

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

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

November 13, 2019  
6:00 P.M.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Kimberly Butt  
Michael Hannah  
Jonathan Livingston

Jessica Fine  
Macy Leung  
Karlyn Neel

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Jessica Fine, Michael Hannah, Macy Leung, and Karlyn Neel\*  
\*Arrived after Roll Call

**Absent:** None

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Planners Roberta Feliciano, Hector Lopez, and Lina Velasco; and City Attorney James Atencio

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** October 23, 2019

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Fine/Hannah) to approve the minutes of the October 23, 2019 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Neel).**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Livingston moved Item 8, Home 2 Suites Hotel up on the agenda as Item 5. He also advised that Item 9, NOMA (formerly Baywalk) Project would be continued pending staff review.

**Public Forum**

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, referred to the concerns he had earlier raised regarding the Valmar Laundromat project and the traffic and numerous accidents in the intersection adjacent to the proposal, particularly around 5:00 P.M. and urged attention to that situation. He added that the Fairmede-Hilltop Neighborhood Council had not been made aware of the Aspire Technology Academy application, and reiterated that as a courtesy the Neighborhood Councils or their president would have to be notified of any application submitted to the DRB for consideration.

With respect to the new T-Mobile Wireless Facility on the current agenda, Mr. Hindler thanked City staff for submitting the application to the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council for its consideration.

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

**City Council Liaison Report**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, November 25, 2019 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

Chair Livingston stated the next four items were Consent Calendar Items. He removed No. 4 from the Consent Calendar and accepted a motion to approve Items 1, 2 and 3 on Consent.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

<b>CC 1. PLN19-174</b>	<b>MCKENZIE DECK ALTERATION AND ADDITION</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO EXPAND AN EXISTING DECK GREATER THAN 4 FEET IN HEIGHT FROM THE GROUND (12 FEET PROPOSED) AND FOR A ±497 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.
Location	1551 SANTA CLARA STREET
APN	508-252-002
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	TONY AND EILEEN MCKENZIE
Applicant	ARIEL CRIVELARI
Staff Contact	EMILY CARROLL
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve PLN19-174, McKenzie Deck Alteration and Addition, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Neel).**

<b>CC 2. PLN19-347</b>	<b>SECOND STORY DECK</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND STORY DECK GREATER THAN 4 FEET IN HEIGHT FROM THE GROUND (9 FEET PROPOSED).
Location	3416 STEWARTON DRIVE
APN	431-281-004
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	ANTHONY A. KIBBY
Applicant	ARIEL CRIVELARI
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve PLN19-347, Second Story Deck subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with six Conditions of Approval; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Neel).**

<b>CC 3. PLN19-162</b>	<b>VIDAL DETACHED GARAGE</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±866 SQUARE FOOT

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

	DETACHED GARAGE.
Location	936 KERN STREET
APN	523-093-018
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant	VIVIANE VIDAL AND ERIC CARLSON (OWNER)
Staff Contact	EMILY CARROLL
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to approve PLN19-162, Vidal Detached Garage, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with eight Conditions of Approval; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Neel).**

<b>CC 4. PLN19-086</b>	<b>NEW T-MOBILE WIRELESS FACILITY</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A MONOPOLE WIRELESS FACILITY.
Location	4000 BISSELL AVENUE
APN	517-280-006
Zoning	CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE (COMMERCIAL EMPHASIS)
Owner	RICHARD LOMPA
Applicant	SCOTT DUNAWAY OF D4 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC FOR T-MOBILE
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO
	Recommendation: <b>RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION</b>

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated November 13, 2019, for a proposed mono-eucalyptus new wireless facility located adjacent to the Macdonald 80 Target Center off of Macdonald Avenue. The City's consultant, Telecom Law Firm PC had recommended that the DRB require a resubmittal of the plans that were of a design more appropriate for the commercial site. She added that faux trees were only allowed by the ordinance where there were other mature trees to camouflage the faux tree within the landscape. No public comments had been received to date.

