

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 8, 2017

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

November 9, 2016

6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Meredith Benz
Tom Leader
Mike Woldemar

Ray Welter, Vice Chair
Brant Fetter
Jonathan Livingston

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Brant Fetter, Tom Leader, Jonathan Livingston and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Vice Chair Ray Welter

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Jonathan Malagon, Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 11, 2015 March 25, 2015

Chair Whitty stated Vice Chair Welter was needed for a quorum to vote on the minutes of March 11th and March 25th and she recommended they be continued.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Benz) to continue the Minutes of March 11, 2015; approved by voice vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Livingston) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter).

Public Forum – Brown Act

MARCIA VALLIER, Vallier Landscape Designs, Inc., stated they presented the Unity Park project to the DRB in December and stated they will be returning at the December 14th meeting with a master plan, Phase I design, and construction documents. They have made revisions to the shade structure, the paving pattern, are creating adventure play equipment, wood fencing and murals and will hopefully build the project with the community in the spring.

City Council Liaison Report – None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty announced that there were no Consent Calendar items and she asked and confirmed members did not wish to place Items 1 or 2 on the Consent Calendar. She announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, January 21, 2016 by 5:00 p.m.

Public Hearing(s)

- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1. PLN16-449 | SECOND DWELLING UNIT | |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±300 SQUARE FOOT SECOND DWELLING UNIT IN THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY. | |
| Location | 5641 HIGHLAND AVENUE | |
| APN | 508-421-016 | |
| Zoning | RL, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL | |
| Owner | SANDRA MCQUILLIN | |
| Applicant | STEVE VALLEJOS | |
| Staff Contact | JONELYN WHALES | Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Recused:

Boardmember Woldemar recused himself from participating in the matter due to his residence location and left the meeting room.

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for design review approval to construct a second dwelling unit.

Chair Whitty confirmed that the applicant was not present for this item.

Chair Whitty had the following comments and/or questions:

- Chair Whitty referred to page 2 of 6, which states there is an existing driveway cut on “South 56th Street” and she asked that this be changed to “South 57th Street.”
- Chair Whitty confirmed that a 2-car garage is proposed to be demolished and replaced with 1 uncovered parking space and a tandem space.
- Chair Whitty asked where is the access driveway to the proposed unit in the rear which was not drawn in. Ms. Whales pointed it out and confirmed the applicant could draw it in when going to engineering for review and/or for building permits.
- Chair Whitty confirmed that there is a curb cut on Highland Avenue and that the new curb cut will be on South 57th Street and into the uncovered parking. She asked that this be drawn into the plans.
- Chair Whitty confirmed there was a vertical redwood fence on Highland Avenue and an existing gate that she asked to be drawn into the plans, and confirmed that the two walkways to the new dwelling unit are accessed from the South 57th Street side and also from Highland Avenue and made of pavers which she asked to be drawn in.
- Chair Whitty asked if there was a fence along South 57th Street, and Ms. Whales stated the applicant would need to answer this.

Ms. Whales noted that second dwelling units will be under the purview of the building department. The State of California will allow staff to approve second dwelling units effective

January 1st of next year. The planning department has set a 1,200 square foot threshold for second dwelling units. .

Ms. Whales suggested the Board approve the project and staff will confirm additional items to be added into the final drawings.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Whitty) to approve PLN16-449 with staff's 4 findings and staff's 6 recommended conditions, with additional conditions as follows: 1) that the applicant return to the planning department and provide driveways, paving edges, fences, walkways and landscaping drawings; approved by voice vote: 4-0-1-1 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Leader, Livingston and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Welter; Abstain: Woldemar).

Noted Present:

Boardmember Woldemar returned to the dais and was noted present.

