

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

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

November 8, 2017

6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Jonathan Livingston, Chair
Meredith Benz
Michael Hannah
one vacancy

Tom Leader, Vice Chair
Kimberly Butt
Bhavin Khatri

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Tom Leader; Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Michael Hannah and Bhavin Khatri

Absent: Boardmember Kimberly Butt

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Lina Velasco and Jonelyn Whales; Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).

Public Forum – Brown Act

BRUCE BEYAERT, TRAC, said in September he provided a report on Bay Trail projects that should complete another 5 miles of trails by the end of next year. Since that time, LDK Ventures has paved one-half mile of new Bay Trail leading north from Atlas Road toward Pinole. The second large project is the BATA (Bay Area Toll Authority) which is out to bid to build a trail across the top deck of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge on the shoulder which will connect San Rafael and Richmond. This project should be completed and opened late next year.

Chair Livingston thanked Mr. Beyaert and TRAC in their efforts and partnerships with organizations in adding Bay Trails.

City Council Liaison Report – Mayor Tom Butt was not present.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Livingston announced that there were no Consent Calendar items.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, November 20, 2017 by 5:00 p.m. and he announced it after each affected item.

Public Hearings:

1. PLN17-319 MAGDANELO RESIDENTIAL ADDITION

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY ADDITON TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING WITH AN ATTACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT.

Location 3030 ANDRADE AVE
APN 526-260-010
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
Applicant JOSE DE JESUS MAGDALENO AND JOHANNA FLORES (OWNERS)
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonelyn Whales gave the staff report and overview of the request for a design review permit to construct a two-story addition and 640 square foot attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU). The project was heard previously by the Board on October 27th at which time the applicant was provided with and adhered to the direction which she briefly described. Staff recommends the Board approve the project based on changes done to the drawings from the last meeting.

Boardmember Hannah stated he reviewed the comments and drawings which were adhered to by the applicant, and he made a motion for approval. Boardmember Benz seconded the motion.

Chair Livingston opened the public comment period, and there were no speakers.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Benz) to approve PLN17-319 with staff's recommended four design review findings and staff's recommended eight conditions; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).

2. PLN17-593 TERMINAL 1 RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED TERMINAL 1 RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WHICH INCLUDES 316 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, COMMERCIAL SPACE, A WATERFRONT PARK, AS WELL AS ROAD, BAY TRAIL AND OTHER SITE AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS. PROJECT INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT WWW.CI.RICHMOND.CA.US/TERMINALONE

Location 1500 DORNAN DRIVE, SOUTHEAST OF INTERSECTION OF DORNAN DRIVE AND BRICKYARD COVE
APNs 560-420-010, 560-420-007, 561-010-007
Zoning PA, PLANNED AREA DISTRICT
Owner CITY OF RICHMOND
Applicant TERMINAL ONE DEVELOPMENT LLC
Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Chair Livingston read an overview regarding the project's history, previous hearings held and involvement by the public and recognized the applicant Laconia LLC. He disclosed he has met about 10 times with the developer and both architects over the last 3 years, as well as with Brickyard Cove residents, held discussion with the Mayor and City staff and others regarding process. The focus of his discussions related to concerns to fit the architecture and landscaping into the context of The Cove.

He said City Council Resolution 63-16 dated July 6, 2016 there are issues involving building height, density, unit count, building shape, roads and site plan issues, which have already been discussed and approved. He asked speakers to limit their comments as to what has not yet been reviewed which are colors, materials, certain architectural features, landscaping, fences, courtyard walls, single family mass and form, glazing, retail plaza design, overall landscaping and other design issues.

Boardmember Hannah disclosed that he met with the applicant regarding landscaping.

Senior Planner Lina Velasco gave the staff report and the following highlights:

- The project has been under review since 2014;
- On July 5, 2016 the Council adopted Resolution 63-16 certifying an EIR, adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) and approving a Vesting Tentative Map subject to conditions for the project.
- The Council modified conditions recommended by the DRB and Planning Commission as part of their final action.
- On July 19, 2016 the Council also adopted Ordinance No. 13-16 rezoning the project site to a Planned Area District (PAD).
- Following approval of the project, the Brickyard Cove Alliance for Responsible Development sued the City challenging the project approvals.
- A settlement was reached and approved by the City Council on November 15, 2016.
- The settlement included the following revisions to the project:
 - Removal of the entire 5th floor of Building 4;
 - Added one unit to the south end of the 5th floor of Building 1;
 - Added one unit to the northwest end of the 4th floor of Building 1 which resulted in a net reduction of 7 units from 323 to 316 units.
- The applicant has submitted project plans for review by BCDC, their Design Review Board and their Engineering Criteria Review Board. Both boards have reviewed the project plans and have forwarded recommendations for approval to BCDC.
- The City and applicant are working with the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to modify the remedial action plan and cleanup order to accommodate the proposed project.

The PAD describes the scope of the first stage design review and distinguishes the broader scope of first stage design review from the narrow scope of the second stage, which is the subject of this evening's public hearing. Basic design elements and architectural tenants define the essential underlying characteristics of the project's built form and aesthetic composition which would be further designed in Stage 2.

Accordingly, the DRB's current review is limited to detailed elements of the design and cannot change the elements of the design framework as the Chair has described. Staff worked with a DRB subcommittee to provide additional comments while the application was being refined. Staff has reviewed the proposed design and determines it is significantly consistent with the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

PAD, with project conditions of approval and is therefore recommending approval of the design review permit.

Ms. Velasco stated the applicant wishes to provide a presentation to describe changes and refinements to the project and noted there were 18 speakers signed up to speak on the item.

