

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Richmond, CA 94804**

January 12, 2022
6:00 P.M.

All Participation Via Teleconference

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

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Michelle Hook
Jonathan Livingston

Brian Carter
Macy Leung

Chair Livingston called the regular meeting to order at 6:06 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Michelle Hook, and Macy Leung

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano, Jonelyn Whales, and Hector Lopez, and Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 8, 2021

The minutes had not been included in the meeting packets presented to the DRB and approval was continued to the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

Roberta Feliciano identified the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

CAROL MAKIN was available to make comment but could not connect to the Zoom meeting.

City Council Liaison Report: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE

Any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, January 24, 2022 by 5:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. PLN20-091 LOWERY NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,470 SQUARE-FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A ±2,594 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.

Location SOUTH OF 550 36TH STREET
APN 516-080-018
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant DENISE LOWERY (OWNER)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

At the request of the applicant, the application was continued to the meeting scheduled for February 9, 2022.

- 2. PLN18-059 MOGHADAM RESIDENCE**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,745 SQUARE-FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.

Location 2439 FOOTHILL AVENUE
APN 549-140-014
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant DARAN MOGHADAM (OWNER)
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Chair Livingston advised that he and former Vice Chair Michael Hannah had worked with Mr. Moghadam over a period of time to address the design issues that had been raised by the DRB.

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated January 12, 2022 and noted this was the fifth time the applicant had been before the DRB. She reported that the applicant had addressed all of the DRB's comments from the last meeting in November 2020, to apply different materials to break up the massing of the proposed structure, to wrap the garage in a different color below and a lighter color above to break up the massing, to re-orient the windows on the west elevation, and to return to another public hearing with the proposed changes for a final decision.

In response to Boardmember Hook as to the grading and drainage plan, Ms. Whales advised the applicant would work with Water Resource and Recovery and Richmond Public Works to develop the grading plan, which would be done prior to the issuance of the building permit.

DARAN MOGHADAM, the property owner, stated the drainage plan would include four dry wells and the pavement of a 100-foot easement in the rear, using cobblestones if available for the 8-foot wide driveway and one foot for planting flowers. The three-level home would have bedrooms on the first floor, an area for his mother on the second floor, and an area for activities and a garden

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

on the third floor.

Boardmember Hook supported the landscape plan.

Mr. Moghadam responded to comments and clarified the trim color and the belly banding around the whole building with the trim to be slightly darker than the siding. He also clarified his intent to use panels for the sidelight window adjacent to the door on the front elevation.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Leung) to approve PLN18-059, Moghadam Residence; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with nine Conditions of Approval; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

3. PLN21-189	HILLTOP VILLAGE RECREATIONAL SPACE (LOT A)
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A PARK WITH WALKING PATHS, PLAYGROUND, BASKETBALL COURT, AND LANDSCAPING.
Location	BRANCHWOOD COURT
APN	405-350-001
Zoning	RM1, MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Applicant	HILLTOP VILLAGE OWNERS' ASSOCIATION (OWNER)
Staff Contact	ANDREA VILLARROEL AND ROBERTA FELICIANO
	Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated January 12, 2022, a request for design review to construct a park with walking path, playground, basketball court, and landscaping for the Hilltop Village Owners' Association on a long, narrow parcel of 65,000 square feet located in the Hilltop Village, which ran alongside San Pablo Avenue and would be accessed from the parking lot entrance at the end of Branchwood Court. She advised that the proposal met the height requirements of the RM1 Zoning District and met the estimated total water use and maximum applied water allowance with a proposed series of native plantings. She presented the details of the plan, stated the park would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant and the park would be open from sunrise to sunset. When asked, she confirmed that the basketball court would not be illuminated.

Ms. Feliciano recommended that the existing chain-link fence be updated to a black metal fence similar to the fence along San Pablo Avenue; that a low-water-need groundcover be chosen for the 8,000 square foot turf, such as Kurapia; and that a directional sign be installed to identify the entry to the park by the parking lot.

RYAN CUMMINGS, the Landscape Architect, presented an overview of the proposed recreational space known as Lot A, and explained that the lot was currently vacant and had previously been used as a ballfield and a walking path. He described the process where the Owners' Association had polled the community to identify the desired use of the parcel and the efforts that had produced the proposal now submitted to the DRB for approval. He described the plant palette as Bay Area natives and highlighted the amenities that had been proposed.

