

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Council Chambers, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
December 13, 2017
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Meredith Benz	Kimberly Butt
Michael Hannah	Bhavin Khatri
Tom Leader	Jonathan Livingston
1 vacancy	

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:09 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Tom Leader, and Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Kimberly Butt, and Michael Hannah

Absent: Boardmember Bhavin Khatri

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Lina Velasco, Hector Lopez, and Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Leader) to approve the minutes of the November 8, 2017 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Benz, Butt, Hannah, Leader, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Khatri).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – There were no changes

Public Forum – Brown Act

BRUCE BEYAERT, 73 Belvedere Avenue, Richmond, Chair of Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC), updated the DRB on the nine active Bay Trail projects in Richmond, and encouraged the DRB to adopt a condition with any approval of the Terminal One project for a Bay Trail sign plan and a replacement of the existing Bay Trail orientation panels on the Ferry Point Loop.

KIM DESEMBERG, 1307 Pelican Way, Richmond, spoke to the single-family component of the Terminal One project and suggested the new design was unattractive and without variation. He preferred the prior iterations and did not believe the latest iteration fit into the area.

BRIAN LEWIS, 1300 Mallard, Richmond, Brickyard Cove Alliance for Responsible Development (BCARD), referred to the comments from residents related to the massiveness of the Terminal One buildings, stated all the elevations looked the same with no depth or character, and characterized the single-family homes design as repetitious and cookie cutter, offering little to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

the community. He urged the DRB to listen to the public, noted the designs seemed to be constantly changing, and asked that the public concerns be addressed.

City Council Liaison Report – Mayor Butt was not present.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Tuesday, January 2, 2018 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. PLN17-593 TERMINAL ONE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM NOVEMBER 8, 2017)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED TERMINAL ONE 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
APN 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**

Chair Livingston advised that the public hearing had been closed on PLN 17-593, which had continued from the November 8, 2017 meeting. He thanked all those involved in the long process related to the application and explained that the DRB's subcommittee had worked with the applicant and architect numerous times over the last three years to address design concerns.

PAUL MENZIES, CEO of Laconia Development, the local development manager for the Terminal One project, explained that at the last meeting they had been directed to review colors and materials, balconies and supports, and single-family homes. He highlighted the recommendations from the public and members of the DRB at that time and noted that Boardmember Hannah had offered to meet with Laconia and its architect, a meeting had occurred, and Boardmember Hannah had reviewed all of the issues raised and as a result of the meeting significant revisions had been made to the project design, which had recently been resubmitted in a package to the Board, and which he believed addressed all of the changes that Boardmember Hannah had proposed on behalf of the DRB.

Mr. Menzies spoke to the DRB's recommendations from the last meeting and stated the Board had requested substituting cantilevered balconies for post-supported balconies. He presented images to identify the size and depth of the proposed balconies at 18 to 22 feet in length and six feet deep. In response to the DRB's request, Laconia's structural engineer had reviewed the possibility of cantilevered balconies and had submitted a letter with conclusions. He quoted from that letter to indicate that almost all apartment projects other than Type 1 construction

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

poured-in-place concrete were designed with bolt-on balconies which resulted in smaller sized balconies, typically 3 ½ feet wide and 6 to 8 feet long. The balconies had been designed to maximize vision glass and views and to maximize the private open space they provided, which had been an early strong direction of the DRB.

The current structural design of the decks minimized penetration of the building envelope and minimized the potential for future water infiltration and was critical to the long-term durability of the project.

Still quoting from the structural engineer, Mr. Menzies explained that these days cantilevered wood decks were not being pursued given that wood was no longer considered suitable for deck construction due to issues of warping and delaminating, and water intrusion. Steel frame construction would dramatically increase costs, and acoustic problems would result. Cantilevered decks would not work for the Terminal One building design because the decks would not align with floor framing inside the units; added floor framing required to support cantilevers would not be cost feasible; decks would be steel while the building would be wood; and deck framing and support members were designed to avoid penetration through the building envelope. Even if those issues could be addressed, the decks would have to be redesigned to reduce the size of the decks to 3 ½ feet wide and 6 to 8 feet long, and eliminate the wraparound decks at the corner.

