

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA
March 14, 2007
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair
Jonathan Livingston
Don Woodrow
Robert Avellar

Michael Woldemar, Vice Chair
Ted J. Smith
Diane Bloom

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Whitty, Vice Chair Woldemar, Board members Avellar, Bloom (arrived late), Smith and Woodrow

Absent: Livingston

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Janet Harbin, Steve Duran and Lamont Thompson

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Minutes of July 12, 2006, July 26, 2006, October 25, 2006, November 8, 2006, and January 31, 2007:

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to accept the minutes of July 12 and July 26, 2006; unanimously approved.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to approve the minutes of November 8, 2006 and January 31, 2007; unanimously approved.

Vice Chair Woldemar said for the minutes of October 25, 2006, he suggested sending them back to staff for completion because they are missing a series of items relating to the Civic Center and a series of handwritten notes which are made reference to in the document.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to bring back the minutes of October 25, 2006 due to missing civic center notes and a series of handwritten notes; unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Whitty requested placing Items 2 and 3 on the Consent Calendar.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the agenda, as amended by adding Items 2 and 3 to the Consent Calendar; unanimously approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Whitty gave an overview of the Consent Calendar, procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. She said any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, by Monday, March 26, 2007 by 5:00 p.m.

Chair Whitty noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Boardmember Woodrow asked staff why the Design Review Board has been asked to review Item 5, the Fire House at Chevron. He said it was located on land owned by Chevron, cannot be seen or accessed by the public and he felt staff would be approving it. **Lamont Thompson** noted that per the city's zoning ordinance, industrial projects must be reviewed. Since the building is more than 1,000 square feet, it is before the Design Review Board.

Vice Chair Woldemar asked to remove Items 4, 5, 6 and 8 from the Consent Calendar.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to approve the Consent Calendar Items 2, 3 and 7; unanimously approved.

Consent Items Approved:

- 2. DR 1103620 – Construct Two-Story Addition to Single-Family Residence on Cutting Blvd.** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,923 square foot two-story addition to an existing single-family residence located at 2729 Cutting Blvd. (APN: 549-081-010). Residential Medium Density (Knox Cutting Specific Plan) Zoning District. Jose Castillo, owner; Daniela DiNucci, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
- 3. DR 1103580 – Construct Residential Duplex on 17th Street** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new ±2,729 square foot residential duplex located at 640 – 17th Street (APN: 514-290-036). MFR-1, Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. Carlos Guerrero, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.
- 7. DR 1102583 – Construct Detached Second Dwelling Unit on Humphrey Ave.** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new detached ±638 square foot second dwelling unit above a new ±714 square foot garage located at 2886 Humphrey Avenue (APN: 528-180-024). SFR-3, Single-Family Low-Density Residential Zoning District. Jorge Ruiz, owner; Hector De Leon, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 4/11/2007.

NOTED PRESENT:

Boardmember Bloom was noted present at 6:05 p.m.

RECUSE:

Boardmember Smith recused himself from participating in Item 4 due to a conflict of interest.

Items Discussed:

- 1. DR 1102921 – Addition to Single-Family Residence on Alameda Ave.** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a two-story room addition at the rear of the existing residence that would contain additional living area and a ±630 square foot second dwelling unit located at 5607 Alameda Avenue (APN: 509-160-017). The applicant proposes interior modifications and reconfiguration of the existing

garage. SFR-3, Single Family Low Density Residential Zoning District. Yusuf Taj, owner; Mohammed Subhani, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Withdrawal.

Chair Whitty noted the item was withdrawn and would not be heard.

- 4. DR 1102584 – Richmond Civic Center Revitalization on Barrett Ave.** - Consider a request for Design Review approval of the revitalization plan for the Richmond Civic Center buildings located at 2600 Barrett Avenue (APN: 515-210-001). The City has formulated a master plan concept for the phased renovation, retrofit and expansion of the Civic Center complex. The proposed project before the Design Review Board is Phase I design drawings which include renovation, seismic retrofit and expansion of the existing City Hall building; improvements to the Auditorium and landscaping in the Civic Center plaza. PC, Public and Civic Uses Zoning District and Public and Institutional/964 General Commercial / 922. City of Richmond, owner; Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency and Harley Searcy, representative for Richmond Civic Center Partners, LLC, applicants. Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Conditional Approval To Planning Commission.

