

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond CA 94804

April 22, 2020
6:00 P.M.

All Participation Via Teleconference

On March 16, 2020, the Health Officer of Contra Costa County issued an Order through April 7, 2020, that directed that all individuals living in the County to shelter at their place of residence except those providing essential services. On March 31, 2020, the County issued Order No. HO-COVID19-03 superseding the Prior Shelter Order and extending certain terms of the Prior Shelter Order to increase social distancing, reduce person-to-person contact and extend the shelter-in-place order until May 3, 2020.

On March 17, 2020 Governor Gavin Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20, authorizing legislative bodies to hold public meetings via teleconferencing, allowing members of the public to observe and address meetings telephonically or otherwise electronically, consistent with notice and accessibility requirements as set forth in the Order. On March 19, 2020, the Governor issued a statewide shelter-in-place order.

Due to the shelter in place orders, all City of Richmond staff, members of the Design Review Board, 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
Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Brian Carter
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Brian Carter, Jessica Fine, Michael Hannah, Macy Leung, and Karlyn Neel

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Lina Velasco, Roberta Feliciano, and Emily Carroll, and City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 8, 2020

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Neel) to approve the minutes of the April 8, 2020 meeting, as submitted; approved by Roll Call vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hannah, Leung, Livingston, and Neel; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDER submitted an email dated April 12, 2020: *Hello my comment is regarding the El Tapatio expansion. If memory serves correctly the applicant did not contact the North and East president to schedule a presentation. Two, I had spoken with the Fairmede Council and they were upset that the Aspire project did not come to the Council. So in the future the applicants must email the president to have the applicant present their project. Sincerely, Cordell.* From an email dated April 28, 2020 from Mr. Hindler: *Hello Lina. My comment is regarding on how projects came to the Board without the input from the neighbors. For e.g. when the folks came to talk about the expansion of Aspire, Fairmede Hilltop was not aware of the project, their main concern was the traffic especially during the afternoon rush, and also the building not being seismically safe.*

Chair Livingston requested that staff advise the members of the public participating in the remote meeting the process to be taken for public input. Roberta Feliciano explained how members of the public could call in by computer or by phone to offer comments.

City Council Liaison Report

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. PLN18-321 | 12TH STREET AND MACDONALD AVENUE STUDY SESSION |
| Description | STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN FOR NEW COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE BUILDINGS WITH ±335 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND ±63,478 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL SPACE. |
| Location | VACANT PARCELS ON THE CORNER OF 12 TH STREET AND MACDONALD AVENUE, BETWEEN 11 TH AND 13 TH STREETS |
| APN | 540-092-016, -18, 540-081-001 TO -005, 540-081-020, -021, -024 TO -026 |
| Zoning | CM-5 COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, ACTIVITY CENTER, AND IS-1 FORM-BASED CODE |
| Owner | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| Applicant | ERNST VALERY, SAA EVI |
| Staff Contact | ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: HOLD TO FUTURE MEETING |

Staff advised that the item would be continued to a future meeting.

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 2. PLN20-057 | POINT MOLATE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT STUDY SESSION |
| Description | STUDY SESSION TO RECEIVE AND PROVIDE INPUT ON THE PROPOSED POINT MOLATE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. THE PROJECT WOULD ADD APPROXIMATELY 1,260 RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND 250,000 SF OF MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, AS WELL AS ADAPTIVE REUSE OF THE EXISTING HISTORIC STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WINEHAVEN HISTORIC DISTRICT. THE PROJECT INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, REZONING, AND TENTATIVE MAP. |
| Location | 2100 STENMARK DRIVE |

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

| | |
|---------------|--|
| APN | 561-100-008 |
| Zoning | PR, PARKS AND RECREATION; CG, COMMERCIAL GENERAL; IL, INDUSTRIAL LIGHT; AND OS, OPEN SPACE |
| Owner | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| Applicant | WINEHAVEN LEGACY LLC |
| Staff Contact | LINA VELASCO AND ROBERTA FELICIANO |

