

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

July 27, 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
Marcus Christeson
Macy Leung

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Jonathan Livingston called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Marcus Christeson, Michelle Hook and Macy Leung

Absent: Boardmember Kimberly Butt

INTRODUCTIONS

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 13, 2022

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Christeson/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2022 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Christeson, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: Carter and Hook; Absent: Butt.)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEETING PROCEDURES

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

PUBLIC FORUM

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

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE

The appeal date for actions taken by the Board at this meeting will be no later than 5:00 P.M. on Monday, August 8, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. PLN21-023**
Description **SUPPORTIVE AND FAMILY APARTMENTS**
(CONTINUED FROM JULY 13, 2022) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO REHABILITATE AN EXISTING TWO-STORY PUBLIC OFFICE BUILDING OVER A BASEMENT AND TO CONSTRUCT A NEW FIVE-STORY BUILDING THAT WOULD INCLUDE A TOTAL OF 135 AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL UNITS. THE PROJECT WOULD INVOLVE A REQUEST FOR A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONING FROM PCI (PUBLIC, CULTURAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL) TO CM-3 (COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE), AND A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR CONCESSIONS AND INCENTIVES UNDER THE STATE DENSITY BONUS LAW.

Location 100 38TH STREET
APN 517-340-004
Zoning PCI (PUBLIC, CULTURAL, AND INSTITUTIONAL)
Owner CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Applicant EDEN HOUSING, INC.
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated July 27, 2022, for a developed parcel of approximately 2.84 acres located on Bissell Avenue between the Richmond BART line and Macdonald Avenue in an area of mixed public, commercial, and residential uses. He explained that the existing building was a two-story public office building with a basement located along the western side of the property with surface parking located along the east side and rear of the site. Approximately 77,000 square feet in size, the building was currently vacant and recently housed the West County Health Center. He added that to the west of the project site was the Contra Costa County Superior Courthouse and to the east was a single-story commercial building currently occupied by a paper shredding business. Ryse Youth Center was located northeast of the project site while Target and commercial retail businesses were located farther to the east. The subject property was in the PCI Zoning District and the surrounding properties were primarily zoned CM-3, Commercial Mixed Use.

Mr. Lopez reported that the applicant Matt Schreiber on behalf of Eden Housing Incorporated had requested approval of a Design Review permit for a residential development that would include rehabilitating the existing office building and constructing a new five-story building that would include a total of 135 residential dwelling units on the site. The existing Building (Building A) approximately 67,000 square feet in size was proposed to be renovated to include 59 new support housing units. The proposed five-story building (Building B) approximately 92,000 square feet would include a total of 76 affordable residential units. The ground floor of Building B would include approximately 8,500 square feet of County office and 1,500 square feet of Micro-Enterprise Retail. The YMCA would occupy approximately 4,500 square feet.

Mr. Lopez explained that the applicant sought approval of a General Plan Amendment and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

rezoning from PCI to CM-3 and a Conditional Use Permit for concessions and incentives under State Density Bonus Law, which included a reduction of open space and parking and an increase to the building height.

Mr. Lopez stated that the DRB was being asked to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission with respect to the design. He added that if the rezoning and concessions under State Density Bonus Law were warranted by the Planning Commission and subsequently approved by the City Council, the project would be in compliance with the applicable development standards of the CM-3 District in which multi-family residential projects were permitted at a density range of up to 50 dwelling units per acre (DU/acre) where up to 144 dwelling units could be permitted on the property.

Mr. Lopez explained that the parking and height concessions sought by the applicant did not appear to be unreasonable given that the building would be slightly higher by two feet and the site was well-served by public transportation and a variety of public services. The subject site was surrounded by CM-3 and the zoning requested by the applicant appeared to be logical and consistent with the surrounding district and the site was physically suitable for the land use.

Mr. Lopez added that the project had previously been reviewed by the DRB on March 10, 2021 as a study session item, and some of the design issues raised at that time included the fact that the primary vehicular access bisected the site between the two buildings from Bissell Avenue to the rear of the site, the parking area had been proposed in the rear of the site with a secondary access on 37th Street behind the Courthouse property, and the DRB had encouraged the applicant to consider a pedestrian paseo instead of a street. In addition, the primary entry to Building A was located on the west side of the building next to the Courthouse building separate from the residential entry of Building B and the DRB recommended that the location of the primary entry be changed to the east or to Bissell Avenue.

