

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
July 11, 2012
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Don Woodrow, Chair
Andrew Butt
Eileen Whitty
Mike Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Brenda Munoz
Robin Welter

Vice Chair Raymond Welter called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Vice Chair Raymond Welter, Boardmembers Brenda Munoz, Robin Welter, and Michael Woldemar

Absent: Chair Don Woodrow; Boardmember Eileen Whitty

Staff Present: Lina Velasco, Kieron Slaughter and Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Robin Welter) to approve the Agenda; unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 23, 2012:

Boardmember Woldemar asked that the minutes distinguish between Boardmembers Robin and Raymond Welter.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Robin Welter) to approve the May 23, 2012 minutes; unanimously approved.

June 13, 2012

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Robin Welter) to approve the June 13, 2012 minutes; unanimously approved.

Public Forum - Brown Act - None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Vice Chair Raymond Welter noted the agenda consists of three Consent Calendar items. He asked if any members of the Board, staff, or audience wished to remove any item. Boardmember Woldemar requested removal of Item 3.

He announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, July 23, 2012 by 5:00 p.m.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Robin Welter) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 1 and 2; unanimously approved.

Items Approved on the Consent Calendar:

CC 1. PLN12-148 COMMERCIAL RENOVATION AND ADDITION ON HILLTOP DRIVE
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR THE RENOVATION AND EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL STRIP CENTER, INCLUDING LANDSCAPE AND PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS, BUILDING EXPANSION, AND CONSIDERATION OF A DRIVE-THRU WINDOW FOR AN EATING ESTABLISHMENT.
Location 4261 HILLTOP DRIVE
APN 426-292-025
Zoning C-1 (NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT)
Applicant HARI KALRA (OWNER)
Architect JOHNSON LYMAN ARCHITECTS
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 7/25/2012**

CC 2. PLN12-164 ELM PARK RENOVATION ON 8TH AND ELM AVENUE
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO RENOVATE ELM PARK TO INCLUDE NEW PLAY STRUCTURES, LANDSCAPING, FENCING, AND SIGNAGE, AND CONVERT THE EXISTING RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 720 ELM AVENUE INTO A COMMUNITY BUILDING IN SUPPORT OF THE ELM PARK PLAYLOT.
Location 720 ELM AVENUE
APN 534-192-005 & 534-192-004
Zoning CRR (COMMUNITY & REGIONAL RECREATION)/SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner CITY OF RICHMOND
Applicant CITY OF RICHMOND PARKS
Staff Contact LINA VELASCO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Since the applicant had not yet arrived, Vice Chair Raymond Welter moved up Item 4; Board Business.

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Mr. Slaughter stated staff provided the Board with an update on a project which had been before the Board (twice in the past) PLN625; the San Pablo Avenue Supermarket project that received DRB approval. The item went to the Planning Commission and the Commission received a letter from an attorney challenging the CEQA exemption status. The City Attorney's Office agreed with the challenge and recommended environmental review of the project. The Commission held the public hearing, heard public comment and voted to direct staff to prepare an Initial Study. The applicant is deciding whether to go this route or provide a permitted use project on the site. If they decide to go with a permitted use, the landscaping suggestions that

the DRB requested would not be required of the applicant. Most likely, the applicant could seek a grocery store of 20,000 sq. ft. or less or a general merchandise use. However, if they still want to seek a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a supermarket, environmental review would be required.

Boardmember Munoz asked staff to explain the difference between a supermarket and grocery store. Mr. Slaughter stated a grocery store is 20,000 sq. ft. or less and a supermarket is 20,000 sq. ft. or more and they both sell similar products. Typically, supermarkets have an expanded variety of items and services.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter referred to the second memorandum from Ms. Whales regarding signage, parking and landscape standards. Ms. Velasco said she could not speak directly to the questions posed by Boardmember Woldemar, but in terms of what is provided in the memo, there was a question as to whether there was signage required as part of a design review application. Based on Section 15.04.930.020 of the Zoning Ordinance, it should be included as part of new building construction. If it is a modification or addition, it does not appear to be a requirement; however, applicants are typically encouraged to provide signage, so they do not have to pay additional fees for a Zoning Administrator Review of the sign or come in with a Master Sign Program later. She said this was something seen in typical projects like the Target development on Macdonald Avenue which included a sign program as part of their initial application.

