

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

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

July 27, 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 6:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Vice Chair Ray Welter; Boardmembers Brant Fetter, Tom Leader, Jonathan Livingston and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Boardmember Meredith Benz

Staff Present: Lina Velasco, Hector Lopez and Assistant City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Public Forum – Brown Act - None

City Council Liaison Report - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty stated there were no Consent Calendar items. She announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, August 8, 2016 by 5:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. PLN16-136 MUNGUIA LIVE/WORK**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT ±2,500 SQUARE FOOT NEW LIVE/WORK BUILDING ON A VACANT PARCEL.
Location 453 FIRST STREET
APN 538-042-005
Zoning M-2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT)

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Applicant DIEGO MUNGUIA (Owner)
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report on behalf of Jonelyn Whales and he described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for a design review permit to construct a 2,500 square foot new live/work building on a vacant parcel, and staff recommends conditional approval of the project.

Boardmember Woldemar asked to amend Condition No. 4 to include the statement that talks about where to find where corrections have been made to conditions on the drawings, as well as for the next two items on the agenda. Mr. Lopez agreed to correct the wording in all instances.

Chair Whitty referred to the top of page 3 of 7, which indicates that a 6' redwood fence will be installed around the perimeter of the site, and she confirmed the front fence would be 4'.

Chair Whitty asked that the conditions require HVAC. Mr. Lopez agreed to add this and commented that the second floor has a large deck and a parapet wall along the perimeter of the building and this is where the HVAC unit will be located.

Chair Whitty called on the applicant to make a presentation.

Tony Bentosa, Designer, introduced owner Diego Munguia and his family and discussed his desire to enhance the neighborhood character of the area and said they were available for questions.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to accessibility on the ground floor and the fire rating between the work area and living area; however, these are handled by the Building Department. The designer stated they can put the 5/8" Type X gypsum board on both sides of the door and a one-hour fire rated door.

Boardmember Livingston posed the following questions and comments:

- He asked and confirmed the applicant would revise the corrugated 24 gauge galvanized metal to be 7/8 inch and there will be no color.
- The details state it is a textured CMU wall and in the drawings on Page 4, there is a layer of stucco on the outside. Mr. Bentosa stated this is a mistake and he will fix this.
- He provided a sketch detail of the fascia given the fact it was not clear how they are finishing the roof to the wall. He noted a precast wall cap comes with it which goes on top of CMU. He said this would look better and would be easier than framing or sheet metaling it.
- On the base, he asked to use 10" block and fill it in with mortar, and he provided a sketch to the designer.

Chair Whitty questioned where the fence details were located. Mr. Bentosa stated they did not submit a fence detail. He stated it would be vertical galvanized steel fencing with the same pattern of the corrugated sheet metal on the second floor which will be brought up to the metal posts. This will be on the front and the sides will be redwood around the sides and back.

Boardmember Fetter asked if staff requested a fence detail, and Mr. Lopez stated they had several design changes for the project and Boardmember Fetter confirmed the designer did not

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

include a fence detail. Mr. Munguia stated they will adhere to whatever fence details the Board would like.

Chair Whitty suggested staff be responsible for approving the 6' wooden fence along the sides and back, and she asked again what the fencing in the front would look like. The designer explained that the front fence was proposed in the past, but it is not proposed now.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested the fencing be subject to staff review to be consistent with the design of the building.

Chair Whitty asked for further details about the HVAC, and the designer explained that the second floor has a large deck and a parapet wall along the perimeter of the second floor. There is ample space for the HVAC unit to be located outside, and he confirmed there was ductwork for this.

Boardmember Woldemar asked what the material was for the base, and Boardmember Livingston stated it sounds as if it is split-face concrete block.

Mr. Bentosa confirmed it is split face concrete block.

Boardmember Livingston noted that planting could be installed on either side of the front door, as the front is completely paved. He asked the applicant if they could put some planting on either side, and Mr. Munguia confirmed.

Boardmember Leader asked that the planting be automatically irrigated with a drip system and that the Japanese maple be replaced with a Sycamore, and the applicant confirmed.

Vice Chair Welter asked what are the insets on both sides of the elevations. He described what he sees as the base, then the pilaster and three levels. He asked how the applicant is obtaining those three different levels.

Boardmember Livingston pointed to a section which states "8" CMU with a 10" CMU for the pilasters and a 12" CMU on the base of the pilaster. He confirmed it was all CMU and not foam or stucco.

Vice Chair Welter asked how they would achieve the offset because he said the module will be different, and Boardmember Livingston said they will need to cut it.

Vice Chair Welter asked about the roof and why they chose two opposing shed roofs which he said is a bit awkward.

Mr. Bentosa stated if they slope on both sides, it will look like a house from the outside.

Boardmember Fetter added that he did not see a color palette for the project and Mr. Lopez confirmed there was one, and he thought it was included in the packet.

Mr. Bentosa said the colors will be of a dark blue called "Nocturne Blue" with the galvanized elements. He said the trim and the wall are the same and everything else is galvanized.

Boardmember Livingston questioned why they would paint a split face CMU wall.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Mr. Bentosa said it will be spray painted, and Boardmember Woldemar clarified it will be painted split face CMU.

Boardmember Woldemar noted it is pretty unusual and pretty expensive because they have to add waterproofing into the whole system because the CMU leaks.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Livingston) to approve PLN16-136 based on staff’s recommended 4 findings, on staff’s recommended 13 conditions of approval, with the following amendments: that Condition No. 4 be modified to add in the standard statement regarding where conditions of approval may be found in the drawings; that any HVAC equipment will be located on the upper deck area behind the parapet wall; that the 24 gauge galvanized metal shall be a minimum of 7/8” tall; stucco is not to be used on the building and the primary building material shall be split face block painted to the colors specified in the color board; that there shall be a precast CMU cap to the top of the parapet; that the exterior walls shall have an 8” thick body, a 10” thick pilaster and overhead beam, and a 12” thick base all out of CMU; a detail for the fence shall be provided in wood reflecting a good neighbor approach subject to review and approval of staff; there shall be automatic irrigated drip system for the plantings at each side of the entry door to be reviewed and approved by staff; change the Japanese Maple to a Sycamore; unanimously approved by voice vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Benz).