2. PLN16-385 MAKING WAVES ACADEMY EXPANSION

Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS AND FEEDBACK ON THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING CHARTER SCHOOL. THE PROJECT WOULD INVOLVE THE RENOVATION OF EXISTING CLASSROOM FACILITIES; DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW MASTER PLAN TO EXPAND ON ADJACENT PARCELS; AND CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW CLASSROOM BUILDINGS, TWO GYMNASIUMS, OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL AREAS, ASSOCIATED PARKING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.
Location	4075, 4123, 4131, 4175, AND 4301 LAKESIDE DRIVE, AND 2900, 2925, AND 2975 TECHNOLOGY COURT
APNs	405-371-034, 405-371-035, 405-371-010, 405-371-032, 405-371-033, 405-371-025, 405-371-013, AND 405-371-014
Zoning	IL (INDUSTRIAL, LIGHT)
Applicant	MAKING WAVES FOUNDATION, INC. (OWNER)
Staff Contact	JONATHAN MALAGON Recommendation: PROVIDE COMMENTS AND FEEDBACK

Jonathan Malagon presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request. He asked that the DRB provide comments and feedback as part of the study session.

Boardmembers had the following comments and/or questions:

- Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 5, top of the page, and said staff indicates that the application is complete. He confirmed that the applicant was issued a letter indicating completion and the project will be phased. He noted that because the draft zoning ordinance has not been approved by the Council, he questioned the process for the applicant as well as the Board's benefit.
- Boardmember Woldemar also stated the parking landscaping is not correct under today's rules.

Mr. Malagon said in terms of the draft zoning ordinance, it had a first reading by the City Council earlier in the month and will have a second reading on November 15th. Assuming the Council approves the ordinance, it would take effect mid-December. He said it was the intention that applications that are deemed complete will fall under the current zoning ordinance. For future

phases of projects, applications that are deemed complete will fall under old regulations, and those not deemed complete will adhere to new zoning ordinance regulations.

- Chair Whitty referred the 4th paragraph on Page 5 which states “The applicant is aware that the ISMND may include mitigations that could impact the design and scope.” She asked how the application could be deemed complete without completion of an ISMND. Mr. Malagon explained that all requirements for the design review permit for the CUP has been submitted and this is a study session.
- Chair Whitty asked what could impact the design as far as environmental concerns. Mr. Malagon said traffic could be one, but his statement relates to the fact that there may be additional mitigations required of the applicant.
- Boardmember Woldemar noted that in the morning, there will be at least 100 drop-offs of children and he confirmed a traffic study was done. When the project returns to the DRB, there will be more information about this and other studies which were conducted. Ms. Whales stated all Boardmembers will have copies of all studies relating to the ISMND prior to making any decision on the project.
- Chair Whitty questioned if all school traffic will go in and out of Richmond Parkway. Mr. Malagon said he thinks the study session is to provide general comments on the design and overall site plan. There will be additional opportunities for comments to be provided by the Board.
- Boardmember Livingston said he thinks traffic would be an issue relating to circulation and potential impacts to neighbors and Ms. Whales reiterated the process that led to the application being deemed complete.

Boardmembers discussed traffic concerns in the area and confirmed that ESA was drafting the Initial Study.

- Boardmember Woldemar referred to materials given to the Board tonight and he confirmed that the renderings were similar but includes more detail than what was included as part of the packet.
- Boardmember Woldemar said he was not able to roll out the full size plans and suggested maybe the applicant can provide half-size plans in the future.
- Chair Whitty stated the only way into the campus was Lakeside Drive. She questioned why there were no curb cuts off of Richmond Parkway or San Pablo Avenue. Mr. Malagon said he did not discuss this with the applicant.

DOUG GIFFIN, Campus, LLC, thanked the Board and staff for providing comments and said they are excited about the campus and he provided a brief overview of the project. He discussed traffic and circulation for the project and stated all intersections met the LOS criteria. Making Waves has a very sophisticated queuing model with two very long pickup and drop-off loops provided.

THOMAS LUMIKKO, Studio Bondy Architecture, reviewed design highlights, renovation of the three existing buildings, drop-off loop, use of colorful glass and new materials, added a cohesive campus color palette and presented improved renderings.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Mr. Lumikko to describe how phasing will work. Mr. Lumikko pointed to the new middle school campus which they will construct first and it is large enough for all programs to move to that for a year while the other buildings are being constructed. They anticipate it being two phases.

Mr. Giffin added that the California Autism Foundation occupies a small portion of the building and they are trying to find a new home.

Mr. Lumikko then presented the drop-off loops for the high school, the parent loop, private school bus service drop-off location, middle school entry and loop, and he noted both are very long with plenty of queue distance. He pointed to parking which is part of the existing drop-off loop and it is generally one-way during drop-off.