The DRB had also recommended increasing the amount of open space by providing balconies and using the rooftop for open space and had commented that the open space areas had been scattered throughout the site making them less useful. The DRB had also noted that the proposed solar panels which had extended several feet over the building parapet wall were not a desirable feature and had recommended instead that the solar panels be relocated to the parking area or be reduced in height so that they were less visible from the street.

Mr. Lopez reported that the applicant had incorporated most of the DRB's suggestions and had submitted revisions for a DRB subcommittee meeting. Those revised plans included a new pedestrian paseo between the two buildings allowing an increase in the overall open space and landscaping. Several months later the applicant had informed staff that the vehicular access to the site must remain at the original location and the paseo could not be implemented. The design team had then provided other improvements including landscaping and fencing, outdoor amenities, a community garden, green walls, and pavers.

During the DRB subcommittee meeting, Mr. Lopez stated it had been recommended that balconies be added to the east elevation of Building B to break up the mass of the five-stories facing from the east and from the BART line to the south, and also to provide at least some private open space. Given the safety constraints described by the applicant, the east elevation of Building B had been revised and three alternative elevation schemes had been proposed consisting of slightly different styles.

Mr. Lopez highlighted the Environmental Initial Study, Consistency Checklist prepared by FirstCarbon Solutions and reported that the proposed project had been found to be in conformance with the analyses and conclusions of the General Plan Final Environmental Impact

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

Report (FEIR), which had adequately anticipated and described the impact of the proposed project and no further environmental review was necessary for the project.

Mr. Lopez reported that staff had received formal correspondence from the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council and a letter had been submitted from a surrounding property owner expressing concern with traffic and limited parking.

Based on the analyses, Mr. Lopez stated the project was an affordable housing development under the State and local Density Bonus Laws, the proposed development would further the objectives of the Richmond General Plan 2030 to provide and generate jobs and economic activity within the City while also meeting the City's goal for construction of affordable housing and maintaining sensitivity to the environment.

Chair Livingston thanked staff for the comprehensive staff report and the applicants for listening to the DRB to create a project that had shown continuous improvement.

MATT SCHREIBER, Eden Housing, Inc., thanked the Community Housing Development Corporation (CHDC) of North Richmond, the co-developers of the project, recognized their representatives on the Zoom call, and stated the project would create over 300 units between the team. He described the break-down of the two buildings and stated the adaptive reuse of the former Health Center would result in 59 units of supportive housing that would be referrals from the County Coordinated Entry System at 20 to 30 percent of Area Median Income (AMI); the new construction on the current parking lot adjacent to the Health Center would result in 76 family units that would include over 25 percent three-bedroom units available for larger families at 60 percent AMI; the ground floor of the building would house YMCA of the East Bay and add different sorts of retail and different spaces to the site including an Early Learning Center; and they would partner with other local service providers such as LifeLong Medical to provide on-site case management services for the supportive housing building.

With respect to the conditions of approval, Mr. Schreiber stated they were in line with the green goals of the City and greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions and would plan for one of the State's Cap and Trade Programs through the Affordable Housing and Sustainability Communities Program to provide funds for the project to enhance public transit, bike lanes, the pedestrian realm and make the off-site as well designed as the on-site plans.

Mr. Schreiber stated that due to the competitiveness of funding at all levels, they had not received any funding but had structured the project as two independent projects while entitlements were being pursued as a single phase project. The long-term goal was that each building would be able to continue on independently. He added that because of state mandates and goals for permanent supportive housing, it was possible that the adaptive reuse of the existing building would move forward first.

WILLIAM DUNCANSON, BAR Architecture, presented the revised site plan, highlighted the design revisions identified by the staff report, pointed out the changes to access, identified the project elements, and the changes to parking, pedestrian improvements, signage, traffic calming measures, the entrance configuration to the family housing building, the manipulation of Building B to provide additional open space, and the changes to the east elevation. He also presented new renderings of the buildings along with the three façade alternatives for DRB consideration.

