 2995 ATLAS RD

APN 405-590-004

Zoning M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT)

Owner LDK VENTURES

Applicant ALAN HERSH, LDK VENTURES

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **ADOPT an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Conditionally Approve a Design Review Permit**

Chair Whitty reported that a subcommittee meeting was held on May 6th consisting of the applicant and Boardmembers Brenda Munoz and Mike Woldemar, with Jonathan Livingston submitting comments. Tonight the Board is being asked to adopt an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and conditionally approve a design review permit for the project. She noted that the Board received information regarding the trail at the back of the project and asked for a staff report.

Jonelyn Whales gave the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal. She said before the Commission is an LED sheet, landscape plans, LEED scoring sheet, a copy of the conditions of approval modifications for Conditions No. 13 and 14.

Chair Whitty suggested a tower of some kind to see out over the parking to the Bay. She thinks it would be a perfect area for a break room. Ms. Whales said office space is toward the front of

the building, and the applicant can discuss this. She also noted that Boardmember Woldemar submitted comments.

Chair Whitty referred to CEQA determination and said 8 comments were received from various community groups and agencies and she confirmed they were responded to in the Response to Comments document.

Boardmember Livingston stated there was no correlation between that and things in the plans, specifically how certain areas are considered future employee areas. He asked if this is something the subcommittee discussed with them, and he clarified that these items will be undertaken at a later date. Ms. Whales said currently the project is a spec building with no tenants. They will be designing the building according to the tenant's plans and the applicant can comment on this.

Chair Whitty called on the applicant to make a presentation.

Alan Hersh, LDK Ventures, introduced Mike Mallone, civil engineer and Paul Norcross and Jim Cherry who are the architects on the project. He spoke about their work on the site with the City for over a year and said the former facility was a contaminated site. Their company has expertise in Brownfield Superfund site cleanup as well as development. He has reviewed all of the conditions and they agree with all of them. They worked with EBRPD with on-site meetings, held a few meetings with TRAC and City representatives and agreed to everything TRAC wanted. He explained that they are building them the trail section, which he briefly described and this is shown as an exhibit in the mitigated negative declaration as well as a condition that references it.

A subcommittee meeting was held with boardmembers and City representatives and they made several significant changes based on that meeting which are included in the packet. He described the adjacent buildings and said the main thing that can be seen is their entrance off of Atlas Road. One of the subsequent questions had to do with the color band on the top and he said they took the vertical elements and tied it into the horizontal elements on the top. He noted that the entire building will never be able to be seen and he thinks they have continuity in the look at each angle, which he briefly explained. Mr. Hersh said he was available to answer any questions and said he has enjoyed working with City staff.

Boardmember Fetter commented that the building is huge and he questioned what the building's vast roof is going to look like from neighbors. He also asked if the applicant will install solar. Mr. Hersh said they designed the roof to accommodate the solar load of the panels, and depending on what the tenants do inside, they anticipate they will install solar panels, given that much roof space. He confirmed the roof material will be white Energy Star EPDM and the roof framing plan is contained within the packet. Mr. Mallone noted that particularly in a building of this size, the warehouse is not conditioned and there is very little or nothing in terms of mechanical equipment on the roof. It would be over the office areas which are typically in a front quadrant.

Chair Whitty asked and confirmed the equipment height is approximately 4-5 feet.

Boardmember Fetter said the building is very huge and he questioned views of the building. Mr. Hersh said they coordinated with neighbors and adjacent businesses to make sure they were comfortable with it. He presented a display of what can be seen from Atlas Road and said there are slopes coming off of Atlas Road and behind them. The other will be on the trail itself where the building can be viewed.

Boardmember Fetter asked about landscaping around the trail, and Mr. Hersh said EBRPD will maintain the landscaping which will be natural and their building's landscaping will be drought-tolerant. Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed that Sheet 8.3 includes the fence detail and it is a black vinyl coated chain link fence and is also in the conditions of approval.

He then referred to future conditions and said his only concern about a shell and TI building is the mechanism by which the applicant makes sure that all of the things the applicants promised make the facilities better for employees which in turn make it a better facility for the community. Mr. Hersh said this came up in their community meeting and they specifically wanted to show the employee break rooms, some of the shading coming off of the entrances and accents to the building, and make sure the walking is safe. He said they will have to go through the building permit and staff will look at the conditions to ensure they deliver those items in the approval.

Boardmember Fetter said he wants to make sure that all conditions and agreements are met, and Ms. Whales stated there is a MMRP that spells out conditions and she is sure all requirements will be met.

Boardmember Livingston asked if a tenant needs rooftop mechanical with screening, he suggested submitting a boilerplate sheet that gets approved of what it may look like. Boardmember Fetter said they are separate permits because the current design does not provide rooftop screening for mechanical equipment given they do not yet need it.

Chair Whitty said the Board can condition that if rooftop mechanical equipment in the future is installed, it will be screened. Boardmembers and staff noted this is part of the code normally.

Boardmember Livingston recognized that the building is huge, and what he looked understated was the arrival to the building. The windows are west facing and he suggested taking the steel awning over the entry and raising it up to cover the glass. Below, he suggested continuing the awning across all of the windows to provide shade and also to help the way it looks. Mr. Hersh said at the meeting there was a lot of discussion about where the awning is and he was not sure he supported the request.

Paul Norcross, architect said they can take a look at this, but said raising the canopy poses some structural work to support it. He said there are columns and a tube that are supporting the upper part of the glass, and he confirmed with Boardmember Livingston that they can look at moving it up one level so it is not the same as the other awning so there is a hierarchy.

Boardmembers supported all suggestions.

Chair Whitty asked about the location of bike parking. Mr. Norcross explained that there are a number of bike parking spaces outside of the main entrance that are provided for the public, but when it comes to the actual employees, then they would provide secured parking inside the building that is covered as part of the tenant improvement plan and Cal Green codes.

Mike Reeves, EBRPD, said he is here to acknowledge what the applicant has done as a commitment to incorporate construction of about one-half mile of new Bay Trail into their project which will go a long way towards closing the gap and help extend the Bay Trail from their planned new entrance to Pt. Pinole Regional Shoreline at Atlas Road north and east along the shoreline. He is grateful for the cooperation of the group and said in the last 24 hours, they have worked on amending language for Condition No. 14 which speaks to the construction of the trail and design specifications.

