

# MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

February 23, 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, Michelle Hook, and Macy Leung

**Absent:** None

### INTRODUCTIONS

**Staff Present:** Planner Roberta Feliciano, and Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** December 8, 2021 and February 9, 2022

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

**ACTION:** It was M/S/C (Hook/Butt) to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2022 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

### 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.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

By email: CORDELL HINDLER: "Good evening Chair Livingston, Board Members and staff. I have some comments for the record. 1. I am reminding the Board that any projects being considered, the applicant MUST communicate with the applicable neighborhood Council. 2. I have a couple of people in mind to fill the vacancies. 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 Monday, March 7, 2022 by 5:00 P.M.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

<b>1. PLN21-468</b>	<b>NEVIN PLAZA FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW FOR 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
Owner/Applicant	RICHMOND HOUSING AUTHORITY
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated February 23, 2022, for façade improvements to Nevin Plaza, an existing 7-story residential building with 140 affordable units that was currently managed by the Richmond Housing Authority. She explained that the City Council had selected EAH Housing to develop and manage the operations of Nevin Plaza. Proposed façade improvements to the existing building included 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 concrete masonry units (CMUs). Design review was required for all projects requiring a permit for new construction or alteration.

Ms. Feliciano explained that the DRB had considered the project during a study session on January 12, 2022 when a number of comments had been offered. She identified those comments along with the responses from the applicant. Based on the applicant's responses and modifications to the plan, she recommended approval of the project subject to conditions. She added that the North and East Neighborhood Council had provided a letter of support.

BRIAN SWARTZ, a Cascade consultant representing EAH Housing, explained that EAH Housing had been providing affordable housing for over 50 years. He described the collaboration with the community on the project and noted that the presentation to be made would respond to every DRB comment.

CHRISTOPHE LAVERNE, Principal at HKIT Architects, presented a Phase 1 renovation project that would completely renovate the existing building with all new finishes throughout, seismic retrofitting and new mechanical, electrical and plumbing along with numerous improvements to the exterior, which were intended to enliven the building's appearance and its presence in the Richmond Civic Center neighborhood while respecting the building's symmetry.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

Mr. Laverne detailed the scope of improvements which included a new cement plaster coating over the existing CMU, color and material changes, porcelain tile cladding, new aluminum retrofit dual-pane windows and storefront, controlled integration of public art at eye level, laser cut metal screens on ground level, laser cut metal sunshades at select upper story windows, plaster cornices, deeper cornices along Nevin Avenue, steel canopy and trellises, landscaping, courtyard design and outdoor terraces, along with a new lighting plan for additional safety.

STEVE LOVELL, HKIT Architects, presented the floor plan and noted that it had not changed in terms of layout since the study session and consisted of public common spaces on the first floor along with offices for the Richmond Housing Authority and two staff apartments. The tenant units started at Level 2 and went up to Level 7. He referred to one of the DRB's comments and the number of tenant spaces that would be on the ground floor facing the courtyard and confirmed there were only two and they were staff apartments. He stated the floor plan included an integration of a more comprehensive landscape plan.

Chair Livingston referred to a stairway that would reportedly integrate with the courtyard, and Mr. Lovell explained that the stairway would be part of Phase 2 that would come on line at some point in the future. Plan 2 was currently in design with no determination at this point as to whether it would be an internal or an external stair.

Mr. Laverne stated the preference would be to have an exterior stair that physically connected the lower courtyard with the upper courtyard, with the landing of the stair to align with the entrance to the lower courtyard.

Mr. Lovell reported there would be no change to the courtyard landscaping and there would be a common zone between the two buildings that would serve as an outdoor egress pathway for the stairs coming down from the upper levels of Phase 1 and exiting to the left and to the right along 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> Streets. The building would sit behind that setback zone and there would be some elements like the stair and some doorways that would exit some common areas on the ground floor of Phase 2. He referred to Level 7 where some landscaping on an outdoor terrace had been proposed, stated the building stepped back from the courtyard and from Nevin at the upper level, and described where the sunshade and banners would be located on the façades.

Mr. Lovell highlighted the comments that had been provided by the DRB and reported that the warm color scheme had been selected, the corner expression of the windows where the metal wrapped around the window jambs at all corners would be maintained, the cornices would be built out of a plaster finish, the mural would be visible to the public eye, the art would be considered a frieze primarily along Nevin Avenue but could extend to 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> Streets, the team was currently in the artist selection process, decorative panels would sit within the cut metal screens on some of the ground floor openings, the porcelain finishes would be in the center of the building in a warm color to also be used as a building finish and in the courtyard, there would be a two-color system for the building walls, and the windows would be dark bronze.

Chair Livingston referred to the steel entry canopy and asked if a Trespa wooden soffit could be inserted.

