

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

February 9, 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 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt,* and Michelle Hook
*Arrived after Roll Call

Absent: Boardmember Macy Leung

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Lydia Elias and Hector Lopez, and Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 8, 2021 and January 26, 2022

Chair Livingston noted some needed corrections to the December 8, 2021 minutes, which would be returned to a later meeting for consideration.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2022 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

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

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC [Trails for Richmond Action Committee], reported that since its opening in November 2019 there had been 180,000 bicycle trips across the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge. He reported that Marin Municipal Water District was backing off the placement of a pipeline on the bridge pending a more thorough study. He added that lots of people were using the bridge to enjoy Richmond's necklace of 12 shoreline parks along the Bay Trail.

By email: CORDELL HINDLER: "Good evening Chair Livingston, Board Members and staff, I do have a couple of comments for the record: 1. The Mayor has mentioned the Design Review Board at the January 25th Council meeting. 2. I must remind the Board that any projects upon approval, the applicant MUST contact the Neighborhood Council President to schedule a presentation. Sincerely, Cordell."

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE

Any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Tuesday, February 22, 2022 by 5:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1.	PLN20-091	LOWERY NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE
	Description	(CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 12, 2022) 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 36 TH 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

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated February 9, 2022 for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,400 square foot two-story dwelling on a ±2,594 square-foot parcel that had been created by a Planning Commission approved small-lot subdivision in April 2020. The proposed new dwelling would include two bedrooms, two and one-half bathrooms, office, living area, and kitchen. A ±200 square foot one-car garage had been proposed with an additional parking space provided in the driveway. The project complied with the zoning requirements in terms of height, setback, parking, minimum lot coverage and the like. The DRB had reviewed the project on May 26, 2021 and had received comments from adjoining neighbors related to the design, in particular that the proposal was out of scale in the context of the street which was predominately one-story or one-and-a half story homes, the massing and setbacks were considered to be inappropriate along the street, and a two-story building would block sunlight to the adjacent buildings.

The DRB had directed the applicant to provide additional information, such as a shadow study and landscape plan, to further engage the community, and to also consider other changes to the design such as providing a window along the side of the entry door, simplifying the entry porch rather than having an angle, unifying the window dimensions, and modifying the interior of the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

garage.

Mr. Lopez stated the building was well balanced, had been decreased in size, complied with all requirements, and certain elements had been incorporated. He recommended approval of the application.

DIANE LOWERY, the property owner, described the background to her purchase of 550 36th Street, which she had redeveloped. She stated that development was three-stories, had been developed in the same kind of plan proposed for the subject lot to the south, and the home had improved the neighborhood. She described the changes that had been made to the subject parcel to cut back the upstairs, which was behind the garage and not close to the street. She had also made changes to the landscape plan. The plans had been revised, the proposal would improve the lot, and she urged the approval of the application to allow construction to commence.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Ms. Elias again identified the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

GREGORY WALSTON, serving as private counsel for objecting neighbors, identified his presence at the meeting.

ANH TRINH, 540 36th Street, Richmond, commented that she had not been aware of the current hearing and described how she had learned of the hearing. She objected to the design of the building given that it was two stories in a primarily one-story neighborhood, and because there would be two big windows on the second floor that would overlook her property and reduce the privacy of her home.

STEPHEN KIRKISH, 535 36th Street, Richmond, commented that he lived diagonally across the street from the home and had a clear view of the property. He had submitted a detailed letter dated December 22, 2021 objecting to the proposal. He disagreed that there were three-story buildings in the area and described those buildings as split level with the lower level at grade, lower than the current proposal. He stated the proposal harmed the charm of the street by being out of scale, breaking the continuity. He disagreed with the staff report and stated the current design did not comply with the current Zoning Ordinance given the small lot where the second floor had to be five feet away from the property line instead of the three feet and four feet shown in the plans. He referred specifically to Table 15.04.201.030; Section 15.04-201.080(c); and Table 15.04.201.080 in the residential section of the City's current Zoning Ordinance. He suggested it was feasible for a one-story home on that parcel and noted that the applicant had on March 21 and 23, 2021 submitted a proposal for a one-story home that met code. He urged the DRB to consider a one-story building for the parcel.