2. PLN16-283 STARBUCKS CAFE

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±2,200 SQUARE FOOT COMMERCIAL BUILDING FOR A NEW STARBUCKS CAFÉ WITH A DRIVE-THRU LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF MEEKER AVENUE AND MARINA WAY PARKWAY.	
Location	NORTHWEST CORNER OF MEEKER AVENUE AND MARINA WAY PARKWAY.	
APN	560-150-012 AND 560-150-012	
Zoning	CM-3 (COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE)	
Owner	RON NAHAS-RAFANELLI & NAHAS	
Applicant	DAVE JOHNSON-JOHNSON LYMAN ARCHITECTS	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for a design review permit to construct a 2,200 square foot commercial building for a new Starbucks Café with a drive-thru. The request is for the DRB to recommend approval to the Planning Commission because of the CUP for the drive-thru. A subcommittee of the DRB met and requested additional refinements which have been incorporated into the revised design. Staff is recommending approval subject to changes for the drive-thru.

Chair Whitty noted that the documents indicate “The Board proposed two alternative schemes neither of which was considered. No analysis supporting the applicant’s claim that the on-site circulation will work has been submitted.”

Chair Whitty called upon the applicant to make a presentation.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

DAVE JOHNSON, Johnson Lyman Architects, stated when they met with the subcommittee of the DRB, they added a significant amount of additional brick, added more glass around the back side, added three green screens on the side for the drive-thru facing the street, and in their plaza area they added a 18" low brick wall with a cap as a buffer between the plaza and the drive-thru.

He said it was not their intent to ignore previous comments. They studied different options of a roundabout element when driving in and this created too much of a dead end situation and circulation confusion, studied a plan with the drive-thru extended closer to the entry off of the side street but it seemed like a very circuitous way to get to the drive-thru.

He said Amber Reed from Starbucks is present and they have developed many of these plans, and they believe that stacking-wise, the drive-thru should be fine. They feel this is the best plan in terms of circulation from Marina Bay to the drive-thru versus either of the other options.

Chair Whitty asked if the Starbucks will have customers from the traffic on Marina Bay Parkway in the morning. Mr. Johnson said yes, the bulk of it will come from Marina Bay Parkway and the drive-thru should be as close as possible to that entry.

Boardmembers noted that the outbound direction will not be that entrance. It will be on Meeker. Chair Whitty questioned how will drivers get their coffee and get back out onto the freeway.

AMBER REED, Starbucks, said in looking at the shopping center itself, it is difficult for them before the store is opened to tell the Board how exactly a customer will use it. There is a lot of daytime use on the opposite side of Marina Bay Parkway as well as customers from the southeast direction that will also trigger more traffic regardless of this center in the morning.

In terms of exiting, customers are coming back out and going to the signal, they can come through and turn left or, by going right on Meeker Avenue, customers can get back to the freeway that way, as well. She said as part of their analysis they drive the different routes. The issue with the daytime population across at Marina Bay and the Lab development is they are a big part of this customer base. Given how light the residential population is to the south, they are a huge part of driving the business which is why they are proposing the entry where it is located.

Boardmember Woldemar asked about northbound traffic in the morning and he asked if Ms. Reed was saying there are not enough people to support a Starbucks from that route. Ms. Reed said she did not have the population counts with her tonight, but for those coming northbound on Marina Bay once they have come underneath the railroad tracks, it is the left onto Meeker and then coming in that way. She said unfortunately, most people start taking what they think is the first turn they can take. What this plan was trying to avoid was people doing a short turn to almost U-turn into the drive-thru or having two different directions of travel trying to merge into one lane. But again, this is the heavier traffic count coming in the morning just because the residential base is not that high in the Marina Bay area.

Boardmember Fetter said there is no evidence of this and he thinks there is a huge population there. Ms. Reed said she agrees there is a large population base there, but in terms of the daytime population, it was significant.

Boardmember Fetter said he was trying to point out that there are many people driving from the Marina area all the way over to the Starbucks in Pt. Richmond and they would all be funneling to this Starbucks instead. He said he spoke with a fellow architect this morning and said he did

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

not think this Starbucks would affect the Point Richmond Starbucks at all. He just was surprised at how dismissive Starbucks was of the traffic patterns in the morning heading to the highway, given it is very heavy.

He thinks there will be many people turning left on the one side to get into the Starbucks and the challenge will be routing them out. The problem is they will not want to get on the Parkway and have to make a U-turn to get on the highway. He said he used to live across the highway and he described typical traffic patterns and said making a U-turn is difficult. He confirmed that Ms. Reed did not live in this area and said he was very familiar with traffic here and thinks it will be pretty even coming from both ways, and it is actually easier coming from the Pt. Richmond area to this location.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Mr. Johnson to hold up scheme #2 and said suppose the circle drawn there was not as expressive. He said at Hilltop Plaza there were some pavement treatments at intersections there but none were as elaborate and were basically changes in color. He drew a sketch of something 10-20 feet round with pavers and it is a simple shape so traffic could go anyway they wanted and it was wider than a 25 foot back out space.

He suggested moving it around a bit so the space became a little smaller by moving both arms of the L-shaped parking inbound on each other. In his sketch, he eliminated the "do not enter" access in, made the note to himself and said he happens to use the one at Home Depot in El Cerrito and he said many times cars are backed up in the drive aisle waiting to get into the delivery aisle. As it is drawn it was 7 cars and he believes it will be more than that so the idea of extending the length of the waiting area makes a lot of sense. He thinks the scheme #2 sketch is the winning sketch and one which offers the most options to people.

Mr. Johnson noted they have Charlie Abrams from Abrams Associates, who is a traffic engineer, but when he learned early on is when there is a driveway like this they do not want people to be indecisive. They want to come into the center and not hesitate. He thinks this creates a havoc in terms of which way drivers will go and most likely, they will stop there and decide what they will do.

Chair Whitty stated another thing that comes to mind is that she anticipates that drivers will line up and she would not put curb stops in the parking lot, given the line will get longer maybe once or twice a day to the north. She suggested losing a few parking spaces and let them line up there, but Boardmembers noted there cannot be cross traffic.

