

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Richmond, CA 94804

December 14, 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 L. Christeson
Jonathan Livingston

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Leah Marthinsen

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Marcus Christeson and Leah Marthinsen

Absent: Boardmember Michelle Hook

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Marytonae Sanchez, Andrea Villarroel and Hector Lopez, and James Atencio from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 9, 2022

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the November 9, 2022 meeting, as submitted; approved by a show of hands: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Marthinsen and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hook.)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: No changes

MEETING PROCEDURES

Andrea Villarroel 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.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

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 Tuesday, December 27, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| 1. PLN22-058 | PORTSIDE COMMERCE CENTER |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW 214,895 SQUARE-FOOT MANUFACTURING WAREHOUSE/MARITIME BREAK BULK FACILITY ON AN EXISTING 15.75-ACRE PARCEL. THE PROJECT WOULD ALSO INCLUDE SITE IMPROVEMENTS SUCH AS LIGHTING, LANDSCAPE, AND HARDSCAPE AREAS. |
| Location | 1411 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH |
| APN | PORTION OF 560-270-055, PORTION OF 560-270-059 AND 560-270-060 |
| Zoning | INDUSTRIAL, WATER-RELATED (IW) DISTRICT |
| Owner | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| Applicant | IV 1411 HARBOUR WAY S. JVLLC |
| Staff Contact | HECTOR LOPEZ |
| | Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated December 14, 2022, for the 214,895 square-foot manufacturing warehouse/maritime break bulk facility proposed on 15.75 acres at 1411 Harbour Way South on the Ford Peninsula known as Terminal 3, and comprised of 18,798 square feet of warehousing/manufacturing space, 30,097 square feet of office space, and dedicated/wharf loading space. The applicant had identified the southern portion of the property as designated for mixed uses or port facility use. The tenant expected to occupy the building was identified as Moxion Power, a battery manufacturing business headquartered in the City of Richmond. As described by the applicant, Moxion Power was the creator and manufacturer of a zero emission mobile battery storage module that would replace diesel generators used on construction sites and as a backup power for homes, offices and hospitals. Prefabricated components would be delivered to the site, assembled on-site, and shipped out to users.

Mr. Lopez explained that waterfront-related manufacturing, warehousing and distribution that supported the Port of Richmond was a Zoning Ordinance-permitted use in the IW District, and the proposed project was in compliance with the applicable standards of the IW District. The property was surrounded by a wide range of light industrial uses and an existing 80,000 square-foot dilapidated metal warehouse structure was currently on the property that included several ancillary office buildings. The remainder of the property was paved. A 1.3-acre portion at the northwest corner of the site was currently in use by a marine transportation company. The property had a wide street frontage with access to the Harbor Channel in the rear. The Ford Assembly Plant and the Cannery building were located across the street on Harbour Way South, the Richmond Ferry Terminal and a parking lot were located to the south of the site, and the vacant Port facility including the buildings and pier needed significant repair.

Mr. Lopez advised that on September 28, 2022, the DRB had conducted a study session to provide comments and feedback on the proposed design, after which several meetings had

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

taken place to illustrate the design intent and direction that should be implemented by the applicant.

One of the issues raised by the DRB had been the site's prominent location near the Richmond Ferry Terminal and the DRB had considered the site as a gateway from the Bay to the City of Richmond. As such, the DRB recommended the design should reflect a sense of arrival.

Mr. Lopez reported that the applicant had made several modifications to the project which had a simple overall design primarily for its functional use. The building was characterized by a clean profile with simple forms with two distinct building styles. The building would be constructed out of concrete tilted panels and would include two corner elements at the northeast and southeast corners that would embrace a traditional style consisting of a brick veneer exterior, large storefront windows, and a metal canopy. At the request of the DRB, certain aspects of the project had been modified to incorporate a large sign to identify the location of the Port. The applicant had also met with the City's Arts & Culture Manager, had set aside space for murals along Harbour Way South, and had met with a representative of Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC) and would be installing historic panels on- and off-site in addition to contributing a fair share to the *Ferry to Bridge to Greenway Complete Street Plan*. The project would also dedicate public spaces and a public outlook area at the southwest corner of the site to connect to the existing space at the northwest end of the Ferry Terminal parking lot.