Boardmember Hook referred to the amenities and verified with Mr. Cummings that the amenities

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

were intended to serve the community only and not the public. She recommended bicycle racks in appropriate areas.

In response to questions, Mr. Cummings explained that an informal edging had been proposed and the park would receive regular maintenance by the company currently maintaining the site. He clarified that the park was bound by a slope with existing eucalyptus trees that would provide some shade for a significant part of the day. Planting had also been proposed adjacent to the playground area. He described the benches that had been proposed in that area; stated the main area of drought-tolerant plants would receive drip irrigation until established; the pathway would terminate at a fence near the property line; and a chain link fence had been installed to discourage homeless encampments. He also noted that there would be a chain across the parking lot, and with no lighting provided there would be no purpose for anyone to access the site after dark. He reiterated that the park would be open from sunrise to sunset and the Owner's Association employed security patrols.

Boardmember Butt verified with Mr. Cummings that the area would remain open as is although there was a cinder block wall along San Pablo Avenue, six or seven feet high with an extended grill up to an eight-foot height. The park would be entered at the end of a cul-de-sac and there would be nothing to stop community members from walking there after dark.

In response to Boardmember Leung, Mr. Cummings identified the benches that had been proposed throughout the park, noted that a communal water fountain had not been proposed given the expectation that residents would bring their own water, and clarified with respect to the surface of the play area that with the eucalyptus trees it was expected that leaves and debris would make way into the play area and mulch had been proposed to make it more natural.

Boardmember Leung recommended that the path be widened somewhat to better accommodate couples with dogs or small groups, noted that she liked the tree selection, asked how the use of the park after dark would be enforced, and recommended some lighting for wayfinding at night.

Mr. Cummings explained there would be no physical barrier to close off the park, the Owners' Association did not want the park to be used after dark, and the park did not connect any spaces.

MARISOL VELAZQUEZ, Hilltop Village Owners' Association, confirmed that there was no desire that the park be used after dark and adding lights could create the idea that it could be used at night. She explained there was a chain link rope that would continue to be used and should be sufficient to indicate that when dark there would be no use of the park.

Chair Livingston stated that the plan neglected to do anything with the property between the concrete fence with the steel on top and the public right-of-way, and he recommended that zone along San Pablo Avenue be landscaped with natives and include groupings of the landscaping across the street to mitigate the large massive wall.

Mr. Cummings stated he would take that under advisement.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

HELENE BURKS, Richmond, an adjacent homeowner whose home abutted the stand of eucalyptus trees, expressed her gratitude for the work that had been done to accommodate the residents. She supported bicycle stands and supported the proposed outdoor space for young people.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

APRIL ROY, Richmond, President of the Hilltop Village Owners’ Association, stated the property inside the fence of the HOA property was either owned by the HOA or the property owners and according to the CC&R’s and the County Assessors Map, the property outside the fence was owned and maintained by the City of Richmond.

OLY _____, Richmond, expressed concern for the existing parking in the development and while she agreed with no light inside the park she emphasized the need for lighting outside of the park.

Ms. Roy stated that HOA security patrolled the area multiple times each night and once the proposal had been completed there would be a reassessment of the number of patrols required. She also noted that landscape lights might also be considered along the line of the park. She added that the parking lot would be restriped to limit the number of cars in the parking lot and signage would be provided to protect the homeowners. The HOA had conducted multiple surveys and meetings and the HOA Board had already voted not to include lighting in the plan.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Ms. Feliciano clarified that no conditional use permit was required in this case since the park would not be public and no recommendation to the Planning Commission was required.

Boardmember Leung supported the project and reiterated her recommendation to widen the pathways.

Boardmember Butt also supported the project and sought some improvement to the property along San Pablo Avenue no matter who owned that property.