MI NGUYEN, 540 36th Street, Richmond, advised that a detailed letter had been submitted to the DRB given concerns that the revised design of a two-story home on a narrow lot was out of proportion and not compatible with the neighborhood, that the implementation of the project would create impacts to privacy and light, and that neighbors had not received information about the project prior to the current meeting.

ROMEIKA EDWARDS and MICHAEL GRANGER, 550 36th Street, Richmond, noted that he lived in the home built by Ms. Lowery earlier referenced. He stated that he had not received notice of the meetings that had taken place nor those that had been rescheduled. He commented that the plans had changed repeatedly. He also noted that his letter had not been included in the public

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

record.

Mr. Granger reported he had been told at the time of the purchase of his home that the development of the subject lot would be for a single-story home for the property owner's daughter. He urged the applicant to meet with the neighborhood to be able to address all the concerns. He supported the construction of a smaller home.

KEVIN KEMP referred to 15 letters of opposition sent to the DRB about the proposal. From his understanding, the neighbors did not object to the development of a home on the property. At the time the Planning Commission had approved the small-lot subdivision, the applicant had proposed a low, one-story building no more than 15 feet in height. He read into the record some emails sent to neighbors by the applicant objecting to the neighbors' objections to the proposal and emphasized the need for the applicant to meet with neighbors to address the concerns.

KASEY and KRIS _____, 530 36th Street, Richmond, commented that the neighbors' frustration stemmed from the Planning Commission's review of the small-lot subdivision and the applicant's statement at that time that a one-story home would be constructed. She stated that the North and East Neighborhood Council had cautioned residents against objections to the lot given the need for affordable housing, although what the applicant had since proposed would not be affordable. She stated that she had submitted two letters to the DRB.

JAN MIGNONE, President of the North and East Neighborhood Council, noted that Ms. Lowery had asked to come to one of their meetings and she had requested the drawings of the property but had never received them from Ms. Lowery. It was also her understanding that a small one-story home was to have been developed on the property. She noted the applicant's unwillingness to work with the neighborhood, supported the neighbors, and emphasized the need for a home compatible with the neighborhood.

JOHN PENBERTHY, 555 36th Street, Richmond, stated he had submitted a letter on December 22, 2021 and had considered the proposed construction an abomination in that filling a 2,500 square foot lot with a two-story residence was out of character with the neighborhood. He referred to an exhibit in the staff report of a similar two-story home on a similarly small lot on 37th Street and stated that home ruined the character of that block and impacted the neighbors with a loss of sun, views, and privacy. He did not believe the proposal met the City's requirements in that it did not fit within the neighborhood.

NILES _____, identified himself as Ms. Lowery's son, was sad to hear about the neighbors' frustrations. He noted that when his mother had developed 550 36th Street, replacing a house with squatters and upgrading the lot had benefitted the neighbors and the neighborhood. He noted that the house for the subject lot had been redesigned in response to the neighbors and the subject proposal would provide a beautiful home on the lot and improve the neighborhood. He did not believe there would be any loss of sun to adjacent properties.

THERESE CASPER, 535 36th Street, Richmond, reported that she had attended the Zoom meeting to determine whether or not the parcel could be subdivided when a variance had been approved to allow the parcel to be 25 feet wide as opposed to 30 feet wide in order to place the one-story home. She suggested a two-story home was now trying to be shoe-horned into the already smaller than normal lot.

In response to the Chair who had referenced the comment related to Table 15.04.201.080 for small lots where a one story would have a zero setback but for the second and third stories there would be a 5-foot setback, Mr. Lopez affirmed that a variance had been involved with the creation

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

of the small-lot subdivision and the issues related to setbacks had to be addressed given that the plan would not work if the setbacks were not appropriate.