Janet Harbin noted the item was not a public hearing and it was mis-noticed on the agenda; however, staff reviewed the prior minutes and direction was given to return the item to the Board as an informational item. She noted **Boardmembers Woldemar, Livingston and Bloom** served as a subcommittee and met with the applicant and Redevelopment Agency, discussed and revised the plans, with additional conditions for recommendation.

Vice Chair Woldemar voiced concern over the process; that if the Board were to act on the item or continue the item, the meeting for late March has been canceled at which time it would not return to the Board until after it was scheduled to go to the Planning Commission. **Ms. Harbin** said the Planning Commission recommended it to the City Council and requested the Design Review Board also review it once modifications were made. **Vice Chair Woldemar** said the Planning Commission denied the design review without prejudice, which was contained in the minutes. He said when Mary Renfro suggested that the item was going to return to the Design Review Board, it made sense only because it had been denied. He questioned whether staff received his e-mail and **Ms. Harbin** said both Jonelyn Whales and she reviewed it, as did the Planning Director. They reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting on the subject and the item was to come back for review by the Design Review Board. It did not say anything about whether there needed to be some sort of action taken, but simply that the Subcommittee would report back.

Vice Chair Woldemar also expressed concern about the completeness of the material before the Board. He said there are item that were included in the submittal package which are not in the current packet, there are items which have been deleted, and he voiced concern that the Board and Subcommittee has benefit of all materials. **Ms. Harbin** said staff included as much as what they thought necessary to conduct the review and she apologized if items were missing; however, it was her understanding that he did not want the email to be submitted along with the materials in the packet, and perhaps that he wanted to discuss his thoughts on some of the conditions instead.

Chair Whitty confirmed that the recommendation was “no formal action – receive and review comments only”. **Ms. Harbin** said the Redevelopment Agency will take the comments into consideration and will be cast onto the City Council once the project is before them for approval. The Planning Commission will not see the item again; however, staff can submit comments from this Board meeting to them for their review. She confirmed with **Vice Chair Woldemar** that the project would therefore not have formal design review approval other than at a City Council level.

Chair Whitty noted the Board would first review Exhibit F, which was prepared jointly by Subcommittee members Livingston and Woldemar. The Board will then review the staff's conditions which are attached to the staff report. Once all have been discussed, the Board may arrive at new or modify current conditions.

Ms. Harbin noted Mr. Duran pointed out that the design review permit will go back to the Planning Commission on April 5th for their consideration and action and they will have the benefit of comments of the Board from an informational point of view in the form of minutes prepared from the meeting which will go to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Woldemar questioned if it was unreasonable to request that when the project goes to the Planning Commission, those items missing from the materials tonight will be included in the Planning Commission packets, which were noted in a memo sent to staff earlier this week which included six items. He said also not included were recommended findings in tonight's packet, and **Ms. Harbin** will include all items for the Planning Commission and findings will be included, as well.

Boardmember Bloom questioned landscaping, said she and Boardmember Woldemar met and marked up a plan, and she did not receive anything in her packet that shows the ideas were incorporated and she was concerned because the project was major. She asked how comments would be incorporated and passed onto the Planning Commission. **Ms. Harbin** said the architect and designer was in the process of preparing the revised plans and they were not ready for the packet for this meeting, but they would be submitted to the Planning Commission for their hearing.

Vice Chair Woldemar said Exhibit F was the list of recommended conditions which came from the subcommittee, it has blue font lettering which were comments made by the applicant's project team but did not include comments made by the subcommittee as to why we included what we did. He said in condition B.05, it asks for a specific horticultural study that tries to answer some of the questions Boardmember Bloom had raised with him when he reviewed it. The applicant has suggested an amendment to that condition to include the entire landscape plan and study to be reviewed by both Tony Norris and by Boardmember Bloom. He said he was told as a subcommittee member that they could not return it anywhere other than to City staff and this was why Boardmember Bloom was not included in the re-writing of the condition. Now the staff or the applicant has asked to bring it back to a member of the Design Review Board. He questioned what would happen--would it return to Boardmember Bloom or staff?