Chair Livingston asked and confirmed there were no questions of staff, and he introduced the applicant, Mr. Menzies.

Paul Menzies, CEO, Laconia Development, LLC, welcomed new Boardmembers and said the project has a long 4-year history which he provided as background, said he would be providing images comparing the current design with the project's former design. He discussed their work with BCDC, Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the State Lands Commission, and work with various City Boards and the City Council and the processes involved with each.

He spoke briefly regarding the Phase 2 design process and refinement of design details, and introduced Rick Christiani, the project architect, to describe refinements.

Rick Christiani, Christiani Johnson Architects, said he worked to develop all plans to the building level refinements and has been careful to adhere to all requests from the City for a project that will maintain its beauty and functionality over time. He then gave a PowerPoint presentation of what was approved in the master plan and modifications made as a comparison and spoke about changes made as a result of the subcommittee's comments.

Boardmember Leader asked and confirmed the Board could receive a landscape presentation and confirmed with Chair Livingston that they did not have samples of the lighting fixtures.

Scott Cattafa, CMG Landscape Architecture, introduced colleague Justin Aft and gave a PowerPoint presentation of the landscape plan, showing views from the edge of the wharf looking back to the City skyline, the new public park on the shoreline, its link to the Bay Trail which tells Richmond's history that would connect Ferry Point, the Rosie the Riveter Memorial and many parks that sit along the edge of the Bay.

He then presented the historic 1950's Wharf which they will trace with a series of park rooms that move to more active spaces as well as passive spaces, a play theater, a flexible lawn space, area of coastal gardens which will include public art, use of recyclable materials from the Wharf, circulation through the site, sculpture park, decking and structural elements, the picnic pavilion and wind screens, their wind protection analysis study and orientations of wind passages which helped in the creation of spaces, the trellis and picnic areas. He displayed lounges that run along the lawn, guardrail detail with leaning bar, lighting within each column, promenade seating, view from the Bay Trail to the Play Theater, an informal play space which could be used as a multi-functional space, and paintings for the sculpture garden.

Regarding landscaping in and around the units, Mr. Cattafa explained and displayed passages connecting the northern and southern routes of the Bay Trail and entrance point into the park, the spaces on the tops of garages for residents which would share a series of garden spaces that include picnic and BBQ areas, fire pits, a pool deck with spa, a playground element, and family gathering spaces connected to a series of pathways. The pathways connect to the single family homes which are attached to the podium.

Chair Livingston opened the public comment period.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Public Comments:

DAVID SCHOENTHAL, Richmond, President of the Pt. Richmond Neighborhood Council, spoke in opposition to the use of brick and steel which makes the project look more massive and better placed in an industrial area. The front has more aesthetic appeal which fits into Brickyard Landing and Sea Cliff. He supported some of the changes and asked to see less use of the brick and more earthy design elements to fit into the context of the area.

GENE SCOTT, BCARD Steering Committee, said in the fall of 2015 more community members than in history made their opposition known and they lost the battle on height and density. The DRB's response to design elements resulted in a more situationally appropriate approach called the Bay Area Regionalism Style approved in 2016, but this is not it. A more extensive use of brick with aluminum-like surfaces, steel and given glass and views, it results in an aesthetic that is far different from the one agreed upon in 2016 and different from what their impression is of the style consistent with Brickyard Cove.

He also said the previous cantilevered decks introduced a major horizontal visual element that helped to mitigate the massive height of the structures. The resulting design is more verticality into a design that is already hyper-vertical. The Shoreline Drive homes seem like an after-thought, and said the sloped roofs have an inorganic feel that should be made different with a spectacular pedestrian walkway. Lastly, his understanding is that schematics are to be second phase in design and he hoped what has been presented as finished drawings is not a means to bulldoze the project forward and hoped that it go back to the architectural drawing board.

MIKE LEDERER displayed two architectural renderings of Terminal One; one presented at the DRB meeting on January 26, 2016 and the new design posted on the Richmond website prior to the meeting. He said residents' supported the January 26th plan which they felt was a great improvement and well-suited to the quasi-rural character of the neighborhoods. The new design of November 2017 is completely inappropriate to the Terminal One's neighborhood which includes Brickyard Cove, Brickyard Landing, Sea Cliff, Miller Knox Park and the Bayfront. He likened it to Hollis Street in Emeryville's industrial development feel. If Laconia had shared their ideas with neighbors and the DRB sooner, they could have received input. Given the developer's apparent contempt for the community in the process, they recommend that the DRB reject the new design outright. He asked Laconia to return with an appropriate design as acknowledged last year and referred to comments received to date.

CHRISTINA LEDERER said she was very surprised when she saw the drawings, said many people have attended all or most of the 39 meetings and provided input on the design. She echoed comments of Mike Lederer and said she thinks many changes were made to the materials and form of the buildings since January's approval, and she hoped this was not the final design review. She voiced concerns of what people will see when walking along the streets and the Bay Trail, said she likes the Wharf area but questioned who would maintain it, stated there was too much brick and too many different kinds of materials, asked to remove the peaked roofs, and for the project to have flatter roofs.

BRIAN LEWIS, BCARD, said they arranged a meeting on 3 days' notice last Saturday at 10:30 a.m. and had over 100 people attend to hear about these drawings. Two boardmembers attended and heard public comments and is surprised to be talking about the need for a totally different design in terms of the peak roof and massiveness of it. In the past, there was a stepping back effect of the project which has been eliminated with sheer walls going straight up. The number of units has not really changed and it could be that the square footage has changed in some of the units which have increased the project's volume. There was also a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

simplification of the façade whereas before there were offsets and the overall exterior appears to be much more clunky and massive. He noted there are no bricks in Brickyard Cove and he questioned the reason there is a lot of brickwork here. Materials used for the exterior should be examined carefully as brick will be cheap and will degrade the overall quality of the building. The project will never appear like a remodeled old masonry structure and samples of all materials should be presented to determine the standard of construction intended and this has not been shown. The public open space has been degraded, particularly in the pier area and no details have been provided and should not be agreed to until there is commitment to construct a quality public space. The design of the entire complex appears to have been re-designed to maximize square footage and minimize cost.

