

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 26, 2023

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level 440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

April 12, 2023
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Marcus L. Christeson
David Plotkin

Brian Carter
Leah Marthinsen

Chair Brian Carter called the regular meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Brian Carter, Vice Chair Marcus Christeson, and Boardmember Leah Marthinsen

Absent: Boardmembers Kimberly Butt and David Plotkin

INTRODUCTIONS

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 22, 2023

The full DRB had not had an opportunity to read the minutes of the March 22, 2023 meeting. As a result, the minutes were carried over to the next meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: No changes

MEETING PROCEDURES

PUBLIC FORUM:

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

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

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, April 24, 2023.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. PLN23-034 ALVARADO SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 26, 2023

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ONE-STORY SINGLE DWELLING UNIT ON A ±5,600 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.	
Location	121 SOUTH 3 RD STREET	
APN	550-130-021	
Zoning	RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT	
Owner	JOSE ALVARADO	
Applicant	TYLER HUTCHERSON	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated April 12, 2023, for a Design Review Permit to construct a new one-story single dwelling on a vacant parcel on South 3rd Street, approximately 100 feet south of Ohio Avenue in the Santa Fe neighborhood characterized by homes constructed in the early 1900's on a wide range of parcel sizes with varying one, one-and-a-half- and two-story single-family dwellings, and with several vacant parcels along the street. An estimated 1,800 square foot one-story unit had been proposed to be developed on the parcel, to include four bedrooms and two-and-a-half bathrooms. A new driveway had been proposed along the northern property line to provide access to two uncovered parking spaces.

Mr. Lopez reported that the application satisfied the regulations, parking was provided, setbacks had all been met, the design was a simple style well-balanced in terms of massing, and the building embraced a traditional style in one story with a hip roof and a center porch, a bay window fronting the street, and the proposed materials were all compatible with similar homes built at the turn of the century in this neighborhood.

Mr. Lopez recommended approval of the project subject to the recommended conditions of approval as well as a condition that the existing curb cut be eliminated, the sidewalk be reconstructed, and a street tree and some landscaping be provided, along with a metal fence in the front not to exceed four feet in height.

Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

The applicant agreed with the staff recommendations with the exception of the height of the fence and requested a taller fence given that there were taller fences in the neighborhood and there was a perceived security issue. Higher landscaping could also be considered to increase the barrier between the street and the home.

Chair Carter verified with the applicant that there would be a sliding gate across the driveway and that the fence would be a fairly traditional wrought iron picket-style fence without spikes.

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

Boardmember Marthinsen suggested there was a lot of new concrete beyond what was needed for the cars and she asked whether there could be consideration of reducing that surface and using permeable pavers instead.

The applicant advised that the owner had proposed in the future to build a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) with a garage at the base, and while that did not necessarily exclude a more environmentally-friendly product, she noted that the owner was a contractor and used heavily-loaded trucks and permeable pavers might not be the best fit since they tended to shift under heavy loads.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 26, 2023

Boardmember Marthinsen suggested that the large concrete area at the back entry might be an area where something different might be considered to create a more person-friendly area, particularly since the landscape plan was not well developed.

The applicant advised that a xeriscape landscape plan had been proposed by the applicant but she expressed the willingness to consider an alternative.

Chair Carter referred to the fence proposed for the front and suggested a compromise where the fence could remain at five feet with no spikes, and the applicant stated the intent was for the fence to be stepped back a few feet with planting between the fence and the sidewalk.

Mr. Lopez explained that fences were allowed at four feet up to six feet provided there was transparency from the street for safety reasons. He also clarified, when asked, that staff-recommended Condition 3 required that all exterior lighting be designed so that all direct light was confined to the property to avoid glare associated with that lighting.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Marthinsen did not see the need to further condition the application with landscape requirements, although she recommended that there be some consideration to make the site more pleasant, and the applicant agreed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Marthinsen) to approve PLN23-034, Alvarado Single-Family Dwelling, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 12 Conditions of Approval and an amendment to Condition 5 where the fence was allowed to be five feet in height with no spikes; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Christeson, Marthinsen, and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Plotkin.)

