

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL  
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA  
August 25, 2010  
6:00 p.m.**

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Andrew Butt, Chair  
Diane Bloom  
Otheree Christian  
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair  
Andrew Butt  
Eileen Whitty  
Don Woodrow

On behalf of Chair Butt who arrived late, Boardmember Woldemar called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. He announced that this was Boardmember Bloom's last meeting.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Butt (arrived late) and Boardmembers Bloom, Woldemar, Woodrow, and Whitty

**Absent:** Vice Chair Welter and Boardmember Christian

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Jonelyn Whales, Carlos Privat and Hector Lopez

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

July 28, 2010:

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the minutes of July 28, 2010; unanimously approved.**

August 11, 2010:

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Bloom) to approve the minutes of August 11, 2010; unanimously approved (Woldemar abstained).**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Boardmember Woldemar noted there was only one item on the agenda. He questioned and confirmed there was no public comment on items not on the agenda.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Bloom/Whitty) to approve the agenda; unanimously approved.**

**Public Forum** – No speakers.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Boardmember Woldemar reviewed the procedure for public speakers. Boardmember Woodrow requested Item 1 be removed from the Consent Calendar.

He noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Tuesday, September 7, 2010 by 5:00 p.m. (due to the holiday) and as needed, read the appeal procedure after the affected item.

Noted Present:

Chair Butt was noted present.

Removed from the Consent Calendar:

<b>CC 1. PLN10-081</b>	<b>HAUSER LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING AND CARETAKER'S UNIT ADDITION ON S. 2<sup>ND</sup> STREET &amp; FLORIDA AVENUE</b>	
Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING LIGHT-INDUSTRIAL BUILDING INCLUDING A NEW CARETAKER'S RESIDENTIAL UNIT.	
Location	150 S. 2 <sup>ND</sup> STREET & 225 FLORIDA AVENUE	
APNs	550-130-013 & 550-130-022	
Zoning	M-2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL)	
Specific Plan:	KCSP (KNOX-CUTTING SPECIFIC PLAN)	
Owner/ Applicant:	HAUSER, KENNETH	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Hector Lopez gave the staff report, a brief description of the request for an addition to an existing light-industrial building including a new caretaker's residential unit. Staff supports approval of the project and believes it would allow for a good transition.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Sheet A.1; the site plan, as attached to the staff report, and questioned what the dotted line box was located to the north of the addition. Peter Greenwood, Architect, confirmed that this is a sunken elevator in it to bring up goods to truck level height, which is no longer in use and is currently and permanently covered.

Boardmember Woldemar said he understands that the area is considered the interior side yard which has no setback requirement. He questioned if there is a setback requirement on the north side. Chair Butt stated he believed the orientation was incorrect on all references; the site plan shows north as being right to the plan, but in fact, this is the south elevation.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned what the side yard setback would be for the right hand edge of the plan, which would be the rear yard off of Second Street. Mr. Lopez responded that the setback would be 15 feet.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the function of the concrete driveway in that rear yard.

Chair Butt opened the public hearing.

The architect stated he was originally involved with the design of the original warehouse and consequently, the Hauser's purchased the site next door which became available. The adjoining site is also depicted in the Board's handouts. He confirmed that the house had been vandalized and due to its condition, is no longer present. He said they learned that a caretaker's live/work space could be allowed. Therefore, they have developed a three-store structure accordingly, and they were able to adjoin the warehouse and still maintain the 15 foot setback from the adjoining residential property. He noted there is a 15 foot setback on the side and a 17 foot

setback on the rear. Prior to purchasing the property, there was a driveway whereby one could drive entirely around the warehouse. He said the sunken pit was going to be used for unloading trucks, but is no longer needed. It is no longer functional and is completely sealed.

He said they were able to accommodate all parking requirements for the caretaker unit's live/work space, they have prepared 3D renderings in the packet, and they plan to follow the same color and design system dictated by the existing warehouse; a red roof, stucco, and a red band to blend in.

Chair Butt confirmed that the existing building has a U-band on the first 8 to 10 feet. Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that the **entire height** of the warehouse is concrete block with a couple of different colors and a stripe and no stucco on the building.