JOSEPH PULEO, Pt. Richmond, said to call this project design undistinguished would be a compliment. It is a mish mash of 15 different materials and 13 different colors. Terminal One is the visual gateway coming across the Richmond Bridge and he said if this is approved as proposed, residents will have to live with it and he asked that the DRB demand something better, simpler and neater.

EILEEN MCYARED said she thinks the efforts the architects have made to create interest are not appropriate. The interest of the entire area is one of nature, the Bay, and excitement in seeing San Francisco. She supported the buildings fitting into what is already there and she echoed comments of the numerous materials and variables in the project. Regarding color, she thinks if gradient colors were used of a particular color it would create less mass and suggested the project go back to what was approved.

ROBERT LANE, Land Use Committee member of the Pt. Richmond Neighborhood Council, said this project continues to move and it has never come before anyone in a final form as seen tonight. They had 3 iterations of the project at the start of the process which never came back. At this point, the applicant has brought the DRB a brand new project that has a forest of poles. The poles are columns that hold up cantilevers and balconies, and they have not shown what these poles will look like on the interiors when facing each other. Every unit that has a balcony has one of these poles and noted that the reason the Berkeley cantilevers failed was because they were under-engineered and not isolated for moisture. This project is brand new because of the poles and he asked that the DRB reject it on that basis.

LEISA JOHNSON reiterated comments of previous speakers, said she knows there is a signed agreement with the applicant/developer which requires them to return for a secondary review but wished that they had been brought into that earlier in the process prior to proceeding with such an advanced design which many people are not happy with. Many people have participated in the process from the beginning and there were several iterations at the time, and the designs at that time were more in line with what the community wanted. She echoed comments of others regarding the industrial design with a much harsher tone and appears to look even bigger. She noted that a consistent comment was for something at the top; however, birds will poop on it as well as people sitting there, with the HOA most likely responsible for maintaining it, and she asked the applicant to reconsider this and for the DRB to listen to the community, honor the signed agreement and take it seriously.

SALLY TOBIN, Pt. Richmond, referred to mitigation of potential negative design effects on the greater community and environment, particularly lighting and access. She thinks it is important to use pedestrian scale and specific colored lighting that conforms to International Dark Sky Association standards so as not to create light pollution. Also, some neighboring residents can see the project from their homes and glares will affect their nighttime views. Regarding access, some of the renderings showed cars that seemed to be parked along Shoreline Drive but this is

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

not permitted. Lastly, she asked to take care of the Ferry Point Park, as she is worried there will be spillover from inadequate parking from this development.

Chair Livingston provided Ms. Tobin with a copy of the lighting plan showing protections from light pollution and providing colors of the lighting.

JUNE HIGHT, Pt. Richmond, echoed lighting concerns, said she hoped they were planning on using 2700 or below kelvin and pedestrian scale lighting is very important so as not to interfere with plants, animals or people.

JANE LUNDEN, Land Use Committee member of the PRNC, expressed her amazement that a totally new design could be sprung on everybody with such short notice. There has been a lot of work to reflect Bay tradition over time and she did not like what was currently proposed, especially the penthouse and the large white frame around several stories and hoped the DRB will address these items.

BRUCE BEYAERT, TRAC, referred to signage and said second stage design review is supposed to include signage; however, there is no plan in the packet and the applicant has not consulted with TRAC or MTC's Bay Trail project for Bay Trail wayfinding orientation signs. Two of the plans show wayfinding exhibits but there are no details about them. On the Ferry Point Loop there are 4 orientation signs and one is south of the pump station of the site which would be destroyed. He recommended a condition that requires working with TRAC and MTC's Bay Trail project to develop a sign plan to be put in the subdivision improvement agreement, along with specific language from a yellow sheet he presented to the Board, which would include updating all 4 wayfinding signs on the Ferry Point Loop where 2 will be destroyed at each end of Sea Cliff Drive. He hoped the DRB could make it a better project for all those using the Bay Trail.

ROBERT MCNEIL said he has lived in Brickyard Cove for 38 years, was involved with previous developers and worked to stop the steam roller effects. He said people walk in this community non-stop and many people are interested in what is going on and thinks the developer should be transparent all of the time. He voiced concerns with 1) the water cleanup; 2) to display the fronts of the single family dwellings and not make them like cookie cutter designs and to fix the poles; 3) the doors of the front of the homes was done well but he could not tell from the drawings; and 4) the response from the developers/applicants and asked them to continue to be transparent.

DON WOODROW, former DRB member, thanked the Board for highlighting Mr. Beyaert's work, said he is a fan of bricks and thinks there should be brick in the project. He said no one has said anything about the impact of the hundreds of new vehicles coming here and asked how the City will be handling all of it. He could see a trail of cars coming to the tunnel trying to get out in already bad traffic situations. Planning has not solved the terrible Sea Cliff Canal Street junction where cars regularly take out the right front wheel going up on the curb, asked that something be done about this and thanked the DRB for its work.