The DRB had also expressed the desire to promote a future development of a mixed-use/retail/restaurant at the southwestern portion of the site and the developer had agreed to reasonably cooperate with the City's efforts for such use so long as the City and developer had reached agreement on an amended lease to remove the southwestern portion.

Mr. Lopez explained that the City was currently seeking approval of an amendment to the Seaport Plan administered by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). Pending BCDC approval, several areas in the Port of Richmond had been requested to be removed from the Seaport Plan. The southwestern portion of the site was slightly outside the 5.22-acres requested to be removed in the Ford Peninsula. Based on communication with BCDC, the request had tentatively been scheduled for a decision in mid-2023, although since the map to include the southwest parcel would have to be modified, the decision could be delayed until the end of 2023. Along with that decision, he explained that a General Plan Amendment and Rezoning would also be required by the City.

Mr. Lopez added that the completion of a Consistency Checklist prepared by Placeworks dated December 2022 had found the project to be in conformance with the analyses and conclusions of the General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), which had adequately described the impacts associated with the proposed project. Mitigations had been proposed in a number of areas that had been incorporated as conditions of approval. The recommended action was to approve the project subject to four findings and 31 conditions of approval.

Chair Livingston asked if there were any traffic-related issues and Mr. Lopez explained that a couple of traffic issues had been incorporated as conditions of approval such as providing red curb for at least 20 feet on both sides of the three driveways on Harbour Way South to prohibit on-street parking and maintain sight distance for vehicles turning out of the project driveways; re-striping Class II bike lanes in front of the property where applicable; and all driveways shall be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant accessible paths of travel. There had been no issues at the intersection with respect to truck traffic. A traffic consultant had done a thorough review of impacts related to traffic and few impacts had been identified.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

GEORGE ATALLA, Development Manager, CA Ventures, advised with respect to traffic conditions that the applicant was required under Condition 22 to contribute a fair share to the intersection signalization of Wright Avenue and Harbour Way South.

WILLIAM LU, Senior Vice President and Market Officer, CA Ventures, Operating Partner for the JV subleasing the property from Terminal 3 Partners and the City of Richmond, explained that CA Ventures would be the applicant and developer of the proposed project. The project was a build-to-suit for Moxion Power to expand their headquarters currently in the Ford Point building and to provide clean energy manufacturing to help reduce greenhouse gases. He described the Terminal 3 site and identified the existing conditions. He stated there was a metal building along the frontage of the facility that would be removed as part of the project, replaced with a brand new building, and all the dirt on site would be reutilized to avoid potential traffic issues. There was a corner of the site that was a Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) capped area that could not be disturbed. The project would work within the limitations of the deed restriction and the parking would be placed over the DTSC-capped area since the top four feet of that area could be disturbed. The 1.3 acres of the southwest corner occupied by Sause Bros would remain on a long-term lease.

THERESA GOODWIN, Architect, HPA Architects, Inc., stated there had been many changes to the site and the elevations. Among those changes, a sculpture had been added along Harbour Way in the middle of the building and two murals had been added along Harbor Way on each side of the sculpture between the main entrances. The solar canopies had been removed but solar would remain on the roof of the building. Flagpoles had been added at the entry along Harbour Way.

With respect to the Rosie the Riverter sculpture, Mr. Atalla described the area where the sculpture would be located on a 75-foot wide paved base with a four-foot tall pedestal as a focus point when traveling down Harbour Way. In addition, the public outlook area would be improved beyond what had been shown on the plans with native grass plant species to complement both the public outlook area on the north end of the Ferry Terminal lot with a pedestrian connection at the north end of that lot.

Mr. Lu anticipated that those changes would be part of the conditions of approval. He added that the applicant was working with the City to select a local artist for the Rosie the Riverter sculpture and had been in discussions with TRAC to address its conditions to increase public access to the site and to tie into the Bay Trail, also to be included as conditions of approval for the project. He added that he had agreed on language with Bruce Beyaert of TRAC, which language had been provided to Richmond Planning staff.