Boardmember Livingston asked if there is any wisdom in trying to coordinate what EBRPD wants in landscaping and what the applicant is proposing so there is a seamless blend. Mr. Reeves said in terms of the 1200 miles of regional trails connecting various parks, most of that goes through areas that are natural in their setting. They do not tend to go towards a lot of landscaped areas around the trails so it makes it easier to maintain. For everything at the trail and the outboard side, they would promote use of native vegetation. He said there is a bit of a drop-off in some places where there is drainage and they would want to make sure that is stabilized through appropriate plantings that go into the design of the trail, but there is not much in the way of landscaping their trails.

Boardmember Fetter asked if the trail connects at both ends and he asked about the status of the construction of the bridge. Mr. Reeves said they should be going to contract for that shortly, but he is not sure of the timeline. Final easements are being secured with the railroad and he thinks the RFP will go out shortly for the contract. This would involve construction of the new bridge over the railroad tracks and a new main entrance into the park. The trail segment would connect with that. To the north and east on the other end, they do not have anything currently, although they hold a floating trail easement in that it covers the balance of the business park there. As each portion of the business park comes up for a development proposal, this is the opportunity to take that easement and transfer it into a meets and bounds easement alignment. This would connect them to the north and east end of the business park.

Boardmember Fetter asked if the trail connects. Mr. Reeves said no, it will be a dead end at this time at the property line. The balance of the business park will be owned by PPP, Inc. and they are talking to them about their disposition plans for the balance of the park, and in the long-term they expect to connect to that.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

Art Rintella, Richmond, said he was raised in Richmond and is on the Fairmede-Hilltop Neighborhood Council and he thinks this is a great project. He was hoping they could get both sides to commit to using local labor because there are many skilled people in their community that are out of work and could really use work. He said many workers must drive to San Jose where there are jobs and this project could provide local jobs.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Whitty said Condition No. 14 has been replaced with revised wording, and Condition No. 13 is amended to remove "jointly". Also, they want to be sure the entrance awning is raised up one or two spandrels, and awnings over adjacent single floor windows.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Fetter/Whitty) to approve PLN14-119 including the staff findings 1 through 4 and staff recommendations 1 through 22, as amended as stated and with the additional condition that the awning at the entry be raised one or two spandrels and that an awning be placed of a similar type over the one single story glazing at the west side and preferably for the south side also; and to adopt an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None.

1. PLN15-074 MUSSI ARTWORKS FOUNDRY NEW INDUSTRIAL METAL BUILDING

Description **(HELD OVER FROM 06/24/2015)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±3,200 SQUARE FOOT INDUSTRIAL METAL BUILDING AT THE ARTWORKS FOUNDRY.

Location 4925 SEAPORT AVE
APN 560-032-021
Zoning M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT)
Owner MUSSI PIETRO & ROSILENE TRE
Applicant CHRIS MARRS
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Ms. Whales stated the item was before the Board in the past and the applicant was unable to attend at that time and the item was not heard. She described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal. She noted there are comments from Boardmember Woldemar regarding his request for more landscaping on the site of the bulb out and the applicant can address that.

Boardmember Fetter asked if drawings are accepted without identification of who they were drawn by. Ms. Whales said she has been working with the applicant to get them further along in the process and tried to integrate many of Boardmember Livingston's concerns into the drawings which he can elaborate on.

Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed that staff discussed comments from the last meeting and can address them tonight.

Chair Whitty opened the public hearing and asked Boardmember Livingston to voice his comments.

Boardmember Livingston thanked the applicant for moving the building. The reason he had an issue with the building was the fact that the adjacent neighbors to the north side and adjacent on either property corners, when they applied for building permits and approvals, had to plant and do certain things. When Mr. Marris made his application, he was not in conformance to what is on the street. He returned and was amenable to moving the building back but drawings were not submitted with much detail. He took the liberty of drawing a landscape plan and tweaked it a bit.

Chris Marris, applicant, said he has no issue with the landscaping; however, they already planted inside their fence line. Boardmember Livingston pointed out the problem that there is a power pole and guy wire in the street so they cannot go straight out. Also, there is roof drainage and no way identified to address water going into a bio swale for C3 requirements. He asked if he would be amenable to having a civil engineer design the drainage system with the two C3 ditches, and this can be worked out with staff. He said also the oak trees are standard and concrete alignment where the curb and gutter area need to be redone. Also, the fence is not allowed any longer in the City, so when the gate is redone, they must redo the fence for whatever distance is required. He said the City has a fence ordinance and examples.

Mr. Marris said he will put this in front of his architect who he hired and can return the drawings and move forward. Boardmember Livingston said if possible, the Board can condition the project so the applicant does not need to return, given Mr. Marris' and staff's efforts.

Mr. Marrs said they simply thought the project was a slam dunk because it makes sense for what they do. They move huge molds from their foundry in Berkeley here, fabrication and having it open allows them to drive their truck through, off-load and drive back out. They probably did not understand the full depth of what they were getting into and he thanked the Board.

Boardmember Livingston suggested a condition that the fence will be replaced with a standard 6' fence, examples of which are contained in the ordinance.

Boardmember Welter suggested working with staff on exterior light fixtures, as some lighting by doors is needed. Drainage was also another item he thought of, which will be addressed.

Boardmember Munoz asked and confirmed that inside the building house giant fiberglass molds that are sprayed with rubber on the inside and many of their artists require some of the larger pieces.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period and there were no speakers. She closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Livingston) to approve PLN15-074 with the design review findings 1 through 4, with staff recommendations 1 through 8, which includes building lighting, Condition No. 9 should be added that a standard 6' fence will be added per the City's ordinance, and the drawing by Boardmember Livingston will be incorporated as Condition No. 10 that shows a couple of bio swales and suggested landscaping; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None.

2. PLN15-302: GOLDEN GATE STORAGE

Description: PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 4780 SF DRY STORAGE FACILITY FOR GOLDEN GATE MEAT CO.

Location: 933 WRIGHT AVE

APN: 560-231-011

Zoning: M-4 (MARINE INDUSTRIAL)

Owner: 803 WRIGHT AVENUE INVESTORS

Applicant: GARY LE

Staff Contact: DAVID BROSKY

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Commissioners waived the staff report for the item in the interest of time.

Boardmember Livingston said he saw a sign posted that states "bicycles turn around" and he asked about this. Mr. Brosky said there is significant traffic there, and he believed the railroad installed it.

Chair Whitty referred to a drawing received for the bio swales which was provided to the Board, and Boardmember Welter asked if there was a plan for the landscaping.

Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed that the applicant did not provide the standard three elevations and that the Board will discuss this.

The public hearing was opened.

Chair Whitty said the Board has reviewed the application and said she did not need a presentation by the applicant. She asked for questions of the Board.

Boardmember Welter asked why the finished floor is above grade. Mr. Le said right now they do not have a civil plan yet. They want to keep the building level to accommodate any slope they find and it will also match the existing building.

Boardmember Welter said along with missing some elevations, the north elevation is drawn incorrectly, noting there are steps in the building but he does not see them in the elevation. The north elevation shows a plain wall, but actually has steps in it. He said the south elevation is okay, but they are missing the east elevation.

Boardmember Welter asked if there is a color board, and Mr. Le said it should be included in the original packet, shown in three different images. He asked and confirmed that the applicant if they were meeting their landscape square foot requirement with the bio retention, and Boardmember Welter asked for more planting details.

Boardmember Fetter said there are many things about the plans that should be ready prior to coming to the DRB. The landscape plan does not match with existing views. Mr. Le said Sheet 1 of 1 replaces another sheet and he presented this to the Board. Boardmember Fetter referred to the landscape plan and said one of the key things is that this is an industrial area where landscape is important. He noted the corner is on a major thoroughfare and a prominent piece. He asked and confirmed that the applicant was willing to add trees and landscaping similar to the property with the same wedge shape to the southeast and across Harbour Way, with a minimum of 4, 15-gallon street approved trees, with low drip irrigation to ensure the trees' survival. Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed that the bio retention had artificial turf and he noted it is a LEED approved solution.

Boardmember Livingston said having visited the taco truck on numerous occasions, he asked about the various items that need improvement. Mr. Le said they will be replacing the fence with a metal fence which is in the conditions. Boardmember Livingston said there is no curb or gutter and the street is in horrible shape. On Sheet 1 of 1, they show a sidewalk, curb and gutter, but on the landscape plan these are not shown.

Mr. Le said this area is heavily used by large trucks. He confirmed they prefer not to install curb and gutter and sidewalk. Boardmember Livingston stated this is required and the applicant concurred. He said there are also no street trees and he confirmed the applicant will plant street trees under Condition No. 5.

Boardmember Fetter asked where the new area for curb and gutter would be, and said the Board needs to be clear about it being all the way from the gate to the railroad tracks.

The owner of Golden Gate Storage arrived, and said they are putting in all new trees and a vine, and it is curb and gutter. He noted heavy trucks come by and tear up the streets and curb and gutter and also broke the water line there about 4 times. Mr. Le asked if they were responsible for maintaining it after it goes in.

Boardmember Fetter said yes, and if neighbors are driving over the property, this is a problem. He said there are regulations about putting in bollards. The owner of Golden Gate Storage said they will address landscaping, install an Italian fence with spears, all new fencing in the back, new trees through the site and the parking lot, and he will plant the triangle area and use the front part of the triangle area for the bio swale area.

Chair Whitty suggested replacing the spear top fence with something else, and the owner stated the reason he is proposing them is that all neighbors around him are identical to these, and Chair Whitty concurred.

Boardmember Fetter recognized problems with the traffic damaging the road, curb and gutter, and he discussed neighboring businesses which include Simms Metal, a concrete company, and other industrial businesses. Boardmember Fetter confirmed that the owner has talked to their neighbors about the problem but nothing works.

Larry Ells said he is part of the applicant team and suggested increasing the size and height of the curb because it is not a pedestrian area. Boardmember Welter said it is supposed to be the standard curb and gutter, but they can try to negotiate this with the Public Works Department.

Boardmember Fetter also suggested higher test concrete be used and Mr. Ells agreed he could look into this.

Chair Whitty asked what the landscaping looks like in the parking lot area. Mr. Le said there is existing landscaping and he pointed to new landscaping they would add to the lot, as well as more trees on the other side of the gate.

Boardmember Munoz said she supported comments for improvements thus far and confirmed there will be landscaping in the back and she suggested putting it also on the other side to provide relief to the wall. The applicant agreed it is not in the drawings, and he will add it in.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Livingston) to approve PLN15-3024 with the design review findings 1 through 4, with staff recommendations 1 through 21, with the following amendments: 1) Amend Condition No. 3 to add landscaping to the interior per Boardmember Munoz's discussion with the owner; 2) Amend Condition No. 4 as necessary indicating that the Board endorses a higher curb if allowed by the Public Works Department; 3) Amend Condition No. 5 to add street trees from the gate back to the railroad in accordance with the City's ordinance and provide sidewalk and curb with special emphasis for dense planting in the southeast triangular corner; 4) Amend Condition No. 13 to move the bio swale per the Board's suggestion to north of the proposed building; 5) Add street trees to the corner of Wright to match the southeast property located across Harbour Way South; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Livingston, Munoz, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Woldemar

4. PLN14-115 NEVIN AVENUE RESIDENTIAL

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING

PROJECT CONSISTING OF 289-UNITS WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE OVER A PARKING GARAGE. THE PROJECT SITE CONSISTS OF TWO ADJACENT PARCELS SEPERATED BY 22ND STREET ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF NEVIN AVENUE BETWEEN 21ST AND 23RD Streets.

Location	NEVIN AVE
APN	514-080-013 and 514-090-018
Zoning	MFR-3 (Multifamily High Density Residential) and C-2 (General Commercial)
Owner	ADAMS CARL TRE
Applicant	Alexis M. Gevorgian
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Ms. Whales said Douglas Gibson, Architect is present this evening and she said he can present the 3-dimensional drawing to the Board. She then provided a brief background and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the proposal.

Chair Whitty asked and confirmed the correct parking space count was 193 spaces. She referred to page 4 which states 80% of the project will be affordable. Ms. Whales clarified that the project is 100% affordable for very low and low income. She said 80% of the units are affordable based on the County's median income which is roughly about \$50,000 annually for low income. She said it is not a HUD project at all and the remainder will be very low income which is about 40 units.

Ms. Whales stated the project received unanimous approval from the Planning Commission based on concessions the developer was able to get. Shortly thereafter the appeal period, the project was appealed to the City Council by Mike Yiu who is present this evening. They went to the City Council on June 16th and the Council felt the affordable project was within the guidelines and vision for the General Plan and the area. Therefore, staff is incorporating some of the form based code in this project.

