

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

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

January 22, 2020
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Jessica Fine, Michael Hannah, Macy Leung, and Karlyn Neel*
*Arrived after Roll Call

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano and Jonelyn Whales

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 11, 2019

Boardmember Butt requested an amendment to the first sentence in the third paragraph from the bottom of Page 4, as follows: *Boardmember Butt verified the need that the garage be a simple appropriate well-designed garage compatible with ~~the modern Mexican architecture of the restaurant itself.~~*

<p>ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Butt) to approve the minutes of the December 11, 2019 meeting, as amended; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Neel).</p>
--

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, referred to the public hearing at the last meeting for the El Tapitio Restaurant, noted that the Neighborhood Council had yet to be contacted with respect to that application, and explained that was a problem in that the Neighborhood Councils could not sign off on applications not submitted to them. He used the Aspire Technology application as an example where the Fairmede-Hilltop Neighborhood Council had also not yet been informed of that project. He urged that the Neighborhood Councils be notified of any application submitted to the DRB for consideration.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

Chair Livingston clarified with planning staff that the City Attorney had opined that contact with the applicable Neighborhood Councils was not mandatory given that a Neighborhood Council was not a formal body.

City Council Liaison Report

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, February 3, 2020 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. PLN17-436 | VALMAR LAUNDROMAT |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 1,500 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING FOR A LAUNDROMAT. |
| Location | 3630 BARRETT AVENUE AND ADJACENT PARCELS |
| APN | 516-090-004 TO 006 |
| Zoning | CM-2 COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, NEIGHBORHOOD (FORM BASED CODE, T4MS-O) AND RL-2 SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (FORM BASED CODE, T4N-O) |
| Applicant | SADIK AHMED ALAMMARI (OWNER) |
| Staff Contact | ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION |

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated January 22, 2020, explained that the application required Planning Commission approval for a Conditional Use Permit, and noted that the application originally submitted in August 2017 had been considered by the Design Review Board (DRB) in February 2018, and August and October 2019. With the comments from the DRB and the help of Chair Livingston, the plans had been updated and submitted for further consideration. She reported that the plans would be modified with an additional page A-2.1 to be replaced by the applicant to include a door on the southern elevation.

Chair Livingston thanked the applicant, owner, and architect for their patience and for continuing to work on the project.

Boardmember Fine noted some discrepancies on the plans and sought clarification as to those discrepancies. She also sought clarification of the zoning after the parcel merger.

Ms. Feliciano explained that when merged, the existing zoning designations would remain and the parking lot would serve both the corner store market and the laundromat.

JOE OAKLEY, the Project Architect, expressed his appreciation to the DRB for its direction during the review process and explained that the project was intended to satisfy a need in the community. In response to the question of light pole placement in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) van accessible parking, he clarified that the light pole in question had been moved, and Chair Livingston clarified that the DRB in its review had moved the light poles in and there was a 10-foot buffer zone for trees to buffer parking lot noise and light glare from adjacent residential properties.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, expressed concern for safety given the history of accidents associated with the adjacent intersection, particularly around 5:00 P.M. He requested that stop signs be required as a condition of approval.

MARY MILTON, Richmond, who lived close to the site of the laundromat, asked about the security measures that would be associated with the use to ensure that it would be a safe place for all. She also expressed concern for potential noise associated with the use.

DRB members explained that the building and the parking lot would be well illuminated, there would be security cameras on site as well as a new perimeter fence; and with the new building, lighting, and activity as well as an employee on site would create a sense of security and order. It was also noted that a letter of support had been submitted from the North and East Neighborhood Council.

Chair Livingston urged the speakers to also address their concerns to the Planning Commission during its hearing of the application.

By motion and second, Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Leung recommended that windows be added in the office so that the manager would have views of the entire area, including views outside the laundromat.

The applicant added that all security cameras would be accessed in the manager's office.

Boardmember Hannah recommended a light, as in a door with a glass window, in the manager's office. He requested that the materials board be refreshed.