Ms. Goodwin presented the four-sided elevations, described the changes to those elevations to improve the brick façade, the mixing of the arch and the brick to provide simplified clean lines along with a clean prominent top above the brick to terminate the brick as previously discussed. She referred to the Port of Richmond signage above the murals to provide a sense of place for Terminal 3, and pointed out the placeholders for art that would be included when the selection of a local Richmond artist had been determined. She also described the changes that had been made to address the DRB's issues with respect to massing and she presented an illustration of what the Rosie the Riverter sculpture could look like.

SHAWN TAYLOR, HMH Landscape Architecture, presented the updated landscape concept that would utilize materials and plantings to tie the site into the surrounding area and to complement the architectural style with a mix of evergreen and semi-evergreen trees with fall color to frame the architecture and add seasonal appeal along with shrubs and plants chosen to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

add curb appeal. He described an alternating double row of potential evergreen trees along the frontage and fall color selected trees with cuts into the sidewalk to get the alternating row in to break up the long mass of the building. That along with unique planting around the Rosie the Riverter sculpture with 36-inch box redwood and sweet gum trees would add seasonal appeal. Street trees would be coordinated with the City.

Mr. Taylor pointed out enhanced paving in the entry plaza, sculptural bike walks, pottery with accent planting, and features in the paving at the plaza, and explained that an additional pedestrian connection on the south portion of the plaza would be added to the public overlook area to attach to the neighboring site with decorative paving, low-wall planters, tables and chairs and various grasses and Monterey cypress in the plaza area to tie it into the Bay landscape scheme.

Chair Livingston asked about the undergrounding of the existing powerlines at the site, and the applicant indicated that they had communicated with the City's Engineering Department and would work with the City to determine what the City wanted to do, and Mr. Lopez explained that any new electrical hookup would have to be underground, which was a standard condition of approval but the Engineering Department would make the call on whether to underground the existing powerlines.

Mr. Lu described some of the sustainability features associated with the project where upsized electrical rooms, conduits, and areas of electrical charging would be provided; the soils stockpile had been designed into the project to reduce significant truck traffic as part of the grading plan; the project would be designed consistent with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold standards; facility operations would be certified zero waste; the tenant would install solar panels along the entire roof and conduits to the pier for future marine electrification; and the site would be constructed with more electrical charging.

Chair Livingston asked why the outlook area could not be moved seaward to the edge of the property line, and Mr. Lu explained that a condition had been proposed to work with the Planning Department to clarify that location given the desire to avoid any permitting issues by expanding the Seaport into areas that were currently not approved.

Ms. Villarroel identified the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

JASON LINDSEY, President and Business Agent for Ironworkers Local 378, representing 2,600 union families many of whom lived in Richmond, stated the Portside Commerce Center would create over 400 permanent manufacturing jobs, would provide technology to replace diesel generators and help other industries reduce their carbon footprint in a LEED-certified facility using union labor that paid family sustaining wages and benefits, and created apprenticeship opportunities, provided solar and offered several other community benefits. He urged the DRB to approve the project.

BILL WHITNEY, CEO for the Contra Costa Building Trades Council representing 35,000 members in Contra Costa County, spoke in support of the project that offered a number of community benefits including the commitment to a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) that would provide good wages spent in the local economies, offer opportunities for apprenticeships as a pathway to the middle class and revitalize and energize a tired section of the City of Richmond in the Port area. He added that Moxion would offer a transition to green technology that would provide impressive numbers in that 10,000 electric vehicle (EV) generators would remove over 8 million tons of greenhouse gas emissions from the air. He urged approval of the project.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

ERIC HAYNES, Business Representative for Sheetmetal Workers Local 104, representing hundreds in Richmond and surrounding cities, stated the project was a great opportunity for a well-planned redevelopment of the existing property that would spur further development in the area and allow Moxion to expand its green technology business and build EV generators that would reduce diesel emissions in the Bay Area by replacing them with green energy units.

Mr. Haynes stated the proposal would also provide construction jobs under a PLA that would bring in union skilled and trained journeypersons and put to work many apprentices to build the future generation of a skilled work force, and all construction workers on the project would earn a living wage and have healthcare for their entire family along with retirement benefits. He asked the DRB to follow the staff recommendation and approve the application.

