

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

August 12, 2020
6:00 P.M.

All Participation Via Teleconference

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, Contra Costa County and Governor Gavin Newsom had issued multiple orders requiring sheltering in place, social distancing, and reduction of person-to-person contact. Accordingly, Governor Newsom had issued executive orders that allowed cities to hold public meetings via teleconferencing. Due to the shelter in place orders, all City of Richmond staff, members of the Design Review Board (DRB), and members of the public participated via teleconference. Public comment was confined to items on the agenda and limited to the specific methods identified on the agenda.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Brian Carter
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Hector Lopez and Emily Carrol, and City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 24, 2020 and July 22, 2020

Boardmember Leung requested the following amendments to the minutes of July 22, 2020 to the first two sentences in the sixth paragraph on Page 10, with the third sentence to be deleted.

Boardmember Leung referred to the fiscal impact, explained she had reviewed the Hatch and EPS Reports in detail, had spoken to the economist, and believed the EPS report was accurate, more accurate than the Hatch Report in that it had taken into account the land use and had done due diligence in terms of the services required for the open spaces along with City services, although she had not seen the peer review document. As a result, she suggested if the project could be built out in the given timeframe based on the assumptions that the homes would be at the market price of over \$1 million, and if the project was not absorbed within a certain timeframe, there might or might not be a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

shortfall in between the development and the fiscal impact buildout. She was therefore confident with the numbers.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the June 24, 2020 meeting, as submitted, and the July 22, 2020 meeting, as amended; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Neel).

Boardmember Neel joined the meeting at this time.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER: *Good evening Chair Livingston, Board members and staff, I have a couple of comments to go into the record. 1. Fairmede Hilltop was not happy that the applicant did not communicate with the council in regarding the Aspire project that was approved a few months back. 2. As far as the El Tapatio matter, I would have suggested that the applicant communicate with the North & East Council as soon as the virus gets lifted up. In conclusion that according to the Brown Act Handbook, anytime when projects come before any appointed body the applicants MUST ADHERE to talk with the neighbors to provide feedback in regarding the projects. Sincerely, Cordell.*

Emily Carroll described the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Livingston advised that the Consent Calendar included items that were considered to be routine and the DRB could approve the item(s) in one motion.

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, August 24, 2020 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. PLN20-052 | CHEVRON CONVENIENCE STORE |
| Description | (HELD OVER FROM JULY 22, 2020) PUBLIC HEARING TO PROVIDE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 800 SF CONVENIENCE STORE AND TO INSTALL 3 FUEL TANKS AT AN EXISTING GAS STATION. |
| Location | 901 WEST CUTTING |
| APN | 550-012-003 |
| Zoning | IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT |
| Owner | CHEVRON USA INC. |
| Applicant | ROBERT PICARD, STANTEC |
| Staff Contact | EMILY CARROLL Recommendation: CONTINUE TO FUTURE MEETING |

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

The application was continued to a future meeting.

- CC 2. PLN17-654 PARKWAY COMMERCE CENTER**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM JULY 22, 2020)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±111,000 SQUARE FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING AND FOR SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON A 7.27-ACRE VACANT PARCEL, AND TO CONSIDER THE ADOPTION OF AN INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (IS/MND).
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: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

ACTION: It was M/S/C (No motion or second) to approve PLN17-654, Parkway Commerce Center; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 13 Conditions of Approval; approved by voice vote: 4-3 (Ayes: Fine, Leung, Livingston, and Neel; Noes: None; RECUSED: Butt, Carter, and Hannah; Absent: None).

- 3. PLN17-236 POWERPLANT PARK DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM JULY 22, 2020)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITY THAT INCLUDES 45 GREENHOUSES, A NURSERY, PROCESSING CENTER, AND SUPPORT FACILITIES.
Location NORTHWEST CORNER OF GOODRICK AVENUE AND RICHMOND PARKWAY
APN 408-220-003, -023, -024, -025, -026, -032, -033, -034, -039, -041, -042, -043, -049, AND -050
Zoning IA, INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURE DISTRICT
Owner RICHMOND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LLC
Applicant POWERPLANT PARK INC., RICHARD TRIEBER
Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONTINUE TO FUTURE MEETING

The application was continued to a future meeting.