SCOTT DUNAWAY, D4 Communications, LLC, representing T-Mobile, reported that he had received a letter of approval from the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council. He referred to the staff report and stated with respect to the design that three different options had been presented to staff, and while he suggested the mono-eucalyptus was the nicest option, he was prepared to change that design at this time to the mono-palm since there were other palm trees in the area. The mono-palm design would be a dual carrier allowing T-Mobile antennas with a second carrier. He added that palm trees would be planted in the area to go with the existing palm trees and suggested it would take five years for the palms to mature. He presented sample boards of the materials involved. He explained that while the area involved was currently covered, the proposed facility would offload existing facilities given the excessive "traffic" and provide the necessary services.

Boardmember Hannah referred to the multiple small cell wireless facilities that had been approved last year, verified that the currently proposed facility might need to be duplicated elsewhere in the City in the near future, and suggested a precedence was being set to continue to meet the demand for this and other carriers.

Mr. Dunaway called the proposed facility a macro facility and suggested that the smaller cell wireless facilities would continue to be placed where needed. The macro facility had been designed for the T-Mobile facility with 12 transmitters proposed by T-Mobile on the top and with

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

the bottom to be utilized by another carrier.

Chair Livingston suggested that a facility should be designed now to accommodate the additional transmitters in the future.

Boardmember Hannah commented that it was shortsighted to approve a faux tree for one location given the obvious lack of mature trees around it and the lack of a committed landscape plan that showed an intent to camouflage the faux tree, with additional faux trees that could proliferate around the City to meet the future demand. Referring to the faux water tank wireless facility that had previously been approved elsewhere in the City in 2018, he recommended the water tower approach or better.

Boardmember Butt preferred a pole to a tree; and Boardmember Fine preferred to have a real tree planted in front of a monopole as opposed to a faux tree or a water tower.

The Board discussed the wireless facilities placed elsewhere in the City and noted that a metal clad wireless facility had been approved on top of a building on Central Avenue that looked like a mechanical screen on top of the roof and had blended in to the point of disappearing. That option was recommended to the applicant for consideration. As to whether landscaping could or should be planted in front of the monopole to screen it, the Board spoke to the question of enforcing the health and maintenance of the landscaping. The issue of precedence was again emphasized. After the discussion and by consensus, the Board supported a building mounted solution, with a water tower option, and with the plans to identify a maxed out facility.

Mr. Dunaway stated his only concern with a building mounted solution would be the height.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to continue PLN19-086, New T-Mobile Wireless Facility to a future meeting; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Neel).**

The next item was taken out of order as earlier requested.

<b>8. PLN19-230</b>	<b>HOME 2 SUITES HOTEL</b>
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PRESENT THE DESIGN OF A 4-STORY 102-ROOM HOTEL ON A VACANT PARCEL LOCATED BETWEEN 1951 AND 2157 MEEKER AVENUE.
Location	MEEKER AVENUE
APN	560-170-018
Zoning	SP-2, RICHMOND BAY SPECIFIC PLAN
Owner	HBF WESTGROUP PROPERTIES, LLC
Applicant	MEEKER AVE LLC
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO Recommendation: <b>PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS</b>

Chair Livingston advised that he had moved the item up on the agenda to accommodate the applicants who had come a distance to attend the meeting. Given the extensive review by the DRB Subcommittee, he suggested that if all areas of concern were addressed the item could be included on the Consent Calendar at a future meeting.

Boardmember Hannah reported that the DRB Subcommittee had worked with the applicants on two or three occasions to maintain an urban edge with the proposed hotel building and future buildings to create deliberate urban conditions, particularly with respect to the area between the hotel and one of the future buildings off of Meeker Avenue where a public plaza was

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019

recommended to have sufficient height to maintain the urban edge.

Lina Velasco presented the staff report dated November 13, 2019, stated this was the first new construction within the Richmond Bay Specific Plan to create a mixed-use pedestrian friendly environment, and noted that many years ago a Hampton Inn Suites hotel had been approved on the site under different regulations. The current applicant had proposed a similar design under the new Form Based Code and with the help of the City's consultant the layout had been reconfigured.