JESSE PERALEZ, speaking for the Nor Cal Carpenters Union representing over 4,000 members in Contra Costa County and 500 in Richmond alone, spoke in favor of the project to provide an opportunity for Richmond residents to work locally and provide great wages, benefits and provide programs like Richmond Build. He requested that the project be moved forward.

RACHEL SHOEMAKE, the Business Representative for IBEW Local 302 representing over 1,300 electrical workers in Contra Costa County, many who lived in Richmond, supported the project moving forward. She stated the PLA would provide well-paid jobs for a local diverse, skilled and trained workforce. She supported the tribute to Rosie the Riveter since her local in Contra Costa County actually employed the Rosie the Riveters. She asked the DRB to approve the project and move it forward.

KATRINKA RUK, Richmond, speaking on behalf of the Council of Business & Industries of West Contra Costa County, stated the Council was in support of the project. She noted the City had commenced with a Blue-Green Economic Development Strategy and a Seaport Plan, which fell in alignment with the proposal and they supported the redevelopment of the Port area. She asked the Planning Commission to continue to work with the business and approve the project.

KEITH LE MOINE, Business Representative for Laborer's Local 324, strongly encouraged the DRB to support the project.

JAMES MADSEN, Terminal 3 Partners, recognized all the work in the proposal over many months, the improvement to the project, the hours of contributions the DRB Chair had made to the project, and he was pleased that Moxion, a local green energy company was expanding, remaining in Richmond, and creating great jobs during construction and long term, and he recognized the contributions to the Bay Trail to increase public access, to public art, and stated the proposal was a great example of collaboration. He thanked the DRB for the time and effort invested in the project that he hoped would move forward.

MARK PLUBELL, representing Heat and Frost Insulators Local 16, was pleased with the plan, the changes that had made the project better, and stated the project that would improve a rundown Port area would only enhance the area and create good jobs during construction and with the operation of the Moxion expansion. He asked the DRB to approve the project.

JED MICKLE, representing Moxion Power, one of the co-founders and Vice President of Infrastructure thanked everyone for their support. To describe the company, he stated the business engineered and manufactured clean mobile energy solutions to replace traditional diesel generators with battery technology similar to Tesla. Moxion was excited to expand into the area and provide 400 additional local jobs and be part of Richmond's clean energy transition. He thanked the DRB for its support of the project.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

DENNIS HICKS, a Richmond resident and a retired member of IBEW in Contra Costa County, spoke in favor of the project that would bring new manufacturing technology to the City and complement the old Ford building and the new simple design of the new building and team up with the Building Trades Council to get it built in the safest most efficient way possible. He asked the DRB to approve the project and encourage more restaurants and shops at the Port. He also supported the proposed Rosie the Riverter sculpture.

DEREK COLE, the Business Agent with IBEW Local 302, requested the DRB's support for the Portside Commerce Center project.

FERNANDO CAMPOS, Laborer's Local 324 representing 2,000 union members in the Richmond area, supported the project and stated the environmental investment, the investment in the Port, the PLA, and the potential career opportunities that would allow folks to live locally, work locally and spend money locally investing in the local economy were supported. He urged approval of the application.

BRUCE BEYAERT, representing TRAC, stated he had worked with CA Ventures on the existing conditions to improve access to the site, improve the existing Bay Trail, the observation point and the *Ferry to Bridge to Greenway Complete Street Plan*. He referred to an additional condition relative to the public access area that the applicant had received and edited. He asked that the additional condition be adopted as amended by Mr. Attala since it would widen the trail coming into the outlook area from Harbour Way South, eliminate the fence on the City's property, and do something about the 20-foot wide stretch of strawberry plants along the shoreline extending to the far northern area on the corner of the site.

MARCIA VALLIER, Landscape Architect, expressed concern with the plant material that had been proposed since the sweet gum tree had pods that were a trip and slip hazard, the roots heaved pavement, and it was a moderate to high water user as were the redwoods, which could burn along the shoreline. She asked the architect to take a look at the plants that thrived along the shoreline since few species worked in that type of area.

Boardmember Butt thanked the speakers for their participation, thanked everyone for their hard work, supported the Chair's recommendations on the window design, and commented that she expected to see the signage like the Port of Richmond sign at the awning. She liked the signage but requested some depth so that 'Terminal 3' and 'Port of Richmond' did not look flat.