Boardmember Leung verified with the applicant that they had not considered anything other than medium gray for the proposed corrugated metal, which the applicant advised would be a baked on matte finish that would be color fast over the life of the building.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

Chair Livingston asked about the civil engineering plans and specifically pointed out a fire riser on Sheet C.5 between the street and the courtyard that would need to be moved or mitigated.

Lydia Elias identified the meeting procedures and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

MADALYN LAW, the current President of the Park Plaza Neighborhood Council and the co-Chair of the South Side Improvement Group Plus One with Naomi Williams, the President of the Pullman Neighborhood Council, stated the project would benefit both neighborhoods and the south side of Richmond. Both had been involved with Eden Housing and CHDC for several years, were satisfied with a senior project development by that group in their neighborhood, had received the layout of the proposal and the expectations, and the neighbors had been allowed to make suggestions on the project that would bring jobs to the community, child care for parents, and more affordable housing to the neighborhoods and to other Richmond citizens. She supported the project and urged the DRB to do the same.

SYDNEY STONE, Richmond, a Marina Bay resident, stated he had submitted written comments for the record. While he recognized the project had been much improved since the original proposal in 2021, he remained concerned with the lack of private space, a lack of creativity on the design, open space concessions and the livability of the project. He also expressed concern with the inclusion of studios in the family affordable component given that it created operational challenges and offered poor living within the development.

JULIA DIENER, JETT Landscape Architecture + Design, presented the landscape plan and explained that feedback had urged more green screening around the fences, especially for the YMCA play area and other public spaces. When asked, she stated the material for the fencing had yet to be determined although a louvered metal panel fence had been considered to provide screening and some visibility from the play area out. A green screen had also been considered with a decorative overhead arbor structure along with other decorative metal designs with a wood finish. She pointed out the other areas of the plan where fences would be located, specifically around the other tot lot where an Ipe soundwall would be provided with vines growing along it. She noted that three different fence types had been proposed throughout the development.

Ms. Diener pointed out the courtyard areas and explained that stormwater planting would be provided around the family building with overhead arbor structures that would create a green backdrop to the courtyard space. A gate would mark the entrance to the space but would not be locked. Open flexible seating outside of the lobby would be provided; the courtyard space in Building A remained with landscaping and flexible seating; and another courtyard had been added to the second floor, the podium of Building B, where vegetable beds would be provided for residents along with seating overflow from the residents' community room.

Renderings of the entry courtyard were provided for Boardmember Hook who also asked about the materials that had been proposed, and Ms. Diener explained that a decorative metal fence had been proposed for the lower fence and columns would have a concrete decorative finish with a decorative metal overhead structure. The gates would include a laser cut panel to match the other decorative material.

Chair Livingston expressed concern for a lack of detail provided for the materials to be used. BRUCE JETT, JETT Landscape Architecture + Design, provided further details of the fence material and explained that the fence around the play area would include a wood-like finish over metal type of slat to reduce maintenance.

Ms. Diener spoke to some of the key areas of landscaping and pointed out the pedestrian paseo along the Courthouse entrance where evergreen bay-shaped trees would be installed along with

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

a green backdrop to separate that area from the parking behind as well as create some screening along the eastern side and from the YMCA play area. More decorative deciduous flowering trees, such as a redbud, had been proposed along that area with evergreen species where the building would be screened from the play area. Street trees had yet to be decided but they would be compatible with the surrounding areas.

Ms. Diener referred to four stately courtyard entry trees at the lobby entrance that would be bay-shaped and upright, probably evergreen, and along the vehicular drive there would be something small and narrow to fit within the space where a deciduous, flowering tree had been proposed. Elms would be planted in the parking lot to provide shade. Along the perimeter, specifically on the eastern side, an evergreen had been proposed to provide a privacy screen. There would be something fairly small in the courtyard areas, such as a Japanese maple, to provide year round interest.

For the podium courtyard, there would be stormwater planting around the perimeter where more decorative shrubs had been proposed along with three- to four-foot high screening shrubs around the units to maintain light in the units and screen the windows, with an accent tree such as a Japanese maple, in the planter. The landscape around the rear tot lot area would provide screening from the parking and the BART tracks with three- to four-foot high plantings inside the fence to maintain visibility.

