

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**

November 14, 2018

6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Meredith Benz
Michael Hannah
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Kimberly Butt
Tom Leader
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:25 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Tom Leader, and Karlyn Neel

Absent: Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Michael Hannah, and Macy Leung

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Jonelyn Whales, Roberta Feliciano, Emily Carroll, and Hector Lopez; and Attorney Rachel Sommovilla

Rachel

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 10 and October 24, 2018

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Benz) to approve the minutes of the October 10, and October 24, 2018 meetings, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Livingston moved Items 6, 7, 8 and 9 first on the agenda prior to consideration of Items 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reminded the Design Review Board that any time a project came before any board or commission the Neighborhood Councils were to be notified so that the Councils could provide comments and identify concerns. He identified a number of applications where the Neighborhood Councils had not been notified.

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 Monday, November 26, 2018 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

6. PLN18-123

Description

T-MOBILE WIRELESS SMALL CELL SITE

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO INSTALL A T-MOBILE WIRELESS SMALL CELL SITE WITH A CANISTER ENCLOSING AN ANTENNA, SUPPORTED BY A POLE ATTACHMENT SUPPORT ARM AND ASSOCIATED POLE AFFIXED EQUIPMENT SHROUD ON A POLE WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY

Location

PG&E POLE LOCATED ADJACENT TO 2100 GRANT AVENUE

Zoning

RM-2, MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant

T-MOBILE C/O EXTENENT – ELLIOTT FROISSER

Staff Contact

EMILY CARROLL

Recommendation: **RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

7. PLN18-128

Description

T-MOBILE WIRELESS SMALL CELL SITE

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO INSTALL A T-MOBILE WIRELESS SMALL CELL SITE WITH A CANISTER ENCLOSING AN ANTENNA, SUPPORTED BY A POLE ATTACHMENT SUPPORT ARM AND ASSOCIATED POLE AFFIXED EQUIPMENT SHROUD ON A POLE WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY

Location

PG&E POLE LOCATED ADJACENT TO 2732 DOWNER AVENUE

Zoning

RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant

T-MOBILE C/O EXTENENT – ELLIOTT FROISSER

Staff Contact

EMILY CARROLL

Recommendation: **RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

8. PLN18-130

Description

T-MOBILE WIRELESS SMALL CELL SITE

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO INSTALL A T-MOBILE WIRELESS SMALL CELL SITE WITH A CANISTER ENCLOSING AN ANTENNA, SUPPORTED BY A POLE ATTACHMENT SUPPORT ARM AND ASSOCIATED POLE AFFIXED EQUIPMENT SHROUD ON A POLE WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY

Location

PG&E POLE LOCATED ADJACENT TO 2901 GARVIN AVENUE

Zoning

RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant

T-MOBILE C/O EXTENENT – ELLIOTT FROISSER

Staff Contact

EMILY CARROLL

Recommendation: **RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Emily Carroll presented the staff report dated November 14, 2018 for Items 6, 7 and 8, three small cell sites on Joint Power Authority and utility poles in the public right-of-way. She recommended that the DRB forward a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission for each application.

Chair Livingston advised that he and Boardmember Neel had reviewed the applications in subcommittee, had toured the city with the applicant and staff, and had reviewed all the sites, pole-by-pole, to determine whether the radio equipment could be placed on the ground out of sight. He reported that the telecom company had placed the equipment on the ground where it

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

was possible to do so.

ERIC HALE, representing Extenent, identified the pole, antenna, and equipment shroud for each of the three new sites, and described how the equipment had been hidden. He explained that all three sites were the same basic design and he described the reasons why one of the sites could not have the equipment placed on the ground.

Mr. Hale responded to questions from the public as to the benefit of the new installations to avoid an encumbrance on the pole and to provide a better camouflaged installation.

Chair Livingston clarified for the public present that as shown in the staff report, wireless facilities in the public right-of-way including small cell sites and networks were controlled by the Public Utilities Code, provisions of State of California law, the California Public Utilities Commission, Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules and regulations, the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, and the Richmond Municipal Code. As a result, the facilities had gone through an extensive set of regulations and the applications complied with all federal and state laws.