DALE JOHNSON, Meeker Ave LLC, the Project Architect, was not present but offered a video PowerPoint to identify the plan and to walk through the design for the vacant, relatively flat site with no trees. He described the uses surrounding the site, stated that an area of soils contamination had been found as a result of a previous industrial use, and described the design approach and the proposed materials to create a unified theme intended to set the main street feel and tone for current and future development as required by the Richmond Bay Specific Plan. The hotel would have a steel structure, be four stories, 102 rooms, and all rooms were suites with a sofa, kitchenette and work space offering a good layout for extended stays. The guest amenities included pool, outdoor lounge with barbeque, exercise rooms, continental breakfasts, and a lobby area with a communal table available for community use. No restaurant, bar or lounge had been proposed on site. The details of the design stated no mechanical rooftop equipment was to be visible from the ground or an adjacent equivalent building elevation. The materials and colors were described as complementing the Harbortate and Starbucks red brick, with a red/orange wood tone in the panels for the main wall, and potentially a light green accent where the building stepped back. All colors would have to be approved by Hilton.

MARSHA VALLIER, Vallier Design Associates, Landscape Architect, presented the plant palette with both deciduous and evergreen plants that were all drought tolerant, pest and disease resistant, and arranged to complement the building. She explained that the Bay Specific Plan wanted to create a street edge with the appearance of individual homes and to do that a dooryard had been created using plant material spacing that would create that effect. Three separate pyramid roof shade structures would be in the plaza space with blue or brick color fabric, with the large street trees along the front in tree grates and with lighting throughout the plaza space. Stamped asphalt walkways in the same brick color and texture would identify the pedestrian areas in the porte-cochere area. She described some of the other amenities that had been proposed including trash, recycle, and tables under the shade trees, and bike lockers and covered bike parking. Hedges would be installed along the edge of the site on the east side adjacent to the commercial area with the creation of a "green wall" to further screen the site. She presented the plant and materials palette and explained that the flowering palette would have pinkish/red tones. She also presented the lighting plan with 16-foot high light poles with 3,000 k LED lights and submitted the cut sheets for the lighting plan. She pointed out a number of bio-swales for the water treatment with sedges and rushes.

Ms. Velasco responded to questions and clarified the public plaza space versus the private space for hotel guests, and explained that the future buildings would extend the urban building frontage and the future retail could include small specialty retail, restaurants, or other uses.

Chair Livingston recommended a standard condition for the future buildings that *Any future building shall integrate the color, material, and fenestration of the windows consistent with Home 2 Suites Hotel.*

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019

Boardmember Fine liked the continuity with the joints and panels throughout the building but had initially questioned the two design strategies given the panels on top of the brick. After being provided the color samples, she suggested that the colors be toned down a bit.

Boardmember Leung also suggested that the orange be muted.

The Board discussed the colors and suggested that alternative prototype colors be submitted to staff who would submit them to the DRB for consideration.

Boardmember Leung recommended some modifications to the screening proposed for the east side given that would be the most visible from the road, especially from the freeway, and Ms. Vallier agreed that the vines could be alternated to bring in some color, with that breakup to be repeated around the site.

Boardmember Leung also requested that the blue fabric that had been proposed in the plaza space be more “brickish,” although not all Board members agreed and another blue tone was recommended to be submitted to staff for consideration.

Boardmember Leung verified that the lighting for the site would be dawn to dusk.

Boardmember Hannah suggested the three canopies would create the appearance of a structure and he would like to see the color options for that element. He liked the porte-cochere and noted that the pyramids linked them together. He suggested that the three-foot fascia around the porte-cochere wouldn't work and he offered a sketch where the edge of the fascia of the porte-cochere should mimic the upper top of the building corners. He submitted his sketch as Exhibit A and stated that the three-foot porte-cochere needed articulation. He did not support the chain link in the landscape plan.

Chair Livingston verified that electric charging stations would be provided. He did not see any drawings for garbage enclosures and requested that detail be provided. He thanked the applicants for working with the Board, stated he would offer his notes to staff to be forwarded to the applicant, and encouraged the applicant to provide everything as requested so that the application could be placed on the Consent Calendar.

Boardmember Neel arrived at this time.

<b>5. PLN19-229</b>	<b>NEW TWO-STORY ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU).
Location	5943 CAPITOL HILL AVENUE
APN	419-191-002
Zoning	RH, SINGLE-FAMILY HILLSIDE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant	SANDEEP S. GAHLA (OWNER)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Chair Livingston commented that he had reviewed the plans and as drawn the proposed ADU looked unbuildable given the nearly 2:1 slope with no retaining walls shown. He recommended that the application be continued.