Recommendation:
PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS

Lina Velasco presented the staff report dated April 22, 2020, and described the process for the development, a proposed mixed-use project seeking to modify the General Plan Land Use Map, some Text Amendments, a rezone to a Planned Area (PA) District (a master plan level mini-zoning) and a Historic District as part of the overall Point Molate site, and a proposal to modify the H-Overlay to include a Historic Preservation Plan in the form of Design Guidelines. The DRB would have to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the design related findings for a PA District to guide future development and review future project components to ensure a high quality built environment. The study session was being held as part of the process to solicit early public input before being formally considered by the DRB for action.

Ms. Velasco introduced the applicant's team as Nicole Emmons (Hart Howerton), Peter Kindel (SOM), and Marc Magstadt (Suncal) representing Winehaven Legacy LLC.

In response to the DRB, Ms. Velasco described the process to be taken for the study session; stated that staff would work with the Historic Preservation Commission to solicit input; and a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) of the previously certified 2011 EIR that had been prepared as part of the Casino project was currently out for public comment that would close on April 30, and be considered along with the project entitlements. Some uses would require administrative use permits and more detailed DRB evaluation would be required when specific project components had been proposed in the future.

Ms. Velasco explained that the city had no jurisdiction over Caltrans but was working with Caltrans to enable what had been proposed and traffic analyses were being considered to identify potential impacts given the adjacent freeway and the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge. The project had been reviewed by the DRB's Point Molate Subcommittee and the Subcommittee's summary letter dated April 16, 2020 would be provided to the DRB electronically. The city was also working with the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) to address the two segments of the San Francisco Bay Trail that would need to be constructed from the existing Bay Trail at the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge to Point Molate. She added that both the city and the EBRPD had partnered together to secure grant funding to build the two separate segments.

NICOLE EMMONS, Hart Howerton, described the portions of the project site being prepared by Howerton and those being prepared by SOM. She identified the project site as that property above main high water, described the elevation and topography and the area where the development would be clustered, and pointed out the natural landscape of hillsides, ridges, valleys, and east/west connectors that were natural drainage ways to a major regional public access along the waterfront in a series of coves. Three study areas on the property that had formed a relationship between the hillside and the waterfront were identified as the Promenade to the south, the Point, and the historic Winehaven village neighborhoods.

Ms. Emmons also described the organization of development in the master plan and the relation of the development to Stenmark Drive, to the views, and how it was shaped by the land. She identified the significant open space consisting of a few primary open space types; the hillside, the shoreline park, 1.7 miles of publicly accessible shoreline, and the shoreline bluff.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

There would be a series of neighborhoods and local parks to provide east/west connections to trails and trail heads and to the center of Winehaven village, and areas to create play areas, walkways and pathways in addition to the Bay Trail. Stenmark Drive was described as one of the primary elements that transitioned through the site. Ms. Emmons described each of the neighborhoods; the characteristics of building type, orientation and placement; the distances involved; views; materials; an overlook; affordable housing to be governed by the Design Guidelines; and other particulars such as hierarchy of street types, style influences, and historic references.

A brief video prepared by Chair Livingston was presented to further detail the expansiveness of the Point Molate location.

PETE KINDEL, SOM, identified the 30 to 40 historical structures on the property, stated that SOM had worked closely with the Historic Preservation Commission, and had further investigated the structure and history of the buildings that had been incorporated into the planning. He pointed out the specific buildings in the proposal along with the “great lawn” and the public waterfront creating a cohesive mixed-use walking district. All streets were allowed to connect into and through the project. He presented a detail of the plaza space, the centerpiece of the project from a public use standpoint, and explained there was a 30-foot grade change throughout the site requiring a series of three levels that he described from Elevation 19 the same elevation as the lawn, the middle lawn for public gathering at Elevation 28, and an upper lawn or upper terrace at Elevation 37, the same level of the railroad tracks that had been incorporated into the master plan. The topmost elevation was identified as the overlook at the elevation of Stenmark Drive at Elevation 49. He referenced the old pier and explained that a boardwalk had been recommended as opposed to a full reconstruction of the pier, flush with the lawn that would allow access to the bike trail.