Vice Chair Carter and Boardmember Hook both agreed with the need to address the area along San Pablo Avenue, if possible.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to approve PLN21-189, Hilltop Village Recreational Space (Lot A); subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with nine Conditions of Approval; with additional DRB conditions: 10) The pathways to be widened to six feet; and 11) Native landscaping to be added between the concrete wall and the property line adjacent to the City of Richmond right-of-way (assuming that property was owned by the Hilltop Village Owners’ Association), with plantings at the discretion of the Landscape Architect who was encouraged to use quercus agrifolia, pilularia, and toyon, with those plants to be temporarily landscaped and irrigated until established; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

4. PLN21-447	HARBOUR 8 PARK EXPANSION
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED PARK EXPANSION CONSISTING OF A ±3,356 SQUARE FOOT COMMUNITY CENTER BUILDING, PLAYGROUND, PICNIC AREA, TOT LOT, ZIP LINES, BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PATHS AND LANDSCAPING.
Location	BETWEEN HARBOUR WAY AND 8 TH STREET
APN	538-420-001, -022, -030
Zoning	PR PARKS AND RECREATION AND IL INDUSTRIAL LIGHT
Applicant	CITY OF RICHMOND (OWNER)

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: PROVIDE / RECEIVE COMMENTS

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated January 12, 2022, for a study session for a City-proposed park expansion including a 3,356 square foot community center building, playground, picnic area, tot lot, zip lines, bicycle and pedestrian paths, and landscaping. The subject site consisted of the existing Harbour 8 Park plus two additional parcels along Ohio Avenue for a total of 67,947 square feet in the Iron Triangle Neighborhood. She advised that the applicant was Douglas Thornley of Goring & Straja Architects on behalf of the City of Richmond Parks Division in partnership with Pogo Park. She described the proposed community center as a two-story building with a green standing seam metal roof, painted stucco exterior, arched ebony windows and an exposed ceiling that would house a multi-purpose room, office, break room, men's and women's restrooms, mechanical/support rooms and a covered exterior porch. She added that the Iron Triangle Neighborhood Council and Friends of the Richmond Greenway had offered letters of support. She reported that the Chair had requested that the entry into the community center be improved and she understood that the design team had worked on that issue and would present some options.

TOODY MAHER, Executive Director of Pogo Park, a non-profit working in Richmond to transform parks in the Iron Triangle into safe, green and vibrant places for children to play, advised when asked by Boardmember Hook, that the bike paths would be open 24/7. She explained there would have to be more meetings with the City to address not only Harbour 8 Park but the whole Richmond Greenway at night because of unsheltered people sitting in encampments and the need to provide some protection. Those from the community and the city would be solicited to seek some conclusion to that issue.

Ms. Maher stated the focus was on Elm Play Lot and Harbour 8 Park, along with the Yellow Brick Road project, a safe bike and walking route through the Iron Triangle that would connect both parks. She described how the park had been proposed in coordination with the community, that a 3-D model had been created of the project on site, and that a talented and committed design team had been assembled to bring the conceptual design to a set of plans in partnership with others.

RON HOLTHUYSEN, Scientific Art Studio, described the team that had been developed to serve the community and explained how the land had been accumulated to serve as a park with a number of features. He described the amenities, the iconic and scenic elements that would be custom built, and stated the park would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant. He noted that Lille Mae Jones had been the visionary who had driven the change of the railroad into the Greenway and a public art memorial in her honor had been included in the plans.

ROSEANN DEL BELLO, Landscape Architect, described the hardscape plan that had been proposed with many of the surfaces under the play equipment offering traditional safety features, and with colors selected to tie together the various components of the entire site. The landscape plan was predominately trees and bioswale in that all water generated would be cleaned up on site. The existing trees were rare specimens of oak from around the world that had been donated partially by Apple Computer. The landscape plan provided shade and lines of viewing into the site for security purposes. The existing lighting of the Greenway path was .4 and four-foot candles and a center area of lighting had been proposed for the community center to provide movement and egress through the entire park. She explained that they believed in the dark sky and did not want overflow lighting into the senior center or the residential areas. The concentration of light would be retained on the property.

Chair Livingston clarified with Ms. Del Bello that warm lighting had been proposed. The Greenway

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

lights would match what the city used. She clarified that the lights would be 2,700K. Fencing had been proposed in a combination of wood fence, brick wall, and ornamental iron fencing on the church parking lot.

DOUGLAS THORNLEY, Goring & Straja Architects, presented the Ohio Avenue elevations, clarified that the structure was one-story not two-story as reported by staff, and explained that the community members had planned an entrance from the park. The existing fence at the main hall would be opened up with transparent wrought iron fencing and a public entrance arch. Each entry point would have a celebratory arch similar to the arch on Harbour Way. He described the main hall surrounded by a kitchen, restroom, staff office, and sporting spaces within, with the main hall to support classes, meetings, parties, events and performances through a partnership with the East Bay Center for the Performing Arts.