Boardmember Woldemar said the Zoning Ordinance states that "including as part of building modification". Therefore, if a building gets remodeled, it is to include a sign program. Ms. Velasco said she would assume that this is the case if it is part of the building and not just off-site improvements like landscaping or parking lot improvements. Staff needs to further discuss is if it is just the sign area or with the condition that it must be channel letters, non-illuminated, or if there is some specificity as to whether the actual content of the sign needs to be reviewed or if it is just the sign area. Sometimes these are spec buildings and they may not have a tenant determined, but the Board could come up with general guidelines for appropriate signage for the development showing where the sign could go and what would be the maximum area of the sign. Additionally, if the Board would allow cabinet signs, or if the Board specified they had to be individual channel lettering, and could they exceed a certain height, etc. But if a tenant is known, it might be more appropriate to require specific signage.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter stated the Board could review some sort of information, whether it is a spec building and get an idea about what materials they want to use, in addition to the size and location of signage. But, there is really nothing else the Board could expect for a spec building.

Boardmember Woldemar said rather than trying to discuss it tonight, the purpose of his raising the topic is that there is a provision in the enabling ordinance to allow the Board to discuss and essentially make policy on items that are unclear, and this is his reason for asking that both of the items be discussed. He wanted to express to the staff the way this Board feels about these items. These type of items should be listed as an agenda item so the public knows the item will be discussed, as well as the tree discussion in parking lots.

Ms. Velasco noted that one thing that staff will need to clarify in terms of when the landscape requirement is triggered in an existing parking lot, or whether or not it is a required when a new tenant comes on board, or when tenants/owners are doing major modifications to the parking lot. She said will ask Ms. Whales to clarify this as well, and staff will agendize the item.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Boardmember Woldemar said about two weeks ago, Andrew Butt and himself met with Hector Lopez and the applicant for adjacent property by the old Toyoto store at Hilltop Mall which may be coming forward to the Board. In addition, as a subcommittee, they also met with the developer of the apartment project next to Chevy's on Garrity Way who he has understood has since withdrawn his application due to funding. Lastly, he was asked by Ms. Whales to illustrate the conversation in more detail that the DRB approved subject to recommendations by the DRB subcommittee review of the third story sunroom on top of the garage on 37th Street, and he distributed a copy of his comments submitted by staff which was then sent onto the applicant.

Item Removed from the Consent Calendar:

CC 3. PLN12-108 THYSELL NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON TEHAMA AVENUE
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,051 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH AN ATTACHED SECOND DWELLING UNIT.
Location 5900 TEHAMA AVENUE
APN 508-282-025
Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
Owner BARRY AND SU THYSELL
Applicant WILLIAM COBURN
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and a description of the request for design review approval, its location, adjacent dwellings, zoning, architectural style of the proposed home, and said staff is requesting comments and direction on landscaping, rain gutters and other details. He said the project meets all setbacks for the SFR-3, Zoning District and the project also includes an attached second unit of approximately 624 sq. ft. which will have a dedicated off-street parking space inside one of the garages with direct access to the second dwelling unit. Staff added a condition of approval that will require the applicant/owner to complete curb and gutter improvements in addition to planting a street tree.

The proposal also includes a photovoltaic solar panel on the south facing roof and the applicant has completed the Build It Green checklist with a score of 94 points. They will pursue Green Building Certification by Build it Green. The project satisfies all parking requirements per the Zoning Ordinance. The project is within the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council and the applicant attended the May 9 and May 16, 2012 meeting. The neighborhood council was concerned about the original height and they recommended the height be reduced by 5 feet. The applicant resubmitted his plans with a reduced height as per their recommendation. Staff also included Attachment 4 to the staff report which is a letter of support from this neighborhood council.

In conclusion, the project will aesthetically improve the property by creating a high quality residence. Staff believes the size and massing fits well in the neighborhood, and recommends approval of the request with conditions of approval as contained in the staff report.

