

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
December 12, 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 6:04 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Michael Hannah, and Macy Leung
Absent: Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Tom Leader, and Karlyn Neel

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Jonelyn Whales and Hector Lopez; and City Attorney James Atencio

Planning and Building Services Director Richard Mitchell thanked DRB members for their service to the community and for doing such an important job for the city. He announced that after 13 years with the City of Richmond he would be retiring at the end of the year.

Chair Livingston thanked Mr. Mitchell for his service to the community.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 14, 2018

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2018 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that the Fairmede-Hilltop Neighborhood Council had expressed concern with the approval of the Aspire Richmond Technology Academy given concerns with respect to seismic and traffic issues. He emphasized for 2019 that as a courtesy all applicants were to communicate with each applicable Neighborhood Council.

City Council Liaison Report – Mayor Butt was not present.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Wednesday, January 2, 2019 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. PLN18-173** **THE CASCADE ON CENTRAL AVENUE (FORMER DOLAN LUMBER SITE)**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF A PLANNED AREA DISTRICT, TENTATIVE MAP, AND A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT 46 RESIDENTIAL UNITS; CONSISTING OF FOUR STACKED FLATS AND 42 TOWNHOMES ON A VACANT 2.58 ACRE SITE.
- Location 5620 CENTRAL AVENUE
APN 510-053-032
Zoning CR, (REGIONAL COMMERCIAL) AND MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL (CITY OF EL CERRITO)
Owner REA PARTNERS LP
Applicant AMG & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES

Recommendation: **RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated December 12, 2018, and noted that the DRB had considered the application at its October 24, 2018 meeting. She confirmed that the letter from Vice Chair Leader with respect to landscaping had been presented to the applicant, and clarified that the DRB was charged with making a recommendation to the Planning Commission for approval of a Planned Area (PA) District, Tentative Map, and General Plan Amendment to construct 46 residential units.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

JOHN COWELL, the Dahlin Group, spoke to the comments offered by the DRB at the last meeting related to the site: the sidewalk interface along Central Avenue where a 5-foot sidewalk along face of curb had been swapped to enhance the street frontage; the width had been increased from 5 feet to 6 feet to mimic what was across the street; and London Plane trees had been proposed. He identified the bio-retention areas and provided images of the changes in response to the DRB's recommendations. When asked if he agreed with Vice Chair Leader's recommendations for grass in the bio-retention area where children could play, he described the intent for a passive area in that there were two tot lots, a sports field, and a pedestrian connection leading to the park across the street. He stated the Central Avenue C.3 area would be for passive recreation with the active recreation to be in the park area across the street, and there would be no need to provide another green area on site.

ANA BUILDER, the Dahlin Group, described the DRB's recommendations that had been incorporated into the design and explained that the coloring had been reconsidered and Scheme A had been retained, Scheme B had added a blue to tie back to Scheme A, and the gray and whites had been switched. A sage green would be used to incorporate more color without being overbearing, two-inch recessed windows had been added as had 2x4 trim for a more detailed look, a gutter would be added around the fascia of the balcony, and a c-channel would be installed in front to hide the gutter. In addition, the garage door spec would match the architecture and lights would be in the soffit as opposed to a sconce on the wall. She identified the proposal for the corners of the entries on the decks.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Boardmember Hannah stated the applicants had responded to his concerns and the signage looked good too.

Boardmember Benz referred to Color Board C and noted one of the reasons for her suggestion for the green on body color 2, particularly on Central Avenue, was because there was a copper mountain color on one end on the horizontal siding and the idea was to bring brightness along Central Avenue that would be echoed in second Building C. What had been proposed had little contrast and the color suggestions had been in part to create a balance on Central Avenue where color accentuated both ends. For a better contrast, she recommended Tansy Green for body color 2 (6424 Sherwin Williams) for Building C.

The Board acknowledged the difficult site, specifically related to the floodplain issue, and thanked the Dahlin Group for working with the DRB to create something that would be good for both Richmond and El Cerrito.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Chair Livingston identified the findings that would have to be made to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission with respect to the General Plan, and while the proposal was not consistent with the findings, he supported the architecture and believed the current PA zoning for the site should remain. He did not agree with staff's summary that the criteria had been conditionally satisfied.

