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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Avellar and Boardmembers Bloom, Smith and Woodrow
Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Janet Harbin, Jonelyn Whales, and Carlos Privat

Chair Avellar gave an overview of the procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. He noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, February 25, 2008 by 5:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S (Avellar/Smith) to approve the agenda; unanimously approved.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL - None

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Avellar noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of Items 3, 4, 5 6 and 7. Item 7 was requested for removal (Avellar), and staff requested Item 1 be added to the Consent Calendar because it is a Hold Over Item to March 12, 2008.

ACTION: It was M/S (Smith/Avellar) to approve the Consent Calendar as Items 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6; unanimously approved.

Consent Items Approved:

3. DR 1104451 – Two-Story Addition at the Rear of the Residence on San Mateo Street
   PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,028
   square foot two-story addition at the rear of the residence located at 2121 San Mateo Street
   (APN: 507-150-011). The project would add three bedrooms and two bathrooms to a 557
   square foot dwelling. SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Robert
   Brown, owner; Chris Volkamer, applicant. Staff Contact: Kieron Slaughter. Tentative
   Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

4. DR 1104312 – Monument Sign on National Court - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a
   request for Design Review approval to construct a 10-foot high aluminum sign located at
   700 / 750 National Court. (APN: 550-020-019). The project would add a multi-tenant
   monument sign to the existing sign program. M-2 (Light Industrial) Zoning District under the
   Knox Freeway Cutting Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. Bay Area Beverage Company,
   owner; David Evans of Evan Sign Company, applicant. Staff Contact: Kieron Slaughter.
   Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

5. DR 1104418 – Two-Story Addition to the Residence on 33rd Street - PUBLIC HEARING
   to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,046 square foot two-
   story addition to the residence located at 932 - 33rd Street (APN: 524-060-020). The
   proposed addition will include three bedrooms and two bathrooms. SFR-3 (Single-Family
   Low Density Residential) Zoning District. David Perry & Finy Prak-Perry, owners; Rodney
   Smith, applicant. Staff Contact: Lina Velasco. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional
   Approval.

6. DR 1104486 – New Balcony at the Residence on Yuba Street - PUBLIC HEARING
   to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±250 square foot balcony on
   the second level at the rear of the existing residence located at 635 Yuba Street (APN: 519-
   080-012). SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Richard Baker,
   owner/applicant. Staff Contact: Hector Lopez. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional
   Approval.

Items Heard:

2. DR 1104277 – Two-Story Addition to the Residence on Thunderhead Court - PUBLIC
   HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,830 square
   foot two-story addition to the existing 2,034 square foot residence located at 4917
   Thunderhead Court (APN: 431-411-018). SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential)
   Zoning District. Sal Ruso, owner; Doug Davis, applicant. Staff Contact: Hector Lopez.
   Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval

Chair Avellar opened the public hearing.

Chris Anderson, Anderson Construction, said he was trying to get the project completed, as the
homeowner has been out of the home for some time and is elderly. He said he satisfied all City
guidelines and asked for approval.

Public Comments:

Tanya Boyce said Richmond has various overlay districts but does not have a view ordinance or
anything dealing with views on a property like this. She the Board to keep this in mind in its
review of the project and asked for the project's approval.

Boardmember Woodrow asked and confirmed with Ms. Harbin that the City does not have an
ordinance regarding blocking sunlight.
John Echeverri, Sinbordes Design, echoed comments of the prior speaker and supported the project.

Boardmember Woodrow asked and confirmed with Mr. Echeverri that a pull-down ladder is provided in the plans for access to the deck on the roof.

Jeff Martin said Mr. Ruso did not tell him of his plans to build over his garage; on June 16, 2006 Mr. Ruso told him he signed a contract for his contractor, that he did not yet have blueprints, Mr. Ruso hired a friend to draw up the plans and one year later he still had no plans in the Planning Department but did have a foundation for a new garage addition that his contractor received with an over-the-counter permit. During the year, Mr. Ruso gave him no indication about the extent of his plans. If he had taken the advice of a licensed contractor with no financial interest in the project he felt he would have gotten through the process long ago.

Boardmember Woodrow said he hoped Mr. Martin could indicate something about what he thought of the revised plans and questioned whether or not they met some of Mr. Martin’s needs. Mr. Martin said taking the addition off has opened quite a bit of view, but the addition would still block their view from sitting inside their kitchen.

Victoria Martin voiced concerns about the size of the house, the loss of home value, loss of sunlight, the future inability for solar panels to work on their roof, incompatibility with other homes in the neighborhood, loss of privacy due to the number of windows on their side and said she thought the project had not changed since the last meeting.

Boardmember Bloom said the neighbor’s meeting and sketch that former Boardmember Livingston drew up was dated November 28, and she confirmed Mrs. Martin saw those changes but not the current revisions made by the applicant.

Eleanor Loynd, El Sobrante Valley Planning and Advisory Committee, spoke of details left out of the staff report such as the total square footage, a floor area reduction, elimination of the second floor over the garage, the reduction of the front balcony, the roof over the deck proposed on the west side of the building being eliminated and revisions to window sizes to comply with building code regulations. She thought the addition was a big box, it did not belong, asked the addition over the existing garage be eliminated, asked for the roofline to have a peak, and questioned the existing fence height and extension.

