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

June 12, 2019 6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt Jessica Fine Michael Hannah Macy Leung Jonathan Livingston Karlyn Neel

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:06 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Michael Hannah, and

Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Jessica Fine, and Karlyn Neel*

Absent: Boardmember Macy Leung

*Arrived after Roll Call

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planner Emily Carroll; Senior Planners Jonelyn Whales and Hector

Lopez; and City Attorney Everett Jenkins

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 22, 2019

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Butt) to approve the minutes of the May 22, 2019 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Leung, and Neel).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, emphasized that any time a project was considered by the DRB the applicable Neighborhood Council would have to be able to review the project first to identify any concerns. He reiterated that before an application was considered by the DRB the applicant would have to receive approval from the applicable Neighborhood Council.

Liaison Report

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Livingston advised that Items 5 and 7 on the meeting agenda had been identified as Consent Calendar items and could be approved by one vote.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Fine) to approve Agenda Items 5 and 7 on Consent subject to the findings and Statement of Facts, as shown, and subject to the Conditions of Approval, as shown; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Leung, and Neel).

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, June 24, 2019 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

Chair Livingston identified a request to consider Item 4 first as a Study Session.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

4. PLN18-304 KIM SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ADU

Description (HELD OVER FROM MAY 22, 2019) PUBLIC HEARING TO

CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY <u>+3,300</u> SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING AND A +800 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY

DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ON A VACANT LOT

Location SKYVIEW PLACE (LOT LOCATED ADJACENT TO 5751 SKYVIEW

PLACE)

APN 433-492-003

Zoning RH, RESIDENTIAL HILLSIDE DISTRICT

Applicant CLARISSA KIM (OWNER)

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: STUDY SESSION

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated June 12, 2019, and identified the large lot accessible by a flag lot with a 25-foot wide access driveway and the proposal to build a single-family home with an attached ADU. She clarified that the actual square footage of the ADU in the staff report was incorrect. She noted that pavers had been recommended for the driveway because staff had some concerns for a dust free environment.

On the request to identify the fire zone for the property, Ms. Whales stated the property was not located in a high fire zone and the Fire Department had reviewed the proposal and had submitted no comments. She added that as new construction there would be sprinklers inside the dwelling.

Ms. Whales also clarified that the maximum square footage allowed for an ADU was 800 square feet and it appeared as if the proposed ADU was 933 square feet in size.

MR. KIM, the owner/applicant, described the proposal for his family's residence, stated they had met with all the neighbors since 2016 when the project had first been proposed, and had received feedback as to potential concerns. The neighbors had been supportive and he was ready to proceed with the project.

With respect to the calculation for the ADU, it was clarified that the measurements had been taken by the applicant from the inside walls while the Planning Department measured from outside walls. It was also clarified that the covered porch was part of the main residence, and the maximum floor area of the home could be 4,000 square feet.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

CLIFF WATTS, 5713 Skyview Place, El Sobrante, described a similar application for development that had been proposed in 1990 behind his nearby home and the impacts from that development. He presented photographs of that situation to offer a cautionary tale to what could occur to the home similarly impacted by the subject application and to show that the proposed home would be higher in elevation and have views into that adjacent property.

While not personally impacted by the subject application, Mr. Watts for the benefit of the impacted property owner, requested that the existing cyclone fence be replaced with a privacy fence, noted that the metal roof that had been proposed was not typical for the area, and expressed concern with the electric gate to the property as potentially being un-neighborly.

ROBERT SPAMPINATO, 5763 Skyview Place, El Sobrante, Vice President of the Greenbriar Neighborhood Council, expressed concern with construction related activities and asked who the project sponsor, as referenced in the conditions of approval, would be. He also clarified that contrary to the staff report, Will Plutte, President of the Neighborhood Council, had corresponded with the City with respect to the application.

Boardmember Hannah stated that the project sponsor was the owner of the proposal who would have to hire a licensed contractor who would be responsible for the construction consistent with state laws and local requirements.

Mr. Kim explained that he had discussed the proposal with the neighbor most impacted who had not attended the meeting because that neighbor was aware that a home would eventually be constructed on the lot and there were no views that would be impacted as a result. He noted that neighbor had also supported the development of the home because it would help block the wind from his property.