Chair Livingston opened the PUBLIC HEARING

Public Comments:

KATHERINE BELL, Richmond, verified that the DRB's role was the appearance, placement, and aesthetics of the application, although she questioned when the residents would have the opportunity to discuss the health concerns related to the application.

Chair Livingston clarified that the DRB would make a recommendation to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission would make the final decision on the applications.

MICHAEL JOHNSTON, Telecom Law Firm, which had been assisting the city in the processing of the applications, explained that the FCC completely occupied the space with respect to the standards for radio frequency (RF) emissions and local governments could do nothing more than to check compliance with the FCC standards, which had been done.

Ms. Bell questioned the reason for the installations, objected to the installations themselves, and questioned the need given the health impacts to the neighborhood.

Mr. Johnston explained that as part of a Congressional mandate, cities and local governments were restricted from saying no to the facilities in all circumstances but could exercise aesthetic control. He added that Congress had stated that the fast and widespread deployment of wireless facilities was an important function that needed to occur as part of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

DAVID SMITH, Richmond, spoke to the aesthetics and image of the city and suggested that the city had an opportunity to change its perception of an unattractive industrial place to something better like so many other cities had done by rejecting these types of facilities, which he suggested would be obsolete in ten years. While the health issues were clearly a concern he understood that argument could not be considered. He urged some attention to the aesthetics.

NATALIA LAWRENCE, Richmond, expressed concern with the noticing procedures in that many had not received notices of the hearing, including many non-English speakers who appeared to have no way to get information about the project. She emphasized the health

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

concerns, noted that other cities had fought the placement of the facilities, and questioned the distribution since the placement of the facilities were primarily in communities of color.

CONNIE COOK, Richmond, commented that an installation had been proposed at the corner where she lived on Garvin Avenue, and that it would look like more trash hanging from the poles. She objected to the placement, did not want it, it was not aesthetically pleasing, would not help the neighborhood, and could harm the health of those who lived nearby.

KAREN NAVARRO, Richmond, also objected to the tower proposed for Garvin Avenue close to her home, objected to the appearance on the pole, expressed concern for the health risks, and suggested the installation itself appeared to have already been approved, let alone the appearance of the installation.

Chair Livingston asked the applicant if the site at 2901 Garvin Avenue could be moved elsewhere, but residents objected to the placement anywhere.

When asked if there was a distribution map of proposed and future sites that citizens could review on-line, Lina Velasco explained that there was a layer of the first 31 sites that had been deployed and there was another 70 sites. She clarified that on January 14, 2019, the FCC would make it even more difficult for communities to regulate wireless sites in that cities would have only 60 days to approve small cell sites.

Mr. Johnston reported that the FCC had established more stringent regulations for the placement of small cell deployments in that cities would have to issue their approvals faster than the current regulations, and the new rules would essentially take the public process out of these types of decisions on the federal level. He reported that there were no avenues of relief at the local level. Local governments were required to comply or risk litigation, which was occurring elsewhere. He added that the deployment process was intended to increase the data transfer speeds that the sites could perform to accommodate the next generation of wireless technology and this was the fundamental infrastructure for that technology, with placement of 60 cells per square mile for each carrier, closer to users than previously required. Co-location was not likely given the structural stability of the poles. He added that there were coalitions of local governments currently challenging the FCC's rules, and those appeals were expected to last 12 to 18 months, although compliance with the regulations would likely be required during that time.

Vice Chair Leader asked and Mr. Johnston clarified that the benefits would be the fastest Internet possible wirelessly through the small cell devices over time. The current deployment was expected specifically for mobile services first, and at some point cable would be wireless rather than through cable or fiber services. He added that it was happening everywhere

Mr. Hale commented that this was just the beginning, installations were going in his neighborhood in Sacramento as well and would be situated on streetlights.

Mr. Johnston stated a condition of approval would be applied that if the pole was ever removed due to undergrounding, the facilities would have to be placed somewhere else. He noted the problem with existing aboveground utilities was that there were physical restrictions and PUC and PG&E safety requirements. He added that the equipment would not become obsolete.