- 4. PLN20-105 MINI-STORAGE DEVELOPMENT**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±250,000 SQUARE-FOOT MINI-STORAGE FACILITY, INCLUDING A THREE-STORY ±98,000 SQUARE-FOOT BUILDING, AND 10 ONE-STORY, NONCONDITIONED MINI-STORAGE BUILDINGS TOTALLING ±150,000 SQUARE FEET ON A 10.44-ACRE VACANT PARCEL.
Location 1014 CHESLEY AVENUE

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

APN	561-270-004	
Zoning	IL, INDUSTRIAL LIGHT DISTRICT	
Owner	WORLD OIL CORP.	
Applicant	INSITE PROPERTY GROUP	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated August 12, 2020 for a public hearing to consider a recommendation to the Planning Commission for a 250,000 square foot mini-storage facility given that Planning Commission approval was required for the Conditional Use Permit. He described the setting and the previous varied uses and multiple operators of the site, which he characterized as unusual given that the light industrial district was sandwiched between two residential neighborhoods. The project would be constructed in three phases starting with a one-story metal building and eight one-story mini-storage buildings, to be located in the rear and along the perimeter of the site. He noted that there were no plans for the metal buildings and recommended that the concept be approved but that the plans be returned to the DRB for final design approval.

Mr. Lopez responded to questions and verified that the letter from the Shields Reid Residents Neighborhood Council supported the project and urged local hiring and employment opportunities.

Boardmember Fine referred to remediation of the site and asked about the scope and quantity left and how that would impact construction, and Mr. Lopez highlighted the level of remediation that would include the removal of the soil.

BRIAN SORENSEN, InSite Property Group, clarified that hazards remained on site, they were currently working with the Water Board, and had been working on a remediation plan that would cap the entire site with two to three feet of imported fill to create a safe site prior to development of the structures. The remediation and cap would occur at the beginning of the project and none of the impacted soils would be re-excavated when Phases 2 and 3 came into play.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Chair Livingston and Vice Chair Hannah reported that they had spoken with the applicant and with the landscape architect for the project. The Chair had recommended that the mini-storage be heavily landscaped for screening purposes from street views.

Mr. Sorensen provided a clarification presentation and stated with respect to phasing that they were flexible. With respect to the elevations, he stated he would provide the elevations for the single-story buildings which would be 12-foot high block buildings that would be painted. The block structure was intended to ensure a secure site between two railroad tracks.

CJ ROGERS, Director of Design, InSight, presented the site plan and pointed out the major features and the differences in perimeter fencing along Chesley Avenue compared to the other sides of the site with a landscape buffer that would continue on down past the proposed basin. He highlighted the design of the building with the use of steel and brick, which considered the industrial history of the city at the waterfront, with a modern twist, and presented elevations of the design, the proposed materials to be used, and the enhanced landscaping that had been proposed.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

Boardmember Hannah objected to the “prison-like” wrought iron fencing and recommended the use of an anti-climb fencing.

Boardmember Fine expressed concern with circulation and pedestrian safety and asked if there might be speed bumps, to which Mr. Sorensen stated that typically there would be an option for speed bumps although there were rarely issues with speeding in any of their storage facilities. Boardmember Fine asked about actual trees versus those shown in the renderings and requested elevations with and without landscaping. She urged integrating the landscaping into the site as opposed to just providing it around the perimeter. In terms of building form, she stated the two different parapet heights felt awkward and visually dense, and while she loved the historical homage to brick, she objected to the use of brick veneer in building material and stated the DRB would need more information on the brick veneer if used. She liked the play with the different spandrel but suggested it felt mismatched. She also objected to the wrought iron railings with spiky tops.

Boardmember Carter commented that in many cases the floor plans did not connect to the elevations. He suggested the blackened art display windows were cool but he saw a discrepancy between the plan and the elevations starting with the stair towers with no reflection on the exterior elevation of those tower elements, specifically with respect to the west elevation next to the art display storefront. He suggested there might be an opportunity to reinforce the verticality of that element and create a break between the more glazed portion to the left and the more solid portion with the majority of the storage façade. He referred to the elevations and a shadow line between the portion with a bit higher roof and the lower portion while the floor plans showed a straight wall. He liked the metal panels which helped break up the massing, questioned the opportunities related to a factory powder coated material, and urged attention to the details. Because security was such an important factor he urged an integrated architectural luminaire.

Mr. Rogers explained that Kynar, a high-end paint, had been intended. He added that InSight planned on owning the facilities and would work to ensure sustainability. He assured the DRB that the floor plan would not drive the look and feel of the building.