Boardmember Hannah added that the zoning for the gateway street, which essentially was a block that separated Richmond from El Cerrito, was currently a dead zone, and the gateway street and the form based codes and both cities' General Plan was intended to repair the urban fabric to make a connection that had not previously existed. The plan indicated to do that would require a mixed use high density development, although he suggested it was not possible because of the FEMA floodplain for commercial activity to exist below the 16-foot level, and regardless of the strict process related to the General Plan that the building needed to be mixed use, he suggested was not possible and the proposal was the best possible use for the site given that the site was undevelopable other than the very well worked through development that had been proposed.

Chair Livingston stated as a result the staff report should be rewritten to correct the mistakes and inconsistencies before being submitted to other public agencies and to the Planning Commission. He added that the DRB had worked well with the Dahlin Group, the plans had evolved, and the DRB was satisfied with the plans and colors, and the DRB had reviewed a proposal inconsistent with the zoning code and with the General Plan.

Boardmember Hannah added that the technicality of process had only come up recently as a subcommittee of the DRB working with the applicant and he was secure that the multiple iterations had input into the building the intent of the General Plan to activate the street with a pleasant park-like recreational street that would not have occurred without the Board's evaluation.

Boardmember Leung agreed with the assessment and suggested the report should be reflective of the activities generated as a gateway rather than a mixed-use definition, and that the activity levels should be shown in the report.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Benz) to recommend approval of PLN18-173, The Cascade on Central Avenue (former Dolan Lumber Site) to the Planning Commission subject to the 19 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 20) Color changes to specifically incorporate the several suggestions by Boardmember Benz to complete the color palette, as shown in Exhibit A from Boardmember Benz; and 21) Provide architecturally concealed detail that matches the rest of the high quality detailing in the building (with c-channel in front of the gutters at the corner of the decks); approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

2. PLN18-345	KOLAHDOOZ SINGLE-ROOM OCCUPANCY (SRO) SHARED HOUSING
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A NEW SRO SHARED HOUSING BUILDING ON A VACANT 5,000 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL
Location	BARRETT AVENUE (AT THE CORNER OF 21 ST STREET AND BARRETT AVENUE)
APN	514-110-001
Zoning	CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE (ACTIVITY CENTER)
Owner	MAJID KOLAHDOOZ
Applicant	BACILIA MACIAS
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated December 12, 2018, and explained that the site had been vacant for three decades. The applicant had proposed affordable housing on the site by proposing a single-room occupancy (SRO) building. The DRB Subcommittee had reviewed the architectural drawings and presented a color board for the site that would consist of 20 rooms inside of one building with community sharing kitchen, community space on the ground floor and with two units occupied primarily by the property manager on site. This would be the first single-room application in the city. The applicant had met all the factors for zoning compliance. The application would also have to go to the Planning Commission with the actual tenancy as well as the facility management plan for approval at a later date.

BACILIA MACIAS, the applicant, described the proposal for a three-story SRO to provide affordable housing to accommodate those who were alone, the commuter, the young professional, potentially those without cars, and those who wanted to be part of a community. There would be on-site management, daily maintenance of the public spaces, with rigorous vetting for an alternative living style that she stated would be perfect for Richmond and for the site given the close proximity to BART and to address the need for housing. She explained that the Barrett Avenue corridor was a huge street that was not active at night and placing people on that street would make it a safer pedestrian street for residents around the project. The architecture would be modern, there were other three-story buildings on the block, and a more traditional siding had been proposed with modern aspects.

Chair Livingston reported that the DRB Subcommittee had met with the architect when the garden entry had been recommended to be moved from the side to the back.

Boardmember Hannah expressed his pleasure with the changes that had been made to the building after review by the subcommittee. Balancing the conflict between security and openness, he recommended that the architect look into a more contemporary perforated metal pattern on the ground level instead of the bars identified on the plans to create a security screen that did not invoke prison or security. He also recommended that the double openings of the garage be treated with a trim piece.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Boardmember Benz loved the project, the concept, and stated it was necessary and overdue.

Boardmember Leung agreed, stated the concept was needed in the region, and verified with Ms. Macias that there were also community spaces on the second and third floor levels where shared meals could occur. She also asked if any amenities had been included on the outside.