Chair Livingston stated that the city had hired an outside consultant to analyze the RF safety and that the applications had met and exceeded the safety standards for every site.

Given the limited scope of the DRB's review with respect to aesthetics, Vice Chair Leader stated

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

that significant work had been done by members of the DRB to find every possible location to keep the equipment on the ground and to reduce their impacts on the pole.

Boardmember Neel acknowledged the constraints and agreed that everything that had been done was all that could be done.

Ms. Velasco advised that the item would be considered by the Planning Commission on December 6, 2018 at 6:30 P.M. in the Council Chambers.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to recommend to the Planning Commission the approval of PLN18-123 (PG&E pole located adjacent to 2100 Grant Avenue), PLN18-128 (PG&E pole located adjacent to 2732 Downer Avenue), and PLN18-130 (PG&E pole located adjacent to 2901 Garvin Avenue) for T-Mobile Wireless Small Cell Sites; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

9. PLN16-658, PLN16-688, PLN16-697, PLN16-701, PLN16-690, PLN16-693, PLN16-703, PLN16-705, PLN16-708, PLN16-710

DESIGN REVIEW FOR TEN SMALL CELL SITES

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER DESIGN MODIFICATIONS TO INCORPORATE PEDESTAL MOUNTS ON TEN PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS FOR SMALL CELL SITES WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY
Location	PG&E POLE LOCATED WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, ADJACENT TO THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 600 CHANSLOR AVENUE (PLN16-658), 156 2 ND STREET (PLN16-688), 370 S 24 TH STREET (PLN16-697), 401 S 28 TH STREET (PLN16-701), 612 12 TH STREET (PLN16-690), 685 HARBOUR WAY (PLN16-693), 1801 BISSELL AVENUE (PLN16-703), 101 17 TH STREET (PLN16-705), 1434 BISSELL AVENUE (PLN16-708), and 1458 YORK STREET (PLN16-710)
Zoning	PLN16-688, -697, AND -701 ARE LOCATED WITHIN THE RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT. PLN16-693 IS LOCATED IN THE CM-2, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, NEIGHBORHOOD DISTRICT. PLN16-705 IS IN THE RM-2/IS-1, MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICTS. PLN16-703 AND -708 ARE IN THE CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE ACTIVITY CENTER ZONING DISTRICT/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICT
Applicant	T-MOBILE C/O EXTENENT – ELLIOTT FROISSER
Staff Contact	EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Emily Carroll presented the staff report dated November 14, 2018 for design review of a series of ten small cell sites with pedestal mounts. The sites had been reviewed by the DRB and approved by the Planning Commission and were being returned to the DRB given a previous condition to underground the equipment. Due to the high water table, undergrounding had not been feasible and an alternate pedestal design had been proposed. Staff recommended approval of the alternate design.

ERIC HALE, representing Extenent, presented the typical design of a pedestal mount and stated they had done all they could to underground the equipment although given existing gas

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

lines and the width of the sidewalk it was not feasible to do that. The design represented a compromise for the equipment cabinets. He explained there were ten with alternate designs for the first 31 sites.

Chair Livingston opened the PUBLIC HEARING

Public Comments:

MARIE POPPINS asked if the engineering had changed for those units on the ground as opposed to those on a pole, and Mr. Hale stated the antennas would remain where they were, would be the same throughout, and only the radio equipment would be placed in the cabinets.

Chair Livingston closed the PUBLIC HEARING

Vice Chair Leader commented that the alternate design appeared to be the only alternative possible.