Given that the applicant for Item 2 was not available at this time, the DRB moved on to Item 3.

3.	PLN23-069	CORPORATION YARD FUEL TANK REPLACEMENT
	Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW TO REPLACE EXISTING FUEL SYSTEM WITH A NEW DUAL COMPARTMENT ABOVE-GROUND STORAGE TANK, INCLUDING INSTALLATION OF NEW FUEL DISPENSERS, MONITORING SYSTEM, STEEL CANOPY, AND VAPOR RECOVERY SYSTEM
	Location	6-13 TH STREET
	APN	540-330-011
	Zoning	CM1, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
	Applicant	CITY OF RICHMOND, PUBLIC WORKS (OWNER)
	Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated April 12, 2023, for a Design Review Permit to replace an existing fuel system with a new dual compartment above-ground storage tank including installation of new fuel dispensers, monitoring system, steel canopy, and vapor recovery system on the property comprised of four parcels located between Harbour Way and Marina Way, accessible from both Harbour Way and Marina Way but with no access to the adjacent Richmond Greenway.

The site was used as the City of Richmond's Corporation Yard by the Richmond Public Works

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 26, 2023

Department for services such as Abatement, Equipment Services, Facilities Maintenance, and Street Paving and included two fuel tanks that needed to be replaced to meet state and federal requirements. The proposal would involve the installation of two new 10,000-gallon dual compartment storage tanks on a concrete slab, and replacement of fuel dispensers, monitoring system, vapor recovery system and a 1,836 square foot steel canopy over the fuel system.

Ms. Feliciano explained that it was the steel canopy that required approval by the DRB given that improvements that exceeded 1,000 square feet in size required Design Review approval. The proposed canopy met all the development standards, including height at 19 feet where 35 feet was allowed. All of the existing parking spaces would be retained and there was a 20-foot drive aisle distance between the canopy and the existing parking stalls. She recommended conditional approval of the application.

GARY OAKLEY, Oakley & Oakley Architects, Antioch, responded to questions from the DRB and verified that the canopy would be pre-engineered. He reported that the tanks had originally been built in the mid-2000s at 4,000 gallons each and over the years the regulations had changed and the City had wanted to increase the capacity of the tanks. With the new regulations, the environment for the canopy had come to be. The canopy would be pre-engineered and the colors had not been discussed but would match the surrounding buildings. There would be two main columns that would be 8x8 feet in size and the height of the canopy would be so that the different City vehicles including police cars, public works vehicles and fire trucks would be able to use the facility.

In response to questions, Mr. Oakley explained there were four to five single-story buildings in the immediate area of varying ages from 30 to 40 years old, some of which were brick that had been seismically retrofitted, in colors that were earth tone brown.

Chair Carter verified with Mr. Oakley that the project was low impact with a canopy over the fuel tanks tucked back into the site away from the public right-of-way with a prefab metal joist and roof system that sat on the two columns and cantilevered out.

Boardmember Marthinsen asked about the assembly of the structure, its slope and drainage since the submitted drawings were unclear.

Mr. Oakley explained that the canopy structure had a fairly flat roof, the preferred materials were metal with potentially a standing seam roof, which had yet to be discussed, and the main thrust was to have an industrial type canopy that would be able to withstand all the elements. Drainage would be to the center columns through the downspouts into the columns and underground into the existing catchment. The canopy would not be much higher than the adjacent building, which was 15 or 16 feet in height, and the canopy was a new regulation.

When told that there was no berm requirement around the tank, Boardmember Christeson expressed concern but Mr. Lopez explained that there would be bollards for spill protection, although Boardmember Christeson still expressed concern that in the event of fire it would be difficult to get water on the tanks because of the canopy.

Mr. Oakley stated the canopy was primarily for protection from rain and the contamination of water.