Boardmember Leader stated there is no way for people get in from Marina Bay going to work expecting to pick up coffee. He thinks the access is sort of set up for people coming home at night to get coffee which they do not do. Therefore, the people coming in are only those that know about it already because it cannot be seen from the Highway, or they are coming down 23rd Street. The scheme preferred by the Board allows both movements to succeed. Drivers can turn left easily onto Meeker Avenue and get into the drive thru line, or they can get coffee coming home at night and turn right and still get into the line, so it treats it more equally. He thinks the rotary is massive confusion and no one would know what to do there.

Boardmember Woldemar said he personally does not see it as a rotary, but a piece of pavement that is wider than a 25 foot drive aisle. He could come in, make a big swooping turn or a sharp turn, so it does not have to be a traditional street, road or parking lot drive.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Vice Chair Welter said he did not see much difference between the entry of the Board's preference and what is proposed by Starbucks. Mr. Johnson said he thinks people are driving more into a dead end situation.

Vice Chair Welter said drivers have the decision to go straight or right. While it is not perfect, he lives by the Home Depot Starbucks and agreed with Boardmember Woldemar. People routinely back up into the drive aisle and the parking behind it as well. The only way not to have the cross traffic is to block the one way area up. He questioned if there was another hybrid solution that uses the drive aisle in scheme #2 but do something different with the entry.

Ms. Reed said in the event this goes beyond the queue in the morning peak, it should not involve their co-tenants in the rest of the center. She noted that they have discussed this and with the entry and the potential for traffic merging here is actually happening right outside of a co-tenant. This was part of their review for the greater shopping center and they do not want to try to bring a congestion issue to this part of the center.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned this rationale regarding congestion, stating there is two-way traffic and there is at least 25 feet across. It could be made wider if there was concern. In his sketch if Starbucks extended their drive or "wait" aisle, 12 cars can be stacked in there, and often 7 cars causes problems, and that congestion on the existing solution seems to be a bigger problem for people who want to park.

CHARLES ABRAMS, Abrams Associates, said they have been involved in the traffic analysis and has worked on many Starbucks. He said given the dimensions of the site, the driveway on Marina Bay Parkways is the only and the best location to get in and out of the site and makes the most sense. It has the best traffic flow and their experience is that 7 to 8 cars in the drive thru were more than adequate for a Starbucks. They have made counts of many locations and what happens is that people who see a queue of 7 or 8 cars are now going to park and not going to wait in the queue for their coffee.

Boardmember Fetter said he understands Mr. Abrams' response of Starbucks knows what it's doing. Generally this is true, but everybody has experiences that show where a couple of layouts, specifically the one on San Pablo Avenue which is very similar to this, do not function. The Board is trying to point out that they prefer not to see that layout and can see it not functioning. Very frequently people are honking and getting angry at each other which is completely unnecessary but he was just trying to point this out. Because he lives near here and because of the San Pablo Avenue Starbucks, it is a compelling reason to pay closer attention to this. Also, when Starbucks says that the configuration most probably works, the Board is trying to make the applicant understand that it does not.

Mr. Abrams admitted he was not familiar with the San Pablo example.

Boardmember Leader said he was not quite sure why coming southbound was so much more attractive to Starbucks than coming northbound. He asked if a traffic study was conducted.

Mr. Abrams said there was no in depth traffic study, but they can surmise what the access patterns are and most people leaving the site will have to come out and go to Marina Bay Parkway and many of those people will probably want to make a U-turn to go back towards the freeway, and this is not an unusual situation.

Boardmember Livingston said he takes a left to go to Pascal's and half of the people here do drive northbound in the morning, so Starbucks' target market is sitting here and contradicts what

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Starbucks and Mr. Abrams is saying. Mr. Abrams said many people will turn left on Meeker and unfortunately, Starbucks does not have the opportunity to put Starbucks across the street.

Boardmember Fetter said it is difficult due the lack of data and he suggested looking at the other Starbucks which has the exact problem.

Ms. Reed said the El Cerrito store is a smaller parcel, smaller building and a shorter drive-thru stack than what is being proposed. It more easily comes out of it and she asked if this alleviates part of the Board's concern.

Boardmember Fetter said it comes down to the expected traffic flow data and the Board has nothing to base this on except for surmising of all parties. Ms. Reed said surmising is the tool, as this is how they project their stores.

Chair Whitty asked what Starbucks' morning coffee count is. Ms. Reed said they would be surmising what a customer count would be and they do not know this until they open. They do their best which is why they have come up with their plan. She said El Cerrito's popularity was a big surprise.

Mr. Abrams said when they review the stores, access is fine and this has about 20 parking spaces generously located to the front which customers can use to get in and out of the site.

Boardmember Woldemar said in more thinking about people who live south of this project and said in the morning they are driving northbound. They turn left onto Meeker Avenue, come down the road to the first driveway entrance. He asked how they get their take-out coffee from there from the drive-thru. Mr. Abrams pointed to the direction drivers would take to the drive-thru.

Boardmember Woldemar said this is very circuitous and he asked how people would find the drive-thru. He said the other solution is straight in. Ms. Reed said people will find it and their concern with the Board's preferred plan is the merging of traffic because there will still be traffic coming in from across the other side. Boardmember Woldemar asked to rework it to make it wider and make sure there is plenty of maneuvering space to get into the drive aisle. He suggested losing one car in the drive-thru line and change the site plan so there is less if any conflict there. He said the worst conflict is someone making a left turn into the drive-thru who will compete with people coming out of the shopping center.

Boardmember Livingston said scheme #1 has the cleanest diagram especially for morning traffic as it serves both directions. Boardmember Fetter agreed and said he would like it if there was a predominance of traffic coming in, heading towards the bay and coming in off of Marina Bay Parkway. Boardmember Leader noted that it seems scheme #1 disrupts the parking in the main shopping a lot less in the morning, and Mr. Abrams agreed.

Boardmember Livingston noted that Starbucks' preferred plan is just as circuitous as scheme #1 in the other direction and he asked why they were favoring nighttime traffic instead of morning traffic.

Ms. Reed said their thought process and concern here is that the entry to the queue is closer to the curb cut. If this gets busy during peak periods, people are closer to the street and they were trying to move the entrance away from a curb cut.