Chair Livingston agreed and noted that the DRB subcommittee had worked hard to design the canisters, had considered different designs and colors, the canisters would be 20-gauge, powder coated, and because of the constraints to undergrounding a different approach had been pursued with the aboveground canisters.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Leader/Livingston) to approve PLN16-658 (PG&E pole adjacent to 600 Chanslor Avenue), PLN16-688 (adjacent to 156 2nd Street), PLN16-697 (adjacent to 370 S 24th Street), PLN16-701 (adjacent to 401 S 28th Street), PLN16-690 (adjacent to 612 12th Street), PLN16-693 (adjacent to 685 Harbor Way), PLN16-703 (adjacent to 1801 Bissell Avenue), PLN16-705 (adjacent to 101 17th Street), PLN16-708 (adjacent to 1434 Bissell Avenue), and PLN16-710 (adjacent to 1458 York Street), subject to all the original staff recommendations of approval; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

The DRB returned to the regular agenda order at this time.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. PLN18-223 | RYSE YOUTH CENTER BUILDING |
| Description | (HELD OVER FROM OCTOBER 24, 2018) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±12,140 SQUARE FOOT YOUTH CENTER FACILITY. |
| Location | 205 41 ST STREET |
| APN | 517-320-017 TO 020, 029, AND 106 |
| Zoning | CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, COMMERCIAL EMPHASIS, AND IS-1 FORM BASED CODE OVERLAY DISTRICT |
| Owner | RYSE, INC. |
| Applicant | ANNE PHILLIPS ARCHITECTURE |
| Staff Contact | ROBERTA FELICIANO |
| | Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION |

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated November 14, 2018 for the expansion of the existing RYSE Youth Center, which had been reviewed by the Board at the October 24, 2018 meeting when the DRB had provided 17 comments. Additional pages to the plans had been submitted to the DRB to address some of the comments provided by the DRB.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

CORDELL HINDLER, a member of the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council, stated the applicant had appeared before the Neighborhood Council to identify the expansion proposal, which had been well received. The Neighborhood Council supported the application.

WINSTON WIN, Anne Phillips Architecture (API), provided an overview of the design and the responses to comments. He oriented the DRB to the RYSE Youth Center site located at the corner of 21st and Bissell Avenue across from the Macdonald 80 shopping center, and explained that RYSE had just celebrated its 10th Anniversary serving Richmond youth and had outgrown the site. The proposal was to renovate an existing 6,650 square foot building and construct a new almost 12,000 square foot two-story building, along with a campus with outdoor spaces for community gathering events and programming for the Youth Center. As part of the renovation, some of the existing murals on the building would be preserved and incorporated into the design.

The DRB's 17 comments and recommendations were addressed point by point.

EVA ROSE LEAVITT, Landscape Architect, Bay Tree Design, described the goal of the landscape plan to support the varied programmatic uses of RYSE and pointed out an active, open, flexible plaza with movable furniture and the ability to have intimate small member group events in addition to the large group events proposed a couple of times a year. A number of uses had been layered onto the area to effect cost and space efficiencies to also include flexible sports and an arts studio outside in addition to a constant dynamic shifting space. On the other side of the new building there would be a contemplative garden with a CMU wall and the garden space. The proposal would be to stain the CMU wall a dark green and train vigorous vines to create a green wall. The trees proposed in the contemplative court were Gingko trees. The intent of the planting was to represent the culture and color of RYSE in the plant material and to that end they had worked with staff from the Botanical Garden at UC Berkeley to create a plant list featuring plants from Latin America, Africa, and Asia climatically suited to Richmond, drought-tolerant, and easily sourceable by a nursery.

Ms. Rose Leavitt identified the street trees, noted that one of the DRB's concerns was for the tree species with thorns which would be placed where it would not pose potential hazards, and with respect to street trees, the Crape Myrtle "Natchez" from the city's street tree list for species to use under overhead power lines had been selected. The street trees on Bissell Avenue had been removed to accommodate the pop-ups and the planting sheets now specified a 36-inch box with a 6-foot clear trunk.