Chair Whitty referred to the project being ¼ mile from the BART station and she does not remember seeing the walk represented in the project plans which she said would be useful. Ms. Whales said the City has a CIP project which looks similar to the streetscape in front of the Civic Center and the BART station is at 19th and Nevin Avenue, which is only 4 blocks.

Boardmember Fetter said it is the City Council and Planning Commission that deals with use of the land use. The Board's jurisdiction is about design and not the mix of use.

Boardmember Welter referred to the setbacks and said required is 10 feet in the front and they are at 8 feet. The rear is 20 feet and they are at 5 feet and the sides are required at 5 feet and they are at 3 feet. He asked what is allowing the setbacks to be reduced. Ms. Whales said they were able to receive concessions for open space based on the size of the lots. However, this can be discussed and she noted the City is going to be changing the entire configuration of the street with bulb outs, Class I bike lanes, etc.

Boardmember Welter asked and confirmed that Nevin Avenue is considered the front setback and not 23rd Street, with the address on Nevin Avenue.

Boardmember Fetter asked Ms. Whales what allowed them to encroach on every setback. Ms. Whales said the applicant received the concessions for the height, but not for the setbacks and this can be addressed. Chair Whitty said an additional 15 foot setback will remove an entire row of apartments, and this is how the applicant designed this.

Ms. Whales said staff is aware of this. She said this project focused more on getting the land use entitlements and staff did not meet in a subcommittee. They spent over a year getting the planning entitlements for the project. They went to the Planning Commission twice and went to the Council on an appeal. Boardmember Fetter said it would have been beneficial to hold a subcommittee meeting earlier in the process, and Ms. Whales said she attempted to coordinate this but they are out of the Los Angeles area and are working on another project in the City. They wanted to get comments and feedback from the DRB and staff hoped this could be a study session, and staff is aware that this is the first time the DRB has seen this project.

The public hearing was opened.

Douglas Gibson, Architect, said they currently are working on the Harbour View project at Harbour and Ohio which is a project under construction after having some relatively intense negotiations. He thinks the final product will be a great addition for senior housing, and they wanted to do the same type of project here. There are two projects, but they are developing it as one. In the spirit of open communication, they are not hiding anything and he has worked with AMG Associates and Pacific Companies in the last 9 years to develop over 6,000 units or about 70 developments.

Mr. Gibson presented a video and discussed Buildings A and B, stating that after the Board reviews the project he can address questions about what the Board would like to see and come to some sort of resolution about where the project needs to go.

He said Boardmember Woldemar submitted a copy of his comments. One item he asked was about colors. The scheme was to have two buildings with similar components between the buildings but use different colors and color value to give them their own identity. The general proportion and scale is based on the Waterford project in Dublin near the BART station. They took what they liked from that design and incorporated it into this new product, but that project is more of a suburban project, while this project is more of an urban product.

Chair Whitty asked what the color sequence is and suggested it needs work. Mr. Gibson said part of it is to get some of the warmer colors to come forward. There is the main building and they are pulling elements out from it. They cannot perforate the tower/elevator elements with windows because they are rated assemblies. He said the Board will see a rhythm of components that come out away from the main structure.

Mr. Gibson said at the corners, they stepped the project back and from Nevin Avenue, the project has open exterior seating areas, plantings, trellis, views of the foothills and out towards the Bay. He presented the corner feature with conceptual landscaping to create a more pedestrian experience.

He said one of the questions that came up was queuing area. They tried to design their parking structure so there is one way in and one way out so they would not have conflicts with the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd Streets. People would come in on one side of the building and egress out of the other side, and there will be secured parking.

Mr. Gibson then referred to the corner looking at 22nd Street and Nevin Avenue or looking east. There is a similar concept where there is a balcony where residents can go up and enjoy the weather. Similar to the Harbour project, they will have solar canopies and it will be either a Green Point rated or a LEED Platinum product as part of their application process. The main

idea is to get residents within the development to be part of the neighborhood and not build a structure that residents are not engaged with.

He then presented the north elevation of Building A between 21st and 22nd Streets, looking over towards McDonald's, and said they have done a commercial component for a restaurant or coffee shop as part of the development. This would also be in response to the existing bodega to the south side. In looking west straight down Nevin Avenue, the graphic shows the magnitude of the structure they are proposing.

Mr. Gibson presented the south façade leading to the courtyard area of the east building and described the many features of this area. He said the concept is there would be circulation and access to light and fresh air for residents with interior units. He also pointed out that on the podium deck level and said there are laundry rooms, meeting rooms and common areas in the building where residents could meet which would come right out onto a patio area. He noted that the interior courtyards do not have the same square footages but they meet the open air requirements for a product at this level. He pointed to unit walks to get into the interior space with railings, columns and unit doors. He concluded his presentation and said he was available for questions and comments.

Chair Whitty said there is the building design, circulation of vehicles, colors, and she asked if the Board could address one item at a time or talk about items as they come up. Boardmembers suggested first going through Boardmember Woldemar's comments.

Tandem Parking: Boardmember Welter said this gets out of the Board's purview and more of a function of the building. He said tandem parking is going to be assigned. He confirmed the unit mix of studios, 1, 2, 3, and 4 units, stating a tandem space will need to be assigned to the 2, 3, and 4 bedroom units. Mr. Gibson confirmed that this is the concept and part of the lease agreement with residents to manage. Ms. Whales stated the concession regarding parking is per the State's density bonus law and the City's local law which implements the state's law. The idea is that the studio and 1 bedroom units do not have their own parking. Chair Whitty confirmed there are about 300 bike parking spaces.

Queuing at Garages: There were no further questions or comments.

Regarding the need for a site plan with property lines and dimensions, the Board needs to confirm the setbacks. Boardmember Welter asked where they delivery/loading van area is located. Mr. Gibson said they do not have a designated spot and double park with cones. The intent was to get the elevators out toward the peripheral of the structure so it would be close for moving purposes.

Boardmember Welter asked if refuse areas are large enough, and Ms. Whales stated Richmond Sanitary District will provide a will serve letter for the appropriate size of these. Mr. Gibson said their intent is to use a dynamic compactor to be sufficient in size to serve the entire development.

Boardmember Welter said the next question is that Boardmember Woldemar questions how the buildings meet the ground. It does not seem to provide variety and interest to the street. Boardmember Welter said his comment was not so much the interest. He commended the use of a base. He thinks it loses some strength because it jumps up and down when going around the site and gets lost. He is not clear on the rhyme or reason for some of the elevations and what the concept is. Some things seem to have some hierarchy which he would not do.