The DRB reviewed the proposal and offered the following comments:

- Recommended a window at the top of the stair of the ADU, which could be obscured glass, to offer natural light and provide privacy for the neighbors. (Fine)
- Given the neighbors' concerns that the home would be higher than the adjacent properties recommended that the design respond to the fact that it would be exposed by all angles. (Hannah)
- Requested a complete landscape plan and sketched a plan with appropriate plantings that would provide privacy to the adjacent properties, and encouraged the applicant to retain a landscape architect to incorporate it into the development plan. (Livingston)
- Given the large amount of asphalt that would be heat producing, recommended decomposed granite instead. (Butt)
- Recommend the one foot area adjacent to the fence of the driveway that could not be paved be planted with vines or other plantings to soften the effect. (Livingston)
- Recommended an adjustment of the windows in the living space and/or the storage space to move up the hillside. (Butt)
- Requested a materials board, to be submitted at the next meeting, to also identify the placement of the trash receptacles. (Livingston)
- Recommended that the gray metal roof that had been proposed be a brown tone more harmonious with the red color of the neighborhood roofs. (Neel)

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

The application was continued to the next meeting for revised plans.

1. PLN18-372 RODRIGUEZ NEW RESIDENCE

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN

REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY ±1,800 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A VACANT LOT

709 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

3

APN 534-072-017

Location:

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant DAVID RODRIGUEZ (OWNER)

Staff Contact EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Emily Carroll presented the staff report dated June 12, 2019, a request for a new two-story home on a vacant non-conforming lot where there had previously been a two-story home. The overall height was 23 feet and the design met the standards of the zoning district. Staff recommended that the applicant install an ornamental vent over the windows on the front façade in order to increase visual interest, modify the front door and the garage side door so that the doors open in, install a concrete pathway from the garbage container area to the street, and increase the porch overhang to at least 12 inches to offer greater symmetry on the front façade. Approval subject to conditions was recommended.

Hector Lopez commented that for a very small lot the proposed house appeared to be excessive in size at 2,085 square feet. While 2,125 square feet was allowed by code for a lot under 3,750 square feet in size, the subject lot was only 2,500 square feet. The lot coverage was 46 percent while the maximum allowed was 50 percent. He recommended the possible elimination of one of the three proposed bedrooms.

Ms. Carroll reported that the applicant had presented a materials board and was flexible with respect to roof materials. A landscape plan had also been submitted.

Mr. Lopez interpreted DAVID RODRIGUEZ' presentation, who advised that the house was for his family and the suggestion to remove one bedroom to reduce the size of the home would not work for his family.

Boardmember Fine expressed appreciation for the development of the lot, appreciated the redwood fence as opposed to the use of wrought iron, and was curious about the gravel bed, to which Ms. Carroll noted that staff had requested some drainage and Mr. Rodriguez explained that he wanted to have a nice clean play yard for his children.

Boardmember Fine requested that the second story vent be centered over the ridge and that the belly band divider splitting up the first and second story mass, while typical, was too shallow, and either a piece of trim or something with more substance was recommended.

Boardmember Hannah recommended that the belly band be doubled in height to be twice as deep. He verified with the applicant that foam would be used for that element.

Boardmember Neel suggested that the column style in the front of the building did not go with the architecture and recommended something simpler. With respect to the color palette she recommended a couple of combos and weathered wood as the roof using "twig" versus more brown or with a yellow palette, and suggested "Mojave," "tan," or "ochre." In addition, the floating cover over the door in the back of the building needed to be resolved with columns or a platform to step out to; recommended the play area be designed to how the space would be used and that the area be softened with plants; verified that the trash would be in the garage and the windows would be white to match the garage door; recommended lights next to the garage door and the entryway; and asked that the styling match the style of the home and that the hardware be consistent.

Boardmember Hannah agreed with those comments and suggested that the front vent might need to be more decorative. He commented that the garage roof, the porch roof, and the roof at the back felt too weak architecturally and needed to be consolidated as one and referred to a sketch by the Chair and supported that sketch for the roof.

Boardmember Hannah also supported three windows in the center of the upper level rather than the two double sliders; fixing the belly band and supported the foam stucco and double height; agreed the columns needed to be simpler with round or thinner square columns or something similar; noted a missing Revit wall; and the lot coverage at less than 50 percent was acceptable to him. He suggested the applicant should be able to build a similar house to his neighbors despite a smaller than normal lot.

Boardmember Butt agreed, suggested the columns be simpler and more traditional, recognized that the Chair would help adjust the proportions, and asked what was happening above the porch on the second floor and wanted to line up that side of the house.

Chair Livingston referred to the sketch he had drawn as Exhibit A, commented that there would be stucco and no siding, and provided his sketch to the applicant which the DRB supported with respect to the roof, the columns, the front door that should include a glass light or window, a smaller bathroom window, if there was a sidelight to the door it should be to the left, with kickers at the back door, and with a concrete pad at the back.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

There was no one to speak.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN18-372, Rodriguez New Residence, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval, and additional DRB conditions as follows: 12) Belly band to be at least 10 inches tall and project no more than an inch and a half; 13) Color to be weathered wood for the roof and twig for the stucco as referenced by Boardmember Neel's sketches; 14) Lighting to be consistent with the architecture; 15) Center the front vent per Exhibit A by Chair Livingston; 16) Consolidate the roofs in front as shown in Exhibit A; 17) Simplify the columns with 6x6 inch or 8x8 inch columns and be smaller in scale; and 18) Exhibit A to be all stucco with no siding; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Leung).