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed with Mr. Privat that State law pre-empts the Board from discussing the solar panel installation and design implications.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the Board is to make separate distinctive findings in addition to the normal design review findings when there is a second unit. Mr. Slaughter said no,

because it is included in one residential dwelling, similar to a duplex, where the Board would be treating them with the same findings.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to Condition No. 2 which talks about 2 street trees and the ordinance requires 1 for every 50 feet of street frontage. This lot has 150 feet of street frontage. Mr. Slaughter said one more additional street tree would be required, and it should read "3" instead of "2" on the Tehama Avenue side.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter referred to parking and said in the paragraph before the table, it states "the proposed project provides 2 garages and not 3." Mr. Slaughter noted that he should have indicated, "One additional space shall be assigned to the second dwelling" and apologized for the error.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter asked if the City considers tandem spaces legal. Mr. Slaughter said in certain circumstances the Board could make a finding that it is legal as required parking. If there are unusual characteristics to the lot, the Board could make a finding to approve tandem parking for the required parking. He clarified that tandem parking is not allowed for the second dwelling because parking cannot be blocked if rented to a non-family member.

The public hearing was opened.

Bill Coburn, architect, said he feels staff has described the project well in terms of the scope of what is being proposed. The two meetings they had with the neighborhood council were very informative to bring out the kinds of important design issues that neighbors had directly adjacent to the property. In recognition of the character of the neighborhood and the desire to have the house fit within the neighborhood context, they reduced the height by 5 feet. They were also very much aware of the impact windows would have on the one side of the house that sits above the adjacent neighbor. We adjusted them to minimize these impacts by their location and to address privacy. We also focused on the views out towards the bay and the back of the house, which was not an issue for the neighbors.

Mr. Coburn said the site sits up high along Butte Street; there is an embankment of approximately 5.5 feet, so therefore, they had proposed a fairly intensive drought-resistant planting plan to provide some landscape detail on the sidewalk and mitigate the steep slope. They then proposed the front fence line at the top of the embankment which is transparent to allow some views from the accessory unit's living room towards the bay. He said the property owner likes to work on cars and had requested larger garages. They exceed what they need for parking spaces, but they worked into the design the garage doors and their placement to fit in acceptably with the style of the house. Also, because of the quantity of garage doors on the Tehama side, they provided landscaping and special entry features to the house to soften and provide character to the house on the side.

During the design process, they enjoyed going through the process of meeting with neighbors and understanding their concerns. The direction they received was helpful to the project and will be helpful later on to mitigate concerns of the adjacent neighbors.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to the site along Butte Street and said she likes the fact the stucco wall is pulled back. She asked if there was a fence on top of the wall, and Mr. Coburn said no, it is just the wall.

Boardmember Woldemar asked what are the colors proposed for the house, and Mr. Slaughter said they are included in the packet. Boardmember Woldemar stated concrete tile is proposed for the one story eave roof on the front and composition on the upper floor. He asked what occurs with the consistency. Mr. Coburn said the owners very much wanted a Mediterranean

style house. They initiated the design with the tile roof on all roofs. They also want solar panels. During the initial research with the solar companies, they found it is very difficult to put solar panels on a tiled roof. With the location of the house on the knoll, the upper roof is a fairly low sloped roof, and the roof itself will only be visible from two properties on the north side. He wanted to maintain the original aesthetic the owners had wanted, and therefore, he kept the tiled roof on the lower section of the front elevation and will use asphalt lapped roofing, which is going to be needed for the asphalt shingles. They would match the color on both. He admitted it is an odd juxtaposition, but he felt that the upper roof would virtually be invisible and the tiled roof over the garages and the balcony at the front was a much more character-defining element which was important to the success of the overall scheme.

Boardmember Woldemar said the reason he asked the question has to do with consistency. His question of the City Attorney having to do with the solar panels was an expected response, but he still suggested doing a thick asphalt shingle in the red color throughout the project, given there is plenty of precedent for that. Mr. Coburn said they would probably prefer the tile because it communicates the Mediterranean aesthetic.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if Mr. Coburn reviewed the City's checklist for design review requirements, and noted a topography map was missing, as well as details in the plans because they are not labeled. Mr. Coburn said they didn't have a topography map survey and there is only about one foot worth of gradient there, so he thought it would be acceptable not to submit the map.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the south side and asked where the top of slope occur, and Mr. Coburn said it is at the fence defining the yard versus the landscaping down at the sidewalk. There is a about a 4.5 foot existing retaining wall at the side on the property line which they would maintain and the fence is on top of the wall. Boardmember Woldemar noted that from the downhill neighbor, they are looking at about 12 feet of fence and wall combined. Mr. Coburn said this is fairly heavily planted and a neighbor could verify this.