With respect to the space in front of the pop-ups, Mr. Win noted that even though it appeared to be flat the site sloped to the west, and to create the grades for drainage and accessibility to the courtyard there would be a grade difference between the main part of the courtyard and the sidewalk. As to the request to move the containers back about three feet and given the concern for the grades across the courtyard, he clarified there was actually a two-foot difference between the interior finished floor of the existing building at that corner and the sidewalk grade. The courtyard had been sloped, steps and ramps had been provided, and sloping the courtyard across its whole length had reduced the grade to a one-foot differential at that location. He explained that moving the containers back would cut into the slope even more and the transitions would be even higher.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

Mr. Win referred to the comments related to the trellis, identified the overall trellis approach, and with respect to design emphasized the need to be cost conscious given that RYSE was a non-profit organization with a limited budget. The trellis had been proposed in wood and while some steel components could be used the intent was to maintain the overall look as submitted. He identified 8x8 redwood posts for the trellis and above the posts the horizontal members would be pressured-treated Douglas fir with a polycarbonate covering on top since the trellis was intended to serve as a weather protected route between the two buildings. The design of the trash enclosure would mimic the trellis design with a corrugated metal roof in that case.

Chair Livingston noted that he had requested that the corrugated metal roof of the trash enclosure run perpendicular to the support members, which the plan had not reflected, and Mr. Win stated there was a layer of plywood underneath the corrugated metal and it had been determined to be more efficient material-wise to turn it and have it span across the joist as recommended, although he suggested it would look better if the ribs ran down the length of the roof and would also work better for drainage.

Chair Livingston stated, however, that when screwing through any sheet metal it would come through the plywood and the fasteners would be visible. The same issue would occur with the arbor where the blocking had not been shown and the corrugated material had been shown going parallel with the joist again.

Mr. Win explained they were still exploring what could be accommodated within the budget and were thinking of using a translucent polycarbonate panel and working with a structural engineer to determine the required amount of blocking. Further with respect to the trellis, he referred to the stairs to the second floor deck and expressed a preference for a brace design as opposed to the traditional row of columns at that location. They had also looked at different scales for the outdoor environment and offered views of the trellis components, upper and lower, to be similar in design.

The DRB urged that care be taken to ensure that the trellis could withstand the heavy winds in the area.

The Construction Manager clarified that what was being discussed had no corrugated roof like the trash enclosure; it had a polycarbonate panel.

Mr. Win referred to the comment related to the west side of the building and referred to the discussion of the blankness of the west façade and how much solar exposure there would be. They had looked at the fenestration pattern and had considered a trellis or canopy and had developed a braced trellis similar to the design of the one in the courtyard to mitigate the unbroken western wall.

Ms. Rose Leavitt stated the fence materials had been further developed and for the wood perimeter fence the angles and bars were galvanized steel and the perforated metal fence would be steel or aluminum and be powder coated after being punched. She would continue to work with API to streamline the site materials.

As to reviewing the visibility with the Police Department for the fence, the Construction Manager reported that they had met with the Police Department and had reviewed the crime checklist for environmental design. The Department had evaluated the lighting and fencing and had expressed no major red flags with the project. A few alarms had been recommended.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

With respect to fence materials, Ms. Rose Leavitt described the aesthetic of the fence and the gate and reported that most of the perimeter of the fence would utilize wood members spaced so that the gap would be no more than a quarter inch to ensure privacy. She stated the pattern of the perforated fence near the front door would be designed by RYSE members at the RYSE studio. The fence would be constructed of Western Red Cedar in the desire of providing durable materials that would not chip or warp and there would be some coordination with the trellis design.

Chair Livingston questioned the ability to provide the 3/8-inch steel plate sheets that had been proposed for the mural wall given their excessive weight. He acknowledged the importance of that material given that there was no desire to use plywood since it would delaminate.

It was clarified that the details were still being developed. The intention for the mural wall was to provide a slim profile but there had yet been no structural review or cost exercise. It was also clarified that since the students would design the wall any perforations would have to be consistent with the manufacturer's guidelines.

Chair Livingston also stated with respect to the visibility of the wall to the neighbors that a steel fence would replace a redwood fence and he suggested the use of redwood boards on the back. The applicant had no problem addressing that concern.

Boardmember Neel liked the idea of personalizing the space but wanted to learn more to ensure a good rhythm and design that did not look too busy, and the applicant clarified that there was a placeholder design in the project plans that was one of the manufacturer's stock products. The students' design would have to meet those basic parameters.