Boardmember Livingston answered and asked that Starbucks to count the number of cars from the window to wherever the curb cut is and to measure it as a distance. From the take-out

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

window all the way around, they will probably have a similar number of cars, and therefore, there is no difference. It comes back to time of day traffic.

Mr. Abrams said their reaction for scheme #1 is that most traffic will come off of Marina Bay Parkway and they will have a very difficult time trying to find the entrance to the drive-thru which will be a drawback and unusual for a Starbucks operation. Chair Whitty stated they will do it once and they will be fine.

Mr. Johnson added that it significantly increases the traffic as it affects the balance of the shopping center. When moving the drive aisle entrance to an environment that impacts the parking and traffic to the rest of the shopping center, they are now inconveniencing those customers as opposed to isolating it.

Boardmember Livingston commented there is no one at the shopping center in the morning unless they are going to Pascal's.

Mr. Johnson said they have Starbucks or Peets in most of their shopping centers, many with drive thru's and although morning is what they are all focusing on and this is a bit busier, it is a relatively balanced experience over the entire day and he suggesting focusing on traffic throughout the day.

Boardmember Fetter said there are two circuitous routes—Scheme #1 favors northbound traffic in the morning and Starbucks' main proposal favors southbound coming off the highway. He pointed out they both have circuitous routes and when Starbucks says that one or the other impacts the rest of the tenants, it is a wash. What the Board is trying to say is if this is the case, he said making that argument does not favor one or the other.

Mr. Johnson said the difference is the number of different ways into this which he pointed to and the area they want to avoid because they have no control over where the stacking goes. Boardmember Fetter again suggested counting the number of cars coming from the window out to that point and it will tell them that there are 2 or 3 more cars than in their preferred plan.

Mr. Johnson said if they stack in their preferred plan, it is a Starbucks customer being inconvenienced by a Starbucks customer. If they stack here, another customer to another business is impacted. Boardmember Fetter said he could say the same thing about getting out because of the crossover problem which is the same.

Vice Chair Welter said honestly, he did not favor any of the plans and said they all have different problems. Boardmember Woldemar said that raises an interesting point. The project is going to the Planning Commission because of its CUP for the drive-thru facility. If there is not an absolute consensus of the Board to make a specific recommendation, they will have to leave it alone and let the Planning Commission make a decision on the right site plan, and it may or may not return to the DRB. He feels like there is no consensus here and lack of data. It might be they cannot make a recommendation on the site plan.

Boardmember Leader said if part of the planning is based on anticipation of more cars coming from one direction than another, but there are no metrics to support it, the Board can ask for metrics. Boardmember Livingston said they all have different experiences at Starbucks and he was surprised there were no figures before the Board supporting the data for traffic patterns.

Ms. Reed said from experience, the relationship between the traffic counts will remain consistent to whatever they are saying. She has traffic counts, but not projections for the store.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Boardmember Livingston said given there are stores in San Pablo, Pt. Richmond and they know the draw on those. They could amortize across those and knowing the number of residents in the local area. He is surprised he has not heard anything that would support how much and where traffic would come from.

Mr. Johnson said it is really the number of people in the general vicinity and what are the alternative means and not how many cars they are driving and what traffic impacts will be. This is not a part of any retailers' analysis unless they are building a brand new shopping center.

Chair Whitty noted what was needed was an algebra rhythm showing population by the thousand and said 10% will always go to the nearest coffee shops.

Boardmember Livingston said in his experience with grocery stores which have finite GIS data which helps them understand where they are getting their customers from, and he was surprised Starbucks does not have a better grasp on this. Since they do not, he suggested traffic counts.

Ms. Reed confirmed that the Board wanted existing actual traffic counts and she questioned whether the count was at the intersection or not.

Vice Chair Welter said he thinks what is needed is traffic data that shows how many cars are traveling south at a certain time of day, north at a certain time of day, numbers of cars coming down Meeker Avenue to see where the bulk of people are coming from. He said it has nothing to do with how Starbucks is going to impact traffic.

Boardmember Livingston agreed and said what Starbucks is saying does not jive what the locals see and this can be resolved by determining counts going in all directions. Ms. Reed said this data is from the City of Richmond.

Mr. Johnson explained that regardless of the analysis and development of this site it is less about where the traffic is coming from as it is what the impacts are when the customer arrives. It is about how to minimize the length of time they spend getting in and out of Starbucks and in doing so, minimizing the number of conflicts they may have. The schemes presented show a far greater degree of potential impacts for customers in the shopping center of Starbucks and other businesses in the shopping center, versus the alternative that isolates all of the Starbucks conflict to the Starbucks pad.

Boardmember Woldemar asked to play the same example on Scheme #2 and he noted there are only two points of conflict there. There is no acknowledgement about the pluses of the other two solutions, and Mr. Johnson said it is not that there are no pluses, but is not a pertinent solution.

Boardmember Fetter noted that stacking on the drive-thru is much longer in Starbucks' plan and Mr. Johnson said it is a difference of 3 cars and the number of potential conflicts is increased. They have reviewed it and it feels as though they have not taken the Board's comments seriously.

Ms. Reed presented information which is somewhat dated from the City and said Marina Bay had 11,000 cars a day on average over the course of a year and the City did not measure Meeker Avenue. Boardmember Fetter said he is looking for time of day traffic counts in both directions, and he said since Starbucks is making it contingent, he asked that they back it up as they do not have anything except for conjecture.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Woldemar made a motion in order to move the Board along. He recommended approval of PLN16-283 to the Planning Commission based on the staff's recommended 4 findings, based on amending Condition No. 2 to include the statement about where conditions have been met in the drawings; modify Condition No. 3 to reflect the sketch prepared by Boardmember Woldemar dated July 27, 2017 labeled Scheme A which is a yellow piece of paper and similar to the applicant's Study #2. He said if there is no consensus another Boardmember may make a motion to disallow the project, or to not recommend it to the Planning Commission, or to forward it to the Planning Commission without a decision.

Boardmember Livingston asked for amendment to the motion that all exterior steel shall be hot-dip galvanized to prevent rusting.