Boardmember Woldemar's comment is more about what is happening at street level and how the building engages with the sidewalk and street.

Mr. Gibson said they moved the community spaces and some would be open commercial at the street level. They will need to provide a lot of concrete to keep the building stable, so where they can perforate it they will. They propose using trellis or vine screens judiciously to offset some of the vertical elements coming down to grade and that would be part of the comprehensive landscape plan to provide a softening of that edge, but also make sure it is not a long term maintenance issue. They want to minimize the amount of articulation at the ground plane to make sure perforations and entries into the structure have more relevance and are more important so people would know where to go to get in. This was part of breaking up the two east/west corners of Building A and B; to give that interest at the corner.

Boardmember Welter said he still is questioning the base and logic and the different heights of the base. He thinks they are losing the value of having this strong base and thinks it gets lost in some of the translation. He suggested finding a way to make it stronger, and Mr. Gibson said they can do this.

Colors: Boardmember Welter said the applicant explained some of the colors, but he looked at the palette and there are 6 stucco colors, but they explained that they are used in various buildings. He suggested in the next submittal to make it cleaner between the two buildings and tie it together with an overall landscape and/or site plan.

Several Large Blank Walls: Boardmember Welter said he knows Nevin Avenue is the front of the project and the City is doing improvements down to the BART station. He noted; however, that 23rd Street is the busiest and it seems the applicant is turning a cold shoulder to the elevation on 23rd Street. He knows there is a stair tower and windows can be on the exterior façade, and he encouraged the applicant to relook at the blank walls especially on 23rd Street.

Boardmember Fetter referred to how to position the stair towers, storage and other elements as a stack. What troubles him is that these are placed in prominent locations and raw to the street rather than narrow to the street which is unusual. Usually not much of the wall should be shown to the street, and he suggested perforating it somehow. There are huge blank unfriendly walls and also some corners anchoring, which is good, but from an exiting standpoint the challenge of good design is that it does not degrade the exterior. Usually corner living units are very valuable and he is not seeing this done.

Mr. Gibson said it was just a function of the unit matrix continually shifting from the feedback they were getting from the developer, and as numbers moved, their main concern was positioning those egress components where they could get to a public right-of-way and not get hammed in. They did not want to end up with stair towers in the middle of the structure and then a 200 foot hallway and he will bring this important feedback back to tweak it.

Boardmember Welter suggested pushing back the elevator tower, pivot the stair part and put real windows on the landings, which is a way he has dealt with this before. Alternatively, you can gang them together and make a big tower element. He said one of the things that bother him about the elevations is that the elevator tower is very skinny. If they gang the shafts or cores together with the stair towers, they can make it into a tower and put a roof on it, as long as the exterior is perforated a bit.

Boardmember Fetter noted there are three large expanses and the corner is so valuable, yet there are only a few windows on the corner. Mr. Gibson noted that this unit type is a studio is, so there are bathrooms along that wall. They can do windows, but they will be smaller.

Boardmember Welter asked what the construction type will be, and Mr. Gibson said probably a 3-B because they are right up to the setbacks and height.

Boardmember Welter asked what the form based code shows for the Nevin Avenue and 23rd Street intersection. Ms. Whales said she does not recall, but she knows there is ground level activity in that area. She noted the code has not yet been adopted, and Boardmember Welter suggested the applicant obtain a copy of it, given it is in the process of being adopted and it deals with a lot of the massing that happens at the corners.

Boardmember Welter noted that Boardmember Woldemar said the application is not complete. Typically, when the applicant returns, the Board will want to see what the typical window details, what kind of shadowing and inset, trim, any major elements or horizontal banding, and material joints.

Boardmember Fetter said there are several instances where there is a tower-like element on the facades and he noticed that he has large blank spaces along the sides when usually on these types of projects, because of the site lines, windows should be proposed so people can see down the street from their units. It also makes it better looking on the outside. There are also other spots where it is more prominent and having glazing along the edge in each of the units would add to both the interior and exterior of the units.

Boardmember Welter said the Board wants to know what materials are for railings and the trellises and things like this, and he asked the applicant to be prepared to have a packet of design details they can review.

Boardmember Welter referred to the accessible spaces in the garage in Building B and said while they are inside the building and not really in the Board's purview, they do not go anywhere. They are not near an elevator and he would review this layout. In Building A, they can access an elevator but it seems they should be shifted over. Mr. Gibson commented that these are things they usually pick up in design development and not just in schematics.

Boardmember Welter questioned the use of Spanish tile on this building and he suggested a concrete flat tile would be more appropriate, given other elements. Mr. Gibson said the developer wanted this, and asked the Board if they would be opposed to use a barrage metal roofing component. Boardmembers said they would like that a lot.

Boardmember Welter said he does not have a problem with the CMU; the masonry should be spot on because if they are not finishing it with anything, the grout joints need to be perfect and a high quality block. Boardmember Fetter suggested the Board might encourage the applicant to come up with something else. Boardmember Welter agreed and said knowing the construction industry the applicant might look at something that is more forgiving than CMU as a base.

Some of the elements come back and the parapet comes up and it returns in a western movie set. He always likes them pulled back a little further so they are not so fake-looking. Mr. Gibson agreed and said this would be the intent to take it back 6 or 8 feet so it is not part of the sidewalk. Boardmember Welter said he had the same comments about the corners which need more attention, and said this was all he had.

Chair Whitty said she is concerned not with the colors but the placement of the pattern of the colors. She asked the applicant to return with something else so it is not an orange building with a yellow balcony or a yellow building with an orange balcony. It is like a checkerboard and she does not think this sleek building needs a checkerboard look. The top balcony is metal and the bottom three are concrete and she asked why. Mr. Gibson said this is to break it up and to provide different interests. Chair Whitty said she thinks it is too busy.

Boardmember Welter said he thinks they are busy too but maybe some tweaking of the color palette and aligning some of the trim to make them more muted. Boardmember Fetter said what the Board is saying is to make it a better or more cohesive pattern. He said the color contrast with the proportions should be articulated, and Boardmember Welter noted that the prints are probably really saturated anyway and this is not what it will look like.

Boardmember Fetter said the fact that the rendering has a more subdued tone to it solves one problem. Also, it is the proportion of the feel to the bright accent element which is the balcony in this circumstance really creates a vibrant contrast by the proportions and this is what Eileen has probably objected to. Therefore, the Board is suggesting either changing the proportions or the colors. Slight adjustments can fix it along with pattern.