Boardmember Woldemar pointed to the location of the new high school two-story building and he confirmed this area was two-way traffic.

Boardmember Livingston asked what would keep a parent from dropping their children off on the street.

Mr. Lumikko said this comes down to management of the school and enforcement by school officials, and this has a lot to do with the school's own culture.

Boardmember Fetter asked and confirmed that there are currently 780 students at the school

STEVE ROTH, Making Waves Foundation, confirmed that drop-off and pickup takes about 20 minutes. No one drops off on Lakeside which is part of the rules of the school and security personnel are out to enforce this. 40% of students come by buses which come 3 times a day in the morning, a return trip at 3:30 p.m. and half of these students stay until 6PM and another set of buses operate at that time.

Boardmember Livingston asked what would occur if there were a fire when fire trucks need 20 feet of clearance and when there are many SUVs parked there.

Mr. Roth said they have other fire access roads not part of the drop-off loop, but this is a fire access drive only. He pointed to a hammer-head turn here, an access to the middle school campus and a hammer-head which could be blocked by traffic. He recognized the area is wide enough for a two-lane road and when the queue starts to develop the fire truck would not require the full 20 feet to drive; just the turns.

Mr. Malagon noted that the Richmond Fire Department has reviewed this and comments are forthcoming.

Chair Whitty asked if the applicant would consider any accessibility off of Richmond Parkway or San Pablo Avenue.

Mr. Giffin stated there are significant grade changes between the Parkway and San Pablo Avenue that would prohibit a driveway. A sound wall runs down San Pablo Avenue with berming and it is about a 15% grade change. Given the speeds of cars and the ditch, he did not believe this would work.

Mr. Lumikko stated they could look at this, but they are trying to control the campus' Lakeside side for security and having additional access locations make it difficult to ensure students are safe. They discussed adding a sidewalk on the back of the campus to the Parkway for pedestrians, but it was a serious security concerns for the operator.

Boardmember Woldemar pointed out the significant residential population in the immediate walk able area and thinks along San Pablo Avenue there should be a sidewalk, curb and gutter and landscaping. He noted that applicant has indicated they will do the Richmond Parkway sidewalk

connection but if he lived in that area and wanted to walk to school, he would have to walk all the way back and around. He suggested at three outside corner points have pedestrian access that could be gated after 5PM or 6PM.

Chair Whitty commented that there is a significant sidewalk that runs all the way along San Pablo Avenue, as well as one on the Parkway. They could cross at the corner, come into the gate or come in from the bottom and this connects across the street to the YMCA. She confirmed that 2/3 of the student population live spread throughout Richmond and 1/3 live in San Pablo; that the school runs its own private bus service and will expand it for the expanded campus. Chair Whitty clarified her desire for the applicant to consider a couple of gates for pedestrian access other than Lakeside Drive and for bike access.

Mr. Roth added that the school has bike racks, but generally most come by bus or by car. There is a public transit stop on Lakeside and some students do take public transit. On this campus, the fields are expanded and they have two gyms. Each student has about one hour of outside activity, as well as after-school sports. He also pointed out that students from the west side can access the campus from Hilltop Avenue onto Research Drive and then Lakeside Drive.

Boardmember Livingston pointed to the location where buses queue up and there is only 10-12 feet of back-out space. He suggested moving the parking and mitigating this because when buses are there the cars are trapped.

Mr. Lumikko agreed and noted that they envision these lots to be staff or visitor lots where cars would not be moved very often. However, while it would be difficult to move, they can look at this.

Boardmember Livingston asked if the applicant could combine one end driveway with another driveway so there is one entry instead of two, and they could do a "T" or big entry to have one arrival to serve both.

Boardmember Leader asked where the front door space was located and questioned where a pedestrian would arrive, and Boardmembers agreed there needed to be an arrival, promenade or node that connects the front door and suggested grander walkways, as well.

Mr. Lumikko noted these are two different schools and people will not be going from the middle school to the high school gym and this circulation spine is important from building to building but incidental. It is not a corporate or college campus, and he presented the visitor lot and main office for that building, the front door to the visitor lot and office, and a path leading to the courtyard side. They have created architectural gestures to locate and enhance entries to all buildings; however, they can do a better job of connecting the sidewalk to the entrance and he recognized the commentary.