Mr. Lovell explained that a metal panel system that appeared to be wood was preferred. He noted that a membrane roof would be put on the roof of that element so that it would not be open to the elements.

Chair Livingston recommended that a similar simulated wood element be included on the back

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

courtyard to add warmth to the design.

The applicant's team supported the suggestion to incorporate a wood element.

On the discussion, it was clarified that the art component had not yet been determined and a range of designs in different locations would likely be provided. It was also noted that a variety of color and detail would help soften the façade as requested by the DRB and that the different facades and spaces in the building would further help soften the appearance.

Mr. Lovell described the warm color scheme of red, gold, orange, copper and rust colors. Red for the steel element entry canopies in the courtyard along with other locations and gold, copper and rust colors as accent colors. He identified the size and scale of the tile elements and noted that the existing CMU block walls, where maintained, would be painted to match the final stone color. Dark bronze would be used for replacement windows and storefront systems. He also highlighted the lighting plan and the LED ceiling-mounted fixtures that would be mounted into the new canopies at the entrance and at the trellis in a dark bronze finish. A decorative light fixture had been proposed along the building facades at all the major pilasters. A couple of fixtures that had been part of the original building had been found and would be used all along the building facades at the column locations. Within the areas along the back where security lighting was needed a similar wall fixture would be used and be mounted higher on the wall.

Mr. Lovell identified a thin modern pole with a canopy that would light the courtyard space, and in the frieze areas a wall wash product would include LED tape-light fixtures that would provide illumination to the mural. He referred to tall pole fixtures and decorative fixtures along Nevin Avenue and stated there were no light poles or fixtures along 24<sup>th</sup> or 25<sup>th</sup> Streets, which was why the wall fixtures had been proposed to spill onto the landscaping and the walkway for security purposes.

With respect to the courtyard in the rear, Mr. Lovell stated a larger specimen tree, as requested, would be planted and the landscape architect had added more trees within the courtyard, using trees to carry the color from the stone tile as a base into the ground floor. He noted the recesses only occurred on the west side, and the doorways underneath the trellises would allow possibilities for bringing in the wood material.

SALLIE HOLT, Keller Mitchell Landscape Architects, explained that there would be special paving at the top near the front entry with some seating and similar color at the front entry with low plantings, especially around the streetscapes for visibility with proposed new street trees along the sides. An arborist would review the existing street trees. The proposal was to replace the ground level planting below the trees with decomposed granite paving. Some color would be added in the courtyard. The center tree in the courtyard would be a 48-inch box specimen *Quercus agrifolia*. The walkway would be realigned on the right and a screen along the south side of the court had been added to screen the walkway between the two phases.

Ms. Holt explained that the existing trees would be retained along Nevin Avenue, or if in need of replacement would be replaced with the same species. Some of the smaller courtyard trees would be flowering dogwood, crepe myrtle or other street tree. She described the colorful front entry planting that had been proposed with low ground cover and reiterated the intent to keep the streetscape planting low, with low-maintenance plantings. The two sweet gum trees on the two ends of the court building would be replaced with a smaller variety that would provide visibility through. She added that some colorful plants could be planted in the window wells along the streetscape sides that were inset into the building, appropriate to the shaded area. With respect to the use of wood or simulated wood elements, she referred to seating areas that could include a wood element.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

Mr. Lovell presented the initial concept for Phase 2 that would be a U-shaped courtyard building facing the courtyard of the Phase 1 building. He pointed out the conceptual passageway and stair, with the courtyard to be above a podium with ground floor parking. Entry B had been proposed on the east side of the building with administrative offices for staff, a game or library room, and the potential to get into the building from Phase 1 on the ground level with secure gates on both ends to provide security for the internal spaces of the building. He emphasized that the plan had yet to be fully developed.

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

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

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

Vice Chair Carter supported the revisions to the plan and spoke to the lighting plan and the F-5 lighting fixture which he suggested had been missed on the plan, although Mr. Lovell explained that the F-5 fixture would be located where the frieze would be located, which was currently unknown given the need to work with the artist and the budget. He suggested the frieze artwork in that case might be limited to Nevin Avenue wrapped around the corners.

Vice Chair Carter supported the wrapping of the corner column to help make the transition and integrate the frieze with the architectural massing. He liked the LED strip used to highlight the friezes and agreed with the need to include wood or wood-like material for the entry canopy, suggesting that the steel worked much better with the massing of the posts and adding the soffit on the interior would not lose the sense of lightness.

Boardmember Leung liked the improvements and the color segments to break up the massing and to humanize the scale. As to what would be in between the recesses, she was told that would depend on the pockets and that the landscaping in those locations of the window wells would be visible from the interior in most cases.

