Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Michael Hannah, and Karlyn Neel
Absent: Vice Chair Tom Leader, and Boardmembers Meredith Benz, and Bhavin Khatri

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planner Jonelyn Whales and City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 25, 2018 and May 9, 2018

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the April 25, 2018 and May 9, 2018 meetings, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Hannah, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Leader and Khatri).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum - None

City Council Liaison Report – Mayor Butt was not present.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, June 4, 2018 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. PLN18-070 MONTES SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT

Description: PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ON A VACANT PARCEL
Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated May 23, 2018, for the construction of a new two-story single-family dwelling on a vacant lot, with a proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the rear of the lot. While the proposed project met all the development guidelines, she noted several staff recommendations related to the off-centered front bathroom window that could be shifted forward to create a better proportion, to the building and perhaps a porch for the ADU.

SERGIO MONTES, the applicant/owner, responded to questions from the DRB with respect to the window placement, trash enclosures, and replacement fencing.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments - None

The Board discussed the proposal and offered a number of recommendations. Boardmember Butt supported the colors which appeared to be in harmony with the color palette of adjacent houses.

The Board offered the following comments and recommendations to improve the plans and make them more compliant with standards:

1) Reconfigure the plans to allow windows in appropriate proportion where they needed to be in the front elevation;

2) Flip the bathroom on the first floor swapping the toilet and sink locations, flipping the door, and moving the closet against the stairs to allow a window in the bathroom and a window on the side of the door in place of the closet, that window to be an egress window;

3) Provide specifications, including materials, for the gutters and downspouts;

4) Recommend a window on the blank wall of the master bedroom;

5) Provide fencing detail on the plans for the proposed redwood fence along the west side and across the back of the property;

6) Provide a porch for the ADU with some sort of roofing material on the trellis or integrated into the trellis to go over the window and the door of the ADU;

7) Recommend the windows behind the master bedroom be smaller; add an egress window in lieu of that either at the front as shown in the plans or at the side; the architect to look at the functionality of the trellis, to potentially be replaced with a low sloped roof like the garage roof from the corner leading out, which would help the elevation feel more residential;

8) Recommend a window above the sink in the ADU;
9) Provide lighting material and specifications;
10) The stucco band did not wrap around to the front of the elevation and needed to be resolved with the roof;
11) Recommend a black/brown composition roof; and
12) Specify location of trash cans with a gate to that area to facilitate movement to the front.

**ACTION:** It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to continue PLN18-070, Montes Single-Family Residence and ADU to a future meeting, with the 12 recommendations to be refined and submitted in writing by the Board to staff along with Boardmember Hannah’s sketched floor plan change; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Hannah, Neel, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Khatri and Leader).

2. PLN17-652 LAI SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ADU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT ON A VACANT PARCEL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>BUENA VISTA AVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>556-151-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>LAI EUGENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>LI-SHENG FU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Contact</td>
<td>JONELYN WHALES  Recommendation: PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated May 23, 2018, for the study session to receive comments on the design permit to construct a new two-story single-family residence with a detached accessory dwelling unit on a large vacant lot, and clarified that while she had indicated a concern in the staff report with the proposed height of the unit requiring a variance, that had proven not to be the case and the proposal did meet the guidelines for the height and for the front and rear setbacks. She noted the proposal was not situated in the Historic District.

Chair Livingston referred to the Resource Management Overlay for Hillside Development standards, commented that the interpretation of the applicability of the standards was not clear, but supported the basic principles and the intent to protect hillsides, which he suggested could apply to the subject hillside application. He read the standards into the record which applied only to lots greater than one acre in size. As such, it was clarified that those standards did not apply to the subject application. It was, however, confirmed that the application was located in the Historic District. He also verified with the applicant that the proposal had been submitted to, and had been approved by, the Pt. Richmond Neighborhood Council in late 2017.

Boardmember Hannah stated that the plans needed to be appropriately stamped and the correct license number needed to be included on the plans.