With respect to the single-family homes and the design that may be too repetitive and that the front door presentation might be insufficiently welcoming, Mr. Menzies described the challenge of offering the theme based design while introducing design diversity without making it look like a suburban subdivision. To make the homes more welcoming, hardscape elements had been minimized; the automobile had been de-emphasized by eliminating private off-street parking pads, driveways and garages, and public on-street parking along the waterfront; native coastal plantings had been used to link landscaping to the shoreline environment; natural colors and materials had been proposed; and there would be a variety of angles and placement and diversity amongst colors and materials.

Members of the DRB expressed concern for the colors given that the elevations of the buildings did not match the colors of the swatches, and there was a concern being able to determine the color palette at this point, although Mr. Menzies noted that they were looking for direction and there would be a different application of color for different homes.

RICK CHRISTIANI, Christiani Johnson Architects, Inc., explained that the issue of replicating physical samples was an ongoing problem. He described the materials that had been proposed after the meeting with Boardmember Hannah, noted there were 21 different units, and a specific palette could be presented for each of the buildings. He described the neolith materials, stucco and lap siding, sloped roofs and flat roofs, and stated it would have been laborious to present all the different combinations for each of the 21 units and their relationship to each other. After comments from the DRB, he stated they could present the color palette for all 21 units individually, if desired.

Boardmember Benz noted that rather than 21 individual presentations, the DRB wanted to see one done completely.

The DRB worked with the applicant and architect to clarify the actual colors involved, particularly given the DRB's desire to soften the colors. The Chair wanted to make sure that the color representations were accurate and clear with the colors matching the color board and the DRB's intent.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

Boardmember Hannah suggested for the larger buildings switching out some of the neolith stone and the darker more intense colors had been successful and the wood grain products that had been introduced should go a long way to address the DRB's concerns. He also noted that the light colored stucco in the renderings was too bright and too jarring even though most of those buildings faced each other and were not so close to the street.

Boardmember Hannah recommended a more off-white in that area. He referred to his prior comments about going horizontal with the detailing, and bringing the brick down, recommended a bit more variation, and stated that the long bricks had been a welcome addition.

The DRB reiterated the general concern for the color representations and the way the modified colors had been submitted which had created confusion, particularly since the renderings and the swatches did not match.

Mr. Christiani clarified that the colors were neutral, worked well together, and could be combined in variations to create a natural palette. As to who would make the decision for the colors of each building, when the working drawings were prepared the colors would be defined. He suggested a notation on the drawings that "colors would be selected from those listed as b to j when the working drawings were prepared."

Chair Livingston requested that the architect create color boards that could be sent to Boardmembers to clarify the drawings, verified that the soffit material would be Trespa and should be called out as such, and asked what would be done with the mahogany to keep it from fading. When he asked about the PPG paint, Mr. Menzies explained that the Homeowner's Association (HOA) would establish a maintenance protocol.

In response to questions, Mr. Christiani stated that the lighting details for the single family homes was not a submission requirement for the DRB, although there were photometrics for the site, which was a requirement. Lighting had not been submitted for the houses or for the general building design. The roofs for the single-family component would be standing seam.

The DRB requested complete specifications for the roofs; the front doors; the light fixtures; street lights and expressed a preference for 2,500 to 3,000 K shielded lights; and the railings at the Terminal One Wharf; as well as the gate frames on the garbage enclosure that were recommended to be hot dipped galvanized.

JUSTIN AFF, CMG Landscape Architecture, explained that the discussion of the lights was ongoing, there would be no spillover, every other fixture of on-site lighting was below 3,000 K although the streetlights were still under discussion, and the preferred look would have to be considered since there would be a trade-off with the number of fixtures involved with the lower lights.

With respect to the architecture, Chair Livingston noted the public comments related to the need to transition from high density to low density housing and the architectural elements that had been considered to create something more compatible with Brickyard Cove.