Boardmember Hannah added that the design was undeveloped, the landscape plan needed a realistic topo, retaining walls, and some notion of the structural challenges.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019

Hector Lopez explained that no landscape plan had been included in the submittal. He recommended that the applicant work with a member of the DRB to address the concerns.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to continue PLN19-229, New Two-Story Accessory Dwelling Unit to a future meeting; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: None).**

<b>6. PLN19-259</b>	<b>TWO NEW TOWNHOMES</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT TWO ATTACHED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS ON A 5,300 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location	657 HARBOUR WAY
APN	534-181-004 AND 534-181-005
Zoning	CM-2, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE NEIGHBORHOOD DISTRICT
Owner	ORANT LLC
Applicant	MAGNOLIA SABRINA ELLIS
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ      Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated November 13, 2019 for an application that had previously been considered by the DRB on October 9, 2019.

MAGNOLIA SABRINA ELLIS, the applicant, explained that this was the second round with the Board for the two new townhomes that had been proposed on a fairly flat vacant lot on Harbour Way that when developed would add value to the street.

The unidentified owner commented that a single-family home had initially been proposed for the site but the zoning had changed and a new proposal had been created to provide more units on the property. He described some of the problems with the site in the high crime area and noted that the proposal would help improve the area.

Boardmember Hannah explained that at the last hearing he had encouraged the applicant to thicken the top fascia although he suggested that what had been submitted was too thick. He recommended that the height of the fascia be reduced by six to eight inches to help with the overall proportion of the building. He also recommended a condition to require the thickest gauge metal possible to avoid "oil canning," the wavy effect of thin metal. He later suggested that reducing the height of the fascia might eliminate the concern for oil canning.

Boardmember Fine referred to the elevations and the element where the house numbers were located and asked about the materials to be used, and Ms. Ellis spoke to the Board's request to bring more symmetry into the elevation which used a modern Hardie panel and she had created a design element unique to the entry, centered on either side, with a Hardie plank abutting that element.

Boardmember Fine asked about the height of the wall between the balconies on the second floor, and Ms. Ellis explained how that had been designed given the windows in that area, and after discussion and recommendations from the Board she verified that the privacy screen between the two units could match the height of the top of door.

Boardmember Butt liked the changes, was not sure of the wood structure on the balconies and

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

suggested that the wood be stained to be darker.

Chair Livingston suggested that the posts encroached into the setback and there was a brief discussion of alternatives such as cantilevering the deck.

Boardmember Hannah did not like the solid stucco railing and expressed concern for a wood structure holding up a masonry solid which looked top heavy. He recommended a new feature in front of the building which was the façade element, the posts, balcony and railings, and the vertical all out of wood, engaged with the stucco and the metal at the top. He drew a sketch to be submitted to the applicant

Boardmember Neel agreed that element needed to be lightened up volumetrically and be darker in color.

Chair Livingston appreciated the survey that had been proposed but noted that the property sloped one foot to the rear. Based on the drawings a two-foot retaining wall would be required in the back. He asked how the drainage would be handled and whether the fence would be placed on top of the retaining wall or not. He also noted there were downspouts on the side of the building that came from a gutter that would have no water coming into it and those downspouts should be removed.

Chair Livingston stated the design needed to be developed a bit more and return to the DRB subject to the Board’s comments such as lightening the mass and darkening the color, clarifying the wood detail with the metal detail to avoid buckling, and addressing the concern for the metal post that could be a traffic hazard, along with the other concerns that had been identified in the discussion.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to continue PLN19-259, Two New Townhomes to a future meeting subject to the DRB’s comments; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung, Livingston and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: None).**

Vice Chair Hannah and Boardmember Butt both recused themselves from the next item and left the room at this time.