Boardmember Hook stated with respect to the proposed trees that while what had been identified made sense, none of the trees mentioned had been included in the plant list and she sought some verification of the species involved. She asked for verification of the entry trees and the upright focal point that could get very tall. She referred to an edible garden, suggested that lemon trees be added to the planting plan or to the community garden, and asked for details of the proposed play equipment. For the overall feel, she supported a focal tree.

Mr. Schreiber noted that the street trees would be worked out with the City and be compliant with the City's street tree requirements.

Vice Chair Carter loved the project, stated it looked great, he appreciated the work that had been done, was pleased that the applicants had listened to the DRB, and asked about the area where the second floor exterior open space (podium) was located. He referred specifically to the space on the west elevation and asked about the material to be used above the storefront windows that would become the guardrails for the open space, and Mr. Duncanson explained that the material in question was cement plaster.

Vice Chair Carter asked if the intent of the use of the cement plaster was to break up the composite texture on that elevation. He expressed a preference for the corrugated metal and suggested the applicant consider whether to use the corrugated metal instead of the cement plaster, and Mr. Duncanson stated that could be done given that it was a material used elsewhere on the project.

Mr. Duncanson added that the base of the building was a composite material and noted that Thermory was the composite material that had been proposed.

Vice Chair Carter requested that the corrugated material be carried out to the base. He referred to the fence around the YMCA play area and asked if there was a reason to change the materiality around the tot lot to what had been proposed for the YMCA play area, and Mr. Duncanson stated there had been a discussion about making a green screen with plant materials to grow along that screen.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

Mr. Schreiber expressed a willingness to consider the Vice Chair's suggestion given that the horizontal fence with the Ipe and vertical vining armature would allow something specific and appropriate around the YMCA area to allow approval of the application at this time.

Mr. Duncanson identified the three options presented for the east elevation as Option Zero (smaller vertical bays across the facade with equal divisions between); Option Two (more bays more closely reflecting the west elevation); and Option One (similar massing to Option Zero adding in canopy elements with some additional shadow, play and lyricism to the facade that would be seen from westbound traffic and BART).

Vice Chair Carter referred to the three different elements for the east elevation and supported Option Two; Boardmember Hook supported Option Two; Chair Livingston supported Option Two; Boardmember Leung supported Option Zero or Option Two; and Boardmember Christeson also supported Option Two.

Boardmember Leung expressed a strong feeling against the corrugated metal and asked if there had been consideration of other colors or materials instead of the gray metal. With respect to the renderings, she urged that where balconies had been proposed to break up the mass of Building B, some other type of balcony material and pattern be considered to ensure the safety of children if the balconies were to be accessible from inside the units. She referred to the gates in the courtyards and suggested they were not functional, she urged attention to sun shade on the east and south, suggested the new rendering looked too industrial with the gray corrugated metal and urged some consideration of other colors to create something warm and inviting. She also recommended more trees or other amenities in the courtyards, supported the traffic calming and wanted to explore other measures to calm traffic at the entrance and throughout the parking lot. She had also noticed that access to the first floor units would be too easy and suggested it would be beneficial to have a buffer to avoid someone being able to just walk into a unit, and supported some safety measures in terms of access to the building. She also asked if trash could be moved closer to the entrance, and noted some diagonal walls in interior rooms and urged some attention to the floor plan.

Chair Livingston explained that the privacy of ground floor units had previously been discussed and Mr. Duncanson added that shades could be utilized to address privacy concerns and a landscape buffer had been proposed to create some deterrent for people to walk right up to ground floor windows. He suggested that a shade and planting plan could be considered to address that concern.

With respect to the color, Boardmember Leung supported warmer less industrial colors and suggested that gray on the exterior might be difficult to maintain over the long term. Ultimately, in terms of functionality she stated the color was the developer's choice but in terms of color she supported a warmer color.

Boardmember Leung left the Zoom meeting at this time due to a prior commitment.

Boardmember Christeson agreed with the issues with respect to the gray color, noted that the windows had a big effect on the look of the building and verified that the windows were gray reflective. He agreed with the need for warmer colors.

Vice Chair Carter recommended consideration of a bronze color. When asked, he supported the corrugated color as long as it was darker, with a warmer gray.