Boardmember Marthinsen was uncertain of the specific requirements for canopies but she stated the Building Code required a minimum of 3/8 inch over a foot roof slope for roofing and she

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 26, 2023

suspected that should be included so that the water actually drained off the roof. As a result, she did not support a flat canopy. If the downspouts were to come to one of the columns in the middle that would be a butterfly roof structure with a low point down the middle and a roof drain that would have a downspout coming down the pipe going directly downward, which she stated should clearly be shown on the drawing since that would affect the structural members. She noted there were limitations on what a manufacturer would do with pre-engineered structures and she was not sure how that would work in terms of the structure. She recommended alternatives that would offer a similar effect.

With respect to finished material, Boardmember Marthinsen strongly recommended standing seam metal for the roof and recommended checking with the City to see if there were bird issues in that area since a nesting area could result and create problems. She added that how the post met the structure condition needed to be documented more clearly.

Mr. Oakley referred to the plans to identify the section through the canopy that showed the tanks and monitoring equipment but the DRB emphasized that more details on the canopy itself were required in that the DRB needed to see detailed plans about the assembly, the edge, and whether there was a fascia around the outside. Many of those questions could be answered by the canopy manufacturer, which would also identify what the canopy would look like, and Mr. Oakley stated that more information from the manufacturer could be provided.

Chair Carter also requested more information on materials, how the drainage would work in conjunction with the structure, the colors as well as a photo of the context with some of the existing buildings to get a sense of how the canopy would fit in. He added that the edge of the canopy would be the most visible from a distance and the fascia should be clarified, along with more generic details as to how the edge assembly would work, how the soffit would integrate and how bird nesting would be addressed to provide a more maintenance-free structure.

Boardmember Marthinsen agreed with the need for that information, did not believe the application was as complete as necessary, but did not want to waste everyone's time on a canopy for a corporation yard that was not visible to anyone.

Ms. Feliciano verified with the applicant and the Public Works Department that the proposal would go to bid and the manufacturer's information should be available around June 2023, and as such she suggested the item could be continued or the canopy could be approved as a steel structure of 1,836 square feet and a DRB Subcommittee could refine the details.

Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office understood the concerns but noted that a process of subcommittee review after the fact was backwards.

In an effort to facilitate the process and not waste time while ensuring the appropriateness of the canopy structure, Ms. Feliciano displayed a "street" view to show the colors of the existing buildings and agreed that it would be easier to establish conditions at this time and allow the applicant to work with the manufacturer to conform to the conditions where and if possible. The DRB discussed a range of conditions to address the issue and verified that exterior lighting was part of the application and that staff had recommended conditions to address that lighting.

The applicant concurred with the additional recommended conditions.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 26, 2023

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Marthinsen) to approve PLN23-069, Corporation Yard Fuel Tank Replacement, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 11 Conditions of Approval and subject to the following additional conditions: 12) The roofing material to be standing seam metal; 13) The structure to have a soffit on the underside; 14) All exposed steel to be painted with a high-performance coating; 15) Color palette to be based on manufacturer’s standard colors and of those the selection shall be chosen from a reddish brick or gray; and 16) The applicant to ensure that the drainage is hard-piped and that the roof has the proper slope and all drainage is compatible with manufacturer’s structural systems; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Christeson, Marthinsen and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Plotkin).

2. PLN23-039	OCHOA SECOND-STORY ADDITION
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±760 SQUARE FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
Location	603 24 TH STREET
APN	515-020-014
Zoning	RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	MARGARITA OCHOA
Applicant	IAN GLIDDEN
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

The applicant was not available and it was recommended that the application be continued to the next meeting.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Christeson) to continue PLN23-039, Ochoa Second-Story Addition to a future meeting; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Christeson, Marthinsen, and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Plotkin.)

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Mr. Lopez advised that Lydia Elias would be leaving the employ of the City and had accepted a position with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). As a result, the City Planning Department was short two planner positions.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:07 P.M. to the regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, April 26, 2023.