Ms. Harbin said the applicant is requesting Boardmember Bloom be involved in the final review of the plan with Tony Norris. **Boardmember Bloom** asked about the timing of when it would come to her, and **Vice Chair Woldemar** said review would occur prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Steve Duran, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, clarified that the City was the applicant, agreed that Vice Chair Woldemar's account was correct, said this meeting was scheduled quickly because one of the attorney's determined it was needed, and the Agency would like to include all of the recommendations of the subcommittee, in addition to the Board's recommendations, as well as any other comments. He said he will ensure all comments are presented to the Planning Commission so they have a complete package on April 5, 2007. He said Exhibit F would be included as well as comments from tonight's meeting.

Chair Whitty read through each comment and **Vice Chair Woldemar** said he would explain any background as needed, and she requested Mr. Duran respond to each comment. Mr. Duran said the comments were the Subcommittee's recommended conditions of approval for the Planning Commission.

B.00 Site and Landscaping Plans

- B.01: (Okay)
- B.02: (Okay)
- B.03: Whether or not the generator area and electric switch area should be screened or not. The Subcommittee requested screening, and the applicant prefers no screening. Mr. Duran said the area is parking for police cars and the corner will be more landscaped. **Vice Chair Woldemar** described what was included on the condition, felt the equipment was large, there was visual concern to the Barrett Avenue entrance to the Civic District and should be properly screened. There are also upper floor windows on the east end of the City Hall and should not look down on the equipment, so a roof enclosure was also proposed for Item B.O.4, which the applicant has agreed to. A simple metal roof and extension of a wall would be okay by the Subcommittee. (Mr. Duran said they will confer with the architect or leave it up to the Planning Commission to decide.)
- B.04: (Okay)
- B.05: (They will work with Tony Norris and Boardmember Bloom on landscaping).
- B.06: (Okay)
- B.07: (Okay)
- B.08: **Vice Chair Woldemar** said this is simply enforcement of the zoning ordinance that talks about landscaping requirements for parking lots. The northeast corner parking lot does not meet the standards and requirements. He felt one parking space could be deleted and creation of two peninsula's with landscaping. It has to do with the 50% of the required landscaping inside the parking area and the back-out distance was in excess, so there is probably additional room. (Needs work-convey to Planning Commission).
- B.09: (Okay)
- B.10: (**Chair Whitty** noted the Board has a handout on paving material choices and said the art selection was to be done in the future). **Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to the landscape plaza plan on sheet L.1.01, and there is a placeholder for public art in the center location, but the whole axis is described as the same ground material which was a "preferred" type of paver and another one that is "considered." He felt the "considered" paver was too busy. When the public art part is established, the area may change, so the "preferred" type was recommended. **Boardmember Avellar** questioned the fish and confirmed with Mr. Duran that it would remain.
- B.11: (Okay)
- B.12: (Okay)
- B.13: (Okay)
- B.14: (Okay)
- B.15: Regarding the news racks, **Vice Chair Woldemar** said because of the civic image and district, it would be appropriate to do a shroud that might lie over the top of a standard box or set of boxes which repeated the character of the signage systems. **Chair Whitty** commented that it would be nice to also incorporate a nearby bench.
- B.16: (Public art continues to be under discussion)
- B.17: Regarding tree grates, the Board wants them, they started with them on East Macdonald, and they felt decomposed granite collected debris and were messy. (Needs work)
- B.18: Bulb-out discussion: Mr. Duran felt there were some street reconstruction issues and questioned whether there was value for the change. **Vice Chair Woldemar** pointed out the zone where bulb-outs were recommended. He said the Board did not have benefit of the actual original conditions that the Subcommittee made. The key he was trying to get at was that there were reasons for these conditions. In this particular