Ms. Goodwin clarified that the letters in the referenced sign would pop out, the reveals in the concrete panel that Boardmember Butt had referenced would read like a repeating horizontal line, and the clerestory windows would allow natural light into the building.

Boardmember Butt suggested that the reveals be repeated in the two recesses in the middle on either side of the Rosie the Riverter panel, which would read better, and Ms. Goodwin agreed.

Boardmember Butt supported the recommendation from TRAC.

Boardmember Marthinsen liked the idea of more texture around the entry and asked if additional texture could be added to some of the tilt-up walls to create a more subtle variation, particularly along the east elevation along Harbour Way.

Vice Chair Carter agreed with Boardmember Marthinsen's recommendation for more variation and texture in the gray panels to create something a bit more special. He asked about the font for the Point Richmond Terminal 3 signage, and Ms. Goodwin explained that some of those

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

details would be worked out in the final design. She suggested it should be representative of what was commonly used by the Port.

Vice Chair Carter concurred and encouraged the applicant to look at that element of the sign. He recommended the Port of Richmond on the water side be a consistent color or potentially two colors to make it easier to read; had no criticism of the architecture; agreed with recessing the windows a bit more; loved the treatment and clean design and liked the way it turned the corner on both ends. He thanked the DRB and the development team for the changes.

Boardmember Christeson suggested that one of the issues with the sign might be the need for backlighting, although Ms. Goodwin recommended lighting the murals and Rosie the Riveter sculpture first before considering an illumination of the sign.

Boardmember Christeson also recommended that entrance and exit signs be used to clearly define the entrances and exits to and from the parking lot. He liked and supported the project.

With respect to the question of lighting, Ms. Goodwin explained that typical lighting would be provided for the parking lot for safety along with the main entrances, and she would use ground mounted lights to light the murals and the sculpture.

Vice Chair Carter did not see it necessary to light the Terminal 3 and Port of Richmond signs, although Chair Livingston suggested that the illumination of Port of Richmond signs on the west side would be beneficial as a landmark.

Boardmember Marthinsen liked the idea of seeing something from the ferry assuming that was an active zone that would be well lit from both parking lots on each side. She wanted to see what the light levels would be as opposed to requiring a feature that was already part of a larger active environment that was already reasonably illuminated.

Chair Livingston sought a lighting plan and emphasized the importance of keeping the lighting down. To that end, a canopy over the bay doors had been recommended, and he asked about that lighting concept of washing up onto the Port of Richmond sign and washing down on the doors.

Boardmember Butt referred to the Ferry Terminal and the Ferry Building where the Port of San Francisco sign in that case used individual illuminated letters.

Mr. Lu advised that they would be comfortable with a condition of approval to shield the lighting to avoid light pollution and planned to use a combination of floor-mounted down point lighting with shields on the side, and the same with the walls. He also commented with respect to canopies and the potential need to protect workers from inclement weather that the trucks would back up to dock seals that would protect people from inclement weather.

Ms. Goodwin noted that while canopies had been requested, they would not be needed from a functional standpoint and had not been added. She stated that adding downlights to wash the wall and parking lot would provide the needed functionality and that had been proposed.

Mr. Lu understood in response to the Chair that there had to be lights provided for the parking lot and the wharf. As to an area on the wharf that had not been clearly described on the plans, he explained that the area in question was currently unimproved jurisdictional BCDC area, and enhanced landscaping and grass had been proposed subject to regulatory approval.

Chair Livingston understood that the applicant would return with a lighting plan to be approved

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

at the staff level.

When asked about a condition to address the lack of a lighting plan, James Atencio recommended that the lighting plan could be submitted to staff for review and comment to ensure consistency with comments received from the DRB on December 14, 2022.

Ms. Goodwin understood the DRB's desire for the font for the Port of Richmond sign to match what had been used adjacent to the site and that it be stretched wider to better fit with the Port feel. She offered an example of what that would look like.

HECTOR ROJAS, the new Planning Manager for the City of Richmond, introduced himself and stated that if signage was not part of the application, it should not be part of the purview at this time, although Mr. Lopez verified that signage was part of the application package.