<b>7. PLN17-654</b>	<b>PARKWAY COMMERCE CENTER</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER THE ADOPTION OF AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (IS/MND), AND FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±111,000 SQUARE FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING ON A 7.27-ACRE VACANT PARCEL.
Location	COLLINS AVENUE AT RICHMOND PARKWAY (THE SITE IS LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF COLLINS AVENUE, WITH THE RICHMOND PARKWAY DEFINING THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF THE SITE AND A SANTA FE RAILROAD LINE DEFINING THE EASTERN BOUNDARY).
APN	408-060-028
Zoning	IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Owner	WANG BROTHERS INVESTMENTS, INC.
Applicant	KATHY TRUONG
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ      Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

Mr. Lopez presented the staff report dated November 13, 2019, and stated the Parkway Commerce Center was a 111,000 square foot light industrial building that had been considered by the DRB in Study Session on August 14, 2019 when the DRB had provided feedback. The applicant had made revisions to the plan to address the DRB's comments to consider reversing the elevation and relocating the building to the east, with all loading docks, rollup doors, and utilities to face the Richmond Parkway to allow a reduction in the impact of trailers facing Giant Road and the residential areas beyond.

Changes to the landscape plan had also been recommended as had the retention of a creek restoration consultant to integrate the entire landscaping. Mr. Lopez clarified that initially the project had included the application for a conditional use permit for a cannabis cultivator, although that was no longer the case and the proposal was for a warehouse building for multiple tenants. He identified changes to the staff report including a date in the first condition of approval and noted some of the information in the staff report that the applicant had disagreed with, such as the requirement for creek restoration.

Boardmember Fine commented that there were some discrepancies between the IS/MND and the actual current plans such as square footage, building height, and number of parking spaces, although Mr. Lopez clarified that the IS/MND made certain assumptions and the changes were not necessarily significant enough to require an amendment to those documents.

ROY COTTERILL, Perkins, Williams & Cotterill, Architects, Rancho Cordova, presented the project and referred to the Board's suggestions offered at the Study Session. He explained that they had studied the opportunity of getting the docks and the business end of the project under the Parkway, although based on the advice of legal counsel that would not be a sustainable option for the owner given the lease requirements and the maintenance provisions of the Parkway. He described the revisions to the plan and reported that substantial landscaping had been added under the Parkway, truck drop/trailer drop spots had been delineated in that area, and a public art plaza had been created at the entrance to the project. The footprint of the building had been highly articulated and the front of the building had been oriented toward the main entry of the project which presented well to the street. The main front parking area had been decoupled from the truck traffic area to make it easier for automobiles to have better access to the front door. A major screen wall had been added to the west and south portions of the property with a staggered tree planting screen with shrubs that could grow to eight feet to screen the docks.

Mr. Cotterill presented the color board, stated the north elevation was the main elevation, and described the colors and materials that had been proposed, which included two-story glass at the main entry. He stated the building was slightly taller than the Parkway and 10 feet had been added to the height so that there would be no view of the roof. The overall top of the building was 49 feet with the highest parapet at 52 feet. He pointed out that the bronze glass had been changed to green glass, as requested.

Chair Livingston summarized the Board's comments to the applicant in August and noted that a couple of sketches had been provided by the DRB. He asked where the roof water would go and the unidentified civil engineer described that element.

Chair Livingston suggested there was a great opportunity to naturalize the bio-swale, which the applicant indicated was what had been intended, although the Chair stated it was not on the plans. He sought a landscape architect familiar with creeks and riparian corridors so that element could be weaved into a landscape plan to solve the water issues and achieve the goals of the General Plan and the City of Richmond's Creek Ordinance. He read a portion of the Creek Ordinance into the record.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019

With respect to the creek, the civil engineer suggested the Zoning Ordinance required a setback, suggested the ordinance talked about restoration, and commented that there was an exhibit in the ordinance that showed where restoration was appropriate. He stated where the project was located was not one of those locations. He added that the creek had previously been restored as part of a bigger project. He presented an exhibit to show the creek and questioned whether any further disturbance as a result of the project would do anything that Mother Nature was not already doing.

Chair Livingston stated the ordinance was trying to encourage a provision that might include a walkway and there was a desire to maintain the creek and the corridor.

With respect to the creek, the civil engineer stated the Contra Costa Flood Control District (CCCFCD) had a 30-foot easement and an access path that they were very protective of.