Vice Chair Welter asked about the modification of Condition No. 3, and Boardmember Woldemar stated staff's recommendation of Condition No. 3 was that the "Drive-thru lane shall be modified to increase the capacity of vehicle queuing and relocating it away from maneuvering aisles of customer parking", and he said his Scheme A does that. It adds length to the stacking room, makes one point of entry into the business coming from east or west. If they elect to modify that entry point slightly to alleviate a perceived conflict, this is fine. He applauded staff and said this is the first time in a long time where a specific suggestion has been made, regardless if it may not be a solution.

Boardmember Livingston noted that he and Boardmember Leader were looking more towards approving Study #1. Boardmember Leader said he began to worry about some of the things the applicant brought up about the fourth access there and he is feeling like more of a believer in this now and asked for a proposed amendment to Boardmember Woldemar's sketch to turn the tiny circle into a triangle which would still allow for proper backing, parking and circulation.

Boardmember Woldemar said he would not make the triangle any bigger than the 25 foot or so backup space. He said the idea is that the pavement in the area is level so if people back out 30 feet, they are rolling on cement.

Vice Chair Welter asked if there was flexibility in this to adjust the entry. Boardmember Woldemar said this is in response to Starbucks' concern about affecting other tenants and pinch point. He thinks it is as easy as making that portion of the drive aisle or the parking lot 35 feet instead of 25 feet to give people more room to turn and maneuver.

Boardmember Livingston said the entrance point is directly opposite Pascal's, and he asked if that owner was aware that everybody turns into Starbucks in front of his parking area. Boardmember Woldemar said this was why he also suggested the applicant elect to widen that section of the drive aisle.

Boardmember Livingston seconded the motion.

Boardmember Leader asked for a friendly amendment, stating for a major street corner with a lot of traffic, the landscaping is too residential, and he asked for one consistent type of shrub that wraps the entire lane outside the drive aisle.

Boardmember Woldemar accepted all amendments to his original motion.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Livingston) to recommend approval of PLN16-283 to the Planning Commission based on the staff's recommended 4 findings and recommended conditions; and to amend Condition No. 2 to include the statement about where conditions have been met in the drawings; to modify Condition No. 3 to reflect the sketch prepared by Boardmember Woldemar dated July 27, 2017 labeled, "Scheme A" which makes the drawing more specific which is similar to the applicant's Study #2 and which turns the tiny circle into a triangle making that portion of the drive aisle 35 feet instead of 25 feet to give people more room to turn and maneuver; to add a condition to require that all exterior steel shall be hot-dip galvanized to prevent rusting; and to add a condition that one consistent shrub type be installed that wraps the entire drive aisle; unanimously approved by voice vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Benz).

3. PLN16-335 TAYLOR RESIDENCE

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±1,700 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE ON A VACANT PARCEL.
Location 447 STEGE AVE
APN 513-161-013
Zoning CM-2 (COMMERCIAL MIXED USE, NEIGHBORHOOD)
Applicant TAYLOR DAVID (OWNER)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for a design review permit to construct a new 1,700 square foot residence on a vacant parcel. Staff recommends approval with modifications to the building and said he was available for questions.

Boardmember Leader asked and confirmed the lot next door is currently being used for a driveway for the coin laundry business and that there is a curb cut.

Chair Whitty called upon the applicant.

Taylor David, owner, stated the area was designed for housing long ago and he asked for approval from the Board.

Boardmembers voiced the following comments and questions:

- Boardmember Livingston pointed to the location of the bedroom window which looks out to a parking lot and he asked if Mr. David would be amenable to produce a landscape buffer. Boardmember Woldemar noted Condition No. 4 addresses this for a Sycamore tree. Boardmember Livingston suggested the Sycamore not be used and replaced with an Evergreen or a Hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*) tree which would not be so large, and Mr. David agreed.
- Chair Whitty referred to the entrance's arch and she asked if this could be squared so it matches the garage door, and Mr. David noted there are other homes on the block with this arch and the designer tried to match these. Vice Chair Welter suggested a shallower or flatter arch and Mr. David and Boardmembers concurred.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

- Chair Whitty asked how deep the porch was and said it looked like 5 feet. Mr. David said he can expand it if he has the room in the front.
- Boardmember Woldemar referred to Condition No. 3 which talks about a 3 to 4 foot differential base trim and he suggested the applicant work with staff as to the materials. To reduce the scale and divide the massing between the first and second floor, he suggested putting a horizontal band at the window sill band which would carry it nicely. He also asked to add to the requirements for Condition No. 3 for expansion joints no more than 12 foot on center so the stucco has an opportunity to crack less.
- Vice Chair Welter said where it states stucco sill, to change this the finish of those pieces are smooth and not like the rest of the house and that they be painted the same color as the trim so it looks like a sill.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to approve PLN16-335 with staff’s 4 findings and staff’s 8 recommended conditions with the following changes: modify Condition No. 2 to show who is responsible for what on the first page; amend Condition No. 2 that a Hornbeam (Carpinus betulus) tree species that grows about 5 feet tall shall be planted in the rear of the property for screening 8 feet on center; amend Condition No. 9 that expansion joints shall be no more than 12 feet on center; amend Condition No. 10 to add a baseline to the walls and a horizontal trim under the second floor window all the way around; amend Condition No 11 that the stucco window sills be smooth and painted the color of the trim; unanimously approved by voice vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Benz).

4. PLN16-331 INTHASONE RESIDENCE

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±1,600 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A VACANT PARCEL.

Location CHERRY COURT

APN 561-262-001

Zoning RL (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)

Owner THIAM INTHASONE

Applicant LECK SOUNGPANYA

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APROVAL**

Hector Lopez gave the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for a design review permit to construct a new 1,600 square foot single family residence on a vacant 5,000 square foot parcel.