As to an alternative location for the fire stand pipe, Mr. Duncanson suggested its placement on the western corner of the property, and Chair Livingston recommended the installation of some shrubs in front to screen the riser.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

Chair Livingston again thanked the applicants for working with the City to address the issues to make the building look better. He supported the Detail No. 5 soundwall in the front, with vines, and asked the design team if it would consider raising the sidewalk on the main street up to the table top to help keep the speed down on the driveway as further traffic calming, and Mr. Duncanson suggested that could be done.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

With respect to the tree specifications, Boardmember Hook asked about the species identified for the front entry and recommended the tulip tree if another tree had not been recommended. She supported an evergreen tree.

Mr. Jett stated there was a desire to provide shade and a ginkgo could be used to provide shade and offer an accent, although it was not the fastest growing tree. He also suggested a lagerstroemia to make it inviting. He stated both those trees were deciduous. He added that something in the evergreen could be the tristaniopses or oaks.

Boardmember Hook liked the taller trees and their relation to the building and supported something in the medium to large range.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to approve a recommendation to the Planning Commission for approval of PLN21-023, Supportive and Family Apartments, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 23 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 24) Change the M-1 corrugated metal to Buckskin or equal, a trapezoidal corrugated with matching fasteners; 25) The fence detail in front to be Detail No. 5 soundwall; 26) The entry tree to the plaza off the main road to be a medium to large evergreen tree; 27) The alternate location for the back flow preventers shall be moved to the east of the entry plaza between the Contra Costa County Superior Courthouse and the new development and be set back from the sidewalk by ten feet subject to Fire Department approval; 28) Add corrugated metal in lieu of cement plaster on the west façade of Building B between the two five-story elements above the storefront; 29) Raise the sidewalk at entry to Building B for traffic calming subject to Fire Department approval; 30) Option Two selected for the east elevation; and 31) The composite material to be Thermory or equal; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Carter, Christeson, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Leung.)

2. PLN21-426	ENERGY PLAZA ALTERNATIVE FUEL STATION
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN OF NEW ALTERNATIVE FUELING STATION ON A PROJECT SITE OF APPROXIMATELY 4.5 ACRES.
Location	835 CASTRO STREET
APN	561-120-015
Zoning	IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Owner	CHEVRON USA INC.
Applicant	FIEDLER GROUP (BEN STECKLER)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated July 27, 2022, and explained that the subject property was over 55 acres in size while the project site was smaller at 4.87 acres, located along the eastern portion of the property adjacent to Castro Street in the General Industrial Zoning District, and surrounded by a wide range of light and heavy industrial uses. The property had formerly been used as an agricultural chemical manufacturing facility and wastewater storage.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

Approximately 20 acres was used for solar power generation with the remaining acreage used for the storage of stormwater and extracted groundwater. The project site is currently covered with an asphalt cap and would be raised by two feet to create the building pad for the new project.

Mr. Lopez stated that the applicant, on behalf of Chevron USA, Incorporated, requested approval of a Design Review permit to operate and establish a new alternative fueling station that would include fueling equipment for hydrogen (H₂) and compressed natural gas (CNG). The proposed project would include eight refueling lanes for heavy vehicles and five lanes for light-duty refueling. Proposed improvements included site lighting, landscape and hardscape areas, and an equipment enclosure for natural gas and hydrogen storage and compression equipment. A new 2,500-foot pipeline had been proposed and would connect to the existing public utility natural gas transmission system. Two fueling canopy structures had also been proposed along with a 1,400 square-foot structure for a security office and bathrooms.

Mr. Lopez explained that alternative fuels and recharging facilities were permitted in the General Industrial District and the project just required Design Review and would have to comply with all standards of the district. He advised that an environmental consultant firm was currently conducting an environmental Initial Study of the proposal and the major areas to be reviewed included air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality and transportation.

Mr. Lopez sought comments, suggestions and feedback from the DRB on the proposed design.

For the record, Chair Livingston stated he had commented three times on the application over many months with Marin Clean Energy, with Chevron and with the DRB.

Boardmember Christeson clarified with staff that the fueling station was for both commercial and non-commercial vehicles.