Chair Whitty referred to Sheet A.10.2.B, there is the base of the building and partway up there is a band that divides the orange and the white. She suggested making the whole column orange and then white and Mr. Gibson said they can play around with all of the variations.

Chair Whitty said lastly, if she lives there and rides BART, she asked the applicant to walk her up Nevin Avenue and she asked where she goes into the building, how does she get up to her unit and what does she see along the way. Mr. Gibson referred to Building B and he pointed out the entrance to the elevator near the leasing office and she would go through a set of doors or another area at the far right side of the building once past the cars.

Chair Whitty asked if she would hit the courtyard right away or stairways or an elevator. Boardmember Welter referred to Sheet L-3 stated it is a corridor and he pointed to the path Chair Whitty would use.

Chair Whitty referred to storage and asked if there is any storage in the garages. Mr. Gibson said there are locations within the structure where they would separate storage and the laundry rooms into smaller areas for residents' use. For example, in the studio units, if there is no storage area in the exterior they would have storage. It is the same concept they are using at Harbour View. There are two separate areas in that structure for residents that do not have storage off of their balconies. He said he will include this as a note and will confirm that every unit has the minimum storage either within the unit or elsewhere in the structure. Boardmember Welter said this will also help with residents not having things stored on their balconies.

Mr. Gibson referred to the previous comments and confirmed that it will be a white Firestone PVM roof. All mechanical units will be up on the roof and screened so there will be no acoustical issues. They do not know if it will be a solar project or not but because it is a flat roof it is relatively easy to put a design for a structure up there as well. Planters within the podium are designed to be part of the rainwater collection system so the intent is that everything they capture stays on site and is re-utilized.

Chair Whitty asked if the applicant is returning with measurements and dimensions. Boardmember Welter said it would help if unit types were labeled on building plans and then

they can go to the unit type. Mr. Gibson said their plans are dimensioned and the parking areas are dimensioned, as well.

Chair Whitty asked if residents will have a pass key and Mr. Gibson said yes, and there are programmatic issues with some of the common areas relative to getting in and having an office space. These are elements that they were not notified to plan in there so they left them to be as open as possible, but the final design intent would be for holding areas for residents' guests before they would enter into the actual interior of the structure or have access to the elevators.

Boardmember Fetter said generally the Board does not need to know much about what is going on inside, but sometimes this is expressed on the exterior and only in that sense they are concerned. He just realized that there is some confusion in how the parking and the stair court carry down and he commented that there is a surprisingly limited number of ways to get up from parking and would be a little worried. Also, just by nature of how people want to get out of the building and the treatment of the building outside and just access from the southeast corners where there is no stairwell. Mr. Gibson said this is a good point and they will take this into consideration.

Boardmember Livingston said he has 34 comments and suggested simply giving these to staff. Boardmember Welter suggested he identify the most prominent items.

Boardmember Livingston reviewed the following comments:

- The first floor tower roof on 23rd Street seemed out of context. It looks too "suburban". What he is looking for in that commercial area was something more like a shop awning. If the belt course of the CMU is changed and brought up higher, the awning can raise up. It just seems like the scale where signs need to hang is too low.
- Building A, second floor deck, northeast corner does not match elevation. There is deck on the floor plan but there are two stories of glass and they must coordinate the elevations.
- There is no detail of the top of CMU wall and also at the top of the belt course. He has many comments about the belt course and will provide his notes on this. Chair Whitty asked to remove any curved eyebrows. The building is a sleek structure and they do not need a curve here and there.
- The CMU is a great product for a more industrial area such as the Marina but not downtown and he asked to consider more suitable veneer. Around the corner at the senior housing project, there are some CMUs they can use and it looks a little dated right now.
- The heavy sand finished stucco is real course for this district. It needs crisper edges and more control joints and the elevations do not show any of these joints.
- He asked about roof drainage and asked if everything goes to the interior, but they do not show any conductor heads on the decks and he asked to show these and the downspouts.
- On Building B, the courtyard is so small that there is almost no light that comes in. There are play structures in there and it is really going to be noisy. One walk-through showed how that looks and they can eliminate a whole middle of that building and all corridors that connect one side of the building to another. Those corridors are floating out there and it looked like a walk-through Alcatraz. It is a real narrow play area for kids. There is no sun that comes in that courtyard. He suggested simplifying the building and opening it up for kids to play with light and air.
- On Building B, the upper tile roof elements seem weak.
- Consider re-elevating these buildings. The 6th floor-to-roof transitions are random and seem clunky. Some roof tile sections are very small.
- They need to provide cornice details, sloped roof, windows, window spec, base detail, steel trellis details.

- Staff states the project conforms to C3 but he cannot find anywhere where there is any bio retention. Staff either needs to amend that in its staff report or show it. Mr. Gibson said they will get the bio swale. He said they have a project in Culver City and they can do it but it needs to be engineered. Boardmember Livingston said on the landscape side, they have these nice vertical arbors or trellises, but there are no vines planted anywhere and it goes right to concrete and there is no planting at all.
- He noticed the only light fixture in the submittal was a Lumar general lighting fixture. He looked at this and it will be super bright. It is a 5,000K light. He suggested dropping it to 3,000K. It also does not have any side flaps so everybody is going to see this thing. It is right on 23rd Street and very bright. If they put the street light in, they need to provide the spec.
- He gave the applicant his notes for the remainder of his comments.

Boardmember Munoz asked where the garbage area is, and Mr. Gibson said they will have fire-rated enclosures with a trash shoot and it would come down to the ground plane. They have a mechanized door that rolls up and they would have central trash receptacles in each of the areas.

Boardmember Munoz asked if there would be an agreement with the developer and commercial area to coordinate colors, and Mr. Gibson said he was not aware of that. She noted there is a Taqueria, a bakery and other retail and she suggested checking on their colors.

Boardmember Munoz referred to parking and asked the applicant to think about moving the gate to the back for relief of cars waiting to get inside. Mr. Gibson said they will show queuing on their final exhibit.

Chair Whitty proposed a subcommittee meeting be held soon, and said Mr. Gibson can pick some dates to meet his needs, and Ms. Whales said she can coordinate this.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

Chung Yeung Yiu, Richmond, said he lives close to this area and owns an apartment building. He voiced concerns about the need for more parking, crime, the proposed trees that will grow too tall that will eventually need to be heavily pruned, drug dealers, homelessness and crime in the area, and the need to avoid designing the project with areas where people can hide or loiter. He also asked that more space be given for children to play, noting that the development will have more than 60% of children. He suggested installing a secured gate at the entrance with a code so the people who do not belong there stay out.