Boardmembers voiced the following comments and questions:

- Boardmember Livingston commented that unless the applicant does a great job with the stone and return it, it will detract from the house. Boardmembers discussed the use of stone and asked that the applicant remove it.
- Boardmember Livingston asked to leave the front gable as drawn and back gable as drawn but that the rest of the roofing be hipped. Mr. Soungpanya agreed.
- Boardmember Woldemar had the following comments and requests:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

- He stated at the rear elevation, the roof is incorrectly drawn and asked that this be corrected.
 - There is no refuse area and he asked that applicant that the trash bins should not be kept on the driveway.
 - The dimensions on the floor plan for the garage are labeled 19'10" and he stated two-car garages are required to be 20 feet clear inside. Therefore, the right hand wall of the garage will need to move to the right.
 - There is an entry door and two side lights. He asked that they be backset an additional feet so the front porch is a bit bigger than just a landing for a total of at least 6 feet.
- Boardmember Livingston asked that the center of the front door and the side lights on the opening at the top of the steps is offset right now and he asked that this be centered.
 - Chair Whitty asked if all windows will have sliders. Vice Chair Welter said given the size of the windows, in most cases sliders are appropriate. He asked to have single hung in the front. Boardmember Woldemar asked that the applicant ensure they address egress and ingress requirements, given the window sizes.
 - Vice Chair Welter stated the garage door header is shown too high and should be at the same header height as the windows and front entry.
 - Vice Chair Welter suggested that the applicant find another location for the powder room given its location is odd. It should be somewhere off of the hallway near the laundry.
 - Boardmember Leader stated the landscape plan is not complete and he asked the applicant to identify and show details similar to what was done for the rear as to where all of the materials are around the house and the fence location. The applicant confirmed they will remove sod in the rear and he suggested the use of various grasses, mulch, pea gravel, etc. and show this on the plans.

Chair Whitty commented that Condition No. 2 read as correct and this did not need to be revised.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to approve PLN16-331 with staff's 4 findings and staff's 11 recommended conditions with the following changes: amend Condition No. 4 to require the applicant to remove the sod from landscaping plan and submit a revised embellished landscape plan for the front and rear and fence details; add Condition No. 12 to remove the stone base trim; add Condition No. 13 to retain the front roof gable and back roof gable and hip the other roofs; add Condition No. 14 to provide a 20x20 foot clear interior dimension for the garage; add Condition No. 15 to enlarge the front porch to 6 feet deep and center the door on the porch opening; add Condition No. 16 to correct the garage door header; and add Condition No. 17 to address window trim; unanimously approved by voice vote: 6-0-1 (Ayes: Fetter, Leader, Livingston, Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None; Absent: Benz).

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

5. **PLN16-401 MIRAFLORES FOR SALE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

Description	STUDY SESSION TO RECEIVE AND PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED MIRAFLORES FOR SALE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WHICH PRIMARILY CONSISTS OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF 160 FOR SALE MARKET RATE RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND 30 FOR SALE MODERATE-INCOME UNITS RANGING FROM THREE-TO FOUR-STORIES IN HEIGHT, THE RELOCATION AND RESTORATION OF CERTAIN HISTORIC RESOURCES, AND A NEW TOT LOT PARK ON AN APPROXIMATELY 7.21 ACRE SITE.
Location	AREA GENERALLY BOUNDED BY SOUTH 45 TH STREET TO THE WEST, WALL AVENUE TO THE SOUTH, INTERSTATE 80 TO THE EAST, AND THE BART TRACKS TO THE NORTH
APN	513-321-001, 513-321-003, 513-330-001,-002,-003, -005, -006,-007, AND -012 THROUGH -014
Zoning	PA (PLAN AREA DISTRICT)
Owner	SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE RICHMOND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
Applicant	MIRAFLORES COMMUNITY DEVCO, LLC
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO Recommendation: RECEIVE AND PROVIDE COMMENTS

Lina Velasco stated the item is a study session on the Miraflores for sale housing development, noting that the City had approved a Planned Area (PA) District for the site that included three major project components; one an 80-unit affordable senior housing development, one a for-sale housing development within a greenbelt and restoration of Baxter Creek where it would be day lighted and a greenbelt.

At the time, the City did not have a development partner. The site was opened by the CRDA and is now owned by the Successor Agency to the CRDA and one of the few projects that remain. The City very recently approved the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) with the applicant; the Miraflores Community Devco, LLC and she said Scott Hanks is present representing the applicant along with Calvin Lu of Hezmalhalch Architects, Jason Neri, the civil engineer and Marcia Vallier who is working for the City on the greenbelt and as the landscape architect for the applicant developing landscape plans for the senior development.

Staff has been working with a subcommittee of the DRB with Boardmembers Woldemar and Leader, and Boardmember Livingston was recently invited to attend and participate, as well. At the last meeting it was suggested that the matter be brought to the full Board with comments and revisions to return for a recommendation. Staff is currently reviewing next steps for the project depending on the total number of units. They will likely need to amend the PA District because there was a unit limitation and they are proposing more than what was directed for the for-sale component, which requires Council approval.

Chair Whitty said she believed the greenbelt plan was approved years ago with funding, and Ms. Velasco confirmed but noted that Boardmembers were interested in hearing what the project includes and tonight is an opportunity to address questions about the interface between the two projects.

Scott Hanks, Miraflores Development, gave an historical account of the original RFP for 150 units which led to them identifying the need for affordable housing, costs for the units which then led them to the unit count of 190 which is well under the EIR which is 226 units. The moderate affordable income level is 120% of the area median income requires homeowners to make no greater than 30% of that gross for their payments. The City amended it to be 110% and 35%

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

maximum payment, so it allows for less affordability but a larger payment. Because of the DDA process and said they are now building 160 market rate homes, 30 affordable homes and fairly constricted with property boundaries.

He displayed what was approved previously and the creek restoration area is funded through a grant and to be approved and he pointed to areas which they cannot access, development of a focal point, and he said at the last meeting they discussed the site's layout and architecture. The plan represents the most plan layout with everybody's feedback.

Boardmembers voiced the following comments, questions and concerns:

- Boardmember Woldemar noted the plan was a bit different than the plan in the Board's packet. He suggested adjusting the plan to develop a hammerhead for the Fire District, as well as adjustment of parking so the entire zone stays green. He said leaving the units out created a focus to the entire historic reference which also is a streets and alleys solution.

Mr. Hanks clarified that the area will be an EVA with bollards, and it will have a pervious surface and acceptable for fire. During the sale of the project, the model homes will front Wall Street and they want to be able to take their potential purchasers through that area.

- Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed the garage were still facing the street, and noted that Boardmember Livingston had discussed flipping the building and putting an alley behind it to create a restful environment away from the historic resources.