PAT ARMOR said she likes a lot of the materials being used in the project, and the problem she has with the project is that there are too many materials used in it and asked to see more of a subtle transition with the colors, as it is too abrupt. She thinks a lot of effort has been put into the landscaping to make it look and feel very natural, suggested using more subdued colors such as a mushroom or pumice and to use gradients of the same colors to make it feel less massive. She said she has not heard discussions about roof material and echoed comments regarding lighting and night pollution.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

HILARY BROWN, Pt. Richmond, thanked the Board and developer for listening to feedback. She appreciates the lighting scheme follows the dark sky standards, and hoped some of the lamps not mentioned could be 2700 degree kelvin which is more yellow than a harsh blue. She suggested eliminating some of the streetlights along the waterway unless they are at a pathway or intersection, and when the speed limit is 25 mph or less, lights are not needed for safety. She asked that windows be bird safe with an etching which will prevent collisions especially where they meet at a corner, and she was excited that native plants are incorporated into the landscaping and hoped that the developer could propose 100% native plantings.

Mr. Menzies thanked the public for their cordial commentary.

Boardmember Leader said there was a previous architect with a different style and a change which led the project to be more urban in its character. There were probably various reasons but he asked the architect to explain the reason for this change.

Mr. Menzies said they had a 15-year relationship with the previous architect and have done innumerable projects with them. They then had a project where the performance was not up to the standard of the prior work and they had to make a change. As a result, they decided to make a change in this project as well. They worked with Rick Christiani and his team with a very successful project in San Francisco and they felt he would best understand what condominium buyers are looking for today which is a much higher standard than 5 or 10 years ago.

Boardmember Leader likened the change to a response to market. Mr. Menzies said it was more a response to sub-par performance and they then decided to work with the current architect for their experience with the market and condominiums.

Boardmember Benz asked what percentage of the building is brick. Mr. Christiani said he did not know off-hand but he estimated it was about 20%.

Boardmember Hannah said he has many comments and said given the Board is reviewing the most developed set of schematic drawings he has ever seen he thinks they can do a lot to improve and mitigate community concerns when dealing just with materials, color and some of the finer details. He suggested getting to materials and color later, as one of the sticking points of the public have to do with the posts versus the cantilever.

He said the Berkeley collapse had to do with the means and methods of the general contractor. It was built very badly and was not waterproofed and isolated from moisture. He thinks the posts and columns make a huge aesthetic difference to this project when comparing them and from his understanding and 15 years of doing these types of projects, he does not think fear of these collapsing should be a reason to never cantilever a 3-4 foot balcony ever again. This is not difficult structural engineering, and the contractor for the Berkeley disaster did a series of missteps of construction which were fundamentally against the drawings, engineer and architect. The posts bring the volume of the building out more and also increase the verticality of how the building is perceived. He knows this is a cost savings to build the building with posts, but there are reasons to move back to what was previously proposed for that element.

Chair Livingston agreed with this argument and said in looking at the previous designs that KH Design prepared, there was a Bay regionalism infused ideal in this project and something to be gained from the horizontal lines and how it helped mitigate the mass. He was glad the public brought this up.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Boardmember Benz said one of the things that repeats the verticality is the glazing, as in the other plan the windows do not have as much verticality, so it is a combination of both and possibly one of them should be changed.

Boardmember Hannah said he communicated something at the public meeting last Saturday and commended Laconia and the new architect, stating one of his major focuses was rust corrosion, durability, dilapidation and maintenance. From his experience, he thinks the team has done a great job in picking materials that are high performance, durable, have long-life, will look good and not degrade. He did not see much corrosion issues, but the only vagueness he finds in the drawings is that there is a generic comment about "balcony metal". This is an important aspect so the more durable and less corrosive metals get, the more expensive they get, which could be a problem for the development. But, he said there is also something to be considered with dissimilar metals. He has used zinc in other projects and likes it but as a facing it can interact and be too close to steel which creates galvanic action. Therefore, he asked the architect to comment on what the plan is for all of the balcony metal. The stainless steel cable rails are excellent, but it is the top and side rails, the posts and fascias as well that he would like more information about.

Mr. Christiani said he wanted to first talk about cantilevers. He said a cantilever is a beam that projects out and the top cord of it is in tension. Any erosion of the top cord which was what happened in Berkeley due to defective construction, and other balconies were also experiencing the same thing. They have not fallen off of the building but no one knew they were about to fall off. When putting all of the force into a top cord of a wood member, whether it is pressure-treated or not, and then one puts a door seal over it which is an opening and a flash pan, the likelihood of a nail or something else penetrating that with 300 units of housing is highly likely. In a balcony deck there should be some redundancy. He said a beam that is supported on two ends, the top cord is not in tension, does not snap immediately and it is in compression. If it is eroding or sagging, someone would see the sag.

He also said with long term creep, cantilevers start warping down, and he noted the example of Frank Lloyd Wright's coffin house where all balconies cantilever unreinforced concrete which drooped and there was no way to fix them.

Regarding the Berkeley Museum, this is reinforced concrete and they have had to go around and put posts under it. The posts are 5" in cross section and there are two on a deck that is 15 feet long. This is not a cage or like adding bars on a window, but they are spaced far apart. They moved them as a way of mitigating them off of the corners so residents would not feel like they are in an enclosure. They can look at the positioning of those elements, but the DRB is not taking the responsibility for this building or the lives or deaths that could occur in the event of failure and reviewing aesthetics.

As far as the way they are planning to treat the steel, Mr. Christiani said the sections slot over each other to avoid on-site welding. The pieces would come pre-fabricated. They have not reviewed all mitigations, but they would be hot dipped galvanized with a high level industrial coating and shipped pre-finished to the site and with one section nested into each other, stacked with a sheer plate into the actual structure.

