

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
February 25, 2015
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair	Vacant, Vice Chair
Brant Fetter	Brenda Munoz
Ray Welter	Mike Woldemar

Chair Whitty called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Boardmembers Brenda Munoz, Brant Fetter, and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Boardmember Ray Welter

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales and Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the status of Item number 9. Hector Lopez stated it has been requested to be continued by the applicant to a time not yet determined and Boardmember Woldemar confirmed it should be changed to be a hold-over item.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the agenda, as amended to change Item Number 9 to read as a Hold Over Item; unanimously approved by voice vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter.)

Public Forum – Brown Act

CESAR ZEPEDA, President of the Hilltop District Neighborhood Council and Hilltop District Homeowners and Stakeholders Association, said they recently formed the new Council, took over the Country Club Vista Neighborhood Council, and have worked with HOAs and enlarged the neighborhood council. They are also encompassing the Hilltop Landscape Maintenance District area, and he explained about the new items to be undertaken, such as landscape, sidewalks and art.

Chair Whitty asked and confirmed that they are also part of the overall Richmond neighborhood council grid.

City Council Liaison Report - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty stated Item 1 is a Study Session, and Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are items on the Consent Calendar.

Assistant City Attorney Atencio clarified that for Item 9 staff is recommending continuation of the item to a future unknown date. Chair Whitty asked if Boardmembers or the public wished to remove any items from the Consent Calendar.

Boardmember Woldemar requested removal of Item 6.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 (as amended); unanimously approved by voice vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter).

Chair Whitty announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, March 9, 2015, by 5:00 p.m.

Item Approved on the Consent Calendar:

Public Hearing(s)

- 2. PLN14-217 KAPPY NEW RESIDENCE**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM 1/14/2015)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±1,938 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITHIN THE CORONADO NEIGHBORHOOD.
Location 2012 CUTTING BLVD
APN 544-292-025
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner KAPPY REI
Applicant KYLE TAM
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**
- 3. PLN14-230 PIÑEDA NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE**
Description: **(HELD OVER FROM 1/14/2015)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±1,800 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE ON A 5,000 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL WITHIN THE SHIELDS-REID NEIGHBORHOOD.
Location: 1301 KELSEY STREET
APN: 561-192-037
Zoning: SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
Applicant: ROLANDO PIÑEDA (OWNER)
Staff Contact: HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**
- 4. PLN14-273 MACIAS NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM 1/14/2015)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,000 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE ON A 2,500 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL WITHIN THE METRO RICHMORE VILLAGE NEIGHBORHOOD.
Location NORTH OF 33 15th STREET
APN 540-340-007

Zoning MFR-1 (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
 Owner RECONVEYANCE NATIONAL TRUST CO.
 Applicant BACILIA MACIAS
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 3/11/2015**

5. PLN15-084 MIRAFLORES SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST TO RENEW A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT (PLN10-128) FOR A TWO-STORY, 80-UNIT AFFORDABLE SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE PARK PLAZA NEIGHBORHOOD.

Location CORNER OF S 45TH STREET AND FLORIDA AVENUE
 APN 513-321-001 AND 513-321-003
 Zoning PA (PLANNED AREA DISTRICT)
 Owner SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO FORMER RICHMOND COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
 Applicant EDEN HOUSING
 Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

7. PLN14-111 BLANDON NEW SECOND DWELLING UNIT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±1,800 SQUARE FOOT SECOND DWELLING UNIT ON A ±7,500 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL WITHIN THE IRON TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Location 526 FLORIDA AVENUE
 APN 550-201-001
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
 Applicant ENRIQUE BLANDON (OWNER)
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

8. PLN15-015 NGUYEN RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±460 SQUARE FOOT, SECOND-STORY STUDIO ON TOP OF AN EXISTING GARAGE, A ±100 SQUARE FOOT BALCONY, AND A ±500 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY STRUCTURE IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOME WITHIN THE RICHMOND HEIGHTS NEIGHBORHOOD.