Mr. Hanks stated their reasoning for the current plan was to make a heavy focus on keeping 'eyes on the park' and ability for lighting for safety and access and pointed to a few areas where they create that desired environment. He thinks this plan is more marketable and from a safety perspective it outweighs the alternative.

- Boardmember Woldemar said when moving through an alley or street, changing the appearance of the garage doors and discussion regarding trellises, landscaping and possibly some offset of garage doors should work given floor plans.

Mr. Hanks stated a problem may be that their legal description is part of their DDA but may have the latitude and space to functionally do this and he introduced Calvin Lu of Hezmalhalch Architects.

Marcia Vallier, Vallier Landscape Associates, stated where there is movement on the vertical face, she would like to put some trellises over the driveways.

- Boardmember Woldemar recognized that the plan deliberately tries to hold space off of the property lines next to single family homes given it is 3 and 4 stories. Boardmember Livingston asked that the developer show future project satellite photos.

Mr. Hanks discussed feedback with the neighborhood, Eden Housing, and design changes over time which made the project much more desirable for the entire area.

Ms. Vallier referred to smaller areas of the project and said they were looking to use colored asphalt along the back edge as well as trellises and concrete apron in between driveways with at least 3-4 feet of planter areas and landscaping that will provide some texture. They will pick up on the different features to bring the trellises to life and they will match the architecture.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

- Boardmember Fetter asked about connection of the bike path which Ms. Vallier pointed to and said it has been revised. He asked that she return to the concept of having it more protected, given the variety of users.

Mr. Hanks introduced Jason Neri, civil engineer with Carlson Barbee and Gibson, said they originally had the typical concept for neighborhood sidewalks and parkway, and they decided to eliminate the parkway on one side and to make the multi-use trail there off of the roadway and adjacent to the units.

- Boardmember Fetter commented that there will not be 90 degree turns and he asked to bring one area back.
- Boardmember Woldemar said in another area, the bike path was right up on the property line and Ms. Vallier said she would not want to ride back there even with the landscaping there.

Mr. Neri recognized that the Boardmembers want them to smooth off the 90 degree turns and make it flow as a bike path, and Ms. Vallier said they can return it to the original intent.

Mr. Hanks stated there was discussion regarding the Sakai House, water tank, water tower and green counts. He pointed to the original location approved through the City's process which has been slightly moved but still stays within the Sakai property. The brown area has not changed which was a tot lot and they have planned for two tot lots. Boardmember Woldemar questioned what would happen in the 90 degree area when that is removed. Ms. Vallier explained that they are under contract for a certain portion and said they have the Architectural Resources Group to help them with the context of the Sakai House and Oishi House. She said she heard that the Board wanted a connection.

- Boardmember Woldemar said the pedestrian spine was important and there should be something at the end of it which was done. There is a horizontal connection which Boardmember Livingston drew that is making its way back to the cul-de-sac and when he drew it, he started distributing the playgrounds differently so kids had the ability to move back and forth through the project.

Mr. Hanks said one tot lot is for smaller kids and one is for larger kids, but they can do both. In centralizing it, he will leave that to Ms. Vallier.

Ms. Vallier said when looking at the historic context of a play structure next to it, she will push away from this and wants to work with the Architectural Resources Group to have a good context. She explained the four different interpretive themes and said they will try to relate the fact that there were greenhouses laid out will interpret their edges with posts and use interpretive signs.

- Chair Whitty asked if it was possible to add an outdoor theater area and one of the applicant representatives stated they have this in Pleasanton and it was possible, but Boardmember Fetter said he thought it would be too cold, given Richmond gets very windy and cold at night.

Mr. Hanks commented on parking and said they have more than plenty, given that they have added more.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

- Boardmember Woldemar said it strikes him that they are getting close to the site plan and he suggested the next layer be the details which should include the bulb-outs, crosswalks, raised paving, and other elements. At the last meeting they focused on architecture and no one reached a conclusion, hence the need to return in a study session.
- Boardmember Fetter referred to Sheet A-2.3 and 2.5 asked how the combination of square elements contrasting with the hip roofs evolved. Mr. Lu said the previous plan included gable roofs which were much more noticeable at the ends, and these were turned into hips and lowered them. Boardmember Fetter said these can be seen from the street and from the freeway.
- Boardmember Woldemar had the following questions and comments:
 - He questioned the location of the HVAC, how screening will work, and Mr. Lu stated they will install high efficiency so they are quiet and they will prepare a screening detail with Ms. Vallier.
 - He suggested removing the parapet and there will be a place for equipment. On the Mediterranean version of architecture, this hangs together better in each of the sizes of buildings, as well.
 - The third topic was whether this is the right product and in going back to the original approval it was a bunch of single family tightly packed units and had a whole different texture than these buildings. He personally feels the larger buildings are okay if the architecture starts working, but he has not yet seen this.
 - He asked if windows are or are not recessed, as he could not determine this.
 - He suggested the opportunity to do some back setting on the garage doors so they can be moved around a bit. The applicant said he thinks this can be achieved without moving the buildings.
 - There are some cases where standard garages and compact spaces are used which can be tinkered to offset the back door 2 feet off of the plane. Any one of the modules could slip on one another and if there is room on the site, this is a good way to get further articulation of the alley and more room for landscaping.
- Boardmember Fetter referred to the particular style of the building on Sheet 2.5 he confirmed the applicant was calling the style 'modern' and asked for comment by Boardmember Livingston.
- Boardmember Livingston said he spoke with Mr. Hanks and what he thinks is the market. It hit him when driving through Lafayette last week and Boardmember Woldemar distributed the picture. If the architect can clean up the existing architecture without a lot of the applied ornament and foam and crisped it up, they could provide the building with a contemporary look while still maintaining the traditional look.

Mr. Hanks stated they had supplied only the contemporary with flat roofs, parapet and said this is the most popular product on the market today. They receive feedback of "Santa Barbara" and City staff sent them a photo and this is how the other elevation came to be. Chair Whitty referred to the new senior housing project called Phoenix Commons Building at the Park Street Bridge in Alameda and thought that style would work.

- Vice Chair Welter said aside from the tile roof, the Santa Barbara style is very contemporary to him. Mr. Hanks stated they actually contemporized since the last

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

meeting. They tried to tone it down to bring them closer and said overhangs were longer, fussy trellises were made more sleek and modernized.