Boardmember Hannah commented that from what he can see from the rest of the building they are concerned with corrosion and he commended the architect for this. He asked if the coated paint would be Kynar paint.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Mr. Christiani said they are thinking of something even more robust such as an epoxy primer and something similar to Kynar paint but there are others and they will need to get the right mix with the paint manufacturer. They do not want any field welding but just be able to be hoisted into place, stacked and have a very long life of durability so as not to build in redundancy.

Chair Livingston asked if it would be possible in an effort to steer the drawings more of the drawings originally approved for the team to consider imbedding the steel into the wood frame structure as opposed to vertical supports.

Mr. Christiani said the original design did not include headers. When running a cantilever out to support the deck they need a header which would drop all of the windows down. They are also talking about changing the direction of the framing and basically making a steel building rather than a wood building. Currently, the wood structure is rationally framed throughout the bulk of the building and the decks are applied to that. This is a cost-effective way to do it and the more they throw into this cost the less money there is to spend on anything else.

Chair Livingston asked if it would be possible to consider this and asked for a simple “yes” or “no”.

Mr. Christiani asked if this means building a frame and welding the cantilevers from that.

Chair Livingston said no; the steel beam would go into the structure and cantilever out.

Mr. Christiani said part of the conditions of approval were that decks be 6 feet deep and this is a long cantilever even in concrete. He thinks it might be possible and they could look at it.

Mr. Menzies noted that what they ended up were decks 4 feet deep, and the issue is if they were going to be 18” on center to support the deck, there will have to be a tremendous amount of steel going all the way back into the building. The general rule which he confirmed with a boardmember was 2 to 1; but he said the building then becomes a tremendous steel building which is extremely expensive.

Boardmember Hannah said most buildings in these kinds of projects are wood frame but they have steel elements and steel beams where needed. He is suggesting they might be needed given concerns about the balconies collapsing. As the Chair noted, they have a certain amount of steel outside the building, and the structural engineer can figure out how to use the same amount of steel and incorporate that as they do every day with wood framed buildings with high beams running through them.

He said there is a 4 foot cantilever that is achieved any day of the year across the world and he did not think it was unreasonable for the Board to ask the applicant to consider this given that this new architectural interpretation of the project departs from what was already approved and what the community was comfortable with.

Mr. Menzies said they can consider it and did not mean to be argumentative, but they are thinking of what will be needed to accomplish this in steel. The issue in wood is that there is a much higher sensitivity about decks in wood not just for safety but ultimate deterioration and its appearance in 10 years. Therefore, they are thinking about safety and deterioration and candidly, cost.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Mr. Christiani asked the Board for what they think would be acceptable and asked if this would be a solution to apply everywhere in the project or he asked if there were areas they could apply a more practical solution, given there will be added cost.

Boardmember Hannah suggested perhaps all of the interior courtyard balconies where there are buildings facing buildings might be focused on given they are much less visible to the public. While not suggesting this, he asked not to provide balconies if the developer is so scared of them collapsing.

Mr. Menzies stated not implementing balconies is not an option.

Boardmember Hannah questioned why they are worried about 4 foot cantilever in wood. As he understands it, the structural engineer for the Berkeley project was not at fault but the contractor was at fault. Therefore, this argument does not fly with him, and an architect, a structural engineer and a contractor practicing within the standard of care should not have these problems. Otherwise, all balconies would have been outlawed across the country, and he did not see this in recent codes.

Mr. Menzies agreed they will look at it to see what can be done.

Boardmember Hannah referred to materials and said there is quite a lot that can be done with a limited pane in a way for the architect and developer because they are seeing the difference. There are essentially two projects here, and if anything the new project is smaller in mass across all fronts because of responses to comments. He thinks what the community has picked up on is the notion of verticality and this can be addressed very simply with materials broken in grid patterns or enlarged panels.

He thinks the developer can introduce horizontality by all of the panel products cut in the factory as not just large rectangular panels but broken down in smaller pieces. This could go a long way to introduce more horizontality throughout the project. He also thinks the 13 to 15 materials are too many as great as they are in terms of performance. The other problem is that they feel like they are straight from San Francisco or Emeryville. He has done two projects like this; one in Tampa and one in Houston, and they all looked the same.

Regarding the brick, he believes it is an important and successful introduction to the project, given Brickyard Cove. His joke; however, is that the bricks in Brickyard Cove would be rolling in their grave to see the tiled brick coming onto the building. He thinks this is the reality of construction, given earthquakes and bricks. He noted the proposed tiles are not a problem for earthquakes and he would urge the developer and architect to not just do one generic red brick with iron spots, but introduce another light beige type of brick that feels more modern and clean. It brings down the redness.

He agrees with the comments of “too red, too abrupt a change” and introducing another brick or changing the brick would help a great deal, as well as seeing what they have in terms of horizontality. Much of the fashion is almost to do double the width of this which brings in more horizontality to it.

One issue with the brick that has caused negative reactions is possibly it does not have to go all the way up to the 4th floor. There is a definite base of brick and then the brick peels off of the building, rises up and peels away. This is a successful technique where they could not only introduce more into the project but it would help quiet and it would feel the buildings are growing out of the landscape more rather than having landed.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

His next comment would be that he would almost condition limiting the brick to the first floor, the podium and up to the third floor and then peel it back and reveal stucco which he thinks is a good introduction for a residential feel.

The other great loss he feels with the project is when he goes into Brickyard Cove and looks around, there are lots of residential architecture and the only two things one can put in common for an overall feel is that the sloped roofs are a domestic vernacular, and they have every type of wood, shingle, siding, clad board, horizontal boards throughout Brickyard Cove. For durability and performance reasons, he would never suggest adding shingles or natural wood.