Mr. Thornley described the proposed building and stated it had been set back with the retention of the existing wooden fencing for security purposes with transparent wrought iron fencing at the grand south window. The materials would be stucco walls, metal standing roofing and exposed wood framing, windows and doors would be wood with metal cladding, decorative concrete medallions with images inspired by native annals of Richmond, window and door surrounds and a water table constructed of cast concrete. He presented the materials and color palette that would be compatible with neighboring buildings and highlighted the lighting plan of decorative and security lighting.

Ms. Maher reported that the funding for the project had come from a State of California Prop 68 grant and time was of the essence. The hope was to be in construction by next summer with the contract to be finished by 2024.

Vice Chair Carter referred to the meeting hall and verified it would be sited to the west of Ninth Street. He supported the proposal, had nothing further to add, and offered his thanks and congratulations.

Boardmember Butt clarified that the discussion at this time was for a study session and there would eventually be a recommendation from the DRB to the Planning Commission. She supported the project, stated it was going in the right direction, and had nothing further to add.

Boardmember Hook commented that she had visited the site to see the mock-up. She referred to the zip-line area and asked whether any lighting had been proposed in that area.

Mr. Holthuysen explained that the grant had very specific requirements. While it could not fund the lighting for the zip-line, more funding might become available in the future to accommodate that need.

Ms. Maher explained that the development of the park had been done in stages and the funds coming in from state parks would be able to leverage more funding. The desire was to illuminate the entire park. The intent now was to do what needed to be done for the grant requirements and campaign for more money for lighting and fencing and tackle some of the questions about the entry to Harbour 8 Park on Ohio Avenue, address work to slow down traffic, make Ohio Avenue more inviting, and provide a grand entranceway. She asked the DRB to be patient since the work was being done in stages.

Boardmember Leung supported the presentation and the work that had been done, supported the way the community had been engaged, and understood the restrictions related to the grant and the time challenges involved. She also supported the multitude of activities that had been

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

imposed, the effort to be inclusive, and asked about the flooring of the park and whether the design was intentional. She asked if residents would be asked to participate in some of the art pieces. She also recommended that some of the wood benches be replaced with a more durable material.

In response, Ms. Maher stated that all the art work at both Harbour 8 Park and Elm Play Lot had been created by people from the community, which process would continue. She described the efforts to pursue sustainability by using recycled wood to create benches and fences.

Mr. Holthuysen explained that the benches were not off the shelf, they would be designed by the Pogo Park Team and Scientific Art Studio and the benches would be repainted and resealed on an established maintenance schedule. As a result, they would be very durable.

Chair Livingston recommended that the architect be allowed to use a sense of proportion, scale and context and allow more latitude in the project to integrate the building and blend it more into the fencing, landscaping and arrival experience. He emphasized the need for a powerful statement to enhance the visibility of the site. He encouraged the design team to allow the architecture to merge with the elements off of Ohio Avenue and he encouraged a bulb out at the Ninth Street/Ohio Avenue entry arch with landscaping, paving, and colors. He offered a sketch to show his idea and encouraged the design team to blend in the horizontal fencing and arbors and bring the architecture across.

Ms. Maher agreed with the Chair's recommendation, reiterated the restrictions related to the grant, and re-explained that separate efforts would be required to make some of those changes.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

5. PLN21-468	NEVIN PLAZA FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON EXTERIOR FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS OF AN EXISTING 7-STORY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING.
Location	2400 NEVIN AVENUE
APN	515-261-001
Zoning	CM-5 COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, ACTIVITY CENTER
Applicant	RICHMOND HOUSING AUTHORITY (OWNER)
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: PROVIDE / RECEIVE COMMENTS

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated January 12, 2022, for proposed façade improvements to the existing seven-story residential building with 140 affordable units owned by the Richmond Housing Authority (RHA). The applicant was identified as HKIT Architects on behalf of EAH Housing, which had been selected by the City Council to redevelop and manage the operations of Nevin Plaza. She explained that the façade improvements would include a new stucco finish, aluminum dual-pane windows, refined color scheme, material and color changes to emphasize a vertical character, porcelain tile details, cut metal banners, cornice elements, entrance canopy, and ground floor expression of CMU.