Boardmember Fine recommended some articulation on the west elevation, changes to the east elevation to ensure that the signage did not get lost behind the trees, and some screening of the mechanical equipment on the south elevation with the opportunity for signage on the screening. She also confirmed that the main building color would be tan and the fence would be exposed wood.

Boardmember Neel arrived at this time.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Butt) to recommend to the Planning Commission for approval PLN17-436, Valmar Laundromat, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 18 Conditions of Approval and the addition of Conditions 19) Install a stop sign at the exit from the Valmar parking lot; 20) Add glazed door to the manager's office for surveillance oversight; 21) Screen the mechanical equipment and consider heavily Boardmember Fine's suggestion to use the mechanical screening as the primary signage of the building raising it up off the walls; 22) Ensure that the light standards do not conflict with any California accessibility provisions; and 23) Project to look like the south elevation, Page A-4.1 with three windows; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung, Neel and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: None).

2. PLN19-421
Description

SECOND-STORY ADDITION AND NEW TWO-STORY ADU
PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO
CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY ±525 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND A \pm 450 ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ABOVE THE DETACHED GARAGE.

Location	6000 FRESNO AVENUE
APN	510-112-025
Zoning	RL-2 SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	ANGELA XU AND NORM FONG
Applicant	STEFAN MENZI
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated January 22, 2020, for a one-story single-family home with a side detached garage and a proposal to reorient some of the bedrooms, which would not increase in size but which would require a slight demolition to the front of the home. She noted that Governor Newsom had recently taken action to eliminate the discretionary aspect from ADUs to help with the homeless crises, although the proposed ADU was over the garage and the proposal had come in prior to January 1 when the new action had been enacted. She clarified that planning departments now had no discretion over ADUs as long as an ADU was no more than 850 square feet in size and no more than 16 feet in height.

Ms. Whales advised that there were other two-story structures in the neighborhood; clarified the orientation of the home on the corner lot and stated that some setbacks would change and there would be a projection into one of the setbacks for the stairs; and presented the proposed colors.

When asked, the applicant advised that the owner had contacted the adjacent neighbors but he was not aware whether or not the Neighborhood Council had been contacted.

STEFAN MENZI, the applicant, stated that he had worked with the owners to create the proposal through a number of iterations and challenges given the tight lot. The owner intended to live in the ADU during the house construction phase; the proposed architecture was intended to match the existing home with materials, roof shapes, window patterns and siding; the application complied with the 2,500 square foot maximum floor area ratio (FAR) that applied to residential projects in addition to lot coverage; and the installation of the stairway to the ADU would project into the required setback as allowed by code creating a 6.5 foot setback.

Boardmember Hannah questioned whether the staircase complied with code with a handrail as opposed to a staircase with a wall, and expressed concern for the staircase and the required setback. He noted the likelihood that the staircase would not be allowed at the proposed location, and if allowed by code suggested it would not be supported by the DRB.

Boardmember Fine expressed concern for the interface between the second floor terrace of the main structure and the sleeping area window of the ADU, and recommended an obscure glass window or that the window be moved. She recommended that the man door to the garage be a solid door for similar reasons. As to the garage, she suggested the door with the thin trim looked heavy and recommended that the trim match throughout. She did not like the trim color and recommended something warmer. She also questioned the redwood exposed brackets prominent on the second floor of the main house but not part of the second floor of the ADU.

Boardmember Hannah acknowledged that the two units were slightly different and should feel like separate houses. He suggested that the corbels be removed from both since the garage door would modernize the appearance. He verified that the gutters and downspouts would be painted galvanized to match the wall colors

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

Boardmember Neel agreed with a warm color palette and recommended a burned orange color for the trim, with the other colors to be compatible. She sought more symmetry between the buildings and offered a sketch of what she proposed to make the two buildings more relatable. Boardmember Butt recommended that the gas and water meters be moved from the front elevation and placed around the corner or be screened.

Chair Livingston liked the building and the architecture, although he suggested it would pull forward on the lot and he objected to having all the mass on the street, a variance to the continuity of the street. As a result, he questioned whether the finding could be made that the proposal was in context with its surroundings.