Boardmember Whitty supported the concept of a caretaker unit. She referred to the concrete driveway around the new section, and confirmed it did not contain any of the required parking for the caretaker's two spaces, which were in the covered garage. She suggested some landscaping around the concrete driveway and noted Boardmember Bloom would go into more detail about this.

The architect said there is a landscaped median that existed prior to the lot being purchased. He noted employees would use the driveway and goods are also delivered into the main area. More often they drive to the back to facilitate delivery of goods.

Boardmember Whitty confirmed there is a driveway into the residential garage as well as a driveway into the concrete driveway. In the center there is fencing and a sidewalk. She questioned curb cuts, and the architect referred to Sheet A.1.e, the curb cuts are shown and are kept as they were.

Boardmember Whitty questioned if there were exterior lighting fixtures to be placed over the southern back door, the roll up garage door front and back, and the upper stairwell. The engineer said they do not show them but they would match the fixtures to globes on the building. He said he was not sure of the lighting standard, but they would be halogen and matched, and placed in all areas Boardmember Whitty identified.

Boardmember Whitty referred to the entrance to the house and the back door and questioned what they enter in to. The engineer said the front entrance has a small hallway which allows people to enter the garage or upstairs to the next level. Boardmember Whitty suggested matching the doors to the warehouse door, such as sheer metal in order to give it an industrial look. The engineer said the rear door is purely a functional access door and could be anything. They wanted to make the front door metal and secure, a minimum 3 foot width, and he could make it look more industrial-looking to match some of the existing attributes. Boardmember Whitty encouraged the architect to use something less traditional. He noted that the hallway will have a porch area and they will have to put in a Chinese-style gate opening to the porch area.

Boardmember Whitty questioned and confirmed that an address would be used, and she asked to match it to industrial style numbering. She then referred to the back deck, said the view would be incredible and she asked if there would also be a deck. The engineer said they formulated the back deck as a second means of egress. In the original design, they had a separate egress inside the building, but it created too much of a problem, so they put it outside the building. They also wanted to maintain the setback. He said they could place a second deck on the back.

Boardmember Whitty stated on the warehouse there are horizontal stripes, and she questioned and confirmed they would be replicated on the residence. Lastly, she said the windows on the

warehouse are almost ship-like and not echoed anywhere on the house. She suggested these be used for the house as well. The engineer noted these are real windows, but when discussing this with planning staff, they tried to replicate the windows to the opposite houses to form the transition from industrial to residential. Boardmember Whitty questioned why sliders were used and not an upper and lower fashioned windows, which are more elegant. The architect said they could change these, but they believed sliders were more industrial. He also said they could also use windows that open up on the top floor, but there are a few sliders that are required.

Boardmember Bloom said prior to discussing the landscaping issue, the use of the driveway would need to be addressed. She referred to Sheet A.1 which shows "landscaped areas" and did not see a landscaped area on the photograph or on the rendering on Florida. The engineer said he thinks there are a couple of trees in between the sidewalk and the street. Mr. Privat stated the Board can recommend, but not mandate, that the public right-of-way be landscaped. He said an encroachment permit or specific process could occur to plant in a public right-of-way.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that there is a specific requirement in the ordinance that those areas be planted. He questioned if staff looked at the original approval relative to what is built, i.e., was the iron fence around it in the original approval? Mr. Lopez said staff could not locate the records; the building was constructed in 2000 and not subject to design review at that time.

The architect said they have no problem with putting trees in the area, and Boardmember Bloom noted that the City could install them after the request is made by the applicant. She noted the bottom right corner of Sheet A.1 states "landscaped areas", and the engineer said the renderings just show the building and not landscaping.

Boardmember Bloom said she was not sure why the applicant wants truck coming along the side, and the architect said when the existing warehouse was built, the driveway was built to enable drivers to come in, go around, and deliver materials.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed that the dimension of the planting strip along what would be the eastern edge is 3 feet, and the dimension of the stairwell is 3 feet. Boardmember Woldemar said 7 feet from 15 feet of setback is less than 8 feet and he was not sure how one would drive through the area. The architect said they would have to maintain the concrete driveway around the stairs, and would only need 3 feet. Boardmember Woldemar said it is also exiting off of the second floor, which is commercial space and not residential space. The code states the stairs must be 44 inches, plus railings, etc. He questioned if the applicant conducted turning radius tests to make the turn around the corner, and the architect said it would depend what sort of truck would drive in and cars could drive through and around the area. He agreed a turning radius test could be done.