Boardmember Woldemar said in the drawings, there seems to be something surrounding the window and door openings. Mr. Coburn replied this is foam molding to give definition to the windows and doors. Boardmember Woldemar asked what is down below and under the upper floor eaves. Mr. Coburn said there is molding on the soffit of the roof and the eave is soffit in. Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed that the plans did not depict downspouts which Mr. Coburn confirmed would drain off the property and they would be clustered in appropriate places. Boardmember Woldemar referred to the second story deck and he assumed there would be a downspout in the corner from the upper roof, and he questioned whether the water would go through the deck, which he also presumes is a hard surface. Mr. Coburn said they would internalize the downspout if they had to, and he said he understood the need for more details.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Mr. Coburn to describe the proposed wrought iron railing. Mr. Coburn said it would be a code conforming wrought iron rail with vertical pickets and be applied to the deck in such a way to meet the load requirements of the 2010 Building Code. He said he did not think at the moment the owners were proposing anything fancy but rather modest, as views are a concern there and they would like to keep it as simple and transparent as possible.

Boardmember Woldemar said the applicant proposes a 9 foot plate for the ground floor and a 10 foot plate to the upper floor, and he asked why the 9 foot plate is proposed for a garage and granny unit. Mr. Coburn said his understanding is that the owners wanted a lot of vertical clearance in the garage for their use on the east side to work on cars. Boardmember Woldemar said it appears there is a step, and Mr. Coburn said they wanted to maintain the agreed upon height of the building by the neighborhood council and the site slopes down to the east. He

added the step so there is a little more height in the garage to satisfy the owner's desire for height.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter said Boardmember Woldemar asked most of his questions about the roof types, detail around the doors and windows, and he confirmed beige vinyl windows are proposed.

Boardmember Robin Welter referred to the back of the retaining wall along the neighbor's property and the fence, and she asked who owned the wall.

Cynthia McMillan, neighbor, said she believes the Thysell's own the wall and fencing. She said there used to be a brick retaining wall there and it used to wrap around on the slope where the plantings are and come around, and it was removed on one weekend.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked what condition the wall was in, and Ms. McMillan said it seems to be in reasonable condition, except for the far corner on the Butte side. Boardmember Robin Welter said it is very tight in there and she was worried about drainage. She asked if the lawn was also wrapping all the way around, and Mr. Coburn said on the slope there would be planting and lawn on the level portion above that, but it stops at the corner of the building. He said he would presume they would look at the structural viability of the wall at some time to verify it is acceptable to build on. He did not think the impact to the building is significant because it is so far away. Mr. Coburn agreed that drainage was a legitimate concern and he suspects the lawn will not wrap around the building there, but they could certainly address it to the satisfaction of the Board's concerns.

Public Comments:

Mary Selva, President of the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council and on the Planning and Zoning Committee, said they met on three separate occasions. The first two were committee meetings with neighbors who had concerns about the scale and bulk of the project. She noted the project is on the very top of the hill and in a very view sensitive area. According to the design review ordinance, she explained that any project that is 15 feet or more comes to the DRB and to neighborhood councils. She said the height of the roof was lowered, they recommended some conditions which are attached in their letter, and they voted to approve the project at a regular meeting on May 24, 2012, with conditions. She said she noticed that one Planning Department condition includes a recommendation for curb side trees, and she asked that careful attention be taken regarding the tree species given the sensitive view area. She did not believe the applicant wanted trees, and she would suggest a condition be included that trees not exceed 20 or 25 feet, or the height of the house at maturity.

Cynthia McMillan submitted copies of a document to the Board and staff and said she is the downhill neighbor at 1612 Butte Street. She attended the neighborhood council meetings and voted to approve the project, but wanted to voice her opinion about an issue to the Board. She said there are a couple of parts of the staff report she takes exception to. On page 3 it talks about parking and states there is a 3-car garage, but it is almost a 6-car garage, or 1100 square feet dedicated to garage space which when looking around the neighborhood, most of the original houses are less than 1100 square feet. She wanted the Board to know some sense of the scale and magnitude of this development. Also, on page 4 under conclusions, there are quotes that state "relates properly to the massing of other residences in the surrounding neighborhood" and "it does not create significant visual impacts to persons living...in the neighborhood." She said she will be looking up at a 20 foot high by 60 foot long wall, 5 feet off the property line and there is a visual impact, as this is where she does all of her gardening. She said when comments are made like this in a staff report, that it not be subjective but based on actual data. This is why she distributed the document to the Board, which looks at the

combination of total living space and garage space. For the average of the immediate neighborhood, the proposed dwelling is 118% larger and 22% larger than the largest house they have ever had developed in the neighborhood.