Location 5427 ESMOND AVENUE
 APN 523-092-014
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
 Owner NGUYEN RYAN
 Applicant TUAN NGUYEN
 Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 3/11/2015**

9. PLN13-180 RICHMOND RIVIERA RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON A REQUEST TO REZONE A 4.92 ACRE SITE TO A PLANNED AREA (PA) DISTRICT, APPROVAL OF A VESTING TENTATIVE MAP, AND A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT 59 NEW SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED HOMES WITHIN THE RICHMOND MARINA NEIGHBORHOOD. THE PA REQUEST INCLUDES A DENSITY OF 12 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE AND

MODIFICATIONS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, INCLUDING STREET FRONTAGE, MINIMUM LOT AREA, SETBACKS, AND OPEN SPACE.

Location SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF MARINA WAY SOUTH AND HALL AVENUE

APN 560-181-096 AND 560-181-098

Zoning PA (PLANNED AREA DISTRICT)

Owner MARINA BAY BUSINESS PARK LLC

Applicant RICHARD POE

Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **TO BE CONTINUED AS A HOLD-OVER ITEM**

STUDY SESSION

1. PLN15-101 HILLTOP LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS

Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON CERTAIN LANDSCAPING AND PUBLIC ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS TO THE LOT NORTH OF THE HILLTOP SCRAPER STATION WITHIN THE COUNTRY CLUB VISTA NEIGHBORHOOD.

Location SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAN PABLO AVE AND RICHMOND PARKWAY

APN 405-050-080

Zoning C-3 (GENERAL COMMERCIAL/M-1, INDUSTRIAL/OFFICE FLEX)

Applicant CHEVRON USA (OWNER)

Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **PROVIDE COMMENTS**

Senior Planner Lina Velasco stated representatives from Chevron are present who are paying for landscape improvements being done to support some natural gas upgrades to the site at the Hilltop Scrapper Station. These are needed in order PG&E to conduct pipeline repairs as part of their on-going maintenance.

Boardmember Woldemar asked what a scraper station is. A Chevron representative explained that when a pipeline company needs to inspect their pipelines, they run a tool in the pipelines to internally inspect it. This is sometimes called a scraper or pig, but it is known as a gridline inspection. The station is the location where you can launch and receive those tools.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the conclusion section wherein staff indicates that the proposed improvements are within the public right-of-way and are not subject to design review permit. He asked where it is indicated in the book that this kind of project is exempt.

Ms. Velasco explained that PG&E is not subject to local permitting requirements for their pipeline work. Chevron is agreeing to make the improvements as part of the City's quit claim, so they do not need building permits as part of this and this is a trigger for design review requirements. But, as part of the City's quit claim of an easement for this public right-of-way in order for this work to occur by PG&E, there was an agreement by Chevron to pay for landscaping improvements. She said staff is not formally calling it a design review permit but are here to get direction and comments.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that PG&E, under its franchise agreements, is not subject to permitting or review, and Ms. Velasco agreed.

Ms. Velasco said as background, the City Council recently considered quick claim of an easement that it had for future roadway improvements related to Hilltop Drive. In agreement to release the easement, they requested and agreed to improve some landscape with some Hilltop Associations. Marcia Vallier has been working on those designs along with Chevron staff on getting some feedback from the neighborhood and City of Richmond staff on those improvements.

Marcia Vallier, applicant, Chevron USA, displayed a series of photos of the current property line, where the current meter station is located. She stated PG&E will install a meter to measure the flow of gas to the refinery.

Ms. Vallier described the proposed landscaping and public access improvements along San Pablo Avenue, including a larger ADA path of travel along the sidewalk, an ADA ramp and crossing, also installing a pedestrian crossing sign and stop at the crosswalk in both directions. Currently, there was only a stop sign in one direction.

Chair Whitty referred to the display and asked for the location of Richmond Parkway. Ms. Vallier pointed to the area in green where additional proposed landscaping will be added and explained the landscaping will consist of native plant material to make the location indigenous, so that no herbicides or pesticides will be sprayed per the City's ordinance. The only non-native plant listed was a Theodore Cedar tree.