Ms. Goodwin added a few more reveals and another color to address the DRB's request for more texture along Harbour Way with differentiation, with a lighter color and some reveals. She suggested the rhythm was right with the murals being the focal point and the pieces in between.

Chair Livingston asked if the letters could be cut out and made part of the cornice and not be part of the building architecture, although Ms. Goodwin suggested that if single letters were put on top of the panel it would not endure well and a structure that would keep the letters straight for the long term had been proposed. She noted some options that could be considered, agreed that there should not just be painted letters on a surface, and sought flexibility in the method to be used.

Boardmember Butt liked the added texture on the two panels and suggested it might come down to materiality.

On the discussion of a method to install the lettering for the signage to achieve the desired effect, Boardmember Marthinsen recommended a condition that the desire for the signage along Harbor Way was intended to have texture and depth along the façade, be integrated into the overall composition, and be durable enough to avoid the need for maintenance over the lifespan of the building.

Chair Livingston referred to the tree species and the need for discussion of the species to consider, and Mr. Lu explained that the condition of approval gave the Planning Department the ability to approve the tree species to be used in the front of the project.

Mr. Taylor added that the sweet gum and the redwoods had only been proposed at the sculpture; two redwood and two American sweet gum trees. With respect to the liquid amber trees, he clarified that in the fall a spiky ball fruit would fall that could be sharp, which was why those trees would only be used near the sculpture and be offset from the sidewalk. That species had been chosen given its vibrant colors in the fall.

Chair Livingston wanted to eliminate some of the bio swale area, to be moved to other areas to be able to provide more dense screening along the high concrete wall to mitigate the mass.

In response, Mr. Taylor stated that had been discussed with the civil engineer and the sculpture and the expanded pedestal and paved base had cut into the bio swale and the entire roof needed to be pitched to change the direction of water diversion. As a result, some lost space had to be swapped with the bio swale at the south end of the site. As to the street tree species that had been proposed, he stated they would work with staff to determine what trees were

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

preferred but what had currently been proposed were the brilliant red zelcova wireless and the evergreen New Zealand Christmas trees.

Chair Livingston commented that the trees proposed to be planted at 52 feet on center could be too sparse and he requested that the spacing be tightened along the frontage.

Mr. Taylor stated that could be done although the trees could have a width of 35 feet at full size. He suggested a tightening of 10 feet on each side to get them closer. He did not want to plant trees in the bio swale given the few species that did well in those areas that still conformed to the C.3 planting requirements.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Marthinsen supported the thoughtful design moves in the places it would do the most good in connection with the adjacent infrastructure.

Boardmember Christeson supported the excellent design that was a far cry from a standard warehouse and supported the placement of a future restaurant at the site.

On the DRB's recommended additional conditions of approval, Mr. Lu advised that the conditions were acceptable with a change to recommended Condition 40, which read: *Move the outlook area 18 feet towards the water side subject to review by regulatory agencies.* He requested that the specific reference to 18 feet be removed. The DRB agreed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Marthinsen/Carter) to approve PLN22-058, Portside Commerce Center, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 31 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 32) Add additional texture and color variation to the Harbour Way façade; 33) Tighten up the spacing of the street trees along Harbour Way to provide more planting coverage along that façade; 34) The large format signage along Harbour Way should be integrated into the overall composition of the façade, the lettering should provide texture either recessed or part of the tilt-up panels, the construction of the signage should consider durability and longevity for the life of the project and the font selection should be comparable to other typical Port signage; 35) Lighting plan to be submitted to Planning staff to ensure consistency with comments received from the DRB on December 14, 2022; 36) All steel components shall be hot dipped galvanized including fences, canopies, bollards and railings; 37) All roof flashing should be stainless steel, copper or zinc; 38) Modify staff Condition 24 to read: *All new and existing electrical lines and connections to the site shall be under grounded to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Community Development Director*; 39) Adopt additional conditions per the applicant's December 13, 2022 meeting with TRAC; 40) Move the outlook area towards the water side subject to review by regulatory agencies; 41) Delete the mistaken public access on the actual maritime loading pier as shown on the drawings; 42) Pursue an effort to illuminate the Port of Richmond sign on the water side; and 43) Adopt Exhibit 1B to modify the brick facade; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Marthinsen and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Hook.)