He noted great strides recently in the resin panel products which is a natural wood veneer impregnated in resin. It has come to this country from Portugal and it is a wonderful, high performance product. Trespa has been mentioned and there were comments about them being very thin. The applicant showed the 6 mm panel and this was too thin. They have the 8, 10 and 13 mm Trespa product which is ½ inch thickness and not thin. Therefore, Trespa stocks all of its products in America and the developer would get the cost benefit of this. The European options of Parklex, Prodema, and Eco Clad are other similar products. He would not add Material 14, stating he would be willing to work with the architect and developer after this meeting to help quiet things down and bring down the abruptness and various things relating to the materials. He thinks there needs to be re-added wood on a horizontal kind of level, and the horizontal sheets can be cut into small panels.

He said he was thankful that the aluminum panel issue has been squashed as this was his concern as well which came up in the public meeting. He was satisfied that the Neolith product is a wonderful new product and is amazing. He would keep with a more neutral or grey or stone-like, thinks the Core Ten is interesting and could be treated like the brick and be low down in the building but should not rise up and be 4 stories tall.

Returning to the panel of joints, Boardmember Hannah said there is a newer technique of cutting and arranging the panels for the rain screen products he would encourage the developer to look at. One of the other things that makes this feel heavy is a running bond or stacked bond arrangement of these panels, and he encouraged the applicant to look at a more contemporary or organic in look which is more random, vertical or horizontal lens, going 6", 1 foot, 18", 6" 2 feet, 5 feet, etc. for a random and cost-effective way. He thinks this would go a long way to make this feel less like an urban San Francisco project and help quiet down the busy-ness of the materials here.

Chair Livingston asked Boardmember Hannah what material the random joint pattern was for.

Boardmember Hannah said this should be looked at for all of this except for the brick. He said it does not cost more but a competent contractor is needed to draw it out, and he would look at this for the neolith panels and the Trespa panels of which there is some in the project.

He asked what the underside of the balcony was going to be.

Mr. Christiani said they were planning on using a natural wood appearing Trespa to introduce the wood element when looking up.

Boardmember Hannah said this will be powerful for people down below to see the wood coming out. He has also heard many comments from the community about the sloped roofs, particularly in the main image. He said this type of aesthetic he might also do, but he suggested tapering it

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

as it goes up rather than it being clunky and heavy. The other option is to square off and not do this angle. He thinks the sloped roofs that look out from the big buildings that make it look like ships docking are very successful, but it is the ones the other sides near the coffee shop or other road the applicant should look at again. Those were the ones people thought were aluminum and they are not.

Mr. Christiani stated on the areas of the sloped roofs, he said in the master plan the roofs are projecting elements and they are in the same location. The angle of the plan view is the same angle and repeats itself in form and vertical, and he thinks there is merit to create a sequence of elements used throughout the project that creates a memory of seeing different things, and this is part of the delight of walking around a project. They have introduced the frame elements at the front of the building, and this was a way for it to sort of poke out the back and also as a different manifestation of the same sort of sensibilities where it ends. That was the thinking of it, and this is why it occurred.

Chair Livingston stated however, these do not look at all like the other ones and are different as night and day. Boardmember Hannah said these are the ones he was referring to.

Boardmember Leader asked and confirmed that when the Stage 1 was approved, it was the envelope, massing and the design which was approved along with the community.

Ms. Velasco said it was her understanding that in this next phase it would be more detailed and refined, so it set the tone or architecture of the project.

Boardmember Leader said the fenestration, the detail of the balconies, and everything here is the historic record of what was approved, and the question is why it is so different.

Ms. Velasco noted there have been refinements in terms of now doing the code analysis, looking at colors and materials.

Boardmember Hannah said the material expression has made the building seem different and more urban.

Mr. Menzies said the underlying bones of the project have not changed per the legal agreement. It was the materials and pallet that has, so this should tell them there is scope for improvement here.

Boardmember Leader said having worked through this with the community, this needs to be respected. Personally, he is glad this project is not overlooking that now. This feels generic or faceless. It almost looks like a Residence Hotel in San Rafael along I-580 and he is glad things have developed. However, some of the things that have been done have increased its appearance and scale, but they also give it a lot more design strength.

He thinks there are certain measures taken now to move some of this horizontality back in and he must disagree that the idea of urban sensibility does not belong in Pt. Richmond. He does not agree; this is not rural and it is the home of the Keyser Shipyard and where people were dealing with bricks, making things out of steel and time has advanced since Brickyard Cove was built. This feels like an older time to him from the previous one, and thinks fixing this in certain ways would respond to what the community is looking for as important. Fundamentally, it has been improved actually but there needs to be a balance. He just thinks some of it has become too vertical but the building before was uninteresting.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Boardmember Benz stated she agrees with Boardmember Leader, thinks it is a much richer building, and the windows on the building from a year ago does not have as many verticals and she thinks if they could simplify the windows behind this, all of the elements would not be as vertical. This would go a long way of simplifying the look of the building.

Chair Livingston stated there were numerous comments about the number of materials and colors, and he recognized Boardmember Benz's comments on her sense of style and color. He asked how she would react to public comments.

Boardmember Benz said she thinks the public's comments were accurate. She thinks there is too much contrast in the colors, particularly the brightness of it. She thinks the idea of having values of different hues is a good idea. She likes the palette in general, but does not like the brightness level which should come down. She thinks it is true also of the stucco sample. She thinks bringing down the crème color closer to the grey color.

Boardmember Leader agreed and said the crème is the color that introduces very strong contrast.

Boardmember Hannah said one of the problems with renderings is they make everything look the same and generic. He re-assured the community that this neolith type of product has natural feel with stone and grain. It is not aluminum or something else, and he noted the reason they use the white neolith for all of the modern buildings is that architects are obsessed with white, and this is the weakest part of the palette.