Boardmembers then briefly described the various elevations and horizontal fence work with fasteners for a clean, contemporary feel.

Mr. Hanks noted there are currently 21 different building sets or groups of buildings and having them all the same was not their goal. They wanted to create two elevations and four different color sets which he brought.

- Boardmember Fetter referred to the 3-D aerial photo of the old project and pointed to the need to include how the massing works together given elevations will only show so much. Mr. Hanks agreed to bring that to the formal meeting.
- Boardmember Livingston asked the applicant to play with the components of that and play with them so the buildings are different instead of changing one to contemporary. He suggested removing gables on one side, making it asymmetrical, create a different base, etc.

Mr. Hanks said he thinks they can, said they want to keep it contemporary because clearly the market purchaser is more contemporary inclined. He explained that clearly around the senior housing they wanted more traditional design and then move away from it. They want to create some relief in both color and architecture and agreed it would be a challenge.

- Boardmember Woldemar said he thinks the contemporary version is easier to tinker with color than the Mediterranean or Santa Barbara one.
- Vice Chair Welter said he was also thinking the roof material could be a standing seam metal roof and more of a consistent color with the same forms which could contemporize it. For this scheme it would be a perfect way to add some difference with some color.
- Boardmember Livingston said he also played with the color in the base and it helped bring the scale of the building down slightly. He also introduced color steps like the tile or colored concrete which brought warmth into the walkway.

Mr. Hanks stated he likes the idea for a metal roof but this product is also price sensitive and would put them into a different category. They changed it intentionally to comp which allowed them lower the pitch to make it less visible and they kept tile on the front elevations where depth and body could be seen.

- Boardmember Livingston commented that with all of the counter flashing and regulates needed on the contemporary one to merge with the hip roof it would be less expensive to install the metal roof on it.
- Boardmember Woldemar pointed to where the project jumps to 4 stories to 3 stories there is a blank wall which is a master bedroom. He suggested a window there to break up the wall and reduce some of the mass. He questioned why they did not play out a 3 and 12 roof particularly when they must deal with the gutters and water pollution, and suggested a parapet building with vertical changes. He recognized the price point but some of them might have 10 foot ceilings in them which would greater sell.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Mr. Hanks noted they wanted the project to be completely temporary with flat roofs across and then 'Santa Barbara' was introduced by the Planning Director and then they tried to fit two different product types in one community.

Vice Chair Welter asked whether the applicant looked at the design more of a row house that would make it less of a big building. Mr. Hanks said they are designing a project in Cupertino in a Brownstone style and the City said no, and Vice Chair Welter said he is working on two projects of 3 and 4 stories in San Francisco and they love them.

- Boardmember Fetter referred back to the site plan and asked about parking, and Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that he provided a sketch to staff to provide to the applicants.

In the next submittal Mr. Hanks said they will provide two elevations that will work for them and the Board and asked to receive comments regarding colors. Mr. Hanks presented one prototype and received the following comments:

- Boardmember Livingston stated that he thinks the color palette is acceptable but it depends on the style of the building.
- Vice Chair Welter said to Boardmember Woldemar's point, if using the Santa Barbara look, the colors will have to be more muted or subtle, and with contemporary more colors can be used.
- Boardmember Livingston asked to also take into account the two communities in using bright colors.
- Boardmember Fetter agreed, but also cited the City's experiences using brighter colors in the downtown.

Boardmembers discussed their preferred style of architecture and indicated generally that they want to see the modern worked out better, and voiced the following comments relating to architecture:

- Boardmember Woldemar commented that with the modern architecture it is easy to get more variation across the field of homes.
- Chair Whitty suggested going with the demographic and concentrate on that.
- Boardmember Fetter asked if the applicant might go with the clean lines, pull in the flat gable end metaphor from the original forms of the Miraflores and work with simple, unadorned features so they end up with a very modern feel but with a house form.
- Boardmember Woldemar said the essence of this lies in the detail and usually in a lot more money. Boardmember Fetter suggested using comp with a decent peak while working with all of the forms which would match well with the senior living. The applicant would have to transition to a color palette with a similar roof peak to the senior living and all of the modern homes would have a color palette and stucco finish but still have a modern feel. They would filter out where they transition to a more modern massing and grouping. Boardmember Livingston did not support this, believing it would not be successful given the applicant's budget and project price point. He thinks it is tough to pull off contemporary with a low budget. Ms. Vallier said there is a simple, strong historic context and she asked for a simpler style.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 22, 2017

Mr. Hanks said they will try and contemporize one of the elevations which Boardmembers supported.

- Vice Chair Welter encouraged the team to keep going with cleaning up some of the trellises, use one color for the barrel tile and said things like this will contemporize it more, along with the fence ideas and tightening up of other details.

Mr. Lu asked how bulb outs and decorative paving and pop outs would be incorporated into the site plan at the level of detail they are at right now.

Boardmember Woldemar clarified that the screeds should definitely have bulb outs and said the next question would be how the entries to the alleys work, should there be pavement changes in the street to turn in and not necessarily bulb outs but an announcement of something. He said he expects to see a street sign program here also that is different from the rest of the City because this is probably one of the last neighborhoods the City has to work on, and this is the interplay between the applicant and Ms. Vallier.

Mr. Hanks said one of his focal issues is getting seniors something to do during the day, and this is why they redesigned the project. There was previously no grass area and now there is more leisure area for them. He asked if they could put a bump out so seniors do not have a transition in elevation, and Boardmembers supported this and said it would also benefit the single family development.

- Boardmember Livingston asked about the roundabout and whether it was flat. Mr. Neri said they need to leave some moundable space so fire trucks can have access for turning radius and so there is some planting areas.

Ms. Vallier referred to landscaping and historic features, and said she they will ensure to interpret what was on site with key plants, making sure there are opportunities for a rose garden or master garden space.

- Boardmember Livingston suggested creating sections of greenhouse when walking down the spine. Ms. Vallier agreed and said there are two actual original greenhouses that can be reconstructed and if they can find funding and maintenance they can be located by the beds.

Chair Whitty concluded the item and she and Boardmembers thanked the applicant team for their comments.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None

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

The Board adjourned at 9:20 p.m. to the next meeting on August 24, 2016.