Applicant - Rebuttal

Chris Anderson, said he already made many changes to the plans which have caused significant cost to the owner and asked that the Board move forward with approval of the project.

Boardmember Smith confirmed with Ms. Whales that revisions and changes were addressed in the staff report under Discussion.

Boardmember Woodrow said he remembered the drawings dealt with ways of shifting the second floor from the garage, they changed the character of the deck on the top, they brought down the roof quite a bit, and the goal from the beginning was to make the building look smaller than it was which he believed was addressed.

Boardmember Bloom asked staff to address whether the existing 6 foot fence on the side property line could be allowed to be extended all the way to the sidewalk from the rear property line. Ms. Harbin said the fence can be no higher than 4 feet tall when it comes within the site.
distance view from the street. **Chris Anderson** said the fence is being built by the homeowner and he is aware the fence needs to be 4 feet high 20 feet back from the curb and then it can go to 6 feet to the rear property line. **Chair Avellar** requested this be conditioned.

The public hearing was closed.

**Boardmember Bloom** referred to the letter from Eleanor Loynd, dated February 13, 2008, and confirmed that the four requested revisions have been addressed.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Avellar/Woodrow) to approve DR 1104277 with staff’s four findings and six recommendations, with additional condition to ensure that the front fence from the 20 foot setback be no higher than 4 feet high, and 6 feet high after the 20 foot setback to the rear of the property; unanimously approved.


**Chris Saunders**, applicant, gave a brief description of the project.

**Demetria Saunders** said the property has been in her family since 1960’s, they wanted to build an addition due to the number of children they have, they incurred a 90% loss due to a fire in the house and it did not make sense to restore it. The cost and time to have the project approved is a major impact to them as they are paying rent and mortgage on the house, and she asked for the Board to approve the request as soon as feasibly possible. She confirmed with Boardmember Woodrow that the house fire and the recent wind from the storm demolished the remaining parts of the home.

**Chair Avellar** asked that a rear porch cover be added over the sliding glass doors, for the applicant to note that a 30-year roof, gutters and downspouts and type of trim be noted on the plans, asked to add a translucent window above the tub in the master bathroom, and indicate that a concrete path be added to the right side of the garage door for the location and storage of the refuse bins.

**Boardmember Woodrow** confirmed with the applicant that double pane sliding windows are proposed for the home and that a color and materials board had been provided. He said all homes directly on the side of the project are single story and he confirmed with the applicant that they discussed the plan with both sides of the neighbors who supported the plans, as well as Whitney Vassio, the President of the Homeowner Association.

**Ms. Harbin** said Attachment 2 shows some of the adjacent properties on Jenkins Way and she noted there are two additional two-story homes on the street.

**Boardmember Bloom** suggested tinting the concrete for the driveway, suggested the applicant apply for street trees, and asked there be a walkway indicated for the front yard. The applicant said there will be a walkway, a driveway, grass and flowers, their gardener will work with their contractor about how to do the landscaping.

**Boardmember Bloom** suggested the walkway also be tinted to match the driveway and possibly make it an aggregate depending upon the cost. She confirmed there is existing grass in the backyard and the applicant proposes installing a border for shrubs. She asked that a brief
meeting be held between herself and the applicant’s gardener and contractor to address landscaping prior to obtaining a building permit, asked that the contractor research what plants and trees works in Richmond’s climate and soil, and she agreed that staff in the Planning Department could review the final landscape plan. Ms. Harbin noted staff can work with the applicant on scheduling a meeting with Boardmember Bloom and the applicant prior to submitting the landscape plan.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION:** It was M/S (Avellar/Woodrow) to approve DR 1104386 subject to staff’s four findings and seven recommendations, with the additional condition that 8) a rear porch cover be added over the rear sliding glass doors; 9) that the plans note a 30-year roof, gutters and downspouts, windows and door trim; 10) to add a window in the second level master bathroom over the tub; 11) to add a refuse area in the side yard with a concrete path from the rear leading to the front; 12) to tint front concrete driveway and walkway; 13) apply for front yard street trees; and 14) for staff to schedule a meeting with the applicant, contractor and Boardmember Bloom to review the landscape plan; unanimously approved.

**BOARD BUSINESS**

8. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff

Boardmember Woodrow said he had questioned how the Planning Commission could function with a quorum of 3 members and asked whether this is an option for the Design Review Board.

Ms. Harbin said the Planning Commission had five members at one time, they knew one member would be leaving and they asked the City Attorney’s office to make a finding on what a quorum was. The City Attorney’s office opined that a quorum of a standing Board or Commission of four would be three members.

City Attorney Privat said he believed the operating Planning Commission ordinance had to be amended to permit a quorum of three members, but it was not done for the Design Review Board. He recommended the Chair make a formal request to the City Attorney’s office, with a vote of the Board, to prepare an amendment to the ordinance for the Council’s consideration.

Boardmember Woodrow requested that the City Attorney determine how the Design Review Board can function with a quorum of 3 members. City Attorney Privat suggested the Chair contact Scott Dickey at the City Attorney’s office at 620-6509.

**Public Forum - Brown Act - None**

The Board adjourned the meeting at 7:03 p.m.