Chair Livingston asked if there had been discussions with Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC) with respect to the site and the possibility of moving the Bay Trail to a section east of the proposal, and Mr. Lopez stated that had neither been discussed nor had there been any communication in that regard.

Chair Livingston referred to an email he had submitted to Chevron with an illustration he had prepared and he verified that staff had received that email and could provide it to the DRB.

Vice Chair Carter verified with Mr. Lopez that there would likely be a public art requirement related to the application.

JOHN SAKAMOTO, Eichleay Engineering, Inc., provided an overview of the Chevron Richmond Energy Plaza Project and identified the site that was formerly a Chevron chemical site making fertilizer. He reported there would be zero gallons of water runoff from the site in that the water would be retained and treated within the site, there would be zero impacted species from site development, it would be the first development of its kind in the United States offering both CMG and hydrogen fuel to fuel all vehicles from commercial passenger cars to 18-wheelers. It would be the first hydrogen facility in Richmond and one of the first in Contra Costa County. There would be up to four light duty vehicle fueling positions for passenger cars and everything up to a commercial bus size. A traffic study had been conducted by AMG and was currently being peer-reviewed by Fehr & Peers with less than five seconds of traffic impact from the increased traffic from the plaza itself. There would also be less than five acres of development, 200 anticipated fueling visits at capacity would ultimately be expected and Chevron wanted to be the leader in developing renewable fuel technologies to lead to lower emissions.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

With respect to the project design, Mr. Sakamoto stated the entire development was within the City limits and substantially surrounded by urban uses, and a biological survey had shown no habitat to endangered, rare or threatened species. No significant event effects were expected related to traffic, noise, air or stormwater quality and the entire site could be certified as a public utility. He presented slides to show the existing site as is with no residual use for the land, which had been proposed to become a net benefit to both Richmond and the public.

Mr. Sakamoto stated there were only four components that made up a hydrogen and CNG facility. There would be two canopies, one in the LDV (light duty vehicle) area for passenger cars and commercial buses. He noted that many commercial buses were already CNG. In the HDV (heavy duty vehicle) area, there would be 18-wheel trucks that could come in to one of eight lanes and fill in either CNG or H₂. An equipment compound would store both CNG and H₂ along with having the compressors that would be able to accommodate both LDV and HDV. One site office had been proposed with 24/7 security and the office would also be used to house site ambassadors to ensure the appropriate use of the nozzles to fill up the tanks. Arrows on the ground would represent the direction of traffic with counterclockwise smaller circles for LDV and a clockwise bigger circle for HDV filling.

Vice Chair Carter noted the unique facility and asked what kind of design or visual aesthetic cues or strategies would be taken to reflect the cutting edge facility in terms of architecture. He suggested that component could come in with the art requirement and the kidney-shaped green space could become a place for a piece of artwork, interpretative signage or something to celebrate the first of its kind type of facility in terms of being a special place. He encouraged the applicant to consider a playful way to identify the uniqueness of the station in the courtyard, on the office building itself, or on the canopies. With respect to the fencing, he verified that the black picket would primarily be new fencing and would be open at the entry. He supported the transparent fence design that had been shown and verified that there would be a curved top.

Mr. Sakamoto stated that security was no longer a concern at the perimeter and there would be no gates. The fence at the site would be taken down as needed for traffic and be pushed back to provide a barrier to the rest of the parcel.

Vice Chair Carter referred to a fence by the Richmond Ferry as an example of what would be appropriate, commented that the architecture of the office building could introduce more color or something to liven it up, and suggested the canopies over the doors could be wider to appear more functional.

Chair Livingston agreed with the need to differentiate the new fueling facility from the usual gas station and urged Chevron corporate to identify eco branding for the very unique site.

In response to Boardmember Christeson, Mr. Sakamoto stated that hydrogen would be trucked in and there were several different spots they were looking at. The pipeline would be going through the plant but the primary source would be for natural gas delivered by pipeline to the facility. He verified that the nozzles would be engineered and set by established safety standards.

Boardmember Christeson liked the project and liked the idea of making sure the facility would stand out.