Boardmember Butt clarified for the speakers that the DRB had received the letters submitted to the DRB.

In response to the comments from the neighbors that no noticing had been provided, Mr. Lopez explained that the application had been continued from the January 12, 2022 DRB meeting. There was no re-notification when an application was continued, although the neighbors had all previously been noticed and there had been a notice in front of the property. He explained that later on the applicant had requested a postponement of the meeting and the application had then been continued.

The section of the code in question was clarified that for a single-story there would be a zero setback and second and third story portions would require a 5-foot setback. It was also clarified that the proposed setback was 4 feet on the garage side and 3 feet on the other side.

Chair Livingston requested that the testimony from the Planning Commission meeting at the time of the small-lot development be provided.

To better understand the applicant's shadow studies the DRB stated it would be helpful to distinguish which shadows were being cast by which structure, that the studies be in color, with justification of how the massing was being distributed based on the shadow studies, and with studies with and without the building.

There was DRB consensus to continue the application to the next meeting to ensure the appropriate data involved and to ensure the correctness of the setbacks, with staff to research the applicable information and make sure that everyone was being treated fairly, with the item to return at the next DRB meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to continue PLN20-091, Lowery New Single-Family Residence, to the meeting on February 23, 2022, with staff to research the appropriate data involved and the correctness of the setbacks, and with the changes to the shadow studies, as noted; approved by a voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)

2. PLN21-050	DUKE RICHMOND INDUSTRIAL BUILDING
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±154,000 SQUARE-FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE INCLUDING OFFICES AND MEZZANINE SPACE, AND FOR SITE IMPROVEMENTS CONSISTING OF PARKING AND LANDSCAPING AREAS ON A 7.94-ACRE PARCEL.
Location	731 WEST CUTTING BOULEVARD
APN	550-030-007
Zoning	IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Owner	AIR REDUCTION CO. INC.
Applicant	RANDY DILAG FOR DUKE REALTY
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated February 9, 2022, for a Design Review Permit to construct a light industrial warehouse that would include offices and mezzanine space, and site

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

improvements consisting of parking and landscaping areas with street frontage on Canal and West Cutting Boulevards, with the Interstate 580 entry ramp located along the northern boundary of the site, elevated up to 30 feet above the ground level of the site.

Mr. Lopez reported that the site was surrounded by light industrial/warehouse uses, a gas station, a hotel, a research and development park and a parking lot for the Richmond Yacht Club. The DRB had conducted a study session for the project on February 24, 2021, and provided comments on the design. Some of the issues raised by the DRB was the site's prominent location near the Point Richmond Historic District and at a busy freeway entrance. While the site was not designated within a Gateway or Community Node, staff and the DRB found that the street intersection of West Cutting and Canal Boulevards should incorporate some aspects of a Node, such as a welcoming corner for the building's entry. Given the long façade of the building, which was the major entry into the city, the corner of West Cutting and Canal Boulevards had been changed to include large store windows and a change of materials.

Mr. Lopez stated that pursuant to environmental review, a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study (MND/IS) had been prepared for the project. The review period had extended from December 13, 2021 to January 14, 2022, and the applicant had agreed to incorporate all of the mitigation measures. While most of the measures would not affect the design of the project, the most significant impacts required that a qualified environmental professional prepare a Site Management Plan prior to any earthwork on the site. He outlined the steps to be taken during demolition, construction, and grading to minimize potential exposure to contaminated soils. Some of the mitigation measures related to traffic and the traffic consultant had recommended further improvements to the design, such as changing the location of the driveway on Canal Boulevard to be farther away from the freeway entrance and extending the center turn lane on West Cutting Boulevard to provide adequate storage for trucks entering the project site.

Mr. Lopez stated the project included significant landscaping, would contribute to the street and would be a welcome project in the City. He recommended approval of the project.

Chair Livingston explained that the applicant and the development team had worked with the DRB for a while and had not hesitated to incorporate the DRB's comments.

DREW HESS, Senior Vice President of Duke Realty, introduced Janet Galvez to make the presentation.