Boardmember Hannah was more satisfied with the variety of the rooflines and noted there might be enough variation between buildings although the revised renderings submitted did not allow an evaluation of what had been proposed. He did not oppose the architecture and suggested the quality of materials that had been planned would be successful.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

Boardmember Butt recognized the material palette would be changed and the buildings were not to be cookie cutter.

Vice Chair Leader emphasized the need for a better representation of the colors. He suggested that diversity could be provided through landscaping.

Boardmember Benz liked the architecture as far as the design of the buildings but wanted to know what it would really look like with the colors.

Boardmember Hannah suggested since the single-family homes were closer to the park some of the railings for the single-family homes could be consistent with the park railing

A representative of CMG Landscape Architecture, reported that the area around the single-family homes would be common areas and there was a desire to connect the common area; there would be no explicit front and side yards for each of the homes and a smooth transition between the common area around the homes and the public open space to the south had been proposed through the use of native coastal plantings to give an appearance of the natural environment. He agreed with the need for a variety of landscaping along the street and suggested that the railing at the wharf be its own thing while the railings at the architecture should relate to the architecture.

On the discussion of fencing, decks, and screening to screen potential clutter on decks, Mr. Menzies recognized the desire of the public to have as much transparency on the balconies as possible given the views, and advised that the HOA would identify what could and could not be put on the deck, to be spelled out in the CC&R's.

Mr. Christiani asked the DRB's reaction to the use of Core 10, and Boardmember Hannah suggested its use as more of an accent to the rest of the neolith and in special places, while Chair Livingston suggested if matched with a complementary color would be appropriate, and Boardmember Butt agreed but did not want it to overwhelm and be dark and urban.

Chair Livingston asked that samples be submitted to staff and on to the DRB in adequate time prior to the next meeting to allow appropriate time for review, and verified that the DRB would need at least 2 color boards prior to the next meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to continue PLN17-593, Terminal One Residential Project, to the meeting of January 24, 2018, with Boardmember Hannah to work with the applicant and architect on the issues of concern with respect to the colors for the resubmittal of the material board; with Boardmember Leader to work with the applicant and architect on the fences; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Benz, Butt, Hannah, Leader, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Khatri).

2. PLN16-732 THE QUARRY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION ON THE DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT AND PLANNED AREA DISTRICT REZONING FOR THE PROPOSED QUARRY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT, WHICH CONSISTS OF UP TO 200 CONDOMINIUMS, A CLUB HOUSE AND POOL, AS WELL AS ROAD, BAY TRAIL AND OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.

Location 1135 CANAL BOULEVARD

APN 560-330-043

Zoning PR, PARKS AND RECREATION

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

Owner RICHMOND COVE 1, LLC
Applicant NEW WEST COMMUNITIES
Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Lina Velasco presented the proposal for a 200-unit condominium project, club house and pool, as well as road, Bay Trail, and other improvements on a former quarry site. A Mining and Reclamation Plan had been approved and site closure granted in 2013. She described the requested entitlements, and explained that a DRB subcommittee had provided early input and review of the project, and recommendations had been offered although not all had been reflected in the plans submitted for consideration.

Ms. Velasco clarified that comments in regards to the road and safety concerns would be addressed in the Final Environment Impact Report (FEIR), which would be considered by the Planning Commission and the City Council, and while the public could make comments on that issue it was not under the purview of the DRB.

The public was encouraged to express their concerns about the road to the Planning Commission.

TODD FLOYD, New West Communities, introduced the design team, presented the proposal, and identified the neighborhood meetings that had been held throughout the review process in the last year.

KEN RYAN, KTGy, spoke to the visual and physical connections of the site and presented the site plan to identify those connections to the Bay Trail and elsewhere, and the creation of a series of open space elements for the 193-unit project of one, two, and three bedrooms, with 15 three- and four-story buildings, six different building types, and with 65 percent of the site set aside as open space.

Mr. Ryan described what had been done to respond to the concerns expressed to enhance the main entry, the modifications proposed to eliminate the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramp in the front, added landscaping enhancements relative to buffering buildings between buildings throughout the site, enhancements to the Bay Trail crossing, the concern for a stronger horizontal connection between open space, improving the sense of arrival in front of the clubhouse, providing better pedestrian access to the Miller/Knox Regional Shoreline, moving the western wall and making the southern wall more appealing, and breaking up the buildings in that portion of the site through a compromise yet to be submitted.