She mentioned additional proposed landscaping, where lighter and darker green shaded areas are located at the station, groundcover shrubs would be placed to follow SEP-TED principles to prevent hiding places for the public, while still creating a screen to block the meter. A Ballard light was also added that will augment what the City of Richmond had recently re-installed along the walkway.

Chair Whitty asked to show where the walkway leads to and from. Ms. Vallier pointed out and explained the direction of the walkway in both directions, heading to the nearby shopping center and then along San Pablo Avenue, calling the area, a park corner.

Chair Whitty asked about the significance of the black lines in the photo. Ms. Vallier stated that it was a crosswalk to an existing sidewalk where the public informally crosses the street, located behind the housing project, which she pointed to leading into the shopping center.

Chair Whitty asked if the crosswalk is in that back alley that everyone uses to cross and she asked where the crosswalk leads to and from what. Ms. Vallier explained the public and especially those in need of ADA improvements or in wheelchairs require a safe, designated crosswalk so people do not have to get on the street to get to the shopping center.

16:42

Chair Whitty commented that it was too bad a crosswalk was not being proposed across San Pablo Avenue because there is nowhere to cross. Ms. Vallier responded there would need to be a traffic study done, but this was not related to the access of this site.

Ms. Vallier then summarized the retaining wall, replacement of fencing, a small Ballard light, and the native plant palette which includes trees, shrubs and vines to grow on the fence. Ms. Vallier then asked if there were any questions of Commissioners.

Boardmember Fetter questioned the fence material and asked if the security, visibility, and traffic needs were being met with that particular fence with such an aggressive top. He asked that the fence be more discreet or appealing.

The Chevron project manager who works with PG&E commented that the security fence design was endorsed specifically by PG&E on other projects. The benefit of the curvature of the fence is preventative of personal injury should anyone try to get over the fence. She said Chevron agreed PG&E's proposed design to remain consistent between the two companies. She added that Chevron shares Boardmember Fetter's frustration with the fence design.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the fence was in lieu of a barb-wired fence and the project manager confirmed. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the existing and new fence will be the same type of fence and he asked if the new design could be without the spears on the top. He had other questions he would like to ask and was disappointed in Chevron and PG&E for not making a better contribution to that part of the City of Richmond.

Boardmember Woldemar asked who was responsible for the landscaping to the north of this site out to the corner. He pointed to the site plan which shows acres of dirt and a few trees which have existed since the new Parkway went in. South of the site the landscaping is beautifully done and to the west is part of the shopping center project built. He asked again who was responsible for the north of this site and whether or not it was a piece of Chevron's property.

CESAR ZEPEDA, President of the Hilltop District Neighborhood Council and Hilltop District Homeowners and Stakeholders Association, replied no and explained the background of the area. The property is owned by Chevron. The City has an easement to it with an agreement they were going to re-landscape it, install a watering system and put in lighting which took 16 years. The Hilltop Landscape Maintenance District (HLMD) is currently maintaining the area with a special assessment.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the budget amount of \$40,000 of the maintenance money and wanted to know if it could be increased or divided up differently to put towards the corner. He then showed a photograph of a pole in the middle of the sidewalk and wondered if the sidewalk could be widened to fit a wheelchair since the corner is currently not accessible.

He continued discussing the new fence along San Pablo Avenue and asked why it could not be 5 to 7 feet inbound of its current location to incorporate a proper sidewalk, proper curb and gutter and proper street landscaping, as required on all other projects within the city.

Ms. Vallier addressed the question regarding the fence placement and said there were three underground pipelines with electrical infrastructure that run under the fence that connect to the station. If it was feasible to change the location of the fence, they would've done so in the plans.