instance, there is a mitigation measure AES-2, which is adopted as part of the negative declaration, that states there should be a strong visual connection to Macdonald Avenue to provide for a refreshed and inviting civic center image and it should accommodate pedestrian based activities oriented to the surrounding neighborhood. Their reason for arguing for the bulb-out was to make people's connection shorter as they move south toward the Library and ultimately move toward Macdonald Avenue and the entire civic district. He felt it should be done now versus modifying it later. **Chair Whitty** felt it could be part of the future Nevin Avenue Resurfacing project which would allow further exploration of design and grading issues. (Mr. Duran said eventually with a decent market and luck, they will be down to 27th and Macdonald between Macdonald and Nevin and eventually when they get some new funding there will be a new library on Macdonald and more building, which speaks to the whole focus on Nevin. He felt it was something that could be done now or done later or in context with an overall Nevin Plan which is not in this phase).

- B.19: Regarding lighting, (Mr. Duran said they disagree with the request; if you look at the lighting at the east end of Macdonald, they look great and make the overheads that the turn signals are sitting on look bad. Given the context of Barrett, they think it works well by introducing a different element for a couple of blocks. They want to focus everyone's attention on City Center Street, from Macdonald to Nevin and then widen it out to the Civic Center Plaza. 27th Street is a pedestrian street, it works fine, and it will end up with commercial retail on Macdonald Avenue and residential above on 27th, so it is a residential street and not for civic emphasis). **Vice Chair Woldemar** said one of the missing documents was the bigger master plan document, and this should be a document before the Board because it would have been useful.
- B.20: (Mr. Duran said they would consider it). **Boardmember Bloom** referred to a recent article in the Chronicle and they are incorporating checker boards in tables, but apparently chess is getting wildly popular, so if there is anyway, it would be nice to do.
- B.21: (Regarding the use of sloping lawn areas, Mr. Duran disagrees with sloping lawns at the proposed location). **Vice Chair Woldemar** said what convinced him was the 3-D view looking north along the plaza towards City Hall you can see two concrete benches down at the middle at each side running east/west at the cultural axis. Somewhere between those two benches is some kind of public art statement. Those two 16 inch high pieces of concrete have a "bunker feeling" to them. So, to slope the lawn up to the top of the bench, across the cultural axis, and then slope the lawn back down toward City Hall, was something that would soften the "bunker feeling" and give a little bit of plane of only about 16 inches. He believed it would emphasize the crossing of the two axis of the plaza. He felt this has a lot to do with the subjectivity of what design these kinds of spaces ought to be.
- B.22: Regarding benches, tables, outside seating, **Chair Whitty** encouraged the use of more benches with backs. (Mr. Duran said they will consider this). **Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to mitigation measures, stating the plaza should "re-shape and replant the civic center plaza to create a more distinctive, attractive and welcoming space and that the project shall restore and enhance the existing plaza to accommodate pedestrian based activities." He felt this had to do with gathering areas, rooms, benches and checkerboard tables.
- B.23: (Mr. Duran said this required follow-up).
- B.24: (Mr. Duran said this required follow-up). **Chair Whitty** requested removal of triangular spots on the plans.
- B.25: (Okay)
- B.26: (Okay)

C.00 City Hall Building

- C.01: (Okay) Mr. Duran said because it is glass mostly on the first floor, the interior colors will be important to the exterior view and they will be made correctly. He felt they would still be informally conversing with the subcommittee on this.)
- C.02: (Okay). **Vice Chair Woldemar** said there were a couple of comments relating to making the ultimate application complete so planning staff knows what to look for, such as colors, materials, etc.
- C.03: (Okay)
- C.04: (Okay)
- C.05: (Okay)

D.00 Former Hall of Justice Building

- D.01: (Mr. Duran confirmed they were the plaza arcades and there would be seismic improvements) and **Vice Chair Woldemar** wanted them compatible with everything else.
- D.02: **Vice Chair Woldemar** said the item relates to the current port-o-sheer on the east side of the existing police station, which is falling down and would be removed. This would become one of two entrances into a lobby that will immediately lead into a new City Council Chambers. There needs to be an entry statement of some sort on the eastern side of the building, as there will be on the western plaza side. He felt the architects ran out of time to finish out the design of the area because the issue was evolving. Mr. Duran noted there were some uses on 27th Street with residential on the other side, and based on the darkness there, it would be best to remove it and not replace it. He felt it was a question on how to emphasize it. They also had architects, engineers and building officials out to the front side of the Hall of Justice to figure out a way to get rid of the interior stairs and they could not without major engineering work. So, there is more work to be done on the 27th Street entrance to the old Hall of Justice. (The final design needs work).
- D.03: (Okay)
- D.04: (Okay)