To address earlier comments related to enhancing the sense of arrival, looking at the recreation center, and providing more open space with connections, Mr. Ryan stated that the building had been set further back and landscaping and tree selections had been enhanced, parking had been removed in front of the clubhouse and landscaping had been added, a pedestrian connection had been considered, and Building No. 8 had been moved to enhance the pedestrian connection and provide a stronger landscape palette. The clubhouse had been redesigned, a barbeque area and gathering spaces had been added behind the recreational area, by changing the parking on the north end additional park area had been provided, and the pedestrian connection had been strengthened throughout the site overall. Changes had also been made to the emergency access which allowed more enhanced landscaping along the edges.

Mr. Ryan explained how the site plan had been modified in response to comments and referred to an open space area that had been modified with additional landscaping between Building 5

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

and Building 6. He asked the DRB to consider that the adjustment had made the open space on the west somewhat smaller with 2,000 fewer feet of play area. In further response to comments, three color schemes had been provided, and zinc metal roofing would be utilized although concrete tile and cementitious siding could be an alternate.

MARCIA VALLIER, Vallier Design Associates, Inc., described the landscaping modifications that had been made in response to comments and described the two treatments for the walls; board form concrete to respond to the industrial look at the entry, with a battered back wall on the south and west sides with an architectural treatment to look like quarry stone. She also noted that when Building 6 was canted more passive lawn space would be created between Building 5 and Building 6 with a reduction of the active space on the top, although there would still be a tot lot in the oak woodland.

Ms. Vallier explained that the landscape palette was architectural and ornamental and the plant palette was a coastal plant palette with an oak woodland Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) palette and coastal scrub at the hillside.

With respect to the plan for the Bay Trail, Ms. Vallier reported that there would be a seven-foot landscape strip, the 12-foot trail, three-foot decomposed granite, and a swale along the base so that water would not run across the trail. She noted the EIR consultant had recommended no trees in the seven-foot strip from a visibility standpoint although having the trees would serve as traffic calming. While no trees had been shown on the southern side, trees on the northern side of the road had been proposed.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments

JEFF VINES, 1400 Pinnacle Court, Richmond, was disappointed that the DRB could not opine with respect to the entry and the safety of Seacliff Drive, which he believed was part of the design given that the road was unsafe as is and proposed traffic calming would have minimal effect. He requested a change in the entrance primarily from a northerly direction and reported that BCARD had offered to share in the cost of some of the safety improvements. He noted an independent traffic engineer was to have considered the alternatives presented by BCARD and others, he had understood those alternatives were to have been included in the EIR, although the EIR had not called for those improvements and BCARD would go to the Planning Commission to address its concerns for safety.

Mr. Vines identified three proposed alternatives: moving the main access from Seacliff Drive and using the existing access road off of Canal Boulevard; installing a mini-traffic circle which would create a safer entry for everyone and which was recommended; or creating a left-turn median and left-turn lane. If the DRB elected to approve the design, he requested that approval be conditioned that the developer fully implement one of those alternatives to create a safer entry into the project.

MARLO MARTIN, 1300 Quarry Court, Richmond, noted that Sea Cliff Drive was dangerous and should not be allowed to serve as the entrance to the development given its unsafe configuration and downgrade along with a steep embankment that ran parallel to Quarry Drive. He requested that Seacliff Drive not be used to provide traffic to access the Quarry Project; requested the installation of a vehicle guard rail along the entire northbound stretch of Seacliff Drive, especially through the descending curved section at the south whether or not the Quarry

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

project was approved; and any entrance to the Quarry project branch directly off of southbound Canal Boulevard well north of the present right angle turn where Seacliff meets Canal.

LESLIE HICKS, 1201 Brickyard Way, Point Richmond, agreed with the concerns for an entrance off of Seacliff Drive, supported one of the three alternatives that had been proposed by Mr. Martin, supported the entrance used for the quarry when it was in operation, and emphasized there would have to be more signage on the road to identify the safety concerns.