Vice Chair Leader commented with respect to street trees that since PG&E was being sued by people with respect to fires, street trees under wires would become an issue in urban areas as well. He sought assurance that there be no recommendation from the city side that people be required to plant street trees that might grow into electrical wires creating a liability for the city as well as PG&E. As a result, he suggested the whole regime of street tree selection around electrical wires would have to be changed. He changed his comment about big trees given that concern.

In response to Boardmember Neel with respect to benches and safety, Ms. Rose Leavitt explained that the proposed benches would be custom manufactured for the site, FSC certified hardwood or powder coated aluminum, and she provided the cut sheets for that equipment.

Boardmember Neel expressed a preference for hardwood benches.

Chair Livingston referred to the location of the trash enclosure adjacent to the green wall and expressed a desire for a simpler design for the trash enclosure and offered a sketch to show what could be done to simplify the design.

Vice Chair Leader agreed that anything that was simplified and more economical would be acceptable to him. The other DRB members concurred.

Chair Livingston closed the PUBLIC HEARING.

Boardmember Neel requested a reconciliation of the materials for cost and design, identifying clearer materials for the design, metal and the like.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

Boardmember Benz had no further concerns, recognized the funding constraints, supported the creative solutions that had been identified, supported the thoughtful choices that had been made, and suggested the choices would continue to be thoughtful even with the budget constraints.

Vice Chair Leader supported the project, the good job that had been done, and verified that if the budget required significant changes those changes would not necessarily be presented to the DRB. He supported the Chair’s sketches and the efforts to create a simplified, more economical trash enclosure.

Boardmember Neel supported the rationale behind relating to the purpose of the school but would have liked to have been provided more finish materials to know that the design would be executed and not be depreciated by cost.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Leader/Neel) to approve PLN18-223, RYSE Youth Center Building, as shown, with a friendly amendment added (Livingston/Benz) to approve PLN18-223, RYSE Youth Center, subject to the 17 staff recommended conditions of approval and the additional DRB conditions as follows: 18) Add blocking at all of the headers and trellises, with all freestanding joists to be blocked; 19) Simplify the garbage enclosure subject to the sketch offered by Chair Livingston as a suggested; and 20) That no plywood be used for the mural wall; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

2. PLN18-261	PINEDA SECOND STORY ADDITION
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±500 SQUARE FOOT SECOND STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE
Location	342 SOUTH 26 TH STREET
APN	549-042-016
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	FAUSTO PINEDA
Applicant	GUSTAVO OROZCO
Staff Contact	EMILY CARROLL
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

There were no concerns or comments related to this item.

Chair Livingston opened the PUBLIC HEARING

Public Comments:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that the Cortez Stege Neighborhood Council supported the application.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to approve PLN18-261, Pineda Second Story Addition, subject to the 10 staff recommended conditions of approval; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

The DRB considered Item 4 at this time.

4. PLN18-237	SKYTOWN PRESCHOOL
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT TO INSTALL A TEMPORARY PORTABLE BUILDING FOR A NEW DAY CARE CENTER AT THE EXISTING MOUNT ZION LUTHERAN CHURCH PROPERTY

Location	5714 SOLANO AVENUE	
APN	520-020-001	
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT	
Applicant	MARTHA MELGOZA	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated November 13, 2018, and identified the request to install a temporary portable building for a new day care center at the existing Mount Zion Lutheran Church for a temporary period up to five years to allow the construction of a permanent structure on the site. Staff had received no comments from the neighbors.

Boardmember Neel verified there were currently no children on the site and the site was well away from the neighbors.

Mr. Lopez clarified that if the new structure was not constructed within five years the applicant would have to reapply for another temporary permit.

Chair Livingston opened the PUBLIC HEARING

Public Comments:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that the Richmond Heights Neighborhood Council supported the project. He supported the project as well because of the need for a safe day care for children.

MARTHA MELGOZA, Richmond, explained that the preschool had lost its lease in Kensington and the preschool had been dissolved. They were working hard to recreate the community and were really excited to be closer to the population and serve the families who needed a day care for their children.