E.00 Sign Program

- E.01: (Okay) **Vice Chair Woldemar** said there was a well developed sign program. Item E.O.1 was simply a subtle tinkering with the location of a couple of signs having to do with how they might better be directional. He said the blue note asked for clarification because it references to the City putting in some "no parking" or limited parking signs. In turn, this related to E.O.3 which relates to "no public works type signs."
- E.02: (Okay)
- E.03: (Okay)

F.00 Technical Conditions

- F.01: (Okay) **Vice Chair Woldemar** noted there was a new list of technical standard conditions that were to make their way into every staff report and he wanted to make sure those standard conditions applicable to this project are incorporated into the final approval. He also wanted to make sure the landscape development guidelines and the urban forest management plan were incorporated in because both are documents that we are supposed to be using.

Chair Whitty referred to page 3 of 6 of the staff report for a discussion of conditions:

1. (Okay-standard condition)
2. (Okay-standard condition)

3. (Okay-standard condition)
4. (Okay-language should read, "...as modified by conditions herein.")
5. (Okay-language should read, "...as modified by conditions herein.")
6. (Okay-standard condition)
7. (Okay-standard condition)
8. (Okay-standard condition)
9. **Vice Chair Woldemar** felt there was wording in Condition 9 that was not appropriate, given the complexity of what the landscape plans will include. The condition should end at "herein approved" and take out the last two sentences.
10. Take out last sentence.
11. (Okay-standard condition)
12. (delete condition). The condition is in conflict with what the subcommittee was recommending, as nothing was going to return to a public level and would stay at staff level.
13. **Vice Chair Woldemar** said if a measure is included in the mitigation measures and then an Engineer or Public Works Director differing in their opinion as to whether or not it is needed, can this be done legally. Mr. Duran suggested using, "as deemed necessary". (Delete everything after "mitigated negative declaration.")
14. Okay-standard condition)
15. (Reference Phase 2 and 3 for context). Regarding phasing, **Vice Chair Woldemar** said there was a document which displayed various phase boundaries, which was not included in this packet. **Vice Chair Woldemar** said this was removed at some point, but should be included in the Planning Commission packet to show context. It is referred to as, "Civic Center District landscape concept plan" dated 1/19/07, received on 1/30/07, prepared by WRT."
16. (Leave in, but delete same wording in Item 5 that talks about the same information). Addresses are not specifically addressed in the sign program.
17. Redundant to earlier Subcommittee comments. It also talks about lighting the front facades of buildings also, which should not be done. Reference is made to B.2 subcommittee notes and **Chair Whitty** asked to weave the two together.
18. (Okay-standard condition)

Chair Whitty questioned if the Board wanted to make additional conditions. **Vice Chair Woldemar** said when he and Boardmember Livingston formalized what they wanted to bring forward, they had a lot of other issues. When neither could convince each other, the item was dropped so there were other issues but they agreed not to bring them forward. If he ever had to do this again, he felt a three-person group would have been easier to arrive at decisions.

Mr. Duran thanked Boardmembers Livingston and Woldemar, said they spent several hours working on providing valuable input and ideas into the project and as a result, the project is better.

Vice Chair Woldemar said because of the importance of the project, it would be very, very important to maintain the public record, have a municipal memory, and have all documents in one place and accessible.