A recess was taken at 8:26 P.M. The DRB reconvened with all members initially shown as present at approximately 8:35 P.M.

2. PLN22-400 RYSE HEALING COURTYARD
Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON THE

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

PRELIMINARY DESIGN OF THE RYSE HEALING COURTYARD INCLUDING FOUR POD STRUCTURES AND LANDSCAPING ON A VACANT LOT.

Location	VACANT PARCEL ADJACENT TO 3912 MACDONALD AVENUE
APN	517-320-020
Zoning	CM-3, COMMERCIAL, MIXED-USE, COMMERCIAL
Owner/Applicant	RYSE INC.
Staff Contact	ANDREA VILLARROEL AND MARYTONAE SANCHEZ

Recommendation: **PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS**

Andrea Villarroel presented the staff report dated December 14, 2022 for the study session to provide feedback on the preliminary design of the RYSE Healing courtyard including four pod structures and landscaping on a 5,000 square-foot vacant lot adjacent to Macdonald Avenue, part of the RYSE Youth Center located at the northwest corner of Bissell Avenue and 41st Street within a commercial and mixed-use district surrounded by retail commercial buildings. The new healing garden proposed a garden space, four prefabricated accessory structures, wood decking, water features, a pavilion and other site improvements, and the proposed landscaping recalled the same plant palette used for the most recent RYSE improvement project with drought-tolerant species.

MARCIA VALLIER, Vallier Design Associates, Inc., the Landscape Architect, explained that the RYSE project had been reviewed by the DRB several years ago. She recommended that DRB members visit the site to see what was being done. The entire project was located between 41st and 39th Street and Bissell and Macdonald Avenues. The parcel involved was sandwiched between a church parking lot and an abandoned church and existing structures. The original building had a large mural and the DRB had previously approved the renovation of that structure along with the approval of a new structure on the site. She explained that everything that had previously been approved would be applied to the healing courtyard and noted there had been an extensive design process that the group had gone through, which included RYSE members, to solicit comments on the healing courtyard.

Ms. Vallier explained that the members of RYSE were at-risk youth. The comments offered by the members were for a calming space where the kids could express themselves. They wanted a place where plants were being planted for ideas and inspiration, and a relaxing, peaceful fun space with private areas as well as larger interaction areas. A peaceful place where members could have quiet time, meet in small spaces to do homework, listen to music to de-stress, create a feeling of being accepted, welcomed and at peace. The students wanted a water feature representing fluidity of change, the symbol of life, calmness and resilience. They wanted the open space to have green walls, a meditation space, a studio and gaming area and a fine arts space. Three different concepts had been designed and she presented those concepts.

Ms. Vallier explained that one of the reasons the members had wanted water was that counselors were counseling individuals and they wanted to have the water sounds, walk in grass with sensory therapy, and a separate pod had been designed to accommodate that need. There was a community garden to the south and the decomposed granite ground plain would be continued and there would be a slight rise in the grade. The pavilion would be up one foot, the decks would be flush with the paving and the doors, and pods would be 12 feet wide by different module lengths. The existing materials on site were wood, permeable concrete walls decomposed granite, glass, roll up doors, punched metals and lights. The pergola would either be sloped like a shed roof or have a flat structure similar to those in the commons courtyard.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

The lights would be fun outdoor galvanized lights, and the ground plain treatments would be decomposed granite at the entry, permeable pavers in different sizes and patterns to create interest and an accessible surface, and the decking would be cedar or a TREX product. She identified the location of the proposed lighting. Site furnishings would be the same as those most recently approved by the DRB, and the punched metal trash receptacles would be used in and around the different pods. The proposed plants had previously been used in the other courtyards and a lot of the plant material was representative of the regions of the world that the members' families had come from to bring home the sense of community.

Ms. Vallier reported the one percent for art would be done on a mural wall along Macdonald Avenue. She identified an existing mural, described it as spectacular graffiti art and identified the street artists who had worked with the members to come up with the theme of the mural.