Chair Livingston explained that he had walked the creek and it would be nice to develop that area without just letting the weeds grow and continue to be an area where the homeless congregated. He suggested room for a pathway with a landscape corridor including the bio-swale would offer more than leaving it as is, which is what the ordinance was trying to do.

Boardmember Leung had no issue but noted factors that might include biological resources.

The applicant's unidentified landscape architect explained that the CCCFCD would have some say over what could be done within its easement, she understood the City had some concern with the creeks, and she explained that they would meet with the appropriate parties, get an expert, and see what had to be done. She noted that the creek was seasonal and was not the same every year. She added that all the appropriate parties would become involved.

Chair Livingston stated that the Board had specifically requested a creek restoration consultant with a landscape architect that was familiar with riparian corridor habitat to address that area, which had not been done. He explained that the application could not be approved without knowing what would be done with the creek as part of the landscape plan and in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan.

Boardmember Fine liked the building but asked why there so many parking spaces beyond the City's parking requirement for the site, and Mr. Cotterill explained that the extras had been included for flexibility if there was increased office use and because of the parking under the Parkway.

Boardmember Neel asked about EV charging stations and Mr. Cotterill stated those would be allocated according to the California Green Code. She suggested the building, as revised, showed more architectural interest and since the buildouts had gotten taller she recommended that the ends should come down, although Mr. Cotterill described what had been done with respect to the roof and the challenges that made it difficult for the ends to come down, particularly since it was unknown at this point what size the individual spaces would be.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to extend the meeting to 9:30 P.M.; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Fine, Leung, Livingston and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: Butt and Hannah).**

Chair Livingston recommended as a way to mitigate the massive building that the rollup door on the east elevation be moved to the other side of the building and that a grove of redwoods be installed in the roughly rectangular section of asphalt out front of that section of the east

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019

elevation, and Mr. Cotterill suggested instead that the rollup door be put in tight to the dock. He pointed out an area on the plan where a redwood grove could be located.

Boardmember Neel pointed out an architectural detail that did not reconcile with the building pop-outs where the design and the height was a concern, and noted that the architectural detail was busy and did not flow with the rest of the building. She identified the elements that concerned her that created visual noise and recommended the elimination of the scoring to simplify the design. She expressed concern for the massing at the entry and there was a desire to make it more inviting.

Mr. Cotterill suggested that some of the visual noise could be removed and made a little less massive with the roof at the entry to be more proportionate to the entry.

Chair Livingston recommended that the 4,000k lighting fixtures be reduced to 3,000k, and that the 25- and 30-foot tall light fixtures include shrouds to avoid light spill onto the residential areas. He requested that the plan show the redwood triangles that had been recommended. The landscape plan otherwise showed appropriate trees for screening and he asked for a gate detail in the front.

When asked, Mr. Cotterill stated that signage might not be desired, particularly since they were currently talking to a single tenant.

The Board expressed appreciation for the articulation of the building and requested a more comprehensive landscape plan as discussed, that the retention basin be identified, the fence be moved up on the creek side to allow more room to address the creek restoration work, the visual noise be addressed as discussed, gate detail be provided, the lighting plan be addressed as requested, and clarified that the Richmond Arts & Culture Commission would address the public art piece.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to continue PLN19-654, Richmond Parkway Center, to a future meeting subject to the DRB's comments; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Fine, Leung, Livingston and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: Butt and Hannah).**

<b>9. PLN14-021</b>	<b>NOMA (FORMERLY BAYWALK) PROJECT</b>
Description	STUDY SESSION TO RECEIVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD'S INPUT ON THE OFF-SITE STREET IMPROVEMENTS, HVAC SCREENING OPTIONS, AND SOUND ATTENUATION MEASURES FOR THE PROJECT.
Location	830 MARINA WAY SOUTH
APN	560-190-007
Zoning	PA, PLANNED AREA DISTRICT
Owner	WILLIAM LYON HOMES, INC. (APPLICANT)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: <b>PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS</b>

The item had earlier been continued pending staff review.

### Board Business

#### A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

There were no staff reports, requests, or announcements.

#### B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 11, 2019**

There was a brief discussion on the staff and Board's efforts to hold developers accountable for conditions of approval which was characterized as a work in progress

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, December 11, 2019.