JANET GALVEZ, Vice President of Leasing and Development, Duke Realty Northern California Portfolio, stated the project would signify a new development standard for Class A Industrial Development in the community. The building was a representation of the partnership approach to a long-term strategic partnership with the City. She described the background of Duke Realty which owned, developed, and managed industrial space across the United States, a long-term ownership group with dedicated partnerships with the communities in which it did business.

RANDY DILAG, Development Services Manager, Duke Realty, the project applicant, highlighted the initial submittal of the application in December 2020 and the work since that time engaging with the City, the community, the DRB and the Point Richmond and Santa Fe Neighborhood Councils, with the main focus to learn of the things most important to the residents of the City from a redevelopment standpoint.

THERESA GOODWIN, HPA Architects, provided the overall context of the site and the work that had been done to respond to the comments from the DRB related to design, with the creation of

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

an angular design inspired by the location with a strong red brick to anchor the building at the prominent southwest West Cutting and Canal Boulevards. She described how the building fit in with the uses surrounding the site where concrete (some without paint) and glazing had been used throughout the design and where the landscaping had now been enhanced throughout the site.

TYNICE BYER, Project Manager, HPA Architects, explained how the design had been revised to show a connection between the surrounding areas and the proposed building and included a pedestrian link, particularly at the prominent corner of West Cutting and Canal Boulevards. She reported that the natural diagonal line formed from the intersection and the prominent corner had been extended through the site to a proposed pedestrian plaza where a wide monumental stair had been proposed to reinforce the connectivity of the entry, the prominent corner and the pedestrian plaza. She presented the materials board and explained that inspiration had been taken from the surrounding historical neighborhoods through the use of brick, steel and concrete. She also presented the building elevations and highlighted how the rear of the building adjacent to the highway ramp had been enhanced along with the entry of the building to celebrate the surrounding neighborhoods.

SEAN TAYLOR, HMH Landscape, explained how the corner pedestrian plaza had been created to tie the architecture to the site and to enhance the prominent corner/intersection inspired by the harbor and the local industrial vibe. He stated the landscape plan had focused on safety and security with a low-to-the-ground planting scheme and with adequate site lighting allowing views through the site. The plaza utilized decorative paving for circulation through the space with low walls for definition. Raised planters and at grade planting areas highlighted the plaza with low water use and climate appropriate planting schemes. Trees had been selected to provide scale to the plaza and tie in with the landscape with higher canopies allowing for clear sightlines through the site for safety. To anchor the plaza a centralized sculptural mast with decorative flags paid homage to the nearby harbor. On the greater site, the landscaping would buffer any unwanted views of parking and break up building expanse with evergreen trees. Stormwater treatment would also be utilized on the site. The goal of the improvements to the corner and the site would be to define and add to the placemaking of the local community.

JANET GALVEZ stated that the project team was very proud of the design. She thanked the DRB for pushing them to create a one-of-a-kind design with intent and meaning. For sustainability and community benefits electric vehicle (EV) charging stations and solar panels would be provided and the building would be Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver. The plaza design allowed connectivity and pedestrian access and would also provide an on-site wall mural for community benefit.

Boardmember Butt verified with the development team that the brick (a thin brick with mortar in between) wall was estimated at 12 inches in width with a concrete structure in between and included a two-story sense of glass with a two-story office behind. Next to that would be concrete with metal siding above. She was pleased with the revised plan.

Boardmember Hook verified with the applicant the materiality of the concrete walkways, a combination of concrete and pavers with a planting scheme and raised planter in the center of the circle. She stated the planting plan was a huge improvement. With respect to the planting along the freeway edge now shown with Monterey cypress, she expressed a potential fire concern and recommended poplars or redwoods, which had been used elsewhere in the area along the freeway edge. She also recommended larger box size date palms in the plan.

Mr. Taylor stated the Monterey cypress had been selected given the climate and the fact the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

species was evergreen but he was open to other species in that area.