Ms. Holt explained that shade-tolerant plantings had been proposed in those areas, although it might make sense to place gravel for maintenance purposes in areas where the landscaping might not be visible from the inside.

Boardmember Leung liked the lighting plan, the art panels and the courtyard along with the warmer color scheme. She wanted to make sure that the top floor was captured properly in terms of fencing. With respect to the front façade, she asked that the signage be a more defined color than just white. As to the area of the two tower-like elements on either side of the entry, Mr. Lovell clarified that was a rendering issue and that area could be painted the same as the color below.

Boardmember Butt also stated the revisions represented an improvement. She supported warm wood under the canopy as recommended by Chair Livingston. She also commented that she had a hard time understanding the artwork.

Mr. Laverne clarified with respect to the art component that they were trying to control what the art would do to the architectural vocabulary. He described how the art proposals would be considered and explained that once the art on the mural was identified it could then be determined how the colors would work together in that the frieze on the element might change the opinion of

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

the red that had been proposed.

Boardmember Butt liked the red because it was a good tie-in to the red brick of the City Hall down the street.

Boardmember Hook verified the lighting plan for the pathways and asked about lighting for the fountain, to which Mr. Lovell explained that in the next phase of work they would be working with the lighting engineers to do all the calculations for the light levels and work with the landscape architect with respect to any kind of specialty lighting in the courtyard, such as near the fountain. He explained that the height of the light poles in the courtyard had been proposed to provide safe and secure background low lighting, particularly for the older population.

Boardmember Hook requested that the trellis include exterior heating to allow the use of the barbeque area during cold weather, and Mr. Laverne commented that while that had never been done in the affordable developments he had been associated with, he would look into that request given the senior population involved.

Boardmember Hook commended the landscape plan and noted that since nothing could be planted under the large oak tree, she recommended the use of 6-inch Sonoma Valley basalt cobbles in tones of tans, reds, and grays, to help inform the paving material. She also referred to the location of the oak tree and the circular bench that cut into the planting somewhat and suggested that the tree be shifted to the south to allow walking all the way around.

Ms. Holt suggested that some low water plants could be planted under the oak and they could look into Boardmember Hook's suggestion for cobbles.

Chair Livingston supported all the comments and thanked the development team for a great job. He closed the public hearing.

Chair Livingston noted that the frieze was a major element and a discussion ensued about where the team anticipated mounting the LED strip, reported by Mr. Lovell that could be placed either at the bottom or the top and the miniature LED lights could be adjusted accordingly. It was his understanding the art would need to be anchored to the wall on a series of channels.

Mr. Laverne displayed a graphic to show that the frieze would stand proud of the façade and be attached directly through the new cement plaster into the CMU block standing proud of the wall by an inch and a half. He spoke to other options for attaching the frieze to the building and explained that until the art had been identified it would be difficult to say how that artwork would be installed.

Chair Livingston emphasized the importance of the details in that how the art was attached to the building would identify whether or not it would read as a frieze in that it could be an application of art as opposed to a frieze. The various ways the artwork could be attached to be a frieze were discussed at which time Mr. Laverne agreed that the artwork would have to be integrated into the architecture and how that would be achieved had yet to be determined.

Boardmember Leung clarified that Phase 2 was not part of the approval.

Chair Livingston made a motion, seconded by Boardmember Butt to approve PLN21-468, with seven additional conditions to the 17 conditions recommended by staff, one of which was Condition 23: *Add electric overhead heater to the trellis area in the rear to keep the tenants warm in cold winter.*

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

Mr. Swartz agreed to comply with all the conditions with the exception of Condition 23 given the budget available for the affordable housing development.

Rather than requiring the heater, Boardmember Hook urged the development team to look into the possibility of providing a heater in the trellis area.

Chair Livingston amended his motion.

**ACTION: AMENDED MOTION M/S/C (Livingston/Hook) to approve PLN21-468, Nevin Plaza Façade Improvements; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 17 Conditions of Approval; and additional DRB conditions as follows: 18) Amendments to Exhibit A to add a wooden soffit (Trespa or equal), architects to select color to match interior to the soffits at the entry, to the four small soffits in the courtyard behind the arbor, and to the other smaller recesses also in the courtyard; 19) The frieze art to feel integral to the architecture and the design team will submit to staff their drawings for staff to review based on the Board’s discussion; 20) F-5 strip lighting shall be placed wherever the frieze art is located, the light to be directed upwards and wrap the corner to help integrate the architecture; 21) Define color at tower (See Page 7 of plans), bring sand color to top of tower roof; 22) F-3 light shall be replaced with F-4 on Page 13; 23) Best effort shall be made to include electric heater trellis overhead; and 24) Move the location of oak tree four feet south in courtyard; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

A five-minute break was taken at this time.