2. PLN18-356 HASSUN NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE

Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON

THE DESIGN OF A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A SUBSTANDARD SIZE PARCEL. THE PROJECT

REQUIRES A VARIANCE TO THE MINIMUM LOT SIZE.

Location FLORIDA AVENUE

APN 513-036-019

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant HASSUN HALUSHKA (OWNER)

Staff Contact EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: RECEIVE COMMENTS

Emily Carroll presented the staff report dated June 12, 2019, for a new home on a vacant parcel of 2,500 square feet where the site had not previously been developed and where a variance and a recommendation to the Planning Commission was required. She advised that the floor area was currently 2,300 square feet where 2,125 was allowed, and there were a variety of design considerations.

Boardmember Hannah clarified that the proposal exceeded the allowable square footage and findings for a variance to the minimum lot size was required with a recommendation to the Planning Commission for approval, and Mr. Lopez stated this would be the first variance of its kind.

HASSUN HALUSHKA, the applicant/owner, recognized that the proposal exceeded the allowable square footage but explained that he had a big family and the home would be his primary residence and he needed the square footage.

CHALANDI CHRISTIAN, the Architect, spoke to the narrow 25 by 100 foot lot that made it difficult to build within the limits, and explained that the proposal met the required setbacks and if reducing the square footage of the home a larger setback than needed would be created. She stated the two-story structure was under the 50 percent lot coverage requirement.

Boardmember Hannah suggested the proposal was similar to one that had just been approved, had no concern with the lot coverage, particularly since it was less than the 50 percent lot coverage, and clarified that the Planning Commission would make the decision on the variance.

The DRB reviewed the proposal and offered the following comments:

- Recommended more family congregated spaces around eating; referred to the condenser unit and suggested that it be placed elsewhere; and liked the trees in the front elevation and would like to see what they looked like from a planned perspective. With respect to fencing, she noted the use of wrought iron in the neighborhood and recommended a wood fence to potentially inspire other people in the neighborhood to install wood fencing. She requested that the front door be centered in the arch and commented that a window on the left side elevation appeared to be too low. (Fine)
- As to the condenser, the DRB recommended that it be placed on the side out of view or up high out of the way, and given the limited space on the side suggested a better, smaller unit that would fit.
- Liked the front elevation but acknowledged that the variance put pressure on the detail, verified with the applicant that the windows would be trimmed and that vinyl windows would be installed; suggested there should be a belly band around the two-story structure and would not do the belly band in the front because he liked the pop-out with corbels below. He recommended a recessed back belly band and offered a drawing to show what he meant. He also recommended a front door with panels and light. (Hannah)
- Suggested a front door compatible with the garage door and recommended a light by the garage door. (Neel)
- Recommended the belly band start at the control joint and be recessed. (Livingston)

Boardmember Hannah offered a sketch he identified as Exhibit A to note the stucco with control joints, the windows be drawn correctly, there be recessed panels at the front door, add a light outside the garage door, and identify the placement of garbage cans. Exhibit A was submitted to staff.

Ms. Carroll referred to the staff recommendation to reduce the size of the garage and enlarge the porch entry, although Chair Livingston suggested that would disrupt the symmetry since the garage was the width of the room above and there was a simple geometry to it.

Chair Livingston commended the plans.

3. PLN19-011 LUCAS SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ADU

Description (HELD OVER FROM MAY 22, 2019) PUBLIC HEARING TO

CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A $\pm 1,276$ SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND A ± 741 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ON A

VACANT LOT

Location 560 ALAMO AVENUE

APN 561-231-001

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant YENDY AND ELVIN LUCAS, YC & JJ LLC (OWNER)

Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated June 12, 2019, for a 1,276± square foot single-family home on a 5,000 square foot vacant lot with a 751 square foot attached dwelling unit in the rear. A garage had been recommended at the last meeting, had now been included, and there would now be a small porch for the ADU unit in the rear. He recommended approval.

ELVIN LUCAS, the applicant/owner, explained when asked that he had not addressed the drainage between the two units. He advised that the garage door would be wood, he would use wood siding, and he preferred a black roof. He also verified that the railing at the front would be wood, which could be the same color as the trim.

Boardmember Butt asked about the details for the front door and the garage door and asked for an example of the cultured stone. The DRB recommended the same stone that had approved for an earlier application and recommended El Dorado stone in "seashell."

Chair Livingston recommended a six-panel sectional painted wood door. With respect to landscaping, he recommended two areas for bioswales offering extra green space, and with the 5-foot setback and the need for a 3-foot walkway would leave a 2-foot planting strip all along the property where vines could be planted along the fence.