He then asked staff to display the courtyard view that looks between the two buildings, and he said what is funny about this is the image on the top is one story taller yet feels one story less than the image below. Down below the new proposed version shows the basalt beige neolith stone panels. This highlights the issue of the gridded joints that look 1930's and he thinks this could be mitigated in the same material by doing a random, more natural organic breaking up of the panels. The second point is the center stone like the brick probably should not go above the third floor. It looks like the top image is set back and there is almost a balcony or breezeway between. This changes the fundamentals that have already been agreed to and it costs money and is not necessary. What the architect could do below is have the center stone be 3 stories and a rain screen or by its nature it is applied over the top of the building envelope that is doing the job.

He would work with the applicant on this, but he would like to have the centered stone and the brick only go up to the third story in any case, have different variations and peel back to a stucco or a thinner more domestic material such as the wood or the Trespa, and this would go a huge distance with the community in anchoring this down to the ground and make it feel much more natural.

Chair Livingston asked if the success of the other design is the fact that the roof there introduces a horizontal line.

Boardmember Hannah agreed this does help, but he thinks this could be done with an indication there is a roofline or awning that comes out a foot to define the roof. He thinks it could be handled and does not need to be stepped back all the way, and have the roof to get closer. Also, he asked what the roofing material is which was a community comment.

Mr. Christiani said in the original plan there appeared to be an element applied to the building in somewhat of a random approach. Being a master plan, the building plans were not developed

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

to the extent they are now but in the process of trying to bring this into a clear organization, they have deliberately stayed away from what he calls random cornices. In the middle portion, they put the metal cornicing around for that particular type of treatment. Where they had the brick they did not necessarily need it because there was not anything jarring in the scale of the building and it was down. So, where they had the neolith, on almost all of the buildings, they eliminated the cornice element in that area and made them read more definitively and “boxy” with punched openings. That was the intent to scale down the building.

He said the points people made about the contrast of the colors dovetailed completely with his understanding of the use of colors and materials, and possibly things are more jarring than they should be. Part of this was to scale it down and have definitive elements. So there is a fine line between the two and possibly they have not yet reached it but have gotten close to it.

Mr. Menzies said they appreciate all comments and he said they were trying to look at the design as it was approved. As they came to look at it again, it had a “boxy” simplicity and a certain pastel color palette. They decided to look at the building again to make a project that was more vibrant and cantilevered and more interesting. They respect the fact there are as many opinions about architecture as there are people in the room, but he was trying to explain where they were coming from.

From their point of view, what they have presented tonight is far more interesting, far more vibrant, unique and different. They would welcome the opportunity to work with Boardmember Hannah directly, and he found all of his points very helpful, and including those from the public, and they hear everybody on these items. He suggested possibly continuing or postponing a decision until December and work with the Board and return with something that hopefully would meet with the Board and the public’s approval.

Boardmember Hannah said he welcomes the collaborative spirit, and thinks it would go a long way and thinks the community would be appeased with him being part of that process. A lot of these things he was talking about may have been received by the design team already, but it is not easy to do architecture, and while it looks like a finished project, this is design development and not construction set drawings, and there is a lot of scope for finessing these subtleties. It does not change anything about the viability of the project, but he thinks there is a lot to be done and it can be done relatively quickly and with hopefully less pain for everyone.

He has developed many notes over the last week or so and he would advocate working with the applicant team on. He was curious to see how the balcony issue goes which is a major item, but he thinks everything else is colors and materials. Regarding the galvanized railings at the park, he would be careful about using the mesh product and he suggested making sure it is of the highest grade hot dipped galvanized. The architect for the building spoke very knowledgeable about how the decks regardless of the posts fit altogether and there are no on-site cuts or any of those things that can be weaknesses that show up later. He would like the same care to be taken for the park and for the bird issue and the windows.

Chair Livingston said what the Board has not talked about was single family and it was the edge of the project the community walks by especially across from the park. There are concepts with the landscaping, but in terms of the architecture and the way it feels there have been comments it needed to have more of a human interactive presence. Some of the neighbors were advocating a long time ago were advocating for more front door appeal, and he would like to receive the Board’s input on single family.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Boardmember Hannah said one of the reasons he did not bring that up is that they have been the least of his concerns. He thinks the single family homes are a big improvement of what was there. The original designs are quite nice but they do not feel right and they all look the same. He thinks the materials and the large plain walls with angled items are working well and are quite informal, and it does not feel "cookie cutter". He thinks the front doors are essential and the fact there is not a gate or fence or barrier is important especially with single family homes in the Bay Area where there are front yards not completely fenced off.

The posts here are actually not a problem and add to the architecture in this case. He thinks the post comments for the big buildings is as much to do with how much it makes them feel bigger and vertical, but here they are nice the way they are inset and he thinks they work well. The balcony metal comments will also apply to this as well, and he was curious as to what it will end up being and should be corrosive resistant at the very least.

Boardmember Leader said there were comments made before they were concerned with the front door needing to be a public front door from the street, and he thinks they did this and illustrated how it works.

Chair Livingston noted that Boardmember Leader was also developing some public/private spaces where the public could see and sense this was an active area, and he asked if this has been achieved.

Boardmember Leader said he supposes the way the planting has been done is the same moving through. They talked about enclosing more areas of front yard and there were some comments made that it may not have been completely picked up as they discussed. Around the side it is difficult to make this work with the way the access is. But, along the front it would be possible to enclose an area beyond the patio or at the face of the balcony.

He added that there has been discussion regarding parking along the street or parking for the park which is a concern. He thinks BCDC reminds him this is not good because it will block the Bay, so all sides should be used as much as possible.