Boardmember Woldemar said he does not see any evidence of the three underground pipelines in the current plan drawings. He mentioned that in Pinole there were restrictions about plant material on top of the pipelines and suggested there could have been a fence or shrubbery at that location. Ms. Vallier rebutted by saying there would have to be a foundation built right

through the pipeline with the need to build piers and it is not possible due to the setback. She added that during the planning process there was talk of removing the right turn lane, but they do not want to remove that flexibility.

In conclusion, if there were any other alternatives to provide ADA compliance, it does not exist and by connecting the new sidewalks to current sidewalks, this provided a safer route.

Boardmember Woldemar said he was not convinced, but said he would move on. He did not see it recommended or suggested that a proper curb or gutter is being installed. Ms. Vallier pointed out the edge of the curb and noted the signs stating the path of travel is around the back.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the width of the walkway and said it brings attention to the one of the busiest streets of the area and it does not make logical sense from the perspective of a pedestrian in a wheelchair.

Boardmember Woldemar then questioned why the overhead utility power lines were not required for the power to be moved underground especially given PG&E is primarily involved with the project. In summary, he said he is concerned that the project is based only on logic alone, foregoing aesthetics. He gave an example of why they were not planting vines along the new fence. Ms. Vallier pointed to the vines which are every 15 feet which are called out on the diagram.

Boardmember Woldemar said he wants to know the purpose of the space between the fence and the new curb and gutter. Ms. Vallier replied that it varies, as they do not have the final survey along this edge but it varies from about 2 to 3 feet to 4 feet at the maximum.

Boardmember Woldemar asked why they would not propose a 4 foot sidewalk, pockets or vines up against the fence, leaving the curb side planting and street trees. He said it all has to do with the aesthetic of this very utilitarian project and why Chevron and PG&E could not do something better.

The Chevron project manager said they are planting native trees along the sidewalk, but they cannot obstruct the view of vehicles pulling in and out of the station and PG&E would need to secure access to the facility and the planting strips need eight feet to work well.

Ms. Vallier added that when putting planting strips against curbs they have not worked very well. Boardmember Woldemar said where they do work well there is at least 8 feet. He said he would like to know why things are not possible because a scraper station is not aesthetically pleasing.

Boardmember Fetter pointed to the north end of the map and confirmed this was PG&E's part of the facility and the scraper station is Chevron's existing facility. PG&E is installing a meter and will have instrumentation.

Boardmember Fetter asked where the access point of the PG&E's meter is along the fence. Chevron's project manager explained there will be an apron and a sliding gate so vehicles can drive through when needed.

Boardmember Fetter also asked about the surface material of the driveway, coming to the conclusion that the fence should be able to be moved back so as to widen the sidewalk. The

project manager expressed the history of the construction of the facility, and said codes and regulations were different back then. She said moving the fence back would escalate costs as they would have to re-instrument everything at the station.

Boardmember Fetter suggested putting in less fence further back, as there is nothing there. The project manager explained there are many buried conduits that run the electrical and this was not feasible to maintain the pipe.

Boardmember Fetter agreed that more information about the underground layout was required. The project manager emphasized that the current location of the fence is to avoid the Chevron pipeline.

Ms. Vallier noted that nothing within that area is changing or being proposed. It is the fence because they are trying to match it. The instrumentation does not need to be changed because it is not part of the project, but if the fence were moved the instrumentation shelter would be triggered.

Boardmember Fetter pointed out that he has seen Chevron moving all kinds of electrical and pipelines and it should be no problem to build a fence in that area. He reminded everybody that Chevron works with the City frequently and typically the City does not apply rules about how they comply with design review, but there are trade-offs the City must get or just some courtesy or consideration. Therefore, this project is a great opportunity for Chevron to step-up and to pay more attention to the aesthetics because this area would have high-impact on the community.

The project manager concurred and referred to work Chevron has done connecting the sidewalks but could not commit to moving the fence because it affects Chevron's pipeline. Boardmember Fetter asked her to take this consideration into account and she said she would consider it.