Boardmember Livingston said he noticed there will be many students driving their cars and going through the intersection and he asked if the school considered a stop sign or signal.

Mr. Giffin indicated that the traffic report reviewed the entire street and there is no signal warranted.

Chair Whitty commented that there is very little traffic on Lakeside Drive, and Mr. Roth agreed and said 83% of their students are Title 1 and very few students actually drive.

Mr. Giffin added that one of the things they modified based on the traffic report was to have the left and right turn movements marked out of that driveway.

Boardmember Woldemar asked the applicant to discuss fences and walls around the campus perimeter, which Mr. Lumikko described as chain link fence, an 8 foot landscaped sound wall, and they are proposing to install a 6' vinyl coated chain link mesh fence in a heavily planted screening. They are not proposing any fencing along Lakeside Drive as the school currently does not have any security fencing here.

Mr. Lumikko then presented a new introduction to the project which is public art installations of 5 sculptures based on their 5 core values of the school and he showed the proposed locations. Wall art is additionally proposed in certain locations which would also be commissioned by artists. He presented samples of the types of art they were looking at and they view it as a teaching tool and complement to the setting.

Mr. Lumikko stated they want to create a green campus and provide access to safe green outdoor recreation and play spaces for kids. Studio Green is their landscape architect and they are creating a parklike setting for the school. Within the campus design there are gathering areas, social spaces, quiet areas, and he presented Phase II high school plans. He said removal of the athletic component frees up the plaza and they are trying to create a student-oriented, pedestrian scaled plaza.

Chair Whitty asked if there was seating at the stadium and asked if it was a legal sized soccer field.

Mr. Lumikko said the soccer field is not intended to host competition events or regulation games but rather a physical education and practice field for the school, and it is surrounded by a track and fencing. There are concrete benches which face both ways which are covered, and additionally there could be bleachers, but there are many outdoor seating and gathering spaces throughout the campus.

Mr. Lumikko then presented the new building which is a student-oriented building with student commons, dining area, career and college counseling center, use of program pieces to break out of the concrete tilt up envelope and create a steel structure for a more expressive roof, plaza off of the main dining area of the high school, introduction of phenolic panels and colorful glass to buildings.

Boardmembers commented there seems to be a lot of concrete and paving. Mr. Lumikko said they are somewhat limited given the need for fire truck access, and he noted there is also a desire to have a big enough graduation space on campus.

Chair Whitty suggested a way for shade protection.

Mr. Lumikko said they have not yet discussed this, except for the permanent structures. Mr. Giffin noted that they had a lot of discussion about shade and they have areas which he pointed to where they focused on having a lot of tree coverage.

Boardmember Leader suggested the trees be filled into meet more the expectation of the design and said it feels a bit underdone, asked to see more types and not scattered types here and there, and he asked to make the C3 requirements a learning tool such as creeks or bio-swailes that are visible. A representative from BKF stated in the area used for different types of programming, they are conveying the water to the front side of the building where there is a large C3 area.

Boardmembers then discussed the use of new hybrid trees of a newer variety which is resistant to disease, tree species in certain locations and identifiable color block themes to distinguish spaces.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested a series of places for students to sit and study outdoors. He suggested a selection for an area of 36" box trees to use as a way to articulate places. He also suggested a diagrammatic colored concept plan that shows details in particular areas, which then expresses where pedestrian circulation is, where front doors, etc.

Mr. Lumikko stated that in order to prepare renderings, they had to scale back the trees but can bring back the full rendering with all trees so the Board can assess what it looks like.

Boardmember Fetter said this is supposed to be a full high school and middle school serving the community. He said instead my daughter has to go other schools to play soccer outside the community, and he recognized that this school had only one field.

Mr. Giffin explained the school can accommodate all practice space for students and sports on this campus, but typically students go off site to school district facilities for games. He thinks the challenge is availability of land. They are drastically increasing the amount of outdoor play space the students will have, but they are limited by land.

Mr. Roth added that their varsity boys' soccer team just won today and they play at nearby fields such as Kennedy. They use the City of Pinole baseball field and pay the City a fee, and they are looking at a more robust partnership to help them improve the baseball field, and are in talks with Richmond schools.