Chair Whitty summarized that a subcommittee meeting will be scheduled and the item can be left open and not continued.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to hold over PLN14-115; unanimously approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Livingston, Munoz, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Woldemar.

6. PLN14-021 BAYWALK MIXED-USE PROJECT

Description STUDY SESSION FOR INPUT FROM THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGARDING A PROPOSAL TO CONSTRUCT A MIXED MULTI-FAMILY

**RESIDENTIAL PROJECT CONSISTING OF 255 TOWNHOMES AND
LIVE-WORK UNITS ON A ±10.ACRE SITE**

Location 830 MARINA WAY
APN 560-190-007
Zoning M-1 (INDUSTRIAL OFFICE FLEX)
Owner PREFACE METROPOLITAN LAND DEVELOPMENT
Applicant MATT HAMILTON
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **PROVIDE COMMENTS**

Chair Whitty stated that a study session was held and the Board will be tasked tonight to provide more comments. Ms. Whales stated the applicant is present to discuss how he has refined the project based on the Board's comments.

Matt Hamilton, applicant, introduced Cathy Kosel who worked hard on making sure local residents are constructing the project, Eric Van Wenchel, architect and Marcia Vallier the landscape architect to present the detail of all changes.

Cathy Kosel said they are here to present the modified designs of the project and said many believe that Richmond is destined to become the prime city it should be and a City that attracts investors, homeowners, businesses and tax dollars. Their plan has evolved based on feedback from DRB members and community members and they expressed an architectural style similar to the Shipyard project. This style is expensive to build and they have modified their plans to do this.

She said the current plan meets the needs and desires of the city and they are also finalizing a labor agreement with local construction trades that includes a provision for 30% of the workers on the project to be current Richmond residents. They have worked with Sal Vaca and Richmond Build to provide training, mentoring and apprenticeships to achieve that goal. The unions are excited about the prospect and being able to build their membership in Richmond with Richmond residents. They believe City officials are excited about the nearly \$12 million in fees they will shortly be contributing as well. In order to realize these benefits, they need to get the project through the permitting process and break ground and the Board's approval of their design direction will help them get back on track.

Chair Whitty suggested the Board ask questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Livingston said he had four comments on the site plan and thinks the applicant did a great job in getting closer to what the Board talked about. They created a lot more walkable open space and have broken up the rhythm they had the last time.

He said TRAC questioned the fact that there is supposed to be a Bay Trail along the west face and he still did not see this in the site plan. Marcia Vallier, Vallier and Associates, replied that in one option they showed two different treatments because right now it is a trail to nowhere. This section is not on TRAC's plan but they wanted to come down Harbour Way. She said this area can be thickened up a bit and have wider sidewalks. They worked a lot with Bruce Beyaert and they can create more of a section.

Mr. Van Wenchel said they put the parallel stalls with the cut in's which then reduced the livability for a trail, so he is concerned they have a conflict with competing people with what they

want. Mr. Hamilton said TRAC wanted to take out two traffic lanes and add bike lanes, and this is addressed in their MND response to comments and it was not feasible. They will have nice sidewalks, parkways, parallel parking, but as far as closing lanes of traffic and introducing bike lanes, it is beyond that.

Boardmember Welter said he did not believe they were asking for a Bay trail but more of a bike sharrow which is out of the Board's purview.

Boardmember Fetter noted there are places to the south where the property owners have really wide sidewalks that TRAC considers if not Class I, Class II and this is why this even came up. He did not see the submission about how the configuration of the right-of-way was but most of this discussion is about inside the property or at least the edge condition, and this is not something the Board is trying to address. Obviously they are trying to strike a balance. Street parking is critical especially for potential retail and/or the corner space. He said along the north there is a fairly decent accommodation of that, but along Marina Way South he thinks the tricky part is a communication between all parties because that is supposed to be a Class I bike route and the City is trying to coordinate this for many projects. He would like to know how this gets signed off and who to deal with. He asked who was asking for parking along there, and Mr. Hamilton stated it was Boardmember Woldemar. Boardmember Welter said he thinks a roundtable discussion is needed to get TRAC involved with the applicant team.

Boardmember Livingston said he went to the site today and said along Wright Avenue there are power poles right at the units facing Wright Avenue and he did not know whether anyone has discussed undergrounding the wires similar to what everything south of the area is like. He said unless it is done now, it probably will not be able to be done and he suggested getting PG&E involved. Mr. Hamilton concurred and he is assuming they will be undergrounded as long as they can be but they look like transmission lines. He displayed a Google Earth map and pointed to the power poles.

Boardmember Livingston referred to the site plan and the bottom of the open space area adjacent to the tracks, and suggested taking out the last 4 units and remove an open space area, it would leave a nice playing space for kids and for people to congregate. Regarding the architecture, he likes the way it looks but the problem he is seeing is that everything is sort of the same. When looking at it in the aggregate of the whole project, there really is not too much differentiation. What he also noticed also is that the live/work units look just like the residential units and this is supposed to be a residential medium density mixed use with a commercial emphasis, and he does not see any commercial emphasis in this. He then thought about how do residents who live there control what functions in the live/work happen. If there is someone into a business with plastics and there is a family next door with children and there are vapors and smells which are not controlled and very limited. Mr. Hamilton interjected and said this will be controlled through the CC&R's, as there will not be these types of businesses next to residents.

Boardmember Livingston said what he actually found that in the City of Sunnyvale and other cities is they have a list of businesses and uses allowed and those that are not. He presented a document showing this to staff and the Board for the record. He suggested distinguishing the live/work units from residential and provided a sketch of this, which shows a galvanized roof and some elements on the side. These could be grouped together which would provide more of a feel given all of the industrial buildings in the area. He noted Artisan Cove has brick and has some of this flavor, and then the galvanized steel elements could be brought into the architecture to fit into the context of that area.

Mr. Hamilton said he is open to that, but said their concern is always getting too far down that industrial level relative to the City's perceptions. He agrees it is the right response for the area, and said with the detached and live/work product, they are appealing to a broader market and they have a much more dynamic community than before to really make the live/work area something special.