Boardmember Woldemar reminded all parties that the comments and discussions are advice. He then presented the photograph that showed a pole just to the north of the existing entryway, about 4 feet back inside the existing fence. There are several poles there which implies that the pipe is not nearby He therefore recommended plotting where the pipe is, see if the fence could be in enough so there can be a planter strip, sidewalk and a small amount of plantings up against the fence.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period. There were no public speakers and she closed the public comment period and moved onto the next item.

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar:

Public Hearing:

6. PLN14-274 BAY AREA NOTE GROUP RESIDENCE

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ±1,510 SQUARE FOOT, ONE-STORY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A ±344 SQUARE FOOT ATTACHED SECOND DWELLING UNIT RESULTING IN A ±1,834 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE WITHIN THE IRON TRIANGLE NEIGHBORHOOD.

Location 849 8TH STREET

APN 534-023-019
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
Owner BAY AREA NOTE GROUP, LLC
Applicant MICHELLE L. THIMESCH
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Associate Planner Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and described the scope, layout and key elements of the proposal. Staff recommends approval of the project with conditions and seeks the Board's advice on potential improvements such as a lower band with some brick veneer or different stucco treatment, and he suggested the Board consider this.

Chair Whitty asked for the alley width and Mr. Slaughter said he believes it is almost 12 feet in width. He commented that the loading area for the rear access was made wider than usual to accommodate the turning radius.

Chair Whitty asked if other people are accessing the property via the alley. Mr. Slaughter referred to Attachment 2, showing a car parked in the rear of the lot, as well as other vehicles. He said staff believes there is current access which is something the Livable Corridors Plan promotes.

Boardmember Fetter asked how this fits with the request to not have covered parking and asked if this would be an exception. Mr. Slaughter said staff is still evaluating what the best approach is for off-street parking requirements. Right now the draft has a required setback of parking of 30 feet and they are grappling with making it 40 feet and are experimenting with what is the best approach.

Boardmember Woldemar stated the applicant requested DRB approval and he asked how this is done without a variance. Mr. Slaughter said it is similar to the situation where the Planning Director can reduce parking by 10% if he sees fit. It is at the Board's discretion and given there will be pavers or stamped concrete, they think it is suitable.

Boardmember Woldemar said it looks as though many of the buildings of the street are right along there so it does not seem particularly bad. He noted there is typically a requirement to improve curb, gutter and sidewalk in the public right-of-way and he asked what the City's standard is for any improvements to the alley. Mr. Slaughter said none that are codified. Because of the proximity to the edge of the alley, while onerous, staff felt there was not a nexus for the applicant to provide tire strips.

Boardmember Woldemar said there is not a particular design for all of the fencing in the project. Mr. Slaughter noted he added a condition that all fencing be 4 feet solid and 2 feet of lattice. Boardmember Woldemar said if the fence on the alley side was durable and possibly moved into the property a couple of feet, it gives the ability to plant on the outside of the fence to help the alley's appearance.

Boardmember Munoz asked what the difference is between a studio unit and the second dwelling unit. Mr. Slaughter said it is the same thing, as it has full facilities for bathing and cooking, as they are called different things like granny units, in-law units and second dwellings.

Boardmember Munoz asked and confirmed that a galley kitchen is proposed and shown in the back of the unit.

Chair Whitty referred to page 2 of 9 which states, "Residence windows will be white vinyl." She said she does not believe the DRB approves this any longer, but if they do, it must be hefty, with trim and wide mullions and not just drawn on the building. Mr. Slaughter said he was not sure what the Board meant by "hefty".

The public hearing was opened.

MICHELLE THIMESCH, applicant, said she was available for questions of the Board.

Chair Whitty suggested Ms. Thimesch address the windows. Ms. Thimesch said the goal with the windows and the project is to minimize the amount of wood. The vinyl windows actually perform better. The stucco max or outer covering can be formed in any shape, so often times the trim will be bullnose. People will not actually see the vinyl window; there will not be cheap-looking windows and this is not what is contemplated. They are using a superior product in terms of its life and moisture and it will wear better than regular stucco. It does not deteriorate in the same way and is also a much better insulator requiring up to 60% less air conditioning because of its performance.