Boardmember Hook also supported the facility and was in agreement with the need for the design to reflect the uniqueness of the facility, creating a precedence that could be sustainable in the future. She added that permeable pavers could be a great option in front of the office.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

With respect to the landscape plan, Boardmember Hook suggested that some oaks should be included along with more natives, paralleling the location by the Bay similar to adjacent Richmond cannabis operations where precedence was being set to create new signage and plant selections in alignment with the ecotones at the edge of the Bay. She also recommended some wire mesh fence Omega options for a clean look.

HAKIM JOHNSON, Chevron USA, Inc., explained in response to Boardmember Hook that there had been an earlier discussion about the issue of the homeless encampment that had raised the question of moving the Bay Trail to bypass that encampment. He stated that Chevron had decided to address the homeless encampment on Castro Street instead of focusing on moving the Bay Trail and creating a safety risk.

Chair Livingston asked if it was possible to have parallel tracks during the process of moving the homeless encampment, and Mr. Johnson reiterated the preference to address the homeless encampment but expressed the willingness to have a discussion.

Chair Livingston emphasized that the new paradigm in fueling needed a new green architecture to call attention to, and to differentiate from, the usual gas station. Referring to the fire wall surrounding the compressors, he recommended one earthen, concrete wall. He referred to the sketch he had presented to Chevron and the introduction of material called PISE (pneumatically impacted stabilized earth), which was fifty percent earth and fifty percent Portland cement and rocks that could be used to create a wall to surround the compressors, which could be the green branding needed to indicate that Chevron was leading the way in green technology. He urged consideration of the changes to the Bay Trail as noted.

Boardmember Hook asked how long it would take to fuel a car and the applicant stated it was the most equal and equivalent alternative fuel to current fuel options and it would take about the same time to fill a vehicle as it would for a gasoline fill-up, with typical fuel fill-up times at five minutes or less.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Lydia Elias identified the meeting procedures and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

BRUCE BRUBAKER, Richmond, advised that TRAC strongly advocated for an alternative alignment for the Bay Trail along the Parkway. The Bay Trail currently went down Hensley Street and turned north through a homeless encampment and a better alignment was being sought. That portion of the Bay Trail was the only connection from the south shore of Richmond and all communities to the south to the north shore of Richmond and all communities to the north. He explained that it had never been a very good route and was currently unpassable, and TRAC advocated for the alternative alignment to cross Hensley, go up the Parkway on the west side of the Parkway connecting to the rest of the northbound Bay Trail, which was on the west side of the Parkway.

In order to do that there would need to be enough space to develop the trail alongside the Parkway, which would be 16 feet of space for a 12-foot trail and two-foot buffer on both sides, the Bay Trail standard. Mr. Brubaker encouraged the DRB to add a condition of approval to ensure that the fence location would allow enough space for a trail to run northward along the Parkway and hopefully Chevron would take that under consideration.

When asked by the Chair to talk to Chevron about the Bay Trail, Mr. Brubaker stated that Chevron's position was to clear the homeless encampment and allow the Bay Trail to move through that area. While there was an effort to clear the homeless encampment, he stated that

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 10, 2022

would likely take five years to accomplish. TRAC was asking that the Bay Trail be accommodated but did not want the project to be built and close off the option of providing the Bay Trail on that side of the street. He added that he would be happy to discuss the issue with Chevron, and Chevron representatives indicated that conversations would continue.

Boardmember Christeson suggested that a modification or an addition of an icon on the Chevron logo along with a color addition would serve the desire to make it stand out differently and still offer the same Chevron logo. He liked the proposal.

3. PLN12-248	LIVABLE CORRIDORS FORM-BASED CODE
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS IMPLEMENTING THE RICHMOND LIVABLE CORRIDORS FORM-BASED CODE (FBC), INCLUDING ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS (AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT WWW.CI.RICHMOND.CA.US/2965/RLC-FBC).
Location	VARIOUS
APN	VARIOUS
Zoning	VARIOUS
Owner	VARIOUS
Applicant	CITY OF RICHMOND
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONTINUE TO AUGUST 10, 2022

The item was continued to the meeting scheduled for August 10, 2022.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Livingston reported that PG&E had started to work with the DRB Subcommittee on its project; Terminal One continued to be mired in problems and there were time constraints involved; and Terminal Three would be considered by the DRB soon.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:09 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, August 10, 2022.