Dan Schwab, said he lives at the end of the block at 1674 Butte Street, appreciates the owners have come to the Council and have made significant changes to their design, but he has two major concerns. He is not opposed to them building their house but the impact has been understated on the neighborhood as this will be a behemoth given its location as viewed from anywhere else in their neighborhood. He thinks by approving the house as designed, a precedent is being set. He is specifically concerned with people taking single story homes and turning them into two-story dwellings which is not the case, but that said, the house is ugly yet what is proposed is massive.

Loren Smyer said she lives across the street and east of the project and did not realize it is doubling the size of the existing structure. While she was pleased something else will be built, it could severely impact her views and would reduce the value of her property, especially if trees go in anywhere near the corner of Butte and Tehama. The setback on the Butte side will also be reduced by 4 feet and the balcony will also be built out so their view will be affected. She said they have a slice of a San Francisco view from their porch and kitchen which she presented.

Vicky Propp, Richmond, said she is a long-time resident and said a 50x100 foot lot with four garages plus a tandem increases an already existing traffic hazard. The size of the building dwarfs the neighborhood, people will lose views and some people purchased their homes based on those views. Tehama is used as a direct route from the freeway to San Pablo Avenue by the City's police, fire, and ambulances. When school was in session, they had to have four crossing guards because of the traffic. Kids also use Tehama as a race track, with skateboards and bikes and something bad will happen there given an obstruction of views.

Maureen Gravett said she lives two houses down east on the corner of Shasta and Tehama. She attended all neighborhood council meetings and did not approve of the project, as it does not belong in the annex especially where it is located. She appreciates the fact that it has been lowered, but it is the size of the Vitale Building, at almost 3800 square feet. There are no Mediterranean houses in the neighborhood, she voiced concerns with water and drainage, did not like the dark terra cotta and green colors, and she agreed the traffic is very dangerous along the street.

Mr. Smyer, a nearby resident, referred to the pictures of their views which his wife presented, and he presented a picture of the view from their house which made them fall in love with the house. Any amount of view they lose will be significant and he asked that the Board take this into consideration.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Mr. Smyer what the setback of the existing house set east of the property line on Butte. Mr. Smyer said he did not, and Boardmember Woldemar said it appears that in looking at the view presented by Mr. Smyer, the northwest corner of the existing house is the limit of his view. It appears as if the house proposed is about in the same position. Mr. Smyer said if the property line of the house line is the same, he does not have an opinion about this or the height, but if there are things in front of the house like street trees, this would encroach and block his slice of view.

Boardmember Woldemar said if a street tree on Butte were placed downhill 25 feet away from the corner, it would be well past this view, and Mr. Smyer said he believes it would not affect their view.

Deborah Dodge, a nearby resident said that she received a notice which indicated that the house was a 2,051 sq. ft. single family dwelling. It turns out that the total building size is actually 3,775 square feet. Therefore, this is misleading because it did not include garages or the extra unit. Also, in the notice she received, she completely disagreed with its statements of "The proposed design is suitable for its purpose, is harmonious with and relates properly to the surrounding neighborhood and contiguous parcels in the site itself." She said there is no way that the building is harmonious with the neighborhood and she asked the Board to look at the square footage and think about the rest of the homes in the neighborhood and what they and their lots are like. Her home is a triple lot of 7,500 square feet which is larger than the size of the proposed parcel, but her house is only 1330 square feet and she asked that the Board consider this, the square footages of homes, and question whether the proposal fits into the neighborhood.