5. DR 1103418 – Construct New Firehouse at the Richmond Chevron Refinery - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new ±22,896 square foot single-story concrete masonry firehouse building and emergency communications facility located immediately south of the intersection of Standard Avenue and Scofield Avenue (APN: 561-100-040) within the Richmond Chevron Refinery. M-3, Heavy Industrial Zoning District. John Jensen, representative for Chevron Products Company, owner; John Parezo, Cal-Am Planning & Design Group, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Vice Chair Woldemar had the following questions regarding the project:

- What was the view of the facility from the freeway;
- He wanted to make certain that the mechanical equipment was properly screened from public view;
- Asked if the Board agreed with staff's recommendation for additional landscaping strip;
- Questioned why the project did not comply with the landscaping requirements for parking lots in the City's ordinance;
- Asked what were the real colors of the site

The public hearing was opened.

John Parezo, Cal-Am Planning and Design Group, applicant, said to their knowledge the facility is on private roads within the refinery and there are no view sheds from any public way to the fire station, including I-580. On site, they have incorporated 6-8 foot high mansard parapets, so even on-site; people will not see rooftop equipment on the building. The owner also agrees with all staff's conditions and recommendations as well as the additional landscape planter along the south portion of the property. Regarding colors, he had hoped a color board had been provided which was submitted, but presented large scale renderings. He said the façade was a light tone plaster base with tri-color brick veneers on most sides of the buildings which was reminiscent of the existing administration building. There is also an additional color around all openings which is a deep white tone precision block. He said the idea is to mimic the existing lab and administration buildings adjacent to it and are using multiple colors of brick veneer and colored cement block.

Boardmember Avellar confirmed with Mr. Parezo that the colors would be a uniform tri-colored tone throughout.

Boardmember Woodrow thanked the applicant for showing a picture of the office, which was a gem in the area, and felt it was ashamed the public could not see it more. He said the staff report indicates the company must collect the water coming off the trucks when they are being washed and confirmed there was a storm water plan. **Lamont Thompson** said it is similar to the plan for car washes and the City coordinates with the County Environmental Health Department.

Vice Chair Woldemar asked if the applicant was amenable to additional conditions to include: 1) To label all drawings with colors matching those to a submitted color board; and 2) that the applicant is responsible for complying with the landscaping ordinance related to parking lots, having to do with the number of trees per parking space and the other having to do with 50% of the landscaping interior to the parking lot; and 3) reorganize the location of the HVAC units on the mansard roof area of the building in such a way that it is very clear they are not visible from the freeway, which he felt was simply a spacing issue and the site distance of the 8 foot high mansard. He felt that an alternative would be to provide secondary screening.

The applicant agreed to comply with all conditions and the three additional conditions.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to approve DR 1103418 with staff's recommended five findings, with staff's 5 conditions, with the additional conditions to include: 6) To label all drawings with colors matching those to a submitted color board; and 7) that the applicant is responsible for complying with the landscaping ordinance related to parking

lots, having to do with the number of trees per parking space and the other having to do with 50% of the landscaping interior to the parking lot; and 8) reorganize the location of the HVAC units on the mansard roof area of the building in such a way that it is very clear they are not visible from the freeway; unanimously approved.

6. DR 1102705 & 06 – Construct Two Buildings at Macdonald Ave. and 15th Street - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct two buildings that would have a total of eight residential condominium units and one retail tenant space on the corner of Macdonald Avenue and 15th Street (APNs: 540-150-002, 540-150-025, 540-150-026). Office / Retail / and/or Urban High Density Residential, City Center Specific Plan Area. Chi Nguyen, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: No Formal Action. Receive and Review Comments Only.

Chair Whitty gave a brief description of the project request, said no formal action would be taken by the Board tonight and the applicant would be receiving and reviewing comments.

The public hearing was opened.

Vice Chair Woldemar referred to the Macdonald Avenue building and confirmed that the applicant did not own the property immediately to the east of the building. He said the building code would not allow the applicant to have windows on residential units within 5 feet of a property line. He also said as much as he likes the cornice details and façade aspect of the building to Macdonald Avenue, these also hang over the property line, which was not allowed by code. He recommended that for both buildings, they be drawn with the adjacent properties illustrated on the plans to show their relationship.

Chi Nguyen, owner/applicant, said he met with Hector Rojas on the design, agreed to re-design the project plans to address the Board's comments and agreed to meet with representatives in the building department regarding code issues.

Vice Chair Woldemar also asked the applicant to better address landscaping and green space for the project, as there will be many people living in the buildings.