Boardmember Woldemar said he thinks the issue is something like Milguard which is a typical manufacturer of a vinyl window. They make several different levels of window plastic and he thinks the Board is referring to the jam head and sill of the window frame and not the trim around it. On some of the newer houses, the Board has required they be of a wider cross section for the jam head and sill than the typical aluminum window at Home Depot which is about one inch. These should be about 2 inches. One company is Simonton. In some instances the Board suggested that the client use Marvin windows which are an aluminum clad wood window. These are very durable and much more expensive, and in a house like this, he likes the idea of a granny unit but it should be done well. Therefore, he would not be opposed to adding a condition that states to use 2 inch wide minimum head jam and sill window frames.

Boardmember Fetter said it seems like the frame is too large for a small window, possibly they should not be used for all of the windows.

Boardmember Woldemar said because there is space he asked to move the rear yard fence in a couple of feet so there is opportunity to plant between the new fence and the alley. This could be as simple as a hedge row of shrubs, Japanese Boxwood at 18 inches. Ms. Thimesch asked and confirmed this would come all the way up to the refuse areas.

Boardmember Woldemar said because he did not see it, there is no design for the wood fence and he asked that it needs to be no more than 6 feet high and that it should read the same from both sides of the fence, or a good neighbor fence.

When looking at the front east elevation, he asked to see a fence that is across there which is more consistent with the house material instead of a board fence. He suggested a double plastered stucco wall that could have the ability to create a courtyard effect as it leads into the granny unit with a more decorative gate. He said in front of that fence and in front of the majority of the house, as Mr. Slaughter was talking about a brick wainscot he noted they were asking for suggestions on the landscaping. These are two places—across the front of the fence and in front of the main part of the house to do a nicely trimmed hedge as a continuous strip of green and he is proposing this in lieu of brick.

Further, Boardmember Woldemar pointed to the right side of the elevation which shows two windows. On the floor plan it shows three windows and three would be much better and create a better balance on the front side.

He also proposed moving the roof and the porch back a couple of feet so it gives it more articulation, and he displayed a sketch which he will provide to Ms. Thimesch. He proposed also doing this on the rear elevation as well.

Boardmember Woldemar said the attic vents shown are somewhat small and could be a bit bigger. Lastly, the Board usually asks for details on things like trim, gutters and downspouts to be shown, and the size of trim around the windows. He referred back to the site plan and the fence that separates the parking from the granny unit which is in line with the house and back side of the porch. He would propose to push that another 4 feet in so the cars when parked could still get their tails away from the sidewalk a bit. Also, there is a planter strip in front of the house between the sidewalk and curb, and this area needs to be landscaped. However, a utility pole is dead in the middle which the driveway will clear it, but for the other one, the driveway will not clear it and it will be half in and half out of the speed bump.

Ms. Thimesch asked Boardmember Woldemar to repeat the fence in the rear, and Boardmember Woldemar said the fence he referred to was the one that separates the parking between there and the granny unit open space. He asked to push it back so it recesses from the porch or moves over. A decorative gate could go there and a plaster wall or arch would be nice for continuity and a courtyard.

Boardmember Fetter said he had a similar list of items which Boardmember Woldemar addressed, but one idea he had for the fence referred to is that it could tie in with the rest of the house and have it at 3 feet and the top part of it would be wood to tie in the rest of the wood fence so there would be a nice division and still be under height, like a 3' with flashing and 3' because it ties in the materials of the fence and house. He also suggested working the arbor over the entry which is an option.

Secondly, Boardmember Fetter echoed the need for more detail on landscaping, but he suggested that instead of a hedge, there are great species of grasses such as purple grass alternating with a green or blonde grass in front at the same height. This would require less maintenance and less water and achieve the same thing.

Regarding window type and positions, Boardmember Fetter said he is concerned with the treatment around the windows and asked for better treatment on the sills compared to the jams and heads, and suggested giving more weight to the sill portion of the foam.