Chair Livingston asked about a landscape plan for the site, to which KAREN RICHARDS, Siegel & Strain Architects, explained that the existing site was an asphalt parking lot with steep terrain on either side. The portable would be installed on the asphalt and previously owned play equipment would be relocated from the previous site to the subject site. Rubberized mat surfacing would be placed on top of the existing asphalt. A small raised garden would also be provided.

Ms. Richards explained that there would be a low fence at the slope and in the future the children would be allowed to engage in the hillside with gardening. With the development of the fence, a swale would be provided to capture drainage. The site could be dismantled in the future when a permanent building had been provided.

Boardmember Neel supported the shade sails and asked how the posts would be installed, to which Ms. Richards explained there would be a perimeter fence and a low fence to divide the two age groups and the posts could be incorporated as part of that fencing.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

Ms. Martha Melgoza clarified that the neighboring house was owned by the Board President of Mount Zion who had supported the application. No letters had been received from other neighbors.

Mr. Lopez reported that the city's noticing had included areas outside of Richmond given the adjacent city boundary and he confirmed that no comments had been received.

Vice Chair Leader understood the reluctance to plant permanent landscaping but recommended the use of pots with 5-gallon pine trees and other landscaping to soften the appearance and the applicant and architect agreed. He recommended six trees in 15-gallon pots, 24 to 30 inches in diameter along the edge of the western façade, and recommended bronze loquat or citrus.

In response to Boardmember Benz that the site looked like an institution, Ms. Martha Melgoza explained her particular philosophy was to blend in with nature. She did not want the bright colors on purpose which she suggested trivialized children's play. The idea was that the building blend in and the nature of the trees and the garden was part of that so that the children could be part of their surroundings. The color also blended in with the existing churches and the surrounding homes.

With respect to screening the air conditioning unit, Ms. Martha Melgoza noted the desire to remove the air conditioning unit because it would not be needed. For utilities, it was clarified that a lateral would trench into the main line at the church and power would be tied into the panel, and the sewer would be a similar alignment to the water across the front of the church.

Chair Livingston closed the PUBLIC HEARING

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Leader/Benz) to approve PLN18-237, Skytown Preschool, as shown, with a friendly amendment added (Livingston/Neel) to approve PLN18-237, Skytown Preschool, subject to the 11 staff recommended conditions of approval and the additional DRB condition as follows: 12) Provide six 15-gallon bronze loquat or equivalent in 24- to 30-inch pots; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

3. PLN18-212	NEW 3-UNIT LIVE-WORK DEVELOPMENT
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO NEW BUILDINGS CONSISTING OF THREE LIVE-WORK UNITS ON A 3,745 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL
Location	SOUTH 31 ST STREET
APN	549-193-019
Zoning	IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Applicant	ROBERT AVELAR (DESIGNER)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ
	Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated November 13, 2018, for a proposal for two new buildings on a vacant lot located on South 31st Street in the Light Industrial District, which required a Conditional Use Permit for a live/work use from the Planning Commission. The applicant proposed to construct two separate buildings containing three live-work units. The building proposed in the front of the site would be two stories and include one live-work unit

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

while the two-story building in the rear would contain two live-work units. Each live-work unit would include ground level work space with a residential upper level. Three parking spaces would be provided in the front yard, there would be two areas for open space, and the design would be simple with corrugated metal siding combined with stucco and a gable roof. He recommended the DRB recommend approval to the Planning Commission.

Chair Livingston opened the PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Livingston recommended that the applicant consider all corrugated vertical siding for the buildings given the district in which they were located, that the flat roof be eliminated and the gable roof go all the way back, and that the back building be moved at least six inches from the rear property line on the north side to accommodate the gutters and fascia and avoid extending over the property line.

ROBERT AVELAR, the Designer, explained in response to the Chair that the owner would be willing to consider all corrugated vertical siding for the buildings, he supported the recommended change to the roof, and agreed to move the building from the back property line as requested. He clarified the location of the trash pads between the two buildings.

Boardmember Neel verified that the parking requirements had been met with a fourth parking space in the garage, and that the fence would be a wood lattice good neighbor fence in a natural color.