Ms. Feliciano reported that on November 15, 2021 the applicant had met with the DRB Subcommittee. The staff report included the DRB's comments to the applicant and the applicant's responses. She responded to questions from the DRB and clarified that the item was a study session, only façade improvements had been proposed at this time, and the project was residential only with an office for RHA staff on the ground floor.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

Chair Livingston requested larger drawings in the future than the 8.5 x 11 inch drawings that had been provided.

BRIAN SWARTZ, EAH Housing, stated that EAH Housing had been meeting with groups such as the North and East Neighborhood Council, the Housing Advisory Commission, and the residents of Nevin Plaza to solicit as much input as possible.

CHRISTOPHE LAVERNE, Principal at HKIT Architects, referred to the comments from the DRB Subcommittee and offered a presentation of the current look of Nevin Plaza. He shared the inspiration of the improvements and explained how the materials, colors and patterns had been proposed to garner interest. He reported that public art would play a role on the overall aesthetic of the building and a public art consultant had been engaged early on in the design process to add cultural interest and add to the fabric of the neighborhood. He explained that the focus was on frieze art and metal screens and HKIT had settled on a scheme that had elicited the most positive responses. The proposed scheme would break down the existing volume. The building was symmetrical with a play of color and contrast, and with other elements such as a metal panel would garner interest and break down the mass.

Mr. Laverne reported that two phases had been proposed. The renovation of the building would be Phase 1 and Phase 2, while a completely separate project that would occur in the future, would incorporate the design of Phase 1. When Phase 2 was developed, there would be a complete renovation in the interior. The rooms would more or less remain the same, although with new finishes throughout, and with fully renovated or new mechanical, electrical, and plumbing to bring the structure up to code. He added that the units on Floors 2 through 7 would be unchanged. Ten percent of the units would be fully accessible and the bathrooms would have to be made larger to bring them up to standard, and four percent of the units would be for the hearing and visually impaired.

STEVE LOVELL, HKIT Architects, described the proposed color scheme. He explained that the building was a combination of flat and split-faced CMU and all of the window units would be upgraded. More interesting finishes had been proposed for the ground floor level with a couple of options. The existing block would be covered with a porcelain tile system or fiber cement panels. He noted that the artwork was currently being evaluated including the use of metal screens in several deep recesses on the ground floor, several with an art panel system. A new cornice element at the front of Nevin Plaza had been proposed to bring more depth to the façade through the use of cut panel screens. Two color palettes had been proposed; one with a cool color palette and one with a warm color palette. There was a desire to provide durable materials throughout. He described the steps that had been taken to add interest to the building and avoid a monotonous finish. The trellis system at the front would also be reduced to provide good visibility into and out of the lobby and a lighter steel structure had been proposed up high with a steel canopy and an improved public entry.

Mr. Lovell described the landscape improvements, referred to the “dirt patches” between the sidewalk edge and the building edge, and explained that the landscape design would come up with a comprehensive overall scheme for the street section as well. He described the improvements on all elevations, noted the same language at the ground floor, the painting patterns at the upper level, and the introduction of vertical metal banners as decorative elements to give some depth to the façade. The elevations were identical but the ground floor would be different to accommodate the entry to the RHA office at the southwest corner of the building.

Mr. Lovell further described the design and responded to previous comments from the DRB Subcommittee, explaining why the stepped terraces and balconies with plantings would not work

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

out. He described the continued theme of the courtyard space with a central interior courtyard and identified a narrow alleyway between the two buildings. Solar was being evaluated for placement on the roof to provide a hot water system.

SALLIE HOLT, Keller Mitchell Landscape Architects, described the courtyard space with an anchoring Chinese elm or coast live oak tree at the center, with vines on the trellis structure in the outdoor seating area, and a concrete loop walk around.

Ms. Holt identified smaller spaces for seating and contemplative spaces with granitecrete paving, and permeable pavers in the center space for multiple uses and informal group gatherings. Along the north side of the courtyard would be an outdoor space for seating with a barbeque off to one side and along the left side of the courtyard space there would be outdoor equipment for seniors to use. The existing black gum street trees would be retained along the perimeter and those replaced would be the same, with smaller-scaled trees along the side. The plants would be kept low on the outside perimeter to increase visibility along the street using durable low water use, low maintenance native plantings. Different paving would be provided at the front entry. She described the pavers that had been proposed in the different spaces, offered an idea for the fountain, and proposed wooden benches for the seat walls or other options, with more durable benches in the front.