Boardmember Fetter commented that the flavor of live/work seems to be more one of either retail or professional services and does not seem to come off as fabrication. In other jurisdictions like San Francisco, they have live/work units in SOMA and none of them are used for work. People may own businesses but they cover up the windows and use them as homes. Therefore, the difficulty is making actual work spaces with signage, awnings and things that indicate a business environment and typically how they do retail in a mixed use. Mr. Van Wenchel said this was their intent; to be more of a live/work product for a home office, professional, architect or accountant and someone who will not have client traffic. He noted that Artisan Cove is more work/live and it works for them.

Boardmember Fetter noted there is a project in San Jose where there is an attorney, realtor, and art dealer. The art dealer really needs more glazing and the realtor and attorney may not, but it will not hurt them. He is trying to say they are restricting their versatility by restricting the glazing and he recommended making it look more like a successful retail front so there is more signage opportunity and more canopy conditions, as well as more appropriate lighting for retail because the lighting shown is for residential.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the central park area and diagonals and asked what the paths are for and what do they point to. Ms. Vallier said what they were trying to do with this one is repeat some of the things that are going on this side, and trying to create an exercise pod area, but said she really likes the other site plan a lot better.

Boardmember Welter suggested Ms. Vallier compare the two site plans and Boardmember Fetter concurred he likes the other site plan, as well, which is Option B for that area. Ms. Vallier said one was very diagonal to keep it diagonal like the buildings are and the other was trying to look at the San Francisco project with sweeping edges and curves. Boardmember Fetter said he works on some real high end, clean and modern homes and the most successful landscaping is the undulating, contrasting forms and he prefers Option B. Ms. Vallier said Option B is more clean, more contemporary, and there are a couple of choices on the paths. She pointed to diagonals across that create more space in front of the units so they will not come straight across. Also, the bio swales are going in these arcs instead of being choppy.

Boardmember Livingston asked how difficult it would be to get more street trees and Ms. Vallier said this is difficult due to the driveways. They would have to work with the architect a bit to get more distance there.

Boardmember Welter stated he liked Option B as well and said everything is so square nowadays and having some relief from that is especially nice. He thinks the site plan is very well done, would support something different for the live/work units and just an indication that it is a different use. Overall, he thinks the project great and would support it.

Regarding the sidewalk on Wright Avenue, Boardmember Welter asked if PG&E is going to be required to remove the lines which are right in the middle of the sidewalk, or he asked who is

responsible for addressing this. He also thinks they are going to be in the way of construction. Ms. Whales said this will be a discussion with PG&E, and Boardmember Welter suggested getting them to underground this which would be much better for the project.

Boardmember Fetter said if the DRB indicates to the City that this is a major change in use of the area and it is important that these be undergrounded, Public Works could be directed to work with PG&E.

Boardmember Welter referred to the use and function of the space and many opinions on how to access it, and he asked the applicant to discuss how the space works. Mr. Van Wenchel said for the moment, they day lighted the corner and they are trying to keep it at a constant single slab for flexibility. They dotted in a line for a worst case scenario where they would have to break it. They created a low planter edge subject to Ms. Vallier's comments, open the corner, allow the patio to take the curve back in to create the relief right on the corner and then let the upper floor mass of their lounge and fitness maintain that edge. They get some shading, more shadows and more depth at that corner, and as they get into it deeper, they will articulate that edge. This allows then for two retail spaces with signage which are placeholders. Boardmembers said this is what they are looking for. Mr. Van Wenchel said this way, those that have businesses established can indicate they need a conference room can use the space and get some work done along with the amenity spaces for the overall community.

Boardmember Livingston said at the corner there are no store lines on the windows and he asked if the applicant could interrupt them. Mr. Hamilton said yes, this needs work and what they were trying to create when rolling around the corner is that they wanted to allow the building to do something different. Boardmember Welter said maybe it is not stucco but just something else that is more forgiving for the curve. Mr. Hamilton said the original ones were not well received which were fins and screens and possibly there were other issues behind that, but he said he would like to create more interesting shadows on that plane as well. Chair Whitty said now it would match the architecture better than it matched back then, so they could almost return with this concept now, and Mr. Hamilton said they will take another look at this. Boardmember Welter said now that the ground floor is carved out, this may actually work.

Boardmember Fetter noted that to make successful retail in there, while the tenant provides the restrooms and plumbing, sometimes it is beneficial if there is a shared restroom, and this way less of the tenant space is spent on standardized items they need.

Boardmember Munoz said she had no comments.

Mr. Hamilton thanked the Board for their feedback, acknowledged that they have a lot of work to do, but it feels like they are now working on the approvable set now.

Ms. Vallier said on the orthogonal plan, they wanted to possibly create garden spaces and she suggested doing pockets of beds for residents that could be incorporated into the curve. Boardmember Fetter said he was not sure how many were needed as he pointed to the amount of shade. Ms. Vallier said she thought the bunk back areas would work and the Board concurred.

Boardmember Livingston asked if the plant palette was of community scale so that they are similar. Ms. Vallier said she would like to have the bio swales create these stripes of different bio swale plants and as they get to the shrubs and foundation plantings at the buildings, those

change so there would be a broader palette that will work with the wind and shade. She said she was thinking of architectural looking plants for the curve rather than little shrubs. She wanted to use bamboo similar to a product in Emeryville on Park Place which has beautiful gardens.

Boardmember Fetter said as a matter of way-finding, Boardmember Livingston's comment about the variety of unit styles for the exteriors is important. He has seen something for a project of this size where they will take the whole plan and for corridors with long stretches, the key is to come back to landmarks of a striking panel or something which makes it so people are able to find their way.

Mr. Hamilton suggested having "districts" at corners or differences in paving for the live/work district. The more he read about live/work the more he thought about gathering areas for those who work at home to get to know each other. This would provide a good landmark feature. Boardmember Fetter commented that it is not much of a cost issue and it really brings more value and sense of place for people who live in a community like this.

Mr. Van Wenchel said he and Mr. Hamilton worked on a project down south and they went way beyond colors he would have proposed but it worked. There was also a bronze statue of a dog that has a name in the community which is those little things that work, and Boardmembers agreed that this is exactly what works.

Chair Whitty concluded the study session and Boardmembers thanked the applicant team.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

1. Nominating Committee for Officer Elections

Chair Whitty noted that the Board elected officers at the last meeting.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements - None

The Board adjourned at 9:42 p.m. to the next meeting on Wednesday, July 22, 2015.