LI-SHENG FU, the applicant, presented the proposal for the development of a main house along East Scenic Avenue with an ADU along Buena Vista Avenue, on a 9,000 square foot plus steep downslope lot. The main house would be 2,400 square feet in size with a two-car garage and the ADU would be 871 square feet with a one-car garage. The main house would have three levels with a deck area in between the main unit and the ADU, and the ADU would have two levels with a deck above the first level. He clarified the height of the units and described the
stairs that would connect both units from East Scenic Avenue to Buena Vista Avenue. He also
described the materials to be used, the proposed color palette, and the various elements of the
plan.

Boardmember Butt explained that the actual National Register of Historic Places included the
boundary for parcels with contributing resources and historic buildings, although the subject site
did not have a contributing resource. She suggested the project, in general, was making the
right moves for building in the Historic District given the larger building on the top of the downhill
slope with the smaller building on the bottom of the lot, emphasizing the District’s standards of
compatibility with surrounding buildings in size, scale, and massing. In terms of scale, she
suggested the rendering was inaccurate.

Boardmember Neel agreed that the profile of the upper building seemed to fit well into the
hillside because it had been built into the hillside and the lower building was in scale context
with its surroundings.

Boardmember Hannah requested a street elevation to get a better sense of scale and noted his
biggest issue overall was how the building met the ground and the grade; the masses of
concrete and stepping of exposed concrete kicked it out of residential vernacular; and while he
appreciated the different sized siding going up the building, the area below the siding and the
massive bands of stucco was a concern to him; the arched supports for the railings also fell out
of place; and the vents were visible and should be handled better. He suggested the way the
building engaged with the slope needed to be more skillfully handled, particularly given the high
visibility of the project. He added that details needed to be added to the plans such as
identifying the metal to be used for the railings and the material to be used for the eaves.

Boardmember Neel also noted there appeared to be a style conflict and urged a clarification of
the style of the home.

Chair Livingston referred to the shingled house located adjacent to the subject site and praised
its ability to disappear, to seamlessly integrate into the site, a simplicity of form, contrary to the
design of the proposed home which emphasized multiple architectural elements. He suggested
the architectural forms seemed arbitrary and created a chaotic roofing mass that appeared to
struggle, and suggested the building was out of context with the community it was trying to fit
into, and did not relate to the site.

Boardmember Hannah suggested the plan needed to be simplified and modernized and
recommended that the architect find a way to bring down the material that could handle being
so close to grade but that followed the slope, and dramatically simplify the roof forms without
necessarily changing the main massing or the size of the houses or location, but how it was
handled and how the building accepted it was on a slope and not just part of another residential
development.

Boardmember Butt recommended caution with how the homes would be viewed from below and
urged the applicant to work with the site. For the ADU, she and others urged the redesign of the
bay window and a reconfiguration of the roof over the upper deck.

Chair Livingston also urged care with the driveway adjacent to a very narrow street that would
have to be considered for safety reasons when building the driveway and garage of the ADU.

On the question of construction, Mr. Fu described the phasing of the project and the downhill
area of the site that would be used for construction parking, and explained that the driveway
would be built first to use as a staging area. The garage of the ADU could also be widened, and Chair Livingston recommended that the retaining wall around the garage be built first and that the upper house be built prior to constructing the ADU.

Boardmember Butt clarified for the applicant that even though the site was located in the Historic District, the building did not have to look historic; it could be contemporary and compatible.

Boardmember Hannah supported Sea Ranch architecture with vertical siding, naturally clean without big overhangs, and simplified forms.

Mr. Fu suggested the color would make a big difference.

LAI EUGENE, the owner, spoke to the challenges of the steep site, particularly with respect to visibility, and supported a design that would fit the home into the hill. He otherwise expressed concern for the time the review process was taking.

DRB Members offered suggestions to facilitate the process and the time involved in the process.

3. PLN18-057 MIKE’S AUTO BODY COMMERCIAL ADDITION
   Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 9,000 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING AUTO BODY SHOP LOCATED IN HILLTOP AUTO PLAZA.
   Location 3230 AUTO PLAZA
   APN 405-330-003
   Zoning CR, REGIONAL COMMERCIAL
   Owner: ROSE FAMILY PROPERTIES, LLC
   Applicant: MIKE ROSE’S AUTO BODY
   Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONTINUE TO A FUTURE MEETING

Jonelyn Whales advised that the application had been continued to a future meeting.

Board Business

   A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

   B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

The status of the Terminal One application was presented.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, June 13, 2018.