Mr. Giffin stated there is an interest in the school to buy more land, but it has not yet been accomplished.

Mr. Lumikko then presented and described the middle school building design features, student commons and dining area, different accent color, with shaded outdoor eating areas, a special volume for the music room for acoustical benefits, the path for middle school students to go between the gym and the main building, active play spaces with equipment and a ball wall, retaining wall which can be used for climbing, and some LED lighting. He then presented the signage board showing a proposed monument sign for each campus entry with an informational display, and he said they have not yet designed building identification signs for the campus other than the use of color to distinguish buildings.

Mr. Roth stated as part of the buildout of the campus, they will be naming the buildings with different addresses for each building per fire department regulations to be visible, and they can return with these at the next meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the lower right portion of the building by the drop-off area and said the landscaping vanished on the side of the building and asked for something there. Along the bottom of that parking lot, people will look up at the noses of cars. He asked that this area along with the other bus drop-off high school area be screened.

Mr. Lumikko said they have two different signs for the corner which is where the entire campus is announced and then augmented by entries to each one of the schools. They arrived at two proposals which he presented to the Board.

Boardmember Woldemar said along the Richmond Parkway the area in front of the West County Times building is a sloping lawn which will be improved, a chain link fence, and asked

for more creativity with fencing. Further up the hill are some non-landscaped areas. He said the Board approved a project across the street and increased its landscaping and he asked to treat the areas between the sidewalk and the property line as areas responsible for maintaining landscaping. This will create the public image of that street.

Mr. Lumikko said the fencing is effective in creating separation and the landscape treatments are about aesthetics and setting the mood for the entire street, along with mirroring their planting of the campus, but they will look at revising the fencing here.

Mr. Giffin asked for feedback from the Board on an entry area, and Boardmember Fetter suggested an arrow or way-finding be included and the Board indicated their preference for one of the slides.

Boardmember Woldemar relayed the following final comments:

- He said the best building is the yellow building because it is attractive. He said everything else is plain and he asked to see more color.
- In general, the tilt-up buildings are the same and asked to see more variety of window treatments and to add more color.

Boardmember Livingston asked to reduce the LED lighting from 4,000 to 3,500.

Chair Whitty referred to way-finding and suggested signs identify locations of specific buildings, areas and fields.

Mr. Lumikko stated they will return with an expanded sign program.

Regarding art for the project, they are working with a person engrained in the art community who is reaching out to 5 different local Bay Area artists to provide concept proposals. They are working with the Richmond Art Commission, but they were not able to provide any local Richmond artists for this type of art.

Boardmember Livingston relayed the following final comments:

- He confirmed that the window color and shades were anodized aluminum and clear as well as for the louver color.
- There will be no colored glazing.
- Roof screening will be a pre-finished corrugated painted panel.
- On the stairways is a perforated metal panel, and he asked and confirmed this was currently under development as to how to screen it, which the architect briefly described and said he will bring details of this at the next meeting.
- Trellis materials are wood and they also have sun shade structures that are steel.
- Sheet A-8.03 shows a cross section and he asked and confirmed they would use a hardy panel. They cantilever within the insulation sandwich from the main structure so the steel is on top of the deck.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that the current zoning ordinance states there are a certain number of trees per parking spaces inside the parking lot. He referred to the east end area and asked that the applicant follow these rules.

Boardmember Fetter referred to the overall color scheme and the southern-most buildings which is very consistent. There are certain examples in Europe with new architecture where

there is a geometric expression that wraps around the building or some bold color and he asked the applicant to give the building a bit more articulation.

Boardmember Livingston asked if it was possible to make the landscaping a teachable experience using native plant palette versus being so business park-like. He said the General Plan encourages this as much as possible. He noted there are no native plantings at the entry of the high school and said it is all deciduous.

Mr. Lumikko said doing an all-native plant palette is challenging and he noted that they have about 25% now. They talked about native as an approach, but kids want to be surrounded by green spaces and there will be learning opportunities, but they can consider more California plantings in certain areas but did not want it as an overall concept.

Chair Whitty concluded the matter and no action was taken by the Board.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

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

The Board adjourned at 8:13 p.m. to the next meeting on December 14, 2016.