Ms. Macias stated that a barbeque grill had been included for outdoor cooking, and there might be space for a small tot structure, but she emphasized that the proposal was not for a family type space. She stated that cookouts were popular and some of the outside space could be turned into a community garden. She also verified the two sinks in each room; one for the bathroom and one for a kitchenette.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve PLN18-345, Kolahdooz Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Shared Housing, subject to the 10 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 11) The alternate gate design, abstract security screen, to be explored by the applicant as an artistic opportunity; and 12) Provide trim around the back parking access openings; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

Chair Livingston moved Items 5 and 6 up on the agenda at this time, both to be considered together.

5. PLN18-015	SMART NEW RESIDENCE
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±2,600 SQUARE FOOT NEW SINGLE-FAMILY TWO-STORY RESIDENCE ON A ±8,700 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location	70 BELVEDERE AVENUE
APN	558-012-015
Zoning	RL-1, SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	AARON SMART
Applicant	ROGER KURATH, DESIGN 21, LLC
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Chair Livingston reported that the architect had met with the DRB Subcommittee on a number of occasions.

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated December 12, 2018 for two adjacent vacant parcels on Belvedere Avenue in Point Richmond. He explained that Belvedere Avenue had a 30-foot right-of-way that included a 9- to 10-foot wide paved road and there were currently eight existing homes with direct access to Belvedere Avenue. The properties located on the western side were all steep downhill parcels. He identified the size of each parcel, the size and particulars of each proposed two-story unit, and reported that both were downslope parcels with a greater than 40 percent grade.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Mr. Lopez reported that the Fire Marshal had recommended either a wider road in front of the two properties or a fire apparatus area. The development proposed a new fire apparatus area across the street on Belvedere Avenue to serve the two new homes and the area would allow placement of a standard fire engine designed for firefighting operations. He recommended approval of 70 Belvedere and recommended that the design of 80 Belvedere be approved with a more distinctive design.

Chair Livingston advised that the Fire Marshal was not able to be present at this time although his assistant Eric Munson was present to respond to neighborhood health and safety concerns.

Inspector ERIC MUNSON, representing the Fire Marshal of the City of Richmond Fire Department, explained that there had been complications with respect to the access to the property given the width of the road for properties that had been developed in the 1900s. While improvements had been made to the firefighting capabilities to access the homes (apparatus had been shortened to accommodate the area), working with the applicant and architect there was an opportunity to use alternative means to address access concerns. A turnout had been proposed to allow the Fire Department to park apparatus in front of the two homes and still allow traffic to go around. With that alternative, the proposal met Fire Code requirements.

DON LEWIS, 50 Western Drive, Richmond, asked if there was a length requirement to the 20 foot width requirement in regards to an access turnout and Inspector Munson stated there was not. With the apparatus parked in front of the proposed home they would be able to drive around with any other apparatus and accommodate Fire Department needs.

MICHELLE BRANT, 75 Belvedere Avenue, Pt. Richmond, stated the turnabout had been placed on the side of her property and she asked if it had been discussed whether one of the homes should be cantilevered to allow the turnabout to be placed on the property in question.

Inspector Munson explained that the Department did not get into the design of the turnout, which he stated was not a turnabout. He clarified that the Department had evaluated the ability to make sure that the homes they were trying to serve could be protected, which was why the turnout had been proposed, to be able to park in front of the homes in question and still allow traffic to move around the apparatus. He clarified for another unidentified speaker that while turnabouts were preferred, there was no area where that could be accommodated; therefore a turnout had been proposed. While a short wheel base engine had turned around in the turnabout at the bottom of Belvedere Avenue, a larger apparatus would have to back out.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

ROGER KURATH, Design 21, LLC, spoke to the constraints of the site, stated that the trees would remain because they would stabilize the hill, and nothing had been proposed on Bishop Avenue as recommended by the Neighborhood Council. He presented views of the proposed homes at 70 and 80 Belvedere Avenue, and noted that the area included a collection of different home styles, and while most had pitched roofs, there were some homes with flat roofs. He explained how the homes had been designed, pointed out guest parking on one lot with no guest parking on the other lot, and the area that would be used during construction and posted with No Parking signs after the completion of construction. He described the design of the homes and pointed out where the mass and bulk would be broken. The design had been proposed to ensure minimal grading. He described the proposed materials and textures and pointed out how the two homes would differ in color, texture, and the direction of vertical and horizontal lines. The roofs would have a grey look, there would be glass railings, recessed windows, and all materials would be non-combustible.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Chair Livingston clarified that PLN18-015 for 70 Belvedere would be considered first.