Boardmember Hannah stated the home looked good and had no issue with the architecture.

Boardmember Neel suggested if changing the pink color to green there could be a slate roof and she recommended that not only the roof should have dark tones. She prepared an Exhibit and offered her suggestions on the material board.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

There was no one to speak.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Butt) to approve PLN19-011, Lucas Single-Family Residence and ADU, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 12) The garage door to be a six-panel sectional door of wood or a wood-look; 13) The columns and cultured stone to be Eldorado "Zinc," with the roof to be comp shingle weathered wood or colonial slate or equal; and 14) Exhibit A, the landscape plan, to add bioswales and planting strips along the perimeter; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Leung).

CC 5. PLN19-156 NEW SECOND STORY DECK

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO

CONSTRUCT A NEW SECOND STORY DECK

Location: 1415 MONTEREY STREET

APN 508-160-003

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Owner VINTAGE INVESTMENT PROPERTY, LLC

Applicant JOHN R. PHILLIPS, JR.

Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

The application was approved on Consent.

6. PLN19-090 CAMARENA TWO-STORY ADU

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO

CONSTRUCT A 687 SQUARE FOOT ATTACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE

Location: 2960 GILMA DRIVE

APN 414-053-009

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Applicant JOSE CAMARENA (OWNER)

Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated June 12, 2019, for an addition to a single-family residence of a 687 square foot attached ADU in the eastern rear corner of the residence. An existing sunroom in the back of the garage would be where the ADU would be constructed as a second story. To enhance the overall design, staff recommended that the shed roof be revised to a gable roof to better match the existing low pitched roof of the dwelling, and that windows be added to the second floor addition facing the street. He reported that the applicant had agreed to those recommendations.

Chair Livingston asked for clarification of the floor area calculation.

JOSE CAMARENA, the applicant/owner, described the proposal to modernize that section of the home and because of the need for more housing in the family and the ability to consider an addition at this time, the ADU had been proposed.

The DRB considered the staff recommendation to revise the shed roof to a gable roof and concurred with that recommendation. Boardmember Hannah supported a 3:12 roof as opposed to a 2:12 roof.

Chair Livingston drew a sketch to show how the bulk and mass could be reduced by matching the roofline. The applicant explained he had wanted the room to look special by having a higher ceiling in the living room area and the Chair stated that would still be the case in that instead of 16 feet the height would be 12 to 13 feet, with the intent to transition from the single-story to the two-story more gracefully.

The DRB clarified that staff's recommendation that there be no deck was because the deck would be in the setback.

Chair Livingston asked the applicant to return with plans that eliminated the deck and adjusted the elevation pursuant to the Chair's sketch.

The DRB continued the application to the July 24, 2019 meeting.

CC 7. PLN19-030 ORTEGA ADDITION

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN

REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY <u>+</u>450 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY

RESIDENCE

Location: 223 S 4TH STREET

APN 550-151-027

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Applicant HUMBERTO ORTEGA (OWNER)

Staff Contact EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

The application was approved on Consent.

8. PLN19-069 KENNEDY SECOND STORY ADDITIONS

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN

REVIEW FOR A 294 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY REAR

ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE

Location: 1647 SAN BENITO STREET

APN 508-292-007

Zoning RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

Applicant ADAM MILLER

Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONTINUE TO 6/26/2019

The application was continued to the June 26, 2019 meeting.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

There were no staff reports, requests, or announcements.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston advised that he and Boardmember Hannah had drafted a policy resolution to the City Council that had ultimately not been submitted, and a discussion developed on why that was the case.

Chair Livingston commended the Aspire Technology project that had been well done; reported that the Bay Walk project was not being built as approved; and stated that negotiations continued with the developer at Nevin and 23rd, which was also not being constructed as approved.

Boardmember Hannah referred to the Foothill Boulevard Project and reported that he had done a number of sketches to advise of the minimum required to approve the project, although there had been no response from the applicant. With respect to the Nevin and 23rd project, he stated the proposed beautifully fenestrated asymmetrically divided windows had been changed to single sliders and because the Chair had been monitoring the developments approved by the DRB, the Chair acting as an enforcement officer, had caught that change. He emphasized that DRB members, on volunteer time, should not have to provide the city's project monitoring.

Chair Livingston expressed his hope that staff would conduct the required monitoring of city approvals, and Mr. Lopez stated the city did monitor although staff had been overwhelmed by the sheer number of projects involved.

Chair Livingston also referred to the Shea project at the Marina where there had been no compliance with the landscape plan; and added that a schematic was to have been submitted to the DRB for the 12th and Macdonald project.

Boardmember Fine referred to the Bridge of Hope project for a women's shelter on Third Street which was to provide a cozy, warm and, inviting space. She commended the project which was to be submitted to the DRB next month.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, June 26, 2019.