It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston/) to extend the meeting to 10:00 P.M.

GAIL BOURQUE, 1400 Pinnacle Court, Richmond, spoke to the evolution of Seacliff Drive, questioned whether it had ever been properly engineered, and emphasized that the road was unsafe and should not be used as access to the development. She recommended the use of Canal Boulevard as access as other nearby developments had done.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, presented written recommendations from TRAC to extend the Bay Trail improvements up to the current Bay Trail Guidelines and standards, to be extended down to Canal Boulevard and along Canal Boulevard north to the driveway going to the beer company. He advised the Bay Trail orientation sign panel would have to be relocated, that both surface and subsurface flows be addressed for the trail, and that the project HOA be required to maintain its portion of the Bay Trail. For cars and trucks leaving the property, he added that there would have to be stop signs and pavement markings along with standard signs to indicate the trail crossing. He presented his recommendations for the specific conditions.

Chair Livingston referred to the diagram of a buttressed wall that would replace the original 10-foot high board form concrete wall that separated the slope in the back from the units and reported the subcommittee had recommended some softening to that wall.

Ms. Vallier explained that the hillside in the quarry had been excavated down to an angle and going further could destabilize the hill if going past the 60-foot contour. The wall was currently following the contours. She stated that different grasses and the plant palette on the back face would be the oak woodland and trees would be planted at the base of the wall and on the inside of the project, with vines planted everywhere and with a broad range of trees and different growth rates, naturally placed. The south wall would also be the same material and application. She described the portions of the walls that would be visible.

ROBERT STEVENS, Prezi, noted that the height of the walls varied from a five-foot retaining wall to a five-foot freeboard above the 60-foot contour as a debris fence. The 60-foot contour was the first bench of the buttress where no excavation should occur and the wall followed the contour of the bench. The tallest point from the base of the wall would be 10-feet high.

Boardmember Hannah stated the proposal represented an improvement and softened the edge, and mixing that with the board form was also successful. He suggested the vines would grow over the natural striations of the wall.

It was noted that the property adjacent to Buildings 5 and 6 would be some four feet lower than Building 6. The wall was required to address a valley at the property line which would block the wall; plantings would help block the wall; the retaining wall was a similar wall with a batter and architectural finish; and the plantings would be on the subject property only and hang over.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

Ms. Vallier explained what had been proposed for the Bay Trail with respect to the shrub layer consistent with Bay Trail standards, and used the cross sections to point out where trees would not be planted to avoid sight distance issues and where trees would be planted on the other side.

On the discussion, Ms. Vallier recommended transitioning the buttressed wall into a board form wall at the corner of Building 9, which would be visible from the pool area. She described how the transition could occur.

Speaking to the alternative roof materials, Boardmember Hannah was pleased with the overall transformation of materials, especially the use of zinc, and suggested the overall palette of the building and adding the gutters and downspouts to one of the example buildings added to the nautical theme and industrial feel. His only question was the difference between the standing seam zinc roof and the concrete tile, and urged the applicant to commit to the zinc, which was far superior, affordable, and available. He added that the redesign of the end elevations was successful given the reality of the buildings, the four-story pop-up represented a good improvement, and reiterated his request to commit to the zinc improvements.

With respect to concrete tile, while it had durability Boardmember Hannah suggested it could crack, and was too heavy for the light industrial look and semi-residential vernacular. The cementitious siding material was acceptable to him but he was less accepting of the concrete tile. He also noted the community's preference for a picturesque view of the distance with the tilt of Building 5, particularly since there would be no loss of amenities with that angle.

Boardmember Benz also liked the zinc, and was satisfied with the color sheet.

Chair Livingston verified that the applicant had submitted a materials sample board when there had been a request to revise the color scheme. He verified the window type as standard Milgard White Vinyl but noted the DRB asked that dark vinyl be explored, which the applicant reported had been done and had determined that white was better because the cost of dark vinyl was prohibitive.