Public Comments:

JULIA NESTINGEN, 60 Belvedere Avenue, Pt. Richmond, noted her concern for parking given the narrow street and expressed a need for additional parking to accommodate guests and delivery to the homes. She was also concerned with drainage that would be channeled by the curb down Belvedere in a more concentrated stream.

DONNA STONEHAM, 60 Belvedere Avenue Pt. Richmond, concurred with the drainage issue and spoke to a public safety issue with respect to drainage and hill stabilization, general access to her property, parking, and privacy if a bank of trees was removed from 70 Belvedere Avenue. She suggested the two structures would significantly limit the public view of the water, and was also concerned about the fire lane and the impact on the views in the neighborhood.

BARBARA AMBROSE, 90 Belvedere Avenue, Pt. Richmond, explained that Bishop Alley had been a historical connector for many years. She described an easement from Bishop Alley to Belvedere and described the history of the area and its use.

CHRISTOPHER WOOD, 90 Belvedere Avenue, Pt. Richmond, spoke specifically to the proposal for 80 Belvedere Avenue, referenced an email he had submitted to the Board, and presented before and after photographs of the site. He objected to the DRB's findings with respect to the design of 80 Belvedere Avenue which would block the views and light from his home, impact the privacy of his home, and compromise his vistas.

MICHELLE BRANT, 75 Belvedere Avenue, Pt. Richmond, explained that the turnout was only a concept and had not been analyzed by an engineer to identify any impacts with respect to drainage, soils stability, seismic strength of design or parking, or aesthetic impact. She urged the DRB to defer any decision pending more clarification of the design and feasibility studies.

LESLIE HANDMACHER, 6 Crest Avenue and 12 Crest Avenue, Richmond, stated her driveway paralleled Belvedere and she expressed concern with the close proximity of the proposed turnout to her property. She was concerned if the turnout came too close to her driveway it could affect the stability of the driveway, which she shared with 75 Belvedere. She also noted that the height of the proposed units would block her view and overwhelm in an adversarial way. She expressed concern with drainage and public safety given the narrowness of the road.

DONALD LEWIS, 50 Western Drive, Richmond, stated the effects of the proposal on his and the adjacent property had already been identified by other neighbors. He asked the applicant if the driveway for 80 Belvedere Avenue was coplanar with the street and the add-on to make a level zone for the off-street parking and for delivery vehicles to be able to use the driveway. He expressed concern for the aesthetics of the turnout wall on the uphill side of Belvedere Avenue and the safety from above given the need for specific protections of people walking on the driveway and a curb to ensure that cars would not slip down the driveway to the fence.

MICHAEL SASSI, 116 Bishop Avenue, Richmond referred to the drainage from the properties and requested that the water be delivered underground to the storm drain at 117 Bishop Avenue. With respect to fire and soils stability, he asked that the trees be cleared and retaining walls be installed to address soils stability issues.

Chair Livingston left the public hearing open for both PLN18-015 and PLN18-016.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Boardmember Hannah suggested that the development of the two lots would stabilize the hillside and a managed stormwater system that collected drainage and directed it to the city's system would improve the drainage on both sites. With respect to views and without a view ordinance in the city, there was nothing to prevent the development of lots that might affect views. He urged the applicant to work with the neighborhood and suggested a talented architect could design a building to minimize view issues. Since building codes would prevent someone from doing something that would add more risk, he suggested the proposal would enhance life safety with no negative impacts to the neighborhood.

When asked, Mr. Kurath noted that they already had a geological report to inform the type and depth of piles that would be involved, and had engaged a structural engineer for the house and everything had already been studied. He recalled that the piles would have to go from 10 to 30 feet. He explained that a shadow study had not been performed for the site, and a civil engineer would be involved as the development proceeded.

Boardmember Hannah noted that shadow studies and view studies were not required and were not applicable.

Chair Livingston clarified that detailed drawings for the retaining walls would have to be submitted.

On the question as to whether the Board could approve the project without the details for the retaining wall, City Attorney James Atencio advised that the wall could be a condition of project approval.

Chair Livingston recommended that the applicant work with the neighbors on the retaining wall, and Boardmember Hannah recommended a planting rail in place of a guard rail and a planting strip, along with an elevation sketch.

The discussion continued on PLN18-016.