Boardmember Hannah suggested the design worked much more effortlessly by pushing out and sliding the stairs up in the middle, and while it could be rearranged he recognized from the homeowner's point of view that had been the driving factor. He suggested the adjacent one-story setback was the one out of step with the rhythm of the neighborhood and suggested that the perception of more buildings and more people with separate properties was better than one big mass. He added that by popping up the main house in the middle of the property would create the least impactful design.

On the discussion, the fact was noted that the neighborhood was being densified by making the house bigger but was being mitigated by the addition of the ADU which would address the need for housing.

Chair Livingston spoke to the sideyard stair and suggested there was an opportunity to conform to the six-foot sideyard setback and move the stair to the ADU to the back to avoid encroachment of the two-story building. He noted there was nothing on the street that was as close as to what had been proposed. He also noted that he liked the bay which helped to break up the mass. He commented that the 1950 foundation would not be able to support a second story load and would have to be rebuilt. With a requirement for a new foundation, he sketched a plan to push the bedroom to the back, left the stairway and everything else as is, and moved the terrace from the back to the front which pushed the massing to the back.

Ms. Whales clarified that there was also a 10-foot distance requirement between the two buildings.

Boardmember Hannah supported a potential reconsideration of the entire design of the project. Given the concern that the proposal was pushing the limits of lot coverage and building guidelines, and set precedent, he recommended that the applicant engage the Neighborhood Council and the neighbors to determine whether the current proposal could be accepted with adjustment to the stairs or whether there would have to be a redesign of the proposal. He suggested the terrace could remain as proposed if made a bit smaller or extended back and the side elevation of the main house could be narrowed a foot overall and projected two feet as opposed to three feet.

Boardmember Neel expressed concern with the smaller windows on the bigger mass and the bigger windows on the smaller mass and sought more balance proportionately.

There was consensus that the sideyard staircase needed to be redesigned.

Mr. Menzi clarified that if moving the staircase to the rear he would be allowed to extend the building to the interior sideyard setback of five feet consistent with RL-2 zoning regulations.

The DRB offered the following recommendations:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

- Access staircase to be moved to the rear of the ADU.
- The bay on the main house to project no more than two feet and be 10 feet wide overall to reduce the mass in back.
- Secure input from the neighbors.
- Utilities to be screened in front or be moved out of view.
- Landscaping details to be provided.
- Corbels to be eliminated.
- Brackets to be removed.
- Garage door trim to match the thickness and style of the window trim.
- Two street trees consistent with City of Richmond's list of acceptable street trees to be provided.
- Colors to change from cool green to warmer colors or the recommended burnt orange.
- Downspouts and gutters to be painted galvanized of the domestic class.
- Bathroom window to the rear of the ADU to have obscure glass or be moved.
- Front door to relate to the accent color or the brown color.
- Lighting for the garage door or front entry styles to match with lights to be shielded, and if an LED to be no greater than 3,000k.
- Trash receptacles to be in the garage or side yard, with a door to the side yard.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to continue PLN19-421, Second Story Addition and New Two-Story ADU, to the second meeting in February 2020 subject to the recommendations as shown; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Leung, Neel and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: None).

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

- Vice Chair Nominations

The Board discussed the role of the Vice Chair and Vice Chair Hannah's preference to focus his time as member of the Board as opposed to running the meetings in the absence of the Chair whenever that should occur. After the discussion, and given the fact that life and work restrictions impacted all members of the Board who were unable to take on additional duties, Vice Chair Hannah agreed to maintain the status quo this year.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MARCH 11, 2020

Chair Livingston advised that the Board vacancy had been filled and the new member would be available at the next meeting. The issue of Vice Chair was tabled at this time.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston updated the Board on the Bay Walk NOMA project and a recent subcommittee meeting; and the first viewing of the Pt. Molate Master Plan.

Ms. Whales identified the status of the UPS application.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, February 12, 2020.