<b>2. PLN21-019</b>	<b>RICHMOND YACHT CLUB – WEST LOT</b>	
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR DESIGN REVIEW OF SITE IMPROVEMENTS TO A 24,394 SQUARE-FOOT (SF) VACANT PARCEL FOR DRY SLIPS FOR SMALL MARINE VESSELS.	
Location	351 BRICKYARD COVE ROAD	
APN	560-420-003	
Zoning	CC, COASTAL COMMERCIAL	
Owner/Applicant	MICHAEL JOSSELYN, RICHMOND YACHT CLUB	
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO	Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated February 23, 2022, for the public hearing to consider a recommendation to the Planning Commission for site improvements to a vacant 24,394 square foot parcel for dry slips for small marine vessels for the Richmond Yacht Club (RYC) in the Point Richmond neighborhood. The RYC, comprised a membership of boating enthusiasts based in Brickyard Cove since the 1960s, proposed to pave the existing unpaved overflow lot and add landscaping to use as additional dry slips for marine vessels and vehicle parking during regatta events that occurred six to ten times a year. Access to the site was limited to RYC members who had 24-hour access. Most members used the area between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. A total of 44 slips would be provided in three sizes to accommodate sailboats and dinghy boats and their trailers when removed from the water. Design review was required given that the proposal consisted of a parking area for vehicle and small marine vessels.

Ms. Feliciano reported that the proposal had been considered by the DRB in study session on January 12, 2022 when a number of comments and recommendations had been offered with respect to fencing details, interpretative signage, landscape details and off-site improvements.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

She reported that Chair Livingston had met with the applicants at the site to go over the fencing detail.

Ms. Feliciano reported that a memo dated February 23, 2022 amending Condition 7 regarding bicycle facilities had been distributed to the DRB, and both Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC) and the applicant had agreed to that amended condition. She also noted that public comments had been submitted to the DRB this date and based on the design and responses she recommended the DRB approve a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission for the design review of the RYC.

Boardmember Hook verified that there was no requirement for bicycle parking as part of the application.

Chair Livingston thanked the applicants and members of the RYC for integrating the neighborhood concerns, for addressing water drainage issues, and for working with TRAC.

MICHAEL JOSSELYN, an elected Boardmember of the Richmond Yacht Club, appreciated the input from the DRB, City staff, TRAC and the public. He reported that Roger Stevens, RYC's civil engineer was available to respond to questions. He identified the primary changes to the plans to redesign the fence from eight feet to six feet tall, to be wooden similar to the fence currently surrounding the dry slips on Mallard Drive; the fence along Brickyard Cove be four feet tall topped with a six-foot design for metal slots to allow views of the Bay; interpretative signs to be installed to identify some of the history of the RYC at specific locations along the Bay Trail; and that striping from the frontage road of the west lot extend all the way to the existing markings on Brickyard Cove to the east.

Chair Livingston verified that the amended Condition 7 had been memorialized in Ms. Feliciano's memo and would be provided to the Planning Commission.

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

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, explained that the RYC had been responsive to TRAC's suggestions with respect to the fencing improvements, the interpretative signage along the Bay Trail across the street, and the striped bikeway from the frontage of the west lot extending across the entire frontage of the RYC property to the kiosk at the entry into the Brickyard Cove area, making the current and future Bay Trail on the Terminal One property safe for users. He thanked RYC for making the improvements to the project.

RICH DEVEAU, RYC Commodore, speaking on behalf of the RYC Board and membership, reported that at the February Board meeting the RYC Board had unanimously voted to approve the recommendations and looked forward to moving forward on the project.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

The DRB supported the project and expressed appreciation for the collaboration with TRAC, for the interpretative signage, and for the fact the applicant had worked with the community.

Boardmember Hook suggested that bike racks might need to be considered.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to recommend approval of PLN21-019, Richmond Yacht Club – West Lot to the Planning Commission for approval; subject to the four**

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 23, 2022**

**Findings and Statements of Fact with 16 Conditions of Approval; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

Mr. Josselyn commented that there were bike racks all around the buildings and the restrooms at the RYC.

<b>3.</b>	<b>PLN20-091</b>	<b>LOWERY NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE</b>
	Description	(CONTINUED FROM FEBRUARY 9, 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 <sup>TH</sup> STREET
	APN	516-080-018
	Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
	Applicant	DENISE LOWERY (OWNER)
	Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ      Recommendation: CONTINUE TO MARCH 9, 2022

The item was continued to the meeting of March 9, 2022, to allow the applicant additional time to conduct a further analysis of the proposal and for the applicant to submit a revised shadow study.

**Board Business**

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

There were none.

**B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements**

Chair Livingston reported that there would be a special Planning Commission meeting on March 4, 2022 at 2:00 P.M. to discuss the Form Based Code.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, March 9, 2022.