Boardmember Benz voiced support for the single family homes. She said her only comment is that the one roof is canted a lot, but it may be the drawings.

Chair Livingston said he noticed some of the side elevations of the single family units were very busy. There were blocks of color and it seemed like it could be simplified and fell along the lines of too many materials and colors. He was glad the applicant strengthened the front doors.

Boardmember Hannah said he agrees with comments about the side elevations and thinks they are close. He would take a look and simplify it a bit. There is one elevation on A-3.02 which shows a random occurrence of stucco, and he suggested removing that one which might be it, but he thinks they are close and again, the neolith stone will be important.

Chair Livingston asked the applicant to show a composition of the streetscape because all of the Board sees is two buildings with sloped roofs on them and one flat roof. He asked what the entire street would look like with all of the sloped roofs, or a roof plan showing which ones are and are not sloped. For example, when in the park, he asked what it would look like.

Mr. Cattafa stated they could show the buildings in a rendering without landscaping to see them more clearly from the park.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Mr. Christiani noted that the entire project was in 3-D and when they submitted the original renderings from the distance past the water at about 65 feet, they can revisit this and bring back in the new version of the latest re-design of those units which would show that configuration.

Chair Livingston said he also noticed he could not find a streetlight in the plan set. It stated in the key "streetlight" but there was no diagram or specification on it. He also referred to lighting on the dock, and the architect stated in between the railing stanchions there is a light and what is not clear is if the light is one or two sided. He asked for a specification because from the water it could be seen. The rest look nice and said 2700 and 3000 kelvin are included.

Comments made by the last speaker mentioned streetlights could be reduced, given the speed limit, and he asked if this was possible.

Mr. Christiani stated the streetlights are the civil engineer's component of the package and they will check with the City's requirements so as not to cause light pollution.

Boardmember Leader said there has been a lot of response with landscaping. The patio with the retail still feels like it needs a point of emphasis of some sort. He said this could be a big tree, a piece of public art, and he said he read comments that it is more tasteful if there are little pieces, but this is a big street corner and recognizing that not only is the façade of the building responding but also what is in the plaza that announces there is a public place beyond. He said it does not need to be a piece of maritime remnant but something that has some strength.

He said Chair Livingston mentioned there could be some sort of windshield between there and the sidewalk because a lot of wind will be coming through there. He would like to know where the applicant is now with that. In addition, he asked if panels could be attached on the pier's seawall to provide some of the narrative storytelling.

Mr. Cattafa said they think the entry plaza is the first view of the project and very important, but they want something special and do not know what it is yet. One idea is a large trees but they want to be more imaginative and look for something like a sculpture garden with several pieces of sculptures with landscaping and hardscape around it. They simply do not have it tied down.

Boardmember Leader disagreed with smaller pieces, stating this is a large windy area with vehicles coming and going, and something of strength and emphasis is needed there. It ought to be something that holds the plaza down. Mr. Menzies agreed and said it could be one large piece or a number of large pieces, and it could be something on a smaller scale than one large piece, such as several pieces of reasonable scale, but their ideas have not been fully developed.

Regarding the wind shield for people sitting there, Mr. Cattafa said the area immediately to the south is designed to have land forms that roll up that have planting and trees to filter the southern wind. They added some planting to the western side which runs parallel to Shoreline Drive they are hoping that create wind protection along that edge, but the built up elements get to be obstructive.

Boardmember Leader questioned the planters along Shoreline Drive, and Mr. Cattafa clarified this was what he was proposing with some tall grasses, and their mapping says the wind comes mostly from the south, and he confirmed planters are proposed along the western side and the southern side with trees.

Chair Livingston commented that the Board needed to extend the meeting for another half hour.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

EXTEND MEETING

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to extend the meeting to 9:30 p.m.; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).

Chair Livingston referred to the plaza and said there was talk about paving design and Mr. Cattafa said they have a step stone modular unit paver in the plaza distinguished from the sidewalk. It will modulate in terms of colors and he confirmed they could show this graphically.

Chair Livingston asked about bringing the paving in the plaza across the street or use of stamped asphalt, given the plaza has shrunk from the first iteration; however, it has expanded a bit. He asked if this would strengthen the sense of arrival, and Boardmember Leader said he did not think it was necessary because he questioned where it would stop on the other side.

Boardmember Leader said the subcommittee discussed planting at the base of the slope which is beyond the property line, and the property of EBRPD. There is a large pine tree by the pump house which should be preserved and a new grove. There is also an area further to the east where it would be a benefit to everybody if EBRPD would allow them to put a grove there instead of just inside the right-of-way. While it cannot be promised, it should be a goal similar to the other end.

There are also various ways of berming up to cover the podium wall, and they found there is so much going on there with accesses and doors, all left is a few lumps along the wall. Therefore, he asked for a robust row of forest trees on both sides of the road. He suggested Canary Island pines. Mr. Cattafa said they found out that Monterey Cypress trees are more susceptible in warmer climates and their arborist thinks they are appropriate for this location, and Boardmembers concurred with this species, as they feel coastal.

Chair Livingston asked why they would introduce something other than coast live oaks which are already there, and Boardmember Leader said his sense is that using the same species along the road would feel more contained and strengthened as a roadway. He would prefer a road going through a forest, and Mr. Cattafa agreed to work with the EBRPD on this.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to close the public hearing; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Leader/Khatri) for Boardmember Hannah to continue to work with the applicant to address comments of the Board and public, and to continue PLN 17-593 to the December 13, 2017 DRB meeting; approved by voice vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Khatri, Leader and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt).

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Livingston announced that the Design Review Board Meeting on November 22, 2017 is canceled given it is the week of Thanksgiving.

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

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 13, 2017

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, December 13, 2017.