Rebuttal – Applicant

Bill Coburn, architect, said it appears the most significant concerns are of the overall size of the building envelope which includes the garages and the secondary unit and residence. He would take the position that the proposed living space of just over 2,000 square feet is modest. Granted, in the Richmond Annex, there is a context of small houses but it does not strike him that in terms of a family with two small children this is over and above the context in the neighborhood. He said he recognizes also that the secondary unit is allowed by State law as long as it meets zoning regulations, and this is a separate matter from the concern of the large building envelope. The only negotiable aspect of the size of the project is the garage space which is the specific request of the owner. As someone who likes working on cars and owns cars, the alternative would be for the cars to be worked on in the yard. Regarding street trees, he said placement of street trees and whether they are evergreen or deciduous would make a difference in their ultimate size.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if there are any deed restrictions, noting that the applicant made reference to state law with secondary living units. He asked if it must be recorded against the property that it will only be occupied by a blood relative or other restriction. Mr. Slaughter said Richmond does not have these types of restrictions. Vice Chair Raymond Welter noted that the owners must file a deed restriction, and Mr. Slaughter noted it simply means that it cannot be sold as a stand-alone unit, such as a condo.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if there is any reason the Board cannot require landscaping in the curbside planting area. Mr. Slaughter said this is not the property owner's property; however, they are responsible for maintaining it, which is awkward. He said the City can require them to plant a tree there which would also need to be maintained.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if staff has a copy of what the notice was, and he said in the agenda, it included the second unit. Mr. Slaughter said the notice states, "A public hearing to consider a design review permit to allow construction of a new, 2051 square foot single family residence with an internal second dwelling unit."

Boardmember Woldemar said staff indicates in the staff report that the existing residence was about 1812 square feet, and the applicant indicates that the new square footage is 2,051 square feet. He asked if they both included garage spaces in each. Mr. Slaughter said it should not include non-habitable space, so neither number includes this. Boardmember Woldemar confirmed with Mr. Slaughter that the issue is about 200 square feet of additional living area of which part of that includes the secondary unit and whatever all the space is being taken up by the workshop and the garage and covered parking. He asked what the total square footage added up is, because the applicant indicates that they have completely filled the building

envelope and up two stories. Mr. Slaughter said he did not and Boardmember Woldemar asked that this be done to see what the net total, particularly the floor area ratio (FAR).

Boardmember Robin Welter asked and confirmed with Mr. Slaughter that Richmond does not have a maximum percentage of lot coverage restriction. Ms. Velasco noted they do have an interior yard space requirement which is equivalent to 16% of the total lot area.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the ordinance allows a single family home to project into the rear yard a certain amount and then back project the other way. Mr. Slaughter said a finger of an addition can be put into the rear setback, and staff has had discussions on whether to remove this. Boardmember Woldemar noted that he likes the fact that it allows the opportunity to break down the scale and shift things around a bit.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the front yard discussion still revolve around taking the average of the front setback of all those on the block. Mr. Slaughter said this can be used or there are corner lot provisions where the side is half of the front and the front is whatever the average is or 20 feet.

Boardmember Munoz asked if there is any maximum requirement for the garage and workshop space, and Mr. Slaughter said not that he is aware of; there are simply minimum garage requirements.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter stated many speakers have concerns about the possibility of the street trees and he confirmed there were several species allowed, and Mr. Slaughter said he would ask that the applicant speak to the Parks and Landscaping Department and get the list of recommended street tree species.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter said regarding the Smyer's who have a sliver of view, he asked what flexibility there is in the placement of the street tree, and Mr. Slaughter said this is up to the Board's discretion. He confirmed there were currently no street trees in front of the residence.

Boardmember Robin Welter said on a corner lot where the fence is all the way to the property line, it should be set back or have a 45 degree jog. She asked if that would apply to this wall, because one edge looks as though it is on the property line but one looks like it is set back from the corner. Mr. Slaughter explained there is a 25 foot site triangle and it must be 3.5 feet or lower within that site triangle. He confirmed it would be measured from the curb and not the property line.

Boardmember Woldemar voiced several concerns that he did not think he could get answers in words. He suggested continuing the item for at least a month to give the applicant an opportunity to address details in the drawings which include everything from where are the trash cans, the location of the screening for them, what are the grades for the site, how is the drainage specifically being handled, the project should have a topography map, there does need to be landscaping and additional street trees in the appropriate location along the planter strip on both frontages, because of the shortness of the driveways, all of the garage doors should have automatic openers and not be manual, that there are a number of many details missing.