Ms. Vallier stated the same process would be used for the proposed double-sided eight-foot tall mural wall facing Macdonald and facing the inside of the RYSE facility. The imagery would be identified by the youth and the theme would be a combination of racial justice, environmental justice, just transition, and gender justice and the art would reflect the intersection of various movements. She would work with the City's Arts & Culture Manager to meet the art requirement.

Ms. Vallier identified the three different types of pods as WellMade, Backyard Eichler and StudioShed, noted that they were off-the-shelf pods and each could be customized, and sought input from the DRB on which pods were preferred, particularly whether a shed, flat or peaked roof should be selected as a common type or whether the roof types should be varied to create the sense of a village. She preferred a shed roof and noted that each pod would have plugs, lights and may have a small wall-mounted heating unit. The healing center would operate during the daytime, 8:00 A.M. to about 5:00 P.M.

Chair Livingston commented that in his experience the shed shown in the plans incorporated Feng Shui principles.

Ms. Vallier also presented exhibits of the water feature she described as small shallow recirculating features to offer the feel, sound and symbolism of water in the space that would be operational only during business hours and would be refilled by the irrigation system.

Chair Livingston opened the hearing to public comments.

Andrea Villarroel identified the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

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

Vice Chair Carter supported the project and preferred the WellMade pod that was contemporary and fit better with the rectilinear plan for the landscape, but also supported clerestories that offered more light.

Boardmember Christeson stated he had visited the RYSE website and had been impressed with the mission statement and with the proposed expansion to the project. He was a fan of the shed roof type and again commended the great design.

Boardmember Marthinsen agreed that RYSE was an amazing organization. She also supported the design, and stated the pods should have the same language in that the landscape should offer the variety and texture while the pods should be in the background. She

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

liked the shed roof that felt lighter on the landscape and less like a feature, although she liked the corrugated material that made it a little less residential. She supported an industrial look on the outside of the pods and suggested wood could be used on the pergola.

Boardmember Butt supported the cool project and agreed that since the area was so small it would be nice to have consistency and have the pods in the same language. She suggested different colors might be considered to offer a calming appeal.

Ms. Vallier identified the overall layout of the RYSE facility and noted that the second building was being turned into a health center that had already been approved.

Chair Livingston concurred with the comments and supported a consistent language in the architecture of the pods. He commented that natural wood was one of the most calming elements and stated the more natural the structure the more calming it would be.

Noting that the shed roofed structure used as an example had cementitious siding and glass, Chair Livingston suggested that structure did not provide privacy, and if the intent of the structure was to provide safety, privacy in a meditation area that might not be the right design. He referred to porcelain panels and suggested that material could replace the cementitious siding and a variety of material treatments could be used to provide variation in the three pods.

Ms. Vallier commented that she had been told that the members didn't want everything closed off because there would be a lot of 'cup caking' and a lot of openness with glass was preferred. She explained that the proposal would return with a stormwater plan and with a revised design in response to the DRB's comments. She also explained that there would be a grand opening at the end of April 2023.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

- Selection of Chair and Vice Chair

Chair Livingston nominated Vice Chair Carter as Chair of the Design Review Board.

Boardmember Butt nominated Boardmember Hook as Vice Chair of the DRB.

Chair Livingston nominated Boardmember Christeson as Vice Chair, as did Vice Chair Carter.

Both Vice Chair Carter and Boardmember Christeson accepted the nominations.

Chair Livingston clarified that nominations would be made at one meeting and the vote would be taken at the next meeting.

Since Boardmember Christeson would not be available at the next meeting on January 11, 2023, the vote for Chair and Vice Chair would be scheduled for a future meeting.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JANUARY 25, 2023

Chair Livingston advised that the DRB Subcommittee had reviewed a project for the PG&E site through the lens of the Planned Area (PA) Plan, which the applicant had since rescinded and had resubmitted the project under the base zoning with the addition of density bonuses and waivers.

Chair Livingston stated, when asked, that the Quarry Project which had been approved as a PA for single-family development had a builder although that builder had pulled out. The Terminal One project had been given a six-months extension by the City Council to solve some issues, although how that would be done had not been resolved.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 P.M. to the regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, January 11, 2023.