6. PLN18-016	SMART NEW RESIDENCE
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A \pm 2,800 SQUARE FOOT NEW SINGLE-FAMILY TWO-STORY RESIDENCE ON A \pm 9,850 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location	80 BELVEDERE AVENUE
APN	558-012-014
Zoning	RL-1, SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	AARON SMART
Applicant	ROGER KURATH, DESIGN 21, LLC
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Mr. Kurath presented the plans for 80 Belvedere Avenue, identified the differences between this property and 70 Belvedere Avenue, with different materials for each; a different roof, different colors, and with different vertical and horizontal lines, and presented elevations. He noted that 90 Belvedere Avenue was a non-conforming home that sat on the property line, and he explained how that would affect the placement of 80 Belvedere Avenue.

Chair Livingston pointed out a design problem on page DP 9, northeast elevation that would need to be corrected. He also asked about the landscape plan and expressed concern with a lack of detailed information related to the plantings.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Chair Livingston commented that the two homes as seen from across the valley appeared to be very similar and he questioned whether the proposal fit into the context of the area.

Boardmember Hannah agreed with the concern for the similarity of the two units and noted that the distinction was close. He agreed that a difference in sheen would be important. He recommended that the architect find a way to do some kind of cutout to create more distinction and eliminate the tall base. He pointed out several ways that the design could be improved and used the plan displayed to recommend some options.

Chair Livingston, in concurrence with the Board, extended the meeting another hour to 10:30 P.M.

Boardmember Leung urged the applicant to look at the context of the neighborhood. She characterized the two buildings as cold, monolithic, and industrial, and recommended the introduction of texture, warmth, a different scale on the façade, or breaking it up through trees or landscaping.

The DRB discussed whether or not to continue the applications to address several issues of concern with conditions to address those concerns, and with Boardmember Benz to identify the colors subject to the Board's discussion as a condition of approval

Boardmember Hannah recommended that 80 Belvedere retain the dark with the gray, and that 70 Belvedere have a greenish brown with a lighter white so that the building overall would be lighter, warmer, more colorful and blend in while the other would be more monochromatic. The selected colors were identified as Exhibit A and presented to staff.

Chair Livingston stated the retaining wall issue behind the fire driveway, the fire turnout, the planting and the landscaping above that and the guard railing would require a city encroachment permit and would be worked out with the city's Planning and Engineering Departments. The applicant would draw up the plans which would be submitted to the city and the DRB would review them for consistency. The drainage issues were civil engineering issues that would also have to be addressed.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing for both PLN18-015 and PLN18-016.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Benz) to approve PLN18-015 and PLN18-016, Smart New Residences, subject to the 15 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 16) Create a carved out opening on each building at the lower portion on the downhill side per Exhibits A and B provided to the applicant; 17) Change the colors for 70 Belvedere Avenue per Exhibit C; 18) Take on the comments for Exhibit D for the landscape plan; 19) Remove the "spy" window; 20) Make the glass railing design distinct between 70 and 80 Belvedere Avenue; 21) Building permits for 70 and 80 Belvedere Avenue cannot be approved without the retaining wall permit where the DRB Subcommittee will work with Planning staff to review the applicant and neighbors' collaboration; 22) Responsibly design the retaining wall on 70 Belvedere Avenue on page DP 9 and an appropriately finished solution whether continuation of the field tile or relate to the innovative design worked out for the retaining wall permit for the design for 70 Belvedere Avenue; and 23) All lights to be shielded and be no more than 3,000k; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

- 3. PLN18-183 LEWIS NEW RESIDENCE WITH DETACHED ADU**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ON A 5,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL
Location 258 WILLARD AVENUE
APN 561-152-007
Zoning RL-2, LOW DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY DISTRICT
Applicant BACILIA MACIAS (ARCHITECT)
Owner EDWARD LEWIS
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated December 12, 2018 for the construction of a two-story 1,637 square foot residence and a one-car garage with an 800 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at the rear of the property. Approval was recommended with the recommendation to move the ADU further to the rear of the site to allow more open space between the units and to make the garage deeper.