Boardmember Bloom asked for more landscape details and labeling, recommended identifying what ivy is being used, recommended a smaller leaf ivy, the species of the black and green bamboo should be identified, suggested using a clumping bamboo and not the running bamboo, and referred him to the Sunset book. She confirmed the applicant would use black Mexican pebbles, asked him to choose slow growing plants for containers or pots, and asked him to identify the tree type. She confirmed the applicant addressed weight bearing issues for the roofs.

Boardmember Avellar confirmed with the applicant that the stucco would be very fine, said addresses would be backlit, and the plans would incorporate back lighting and heavy molding treatments.

Chair Whitty felt the model was fantastic, liked the trellis detail, asked the applicant to show how people would circulate on the ground in-between buildings, in patio areas, and asked for a drawing showing the two buildings and ground area with public space. Mr. Nguyen felt he could provide a circulation plan, and could also explain circulation to the Board through the model.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to continue the public hearing on DR 1102705 & 06 to April 25, 2007; unanimously approved.

8. DR 1103518 – Construct Detached Second Dwelling Unit on Gaynor Ave. - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a new detached ±555 square foot single-story second dwelling unit located at 2427 Gaynor Avenue (APN: 528-180-024). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Residential Zoning District. Harjit Bains, owner; Maxwell Beaumont, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Chair Whitty briefly described the request, and opened the public hearing.

Vice Chair Woldemar apologized for keeping the applicant late, said the reason he removed it from the Consent Calendar had to do with the parking space on the rear adjoining the alley. As it is illustrated, he would pull 90 degrees in and park in the back yard, have an 11 foot wide alley to back out, and he felt it was technically impossible. He proposed adding a condition of approval that states that the parking be re-arranged with proper functional back-out space either by the inclusion of an angle parking space or by shifting the space to another part of the lot where it can be located deeper into the lot and allow for proper back out space. He felt it could also be parallel.

Maxwell Beaumont, applicant, agreed to the condition and felt parallel parking could be used.

Boardmember Bloom suggested that rather having the lawn come all the way up to the edge of the building, the applicant create another bed of shrubs there. She felt it was too much lawn, and the applicant agreed to make a border of at least two to three feet. She asked also to specify the type of sod on the plans, as well as the size and color of the shrubs on the plans, and suggested the applicant refer to the new Sunset book. She also requested the applicant add a bed between the two palm trees and felt the bed size could also be increased, as lawn is typically discouraged.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve DR 1103518 based on staff's recommended 4 findings, based on staff's recommended 8 conditions, with the additional conditions as follows: 9) that the rear yard parking be re-arranged to provide for proper, functional back-out space by any number of methods including parallel parking, angular parking or relocated parking deeper on lot; and 10) to incorporate the landscape suggestions made by Boardmember Bloom, subject to final review and approval by the Planning Director; unanimously approved.

Public Forum – Brown Act

A Human Relations Commissioner who was in attendance said it was a pleasure sitting through the meeting and felt the discussion provided an educational experience.

BOARD BUSINESS

9. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff

Boardmember Smith referred to the fax regarding a meeting called, "Healthy City Planning" to be held in San Pablo on Friday, April 7, 2007, and the Board discussed the omission of a

registration sheet.

Chair Whitty requested forming a subcommittee meeting regarding the Live/Work project on Harbour Way with Boardmembers Bloom, Livingston and Avellar. However, Boardmember Livingston was on vacation. **Ms. Harbin** said David Barbary was the project planner and Boardmember Livingston had already prepared some conceptual designs and would take back to the applicant's architect to revise plans.

Boardmembers questioned the tentative formation of a new Planning/Design Review Commission and discussed future re-application procedures.

Vice Chair Woldemar announced to the Board that he has decided to resign effective March 15, 2007, said he has prepared a letter to the Mayor and discussed his decision with the Board. Boardmembers and staff acknowledged Mr. Woldemar's dedication and hard work, his decision to resign, and the future of design review for the City of Richmond.

Chair Whitty asked everyone to think about nomination of a Vice Chair which would be appointed at the next meeting.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.