Boardmember Bloom said there is a lot of concrete in front and she asked if there could be planting done in that area. The architect said they could install landscaping in between the two driveways and he clarified that the height of the fence running along Florida is 6 feet. The code allows 6 feet without a permit. Boardmember Bloom suggested seeing landscaped plantings in the area. She questioned the wrought iron gate, the shape of the gate, and questioned why they were not shown in the photographs. Boardmembers questioned why elaborate gates were drawn in, and suggested they be simpler. The architect confirmed the gates now were the same height as the fence.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to Sheet A.3 which shows the west side of the building. He asked why the drawing was not complete, stating it does not show the entire building but it does show only the part the applicant intends to build. The architect states the existing building is already there. Boardmember Woodrow said in going back to Sheet A.1, the west side, based

on the drawing, will be a place where semi-trucks exit. He said the truck will not be able to get out; the width of the driveway does not provide swing, and the curb is blocked by cars parked there. He asked how the exit would be used.

Chair Butt questioned and confirmed that tractor trailer trucks back down from Second Street on the driveway where cars park and they back in parallel to the building, which goes fairly smoothly. Boardmember Woodrow questioned why the door is needed on the west side. The architect stated it was in the original plan and is used mainly as an unloading door with forklift operations. When there are no cars parked there, it is very simple.

Boardmember Woodrow noted that the plans show some parked cars off Second Street and asked if a truck typically would back up in there having to cope with those cars. The applicant said they typically have the cars move. Sometimes a container is delivered, dropped, and leave it up high, and it is unloaded with the tractor truck leaving. There is usually enough space between the two buildings.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to fencing and said he came around Second Street off of Ohio. He went down to Florida and looked at the drawings and a man came up to him. He felt fencing would be a serious thing, but a 6 foot fence will not deter someone from getting in. He questioned and confirmed they have had no people coming in since they installed the current fencing and electric gate, but they have had problems in the past.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the view from the back deck, and Ms. Hauser said the view reveals residential houses on one side and commercial on the other side. Chair Butt questioned the orientation, stating Florida runs east/west, and they would be looking north over the Iron Triangle. Boardmember Woodrow said when there is a porch on the Florida side, all that can be seen is I-580 and not the Point, and there are smells from California Oil. Boardmember Woldemar said if the porch was on the front of the building, it may also create some eyes on the street, which would help with security, regardless of smell.

Boardmember Woodrow said there are also gunshots heard in the area, and whatever the applicants can do to make this secure would be appreciated. He noted that the drawings are not complete in many ways, there is not a single light fixture shown or their location and style, which should be shown.

Boardmember Woodrow said he believed trash would be something inside and the company would put it out on Second Street on every Tuesday where the gate is and the trucks arrive.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the existing and new building on the ground floor, in the rear there appears to be an existing roll-up door, and he confirmed that the new building will have an opening as well. On Sheet A.4, the roll-up door indicates it is being removed. The architect said this is a mistake; there will be an opening in between the garage. Boardmember Woldemar questioned why there is an opening if this is a garage, and he asked who would park in it, or was it more of a shop space. The architect said it is a combination of both. Boardmember Woldemar then asked how the parking requirement is met for 8 spaces; 4 inside and 4 outside. Boardmember Whitty noted there is 1 for the warehouse, 5 for manufacturing and 2 for the caretaker.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned if there is a handicapped parking space required for the project. The engineer said he was not sure and would need to find out.

Chair Butt confirmed that there are two dumpsters for refuse; one for recycling and one for garbage. He said his questions regarding fencing, colors, and truck circulation have been

answered. He said a note on the site plan points to a line that should state “concrete groove” and he confirmed it is existing.

Chair Butt referred to the 1991 Knox Cutting Specific Plan and asked if this document still governs development in the area, or has it been superseded. Mr. Lopez said certain parts of it governs the area. Chair Butt said the plan has specific details about refuse, parking, landscaping, percentage of landscaping per site, landscaping for trees in the parking lot, setbacks indicated differently than what is on the drawings, and he recommended the applicant familiarize himself with it, as it will change the proposal. The engineer said he has asked planning staff questions about this, and Mr. Privat noted there is a more current zoning ordinance that follows the plan which would supersede the Knox Cutting Specific Plan and any inconsistencies.