Mr. Lovell stated that more comprehensive detail would be provided at a later date for the art pieces. He reiterated the question of the two color palettes, described the materials, and noted that the materials would have an anti-graffiti coating. He referred to the DRB Subcommittee's comments and highlighted their responses to those comments, repeating that all materials would be very durable using cement plaster, stone, CMU or steel, with no wood on the building.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Boardmember Butt verified that the building had been constructed in 1985. She liked the correlation of the stacked block, the connection to City Hall, verified that the artwork shown was a placeholder only and concurred that bringing the art down to the street level was preferred. She wanted to be sure that the art integrated well with the building and the color, especially if it was placed at the street level and made part of the building and not something tacked on. She asked if the CMU was painted and Mr. Lovell stated it was currently painted but had been proposed to be enhanced with porcelain tile to offer a durable finish.

Vice Chair Carter liked the direction of the proposal and expressed a preference for the bronze window mullions instead of the white. On the subject of windows he wanted to maintain the consistency of the wrapped windows at the corners. At the courtyard, he was concerned about the windows on the ground floor and whether the activities in the courtyard could impact the privacy of the indoor spaces.

Mr. Lovell stated there were public spaces on the ground floor of the north building and then office and support spaces to the left.

Vice Chair Carter suggested that the residential patterns above had been copied down and he requested a slight change so that it did not read as private apartments. He asked the architect to be cognizant of that relationship.

Boardmember Hook suggested the hardscape in the landscape plan was better; supported the loop path especially for older folks; and stated the form was nice and the seating was social and flexible. She suggested the edge should be cleaned up in a smooth line. She asked the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

applicants to show the integration of how Phase 2 would come into the landscape design with the next iteration.

Ms. Holt described the proposed plantings for the courtyard and explained that the parking garage was in that area and some sort of screening might need to be considered.

Mr. Lovell added there would be a 10-foot wide alleyway to the south of the greenspace between both properties and a 12-foot high podium of the courtyard of the new building, with some shade cast on the south side of the courtyard during certain times of the year.

Boardmember Hook recommended more flowering plants in the courtyard to bring in more color. She also expressed her support for a warmer tone color palette playing off the Civic Center buildings. She also asked whether the oak could be a 36-inch box or larger for prominence in the courtyard, and Ms. Holt suggested that a 48-inch box could also be considered.

Boardmember Leung asked if there was a desire to create one master plan that would include the approval of Phase 2 now, to be built later, to which Mr. Laverne explained that Phase 2 was conceptual at this time, a separate project, to inform what was being done on Phase 1.

Mr. Swartz clarified that the two projects were separate and would follow different processes.

Boardmember Leung suggested that with Phase 2 being configured to mirror Phase 1 would create some natural lighting issues on the first floor, and she asked if there could be more separation of the two buildings in the future. In general, she liked the yellow, suggested some of the facade read to be monolithic, especially in the courtyard with lots of gray. She wanted to break out the gray and white more and suggested the fiber cement board could be treated with different colors and there could be more emphasis on façade treatment as opposed to tacking on other elements. She wanted to see more articulation in terms of what the art would reflect and sought more emphasis towards the entrance. She asked for a verification of the ADA compliance percentage, asked about lighting on the building and bike racks, and wanted the entrance to be better articulated.

Because of the height and mass of the building, Boardmember Leung recommended that the façade be softened by breaking it up more with colors or with landscaping in varying heights in the courtyard. She sought a more human scale, friendly, and general. She liked the landscaping, stated the cornices looked like ornamentation being tacked onto the building, and would rather the façade be treated with materiality and different patterns. She stated the proposal would represent a great improvement to the neighborhood. She also expressed concern for the actual usage, daylighting needs, residents' experiences on the lower levels and the impact of Phase 2 both inside the courtyard and living in the units on the lower levels, and whether it made sense to do the exact same thing with Phase 2.

Chair Livingston objected to the painted CMU and recommended that the porcelain tile be brought down to the ground floor at the street level since it would be easy to keep clean, be durable, and offered a crisp look. He liked the way the vertical cornice had been used to break up the massing.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

There were no staff reports, requests, or announcements.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 26, 2022

There were no Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:42 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, January 26, 2022.