Vice Chair Carter was impressed with the design that would be a great addition to the City. He referred to West Cutting Boulevard and a number of exit stairs and asked how the surface of the concrete stair screen would be articulated. He verified with the development team the intent that the same board form concrete would be all around the building at the stairs.

Vice Chair Carter also asked about the light fixtures at the exit doors and recommended something to positively accentuate the building rather than looking tacked on.

Chair Livingston commended the well-composed design and commended the applicant and his team for the willingness to work with the DRB to produce a better project.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

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

ISRAEL ABULA, representing Carpenters Local #132 in Contra Costa County, which represented 3,800 members, supported Duke Realty which had made a commitment to use responsible general contractors who paid livable wages, provided healthcare for their workers and supported a joint labor management apprenticeship program that would offer an opportunity for a career. He asked the DRB to also support the application.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, stated there was a lot of bicycle traffic in the bike lanes on each side of West Cutting Boulevard going to and from the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge Trail and the City had contracted with W.R. Forde to build a two-way protected bikeway from the Richmond/San Francisco Ferry Terminal on Hoffman and Cutting Boulevards, extending to Garrard Boulevard on the opposite side of the street from the warehouse. He reported that Duke Realty would pay a fair share cost of building the bikeway, which had been raised from the \$75,000 originally committed by Duke Realty to \$112,000 due to a 50 percent higher than expected cost for the West Cutting Boulevard section. Duke Realty had agreed to pay half the additional amount and he requested an additional condition of approval that *Within 30 days of the date of issuance of the Design Review Permit for the project, Duke Realty shall make a \$93,500 fair share payment to the City of Richmond for the purpose of implementing the Ferry to Bridge to Greenway Complete Streets Plan.*

LISA JOHNSON supported the new improved design and asked about the final lighting plan to avoid glare to adjacent properties, and any improvements to the left turn lane (only) from Canal onto West Cutting Boulevard, with the other two lanes to go straight.

DOUG LEMOINE, Laborers Local #324, supported the project and all the work that had gone into it, particularly from Tynice Byer, a local architect who was a part of the development team. He asked the DRB to support the project.

LINDA WHITMORE, Community Outreach for the Santa Fe Neighborhood Council, explained that Duke Realty had made presentations to the Council, had heard comments and had responded to questions from the community and had incorporated some of the comments into the development proposal, which included a community mural. She supported the hiring from local trades and urged the patronage of local businesses. The Santa Fe Neighborhood Council strongly supported the application as a benefit to the Santa Fe community. She asked where the community mural would be located and asked what would be done to the solid wall on the West Cutting Boulevard side of the building.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

Ms. Goodwin responded to questions and presented renderings of the simple, industrial angular black light that would be used at the exit doors, which would be cast down. Given the desire for a mural, the architectural team had proposed white panels with reveals as a placeholder and had loved them but were prepared to trade those out for murals. She pointed out areas where murals could be placed on all sides of the building or which could be placed on just the West Cutting Boulevard side.

Vice Chair Carter recommended a light fixture with a fully shielded face that cast light up and down.

ERIC HAINES, Business Representative for Sheet Metal Workers Local #104, and Delegate to the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council, expressed strong support for the Duke Realty light industrial warehouse which would be a significant improvement to what currently existed at the site and which would provide work opportunities for local tradespersons that would get benefit from the best pay and training available to local construction workers with standard benefits for those from Richmond and surrounding areas.

JESSE PERALES, a carpenter who supported the Duke Realty application stated it was projects like this and Richmond Build that would allow Richmond residents to work in their own backyard. When asked, he noted that there were over 400 carpenters in Richmond.

NICK GOODWIN, Assistant Business Manager for Plumbers and Steamfitters Local #159, expressed strong support for the Duke Realty project that would offer great improvements to an existing site, local hire opportunities for Richmond, and construction jobs with apprenticeship opportunities for Richmond's youth, women, veterans, and the rehabilitated to build a pathway to the middle class. He urged the DRB to support the project.