Boardmember Woldemar agreed and said the proposal for South 50<sup>th</sup> Street did not fall under the Knox Cutting Specific Plan because all of the zoning approved after it superseded it. Chair Butt said he always thought specific plans were above any regional zoning, and Boardmember Woldemar said he had that same impression, but was told it did not.

Chair Butt said he would want to confirm this, and voiced concerns about proper setbacks, percentage of landscaping for the entire site, directional misrepresentations, combining of the lots which he feels opens the rest of the project, and conformance to zoning versus Knox Cutting Specific Plan.

Ms. Hauser said the building has improved the area, expanded business, they have seen positive things happen as a result, and adding to the property and to the business is positive. She noted the metal building was originally a machine shop. They bought the property where the new building is, which was previously vacant land. She confirmed there is a parking lot nearby, but this is not their property.

The public hearing was closed by the majority of the Board, with Boardmember Woldemar opposing.

Boardmember Whitty noted outstanding issues include:

1. Width of exterior stairway;
2. Requirement for disabled parking;
3. Square footage of required landscaping and actual evidence of where it exists;

Boardmember Bloom added the following:

4. Requirements for landscaping;
5. Requirement for City installed or installation of street trees by applicant;
6. Question regarding the width of the driveway and whether it will do its intended job;
7. What the entry area is; concrete—width and number of feet across and depth by inches. Landscaped beds needed on both sides;
8. Calculations about trees and parking;
9. Replace Indian Popcorn shrub with an Escalonia of comparable height;
10. Question whether the applicant wants the Pyracantha. The existing ones are 10 years old. Question to allowing it to go into a different shape, color or choosing another type of plant, like Crepe Myrtle or a Trestania Laurina for lower maintenance;
11. Conduct a drainage test in the new area to ensure proper landscaping

Boardmember Woodrow added the following:

12. Need for Color board;
13. Need for drawings that show light standards;
14. Dumpsters shown on drawings;



15. The color scheme on walls should show stripes going all the way around;
16. A couple of the parking spaces inside might actually be some of the shop, which should be clarified;

Chair Butt re-opened the public hearing, which was unanimously approved.

Boardmember Woldemar said he thinks this is a laudable project, putting a caretaker's residence in this area makes a lot of sense for many reasons. He stated the existing warehouse building is very well done. He confirmed with the engineer that he may be able to find the existing drawings and history of the original project.

Boardmember Woldemar said he wished the addition was more compatible with the existing warehouse, and identified the following issues for consideration:

17. The eave line of the second floor of the addition is not consistent with the eave line of the warehouse, although it appears that the warehouse has a 16 foot ceiling, which is about two stories. The garage only needs to be 8 feet high, and it is conceivable that things could be lowered, pushed back slightly, and the eave lines would line up, which would be more compatible. The third floor of the residential unit could look like a tower element, particularly as roofs from the second floor up to the third floor walls. This could be a major element to make the buildings more compatible with each other.
18. Regarding the use of materials, an approach on the Florida Street side and the residential side would be to bring the concrete block around so there is a compatibility of materials and color for those two elements. The third floor can be its own thing. He likes the ideas about the balcony or deck for the caretaker to utilize, which could be on the front because it shows someone is living there. Because the roof slopes in the addition do not match, they stand out and he thinks they should.
19. The idea of doing a stucco building attached to this concrete block building is not very consistent.
20. More answers need to be addressed regarding handicapped parking.
21. He asked staff to look into C3 issues. He was not sure how this can be treated independently now that the property will be 15,000 feet and almost 100% paved.
22. If the refuse area is outside, it is a policy of the City to now put roofs over them.

Boardmember Woldemar made a motion to continue the item to the September 22, 2010 meeting.