Vice Chair Leader referred to the birch willow that had been shown on the plans and the applicant explained that it might be misspelled but he had gotten the name from the city's tree list. The Vice Chair suggested the use of a standard Himalayan birch. He verified that concrete pavers would be used with pea gravel in the middle and everything was permeable. He also verified that the roof would be presidential shake.

Chair Livingston recommended the use of Old Zinc Gray as the color for the roof.

Mr. Avelar advised that vinyl windows had been proposed, and the Chair recommended bronze anodized aluminum windows which would look better with the techie look of the galvanized siding. The applicant agreed to that change.

Public Comments:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that he had spoken with the Cortez Sege Neighborhood Council. He recommended a lime green for the door with a white strip that would look retro and supported the approval of the application as is or with conditions.

Chair Livingston closed the PUBLIC HEARING

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to approve PLN18-212, New 3-Unit Live-Work Development, subject to the DRB findings and 11 staff recommended conditions of approval, and the additional DRB conditions as follows: 12) Tree to be Himalayan birch; 13) Exterior to be 24-gauge galvanized sheet with Old Zinc Gray; and 14) Provide bronze anodized windows; with a friendly amendment to add 16) That all roofs be gable; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

5. PLN18-218 YARAMALA RESIDENCE

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 1,700 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A VACANT 4,124 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL	
Location	SOUTH 29 TH STREET	
APN	549-192-006	
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT	
Owner	MEHREN JAY	
Applicant	KRISHNA YARAMALA	
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated November 13, 2018, for a single-family dwelling with a one-car garage, with two parking spaces, one in the front yard and one in the garage. The proposed design was low profile with a 4:12 pitch gable roof which would be asphalt shingle, the building material would have a stucco finish, and there would be a front porch with two columns along the side. He recommended approval of the application.

Chair Livingston opened the PUBLIC HEARING

Boardmember Benz verified the color of the stucco with White Dove trim, and the body reported to be a "beige."

To verify the hue of the beige that was inconsistent between the color board and the plans, Boardmember Neel verified the color from the manufacturer's website and reported that the "beige" was a normal beige.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Neel) to extend the meeting by 15 minutes; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

Public Comments:

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that the Cortez Stege Neighborhood Council liked the project and supported its approval with or without conditions. He too supported the project.

Chair Livingston thanked the applicant for the complete set of plans.

Boardmember Neel questioned whether there would be any symmetry with the doors and the windows given her understanding from the plans that the windows were close to the roofline and there was a concern that the windows had not been scaled properly. After discussion, it was noted that the windows and doors appeared not to have been aligned correctly and she recommended that the door be moved over slightly and that the drawings reflect the alignment of the doors and the headers. She also recommended that the color be changed to a darker beige with a little green and recommended the Sherwin-Williams Garden Sage for the beige.

Boardmember Benz recommended that the front door be painted a color other than the color of the body of the building to stand out.

The applicant advised that the windows and doors would be aligned appropriately.

Chair Livingston closed the PUBLIC HEARING.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 12, 2018

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Leader) to approve PLN18-218, Yaramala Residence, subject to the DRB findings and 12 staff recommended conditions of approval, and the additional DRB conditions as follows: 13) The front door on the front porch be moved six inches closer to the window to better align with the column; 14) Replace the beige color to Sherwin-Williams Garden Sage; 15) Provide a contrasting front door; and 16) Provide automatic irrigation for the front yard; approved by voice vote: 4-0. (Ayes: Benz, Leader, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Hannah, and Leung).

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

1. Nominating Committee for Officer Elections

Chair Livingston recommended that the item be continued pending the availability of the full DRB membership.

Boardmember Neel advised that she would not be present for the DRB meeting scheduled for December 12, 2018.

Mr. Lopez clarified that the DRB meeting scheduled for November 28, 2018 had been cancelled.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Boardmember Neel commented that some of the plans for the items considered at this meeting had not been complete enough for her comfort and she questioned how to address those types of issues to ensure that complete plans had been submitted prior to being considered by the DRB.

Ways that members of the DRB could address some of their concerns were noted and staff clarified that they were always available to speak to the concerns. It was also clarified that approved applications that came in vastly different from what had been approved would be returned to the DRB.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, December 12, 2018.