MARK PLUBELL, Business Representative for Heat and Frost Insulators Local #16, offered his support to Duke Realty and its endeavor. Representing members from Monterey to Humboldt Counties he was pleased and surprised to see that everyone was on board for the project. He stated that Duke Realty had been a proven community partner, built aesthetically pleasing buildings, and offered long-term jobs. He urged the approval of the project.

BILL WHITNEY, representing 35,000 members of the Contra Costa Building and Construction Trades Council, stated that a letter of support had been submitted weeks ago and the support remained. He commended Duke Realty for reaching out to working men and women and stated that they had come to an agreement with Duke Realty on a Letter of Intent and a draft Project Labor Agreement (PLA), which aligned with the City of Richmond's citywide PLA. He stated that veterans would receive benefit as would local hire, apprenticeships and training. He looked forward to working with Duke Realty and thanked them for working with the Building and Construction Trades.

Ms. Byer presented some cross sections that the Chair had requested to respond to comments. The first cross section was through the portal and how the canopy rested on a decorative column at the concrete wall and at the portal wall. The second cross section was at the balcony to show the canopy over the balcony and the support columns. The third was at the second canopy. Further detail of that portal wall had been called out with thin brick on both sides of the wall, with the front and back of the wall both to be consistent in design with a C-channel at the top of the wall and also at the opening of the wall, as well as at the opening where you would go through the portal to the main entry. It would all be steel and would be painted a dark peppercorn color. There was a desire to match the cover of the fake column a peppercorn as well. All guardrails would be steel and painted a peppercorn color and the masonry corners would come as a solid

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

corner piece. A plan view of the canopies was also presented.

Chair Livingston stated it was important that those details became part of the record.

When asked, Ms. Byer described the spandrel glass and the vision glass, stated the colors would be about the same, and pointed out where the different glass would be located.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN21-050, Duke Richmond Industrial Building; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval; and additional DRB conditions as follows: 12) In addition to the plans dated February 3, 2022 there were additional clarifications submitted and discussed dated February 9, 2022, which had been presented by Tynice Byer and Theresa Goodwin of HPA Architects and included materials, colors and sectional clarifications; 13) The modification of the light fixture specified above the doors with an up or down sconce fully shielded on its face, LED to be no brighter than 3,000K; 14) Encourage the largest possible palms attainable but no smaller than 48-inch box; 15) Substitute the cypress trees along the freeway to *Sequoia sempervirens*; 16) The front standing brick faced wall to be no less than 12 inches in thickness; and 17) Within 30 days of the date of issuance of the Design Review Permit for the project, Duke Realty shall make a \$93,500 fair share payment to the City of Richmond for the purpose of implementing the Ferry to Bridge to Greenway Complete Streets Plan; approved by a voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)

3. PLN21-327	QUARRY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT REDESIGN
Description	MAJOR MODIFICATION OF APPROVED PLANNED AREA PLAN TO REDUCE OVERALL NUMBER OF UNITS FROM 193 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS TO 76 SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED UNITS AND DESIGN REVIEW FOR SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSE PLANS. THE PROJECT ALSO INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR A VESTING TENTATIVE MAP TO SUBDIVIDE THE LOT INTO 76 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS AND 7 COMMON-INTEREST LOTS.
Location	1135 CANAL BOULEVARD
APN	560-330-043
Zoning	PA, PLANNED AREA DISTRICT
Owner	RICHMOND COVE 1 LLC
Applicant	NEW WEST COMPANY
Staff Contact	LINA VELASCO
	Recommendation: CONTINUE TO A FUTURE MEETING

The application was continued to a future meeting.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

There were none.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Livingston asked about the status of the proposed separate meeting that had been proposed to discuss the form-based code as opposed to meeting jointly with the Planning

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 23, 2022

Commission on that subject. By a straw poll, DRB members expressed a preference for a separate meeting to discuss the form-based code.

Chair Livingston updated the status of the Terminal One and 12th and Macdonald projects.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, February 23, 2022.