The architect said the idea for the project was to have something a little different, while being compatible. He said for the first 10 feet, they could bring the rugged face block around and have stucco above that. Regarding the slope of the roof, he said one is a warehouse with a long span or about 100 feet, and another is a house with a short span of about 20 feet. They also need a commercial feel with regard to the floor height and they purposely made sure the gutter line did not line up so as to separate it.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned why the ground floor needed to be 10 feet tall, as it is a garage. The architect said his client has requested this, but a small commercial vehicle will need to fit in it, as well as a trailer.

The architect said he would like to maintain the sizes of doors proposed. He asked for some direction on how to alter the drawings for the next meeting. He agreed he could add the exterior lighting, but he cited significant re-design. Boardmember Woldemar suggested the applicant ask staff if a study session could be arranged, and a boardmember could meet to convey ideas to solve problems.

The architect referred to the requirement for dumpsters to be covered. He noted the dumpsters are mobile with lids, and Boardmember Woldemar noted these types of things are mandated policy items of the City. The engineer questioned the use of a canopy, and Chair Butt felt there were clear regulations that govern these things. The architect questioned whether the trash could be separated out from the existing building and the new addition, which would simply require a garbage can. This would relieve them from having to build a shelter. Boardmember Whitty noted the lots were being combined.

The architect noted they located the deck in the back because they need a means of egress with the staircase. It was located in this manner so as to avoid someone jumping the fence, running up the staircase, and they may have to have a secure, wire enclosure at the top of the stairs. Chair Butt questioned whether the staircase could be inside, and the architect said it takes up too much room and parking. They could have a small balcony in the front, which they could incorporate which would provide an eye on the street. However, he did not want someone barbecuing in the front to get shot at. Boardmember Woodrow noted the area was not as bad as it used to be.

Chair Butt restated the primary issues; refuse for the addition, the type and details of gates and fencing, landscaping, color and material board, exterior lighting design, secure door and window designs, driveway width and making sure stair design is adequate width to get a car in and out, relevance of the Knox Cutting Specific Plan, which will be superseded by the new General Plan, detailing of the roof edge and articulation of the horizontal band, gutter details and a main wall section to identify how such things are actually built, going more toward an industrial aesthetic rather than traditional residential, going up to the base part with CMU and then stucco on the top, the ability for a study session, correct the orientation on the plans, compatibility of materials and volumes between existing and the addition.

Chair Butt said this will be a great project, but there is a level of detail, articulation and issues that need to be worked out further so that the Board is able to confirm what the project will look like.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Butt) to continue PLN10-081 to September 22, 2010; unanimously approved.**

The Board discussed homes in the nearby area which the applicants indicated were foreclosed, and the Board thanked the applicants for their willingness to invest in the neighborhood.

**BOARD BUSINESS**

**A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements**

**B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements**

Boardmember Woldemar requested a formal clarification of specific plan applicabilities. Mr. Privat noted he could provide certain provisions on a case-by-case basis, to which Boardmember Woldemar made a second request to have the Attorney provide answers at the meeting as to whether rules apply or do not apply. He also requested formal clarification about how to deal with additions and refuse per the appropriate ordinances. Boardmembers concurred with the need for further clarification.

Mr. Privat responded that it would take planning staff numerous hours to go through the Municipal Code and the Knox Cutting Specific Plan, which is not an efficient or effective use of time. He noted that once the General Plan is approved, the Knox Cutting Specific Plan will no longer be applicable.



Chair Butt suggested an official reply from the City Attorney and Planning Departments as to the applicability of the Knox Cutting Specific Plan, as the General Plan may not be adopted for 2 years. He said it could be as simple as a response indicating that, any zoning that has been published since applies to the zoning area, and overrides this document.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned an update on the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan status, and Ms. Whales noted staff was still awaiting an update from the City of El Cerrito.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed that there was no update on landscape bonding for maintenance.

Boardmember Bloom said she could provide a list of landscaping requirements and references, and reported that she visited the Plunge. She reported that the retaining wall was removed, the fountain can be turned on but its stream is thin, there is nowhere to sit, there is some wetland area, there are some curb benches which do not have backs, a couple of large seahorses were located in bathrooms, and the trees planted will unfortunately drop thousands of berries on cars parking in front.

Boardmembers wished Boardmember Bloom good wishes for the future and thanked her for her excellent service on the Board.

**Adjournment:**

The Board adjourned the meeting at 7:59 p.m. to the next meeting on September 22, 2010.