Boardmember Munoz echoed comments of Boardmember Woldemar. Because this is a studio, she suggested the same kind of elevation to cover the door as in the front. She asked and confirmed with Ms. Thimesch that walls are steel framing with ESP foam and she said it is a made to order, built to specification and it will follow whatever the final plan is. Boardmember Munoz said instead of having just one door in the front, she asked that a window be added in the front by the entrance. Chair Whitty confirmed the front was a French door and simply asked to make this glass. Mr. Slaughter said the intent of this was to be able to open up to the courtyard.

Chair Whitty referred to the breezeway which she loves and asked what it will be like walking through there. She asked if the roofs meet. Ms. Thimesch said she believes they must connect

and it is about 14 feet high. Chair Whitty asked what it will look like when looking up. Ms. Thimesch said she does not think there is lighting, although they thought about putting in tubular solar lighting there which lets in quite a bit of light.

Chair Whitty asked and confirmed that the roofs will be connected structurally and Mr. Slaughter referred to the sheet after A.2 which is the roof plan. Boardmember Fetter suggested addressing where the gutters and downspouts are and where it is taken. Ms. Thimesch said they plan to collect water and will have rain barrels and was not sure there was enough space. Chair Whitty said they could propose a raised wooden walkway with it underneath, given it is a 14 foot breezeway, which would be wonderful to consider. Ms. Thimesch said aesthetically she thinks it would be beautiful, but was a little worried about the cost.

Chair Whitty asked if the Board wanted the applicant to return with adjustments or do they feel confident to approve and condition the project.

Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed with Ms. Thimesch she liked the front fence, its location and style, that she would like to evaluate the cost of the arbor, that she will match the base with matching materials of the house, a vertical wood double sided wood fence, to include the back 18" of planting, and as to the other conditions, Mr. Slaughter said based on his notes, he would be able to create conditions.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Whitty) to approve PLN14-274 based on staff's four findings and staff's recommended 17 conditions, with an list of conditions to be added and communicated to the staff based on the set of notes from Boardmembers the applicant, staff and the recording; unanimously approved by voice vote: 4-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter).

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Ms. Whales stated the Board will discuss nominations and she will defer to the Assistant City Attorney.

Assistant City Attorney Atencio said he has reviewed the DRB rules. In the past there would be a nominating committee in June comprised of 3 members and they would recommend a slate of officers. Boardmembers would then nominate additional individuals if they choose and then there is a vote. In thinking about it, there would be 5 members on the Board and 3 would be a quorum. He recommended placing "Election of Vice-Chair" on the agenda for the next meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that Boardmember Robin Welter resigned which had not been announced, and he said he believes election of officers was coming up soon. Mr. Atencio said they could wait until June, but it was up to the Board. Chair Whitty asked to agendize it for the next meeting.

Chair Whitty announced that she and Boardmember Woldemar both need to re-apply to the new Mayor before March 17, 2015. Boardmember Woldemar said he already faxed it to Mayor Tom Butt and also to the City Clerk. Boardmember Fetter said he was not sure if he needed to re-apply or not, and Ms. Whales said she will double-check on the status.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Whitty announced that next Thursday at 2PM, she, Boardmembers Woldemar and Fetter will be meeting at City offices as a subcommittee.

Boardmember Woldemar said Ms. Velasco provided some preliminary information on Terminal One. There was originally a meeting scheduled for this Friday at 5-6PM, but they both spoke yesterday and agreed the meeting was not yet necessary. He asked if staff could confirm with him, Boardmember Fetter and Boardmember Welter tomorrow.

Boardmember Woldemar reported that last week he sent a message asking if it was possible to schedule an hour at their next meeting to discuss. Ms. Whales said staff wanted to go over it first and she was going to report out. She said there are many changes in the department with the departure of Hector Rojas who will accept a position with the City of Pittsburg which is where he lives.

The Board adjourned at 8:15 p.m. to the next meeting on Wednesday, March 11, 2015.