He stated the ordinance requires that garages have a minimum of 10x20 foot clear. Based on the applicant's dimensions, it does not appear this is the case. Because of the fourth car, he does not think this number applies to the two-car garage. He thinks there are some dimensional problems with French doors opening up onto the balcony which seem to be 3 foot doors, yet the balcony is less than 3 feet. There are a number of discrepancies between the plans and the windows in terms of what is shown on the elevations. There are many places he cannot read

what the notes state. And, he feels that this project has been built out to its maximum and he was hard pressed to make the findings indicated in the staff report, particularly relating to its harmoniousness with the neighborhood and characteristics of the project.

In principle, he is not opposed to the square footage as he is about the mass, bulk and design characteristics are. For example, the applicant could have elected to put two of the cars in from Butte Street and tuck them underneath, and could have moved some of the second floor down to the first floor. Now it meant that the primary unit was a two-story unit and there was still a secondary unit. He felt there are a number of options that would have reduced the mass, and he thinks the building needs more detail and more articulation to give it more scale and break its mass and scale down. He would note that during the continuance, this would give the opportunity time to meet with the neighbors and try some new ideas.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter agreed and said he thinks there is still some disparity even though they have met with the neighbors a few times. He also agrees that it is a cluster box and needs more detail which other homes in the neighborhood have, as well as other materials other than plaster. He was not sure he was sold on the two roof types either and does not think the tile goes with it at all. He therefore, supported a continuance.

Boardmember Robin Welter said because this is on a slope, she would like to see the existing topography and the existing house. In looking at the pictures, the applicant is replacing a two-story with a two-story, and to her she cannot identify massing without a plan and without elevations, she does not know exactly what the existing house looks like. They are also maxing out the amount of space on the site.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter noted that the Board had a similar issue on a second story addition in the Annex where it was in the middle of a slope and the uphill neighbors were concerned about the hill views. There was no topography map and the Board could not tell or make a finding on whether there were impacts or not. Mr. Slaughter said he thinks this was the house on San Mateo Street. Vice Chair Raymond said a topography map is required on the checklist; however, sometimes the Board lets this go if it is flat, but where views are critical, the finding cannot be made without knowing this. Mr. Slaughter added that typically staff also suggests holding the meeting before requiring one because of their expense. Staff also cannot take views into consideration when reviewing the project because the City does not have a view ordinance.

Vice Chair Raymond Welter said; however, when hearing from neighbors, this helps the Board make its decision. Mr. Slaughter noted that he did not hear from neighbors and the only correspondence he received was for support from the neighborhood council after multiple meetings.

Boardmember Robin Welter asked for a legible landscape plan, with plants to scale, with trees to scale, and legible notes. She said her issue is seeing what the existing house is on the plan which will help everybody, and Boardmember Woldemar covered the remainder of her issues.

Boardmember Munoz asked to receive more information about the height of the retaining wall and drainage. Boardmember Robin Welter added that drainage will be important because of downhill neighbors. She asked that the applicant show area drains and directional flows with arrows.

Mr. Slaughter said as far as the parking entry, staff reviewed this with the applicant prior to submitting the application. He asked if it was possible to add parking on one side to split up the garages, but the grading would be so significant to go into the hillside, it would be a challenge. Also, regarding the size of the garage space, this is being met for the main residence. For the second dwelling, any additional parking space can be tandem and not enclosed in a garage.

Mr. Slaughter confirmed with Boardmember Woldemar that the second unit's parking is the garage furthest west; or the one-car garage. The two car parking spaces required for the residence are on the left side in the oversized garage. Boardmember Woldemar said therefore, this needs to be 20 feet width in the inside, and Vice Chair Raymond Welter said the dimensions are taking from the outside of the walls and this should be made clear.

Boardmember Woldemar said he was inclined to make a motion to continue the item and asked the applicant for his availability for returning on August 8 or 22, 2012. It will also provide an opportunity to meet with the Neighborhood Council. Mr. Coburn said it is best to try and resolve neighborhood issues and he agreed to return on August 8, 2012.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Robin Welter) to continue PLN12-108 to August 8, 2012 at which time the applicant will return with revised plans to clarify concerns raised at the Board; unanimously approved.

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned at 7:40 p.m. to the next meeting on Wednesday, July 25, 2012.