Chair Livingston asked about the specifications for the gutters and downspouts and in the subsequent discussion a concern was expressed for vinyl windows and vinyl gutters and downspouts. The DRB did not support vinyl gutters and downspouts. He noted there was no specification on the drawings for metal garage doors, and sought a more detailed description of what had been proposed.

Mr. Ryan advised that they had been very careful not to pursue corrosive materials given the close proximity to the water. Aluminum garage doors were discussed by the DRB and the applicant was asked to research that type of garage door.

Chair Livingston sought a clarification for the light fixtures next to the garage doors and recommended that the light fixtures be shielded; verified with the applicant that a 20/30 sand finish stucco had been proposed throughout with a smooth stucco finish applied at framed openings; that there would be cementitious trim; and control joints at the stucco elevations. He sought a section elevation when driving into the project through the street looking to the buildings to the north and the south to be able to determine if the scale of the entry was something to be concerned about; referred to the fence on the upper retaining wall that was six feet high and requested the use of cable rails instead; sought a walkway from the pool area or the main part of the site along the wall without having to walk along streets and recommended a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

sidewalk behind Building 10, and asked that the sidewalk behind Building 12 be continued to connect to the park.

By consensus, the DRB extended the meeting another 15 minutes.

Chair Livingston also expressed concern for how close buildings were to pavement, and with respect to Building 3 requested that the planting area be enlarged, and that the paths at Building 6 and Building 2 connect to the sidewalk. Since the pathway connecting all the buildings on the south side of the property would require a crossover of the driveway, he asked for the creation of an elevated or better defined walkway to ensure a pedestrian dominated environment. He also requested that the cable rails be stainless steel, and verified that the sign package would return to the DRB for review.

Ms. Vallier recommended a painted finish striping walkway for the crossovers.

Boardmember Benz wanted to see the actual colors and liked the yellow.

Motion by Boardmember Benz to continue PLN16-732 for The Quarry Residential Project to the meeting of January 10, 2018 to request physical color swatches for the proposed colors and details and manufacturer cut sheets for the garage doors, the light fixtures, and for the gutter and downspout materials.

There was a discussion on what had been agreed with respect to the garage doors although the DRB had expressed a preference for aluminum. Boardmember Hannah supported non-corrosive, aluminum garage doors, and sought more construction detail than schematic design. He also supported a condition for non-vinyl, non-corrosive gutters and downspouts, and suggested guidance had been offered for the colors.

Mr. Ryan emphasized that the colors had been provided and he asked for direction from the DRB and clarity as to what was being requested.

There was no second to the motion and the motion died.

Boardmember Hannah offered a substitute motion to approve the colors despite not having a materials and color board and to apply conditions for approval of the gutters and downspouts to not be vinyl and to be non-corrosive, the garage doors to be aluminum, and the light fixtures to be shielded and indirect. Vice Chair Leader seconded the motion.

Chair Livingston asked for an amendment to offer Mr. Ryan more clarity as to what was being expected in the aluminum garage doors.

Boardmember Hannah requested that the aluminum garage doors be of horizontal sectional paneling, with horizontal lines about eight inches on center, and be colored in relation to the palette color scheme set forth for each building.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Leader) to recommend approval to the Planning Commission PLN16-732, The Quarry Residential Project, subject to the findings in the staff report along with the staff recommended conditions 1 through 16, as well as additional conditions for approval of the color palette as proposed; aluminum garage doors in a design to be emailed by Boardmember Hannah; gutters and downspouts shall not be vinyl; all light fixtures shall be shielded, with indirect lighting, LEDs not to exceed

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 24, 2018

3,000 K; to include the buttress retaining wall that was not in the drawings; the agreed to pathway extensions; there would be no fence on top of the retaining walls adjacent to the two entry buildings; the cable rails to be stainless steel 1x 19 316 stainless steel, 42 inches high; Building 6 to be rotated as submitted; texture of stucco to be medium sand finish; to include TRAC's recommended conditions and suggestions for the Bay Trail dated December 13, 2017; and in the event the Planning Commission recommended a different entry configuration that configuration to return to the DRB for review of the new site design; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Benz, Butt, Hannah, Leader, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Khatri).

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements –**
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements –**

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, January 10, 2018.