Boardmember Neel liked the metal paneling and recommended consideration of Bridger Steel products, which offered a coated metal paneling along with solutions for flashing. She liked the color accents and display windows but agreed that the spandrel pattern needed some refinement such as a variation of panel size, thick and thin. She also asked about the solar requirements and electric vehicle (EV) charging, and agreed with the need to integrate the landscaping more into the site.

On the question of the completeness of the plans, Mr. Sorensen agreed with a recommended two-foot bump out and agreed the floor plan would have to be reworked to include the bump out, with potentially more at the leasing office.

Boardmember Butt referred to the small area for the artist’s studio on the south side of the building and questioned whether there would be a way to include a usable outdoor space related to the art space in the landscape plan.

Chair Livingston asked if there was sufficient parking to delete the parking spaces in front of the art studio and move the handicap space over to be able to create the recommended artist’s landscaped area, and Mr. Sorensen suggested it would be simple to shift the security gate in towards the site and move the bicycle parking to create an area for artists.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

Boardmember Leung liked the interesting design, especially the north elevation with the pre-cast trim and the metal canopy along with the tilt up, and liked the contrast with the brick. She asked about the trash enclosure with respect to security and the fire lane access and turnaround, whether a white roof could be considered, and whether there would be issues with elevation changes. She recommended the planting of more trees directly in front of the more prominent north side of the building.

Mr. Rogers identified the fire lane, a 26-foot access road along the building to access each of the drive aisles. With respect to trees in the front, he stated the renderings had not been updated to show two rows of trees. He added that the trash enclosure would be situated behind the gate and would be incorporated with municipal services.

Chair Livingston referred to Sheet L-1 and recommended that the double row of 19 trees be larger than the 15-gallon shown given the desire for a mature canopy. He recommended 24- or 36-inch box size instead, subject to the approval of the landscape architect.

Mr. Sorensen explained that the single-story buildings would have light roofs and the multi-story building would have a white roof. There would be no dark or colored roofs.

Vice Chair Hannah agreed with the prior comments and integrating those comments into the plan. He emphasized the desire for durability and maintenance over time. Reiterating the comments, he agreed that the high roof should be raised another foot to 18 inches, the top parapet corner should be pulled in a bit, he supported the landscaping and the artist's outdoor area, and stated the project was withstanding the scrutiny of a much larger, more visible project in the city. He added that the building looked like a mixed-office building and he commended the designer for the example of a humble project that would make a huge difference to the neighborhood. He and the entire DRB applauded the design effort.

Chair Livingston again referred to the landscape plan and Sheet L-1, and requested that Building 2 be moved to allow more trees in the corner, and Mr. Rogers stated that area, which he characterized as a "pizza pie of asphalt" would be landscaped.

Chair Livingston stated that every fixture was 4,000 K and should be no more than 3,000 K to comply with the City's Dark Sky Ordinance, and that all lighting was to be kept on the site and not allowed to bleed into the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Carroll again described the process to allow the public to speak during the meeting.

There was no one who desired to speak to the item.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to recommend to the Planning Commission the approval of PLN20-105, Mini-Storage Development, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval; and the additional DRB conditions as follows:

- 12. Replace all specified lighting at 4,000 K with 3,000 K and shield with optional shields;**
- 13. Move Building 2 parallel with the main building to add more landscaping on the east property line adjacent to the railroad tracks;**
- 14. Raise the parapet on the high section one foot 6 inches and reduce the sheet metal cap by 4 to 6 inches;**
- 15. Replace the wrought iron railing specified in the front with anti-climb security**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2020

fencing;

16. Amend the floor plans to match the elevations; there should be a two-foot offset at both somewhere near Line K and Line 8;

17. Introduce a landscape element at the north side setback;

18. All factory painted panels to be Kynar or equal;

19. Integrate light fixtures on the main building into the architecture;

20. Return the spandrel design to Planning staff and a subcommittee for further work and evolution;

21. Add EV charging stations as appropriate;

22. Add a landscaped area to the arts studio in front by removing parking spaces and perhaps moving the security gate further to the south;

23. Require trees off Chesley Avenue, approximately 19 in number, from 15-gallon size to 24- or 36-inch box pending approval from the landscape architect;

24. All roofs to be cool or light in color;

approved by voice vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hannah, Leung, Livingston, and Neel; Noes: None; Absent; None).

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, August 26, 2020.