Boardmember Hannah noted that his only concern was the front façade. He prepared an Exhibit A to narrow the porch, center the roofs, and add two windows.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston) to approve PLN18-183, Lewis New Residence with Detached ADU, subject to the 12 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 13) Front façade to be revised pursuant to Exhibit A; 14) The ADU unit to be placed eight feet from the rear property line; and 15) The garage to be at least 20 feet clear taking space out of the raised porch; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

- 4. PLN17-663 HALLUSHKA SECOND-STORY ADDITION**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±600 SQUARE FOOT SECOND-STORY, WHICH WILL INCLUDE AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU).
Location 928 SOUTH 45TH STREET
APN 509-350-022
Zoning RL-2, LOW DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY DISTRICT
Applicant HASSUN HALLUSHKA (OWNER)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated December 12, 2018 and stated the proposal involved a new second floor of 600 square feet and would include an ADU. He noted a concern for one window located on the side which could affect the privacy of the next door neighbor, and he recommended that the staircase be redesigned to be U-shaped and go to the deck on the second floor.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

SHALANDA WHITE-CHRISTIAN, SMC Construction, agreed with the recommendations from staff, and because they were maintaining the setback on the side preferred to keep a window at that location, which was a bedroom, but agreed to make the window smaller.

Chair Livingston suggested the 10-foot ceiling that had been proposed for the second floor was abnormally tall and recommended an 8-foot plate height on the second floor.

Boardmember Hannah agreed and supported the applicant’s request for at least a 9-foot ceiling height. He noted that the drawings were not quite the preferred architectural quality and the roof eaves were not correct, although Page A5 showed the roof detail correctly drawn. He pointed out other drafting issues and noted that the railings that had been shown had gaps in them which was an error. He supported the project and confirmed that the proposed materials matched the existing materials. He added that the vents had to be non-corrosive.

Chair Livingston drew a sketch of the roof to provide to the applicant.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve PLN17-663, Hallushka Second-Story Addition, subject to the 11 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 12) Applicant to follow the design direction on the yellow sketch from Chair Livingston; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

7. PLN18-305	BARTEK ADDITION
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±652 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.
Location	5619 FRESNO AVENUE
APN	510-143-025
Zoning	RL-2, LOW DENSITY SINGLE-FAMILY DISTRICT
Owner	MICHAEL BARTEK
Applicant	CARI ROSNER
Staff Contact	EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated December 12, 2018, for a small addition.

The Board had no comments and commended the applicant for the complete drawings.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston) to approve PLN18-305, Bartek Addition, subject to the 10 staff recommended conditions of approval; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Benz, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leader, and Neel).

The next item was continued to the meeting scheduled for January 23, 2019.

8. PLN18-227, PLN18-228, PLN18-229, PLN18-230, PLN18-231, PLN18-232, PLN18-233, PLN18-234, PLN18-319, DESIGN REVIEW FOR 9 SMALL CELL SITES

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE 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 POLES LOCATED WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, ADJACENT TO THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 727 MACDONALD AVENUE (PLN18-227), 532 BARRETT AVENUE (PLN18-228), 401 MACDONALD AVENUE (PLN18-229), 253 22 ND STREET (PLN18-230), 2816 FOOTHILL AVENUE (PLN18-231), 548 MARINA BAY PARKWAY (PLN18-232), 2220 CUTTING BOULEVARD (PLN18-233), 2012 CUTTING BOULEVARD (PLN18-234), 166 S. 12 TH STREET (PLN18-319)
Zoning	PLN 18-319 IS LOCATED WITHIN THE RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT, PLN18-233 AND PLN18-234 ARE LOCATED IN THE CM-1, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, PLN18-232 IS LOCATED IN THE CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, PLN18-231 IS IN THE RM-1/IS-1, MEDIUM DENSITY MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICT, PLN18-227, PLN18-228 AND PLN18-230 ARE IN THE CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE ACTIVITY CENTER ZONING DISTRICT/IS-1, FORM-BASED CODE STUDY AREA ZONING DISTRICT, PLN18-229 IS LOCATED IN THE PR, PARKS AND RECREATION DISTRICT
Applicant	T-MOBILE C/O MD7 – ELLIOTT FROISSER
Staff Contact:	EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: HOLD OVER TO JANUARY 23, 2019

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

1. Nominating Committee for Officer Elections

Chair Livingston stated that more Boardmembers should be present to discuss the Nominating Committee for Officer Elections and the item was continued.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston and Boardmember Hannah highlighted the Subcommittee meeting held this date for the project proposed at 12th and Macdonald Avenue.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2019

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, January 23, 2019.