Mr. Kindel also described the various villages and neighborhoods, the historic buildings, explained that trees would be kept to a minimum to preserve views, and noted how new construction could be merged with old construction on a building-by-building basis where anyone building in the area would have to conform to the guidelines and align with the architecture.

Ms. Emmons presented the Design Guidelines and its format, to be used as a tool to help the respective boards know how to use the guidelines for design and for historic preservation and references to prior approvals. She pointed out the various sections and explained how blocks would be organized to create a pedestrian-friendly environment considering building height, the hierarchy of street types, primary frontages, primary roadways, secondary and tertiary roadways, emergency vehicle access, style influences regional and within Winehaven, building type, massing, and placement for development ranging from single-family small lot to a multi-family mixed use parcel. The rules would relate to proportion, massing and articulation of buildings. The landscape guidelines would look at the planting, trail work, elements of the Bay Trail Design Guidelines and other city documents within the Richmond Municipal Code such as signage and lighting, drainage and stormwater management, invasive species management, and a suggested plant list of native plants, which would be in the appendix.

Mr. Kindel described the Design Guidelines specifically for the Winehaven Historic District.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC [Trails for Richmond Action Committee] presented a number of exhibits and stated that TRAC would like the Bay Trail to be extended from the Point Molate property all the way to the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

Mr. Beyaert explained that the project, 2.5 miles from the bridge and the northern border of Point Molate, was shovel ready and only full funding was needed in order to build it. He pointed out the East Bay Regional Park District's (EBRPD's) proposed extension of the trail, which was also shovel ready, and presented a slide of the southern end of the Loop Road for the Point residential development co-located with the Bay Trail along the shoreline. Given that there was insufficient space along the southern stretch of the Loop Road off Stenmark Drive to properly accommodate the Bay Trail, which required a width of 18 feet (and the Loop Road required a width of 24 feet), he suggested there was insufficient room to co-locate both, particularly given the fact that the Loop Road would likely be well used. He suggested a co-location would destroy the Bay Trail experience from the shoreline. As such, he requested that it be accessed only from the Winehaven Historic District or from an emergency access corridor.

Chair Livingston narrated a video which was displayed at this time to identify the area involved, specifically the narrow portion where the 18-foot Bay Trail and 24-foot Loop Road would be difficult to provide.

Ms. Velasco noted that the Bay Trail allowed precedence for where there were constraints with specific guidelines when space was limited. She explained the City was following that guideline in this case and advised that staff would look into that situation to see whether any additional adjustments could be made.

Mr. Beyaert clarified TRAC's desire to extend the Bay Trail from Point Molate Beach to the trail at the ridge, and that the southern extension of the Loop Road be eliminated and accessed only from the Winehaven Historic District or from an emergency access corridor rather than creating a new shoreline road adjacent to the Bay Trail.

When asked, Ms. Velasco verified that traffic analyses had been conducted as part of the environmental review when Abrams & Associates had looked at the traffic flow.

SALLY TOBIN, Richmond, an open space advocate, suggested that development at Point Molate should be confined to the historic area. She asked how the proposed zoning changes would influence what the city had planned for Terminal 4 when industrial traffic could go back and forth on Stenmark Drive. With respect to the drainage, she questioned whether permeable or impermeable surfaces were being used for the civic plaza. She noted that drainage came down through "the yard" and she asked if that could be more meandering and be accompanied by native plants. She suggested it then seemed to go underground through civic plaza and across "the lawn" and noted that should be restored in Point Molate. She also noted it seemed as if the DSEIR had considered only 1,200 people as opposed to the expected 2,000 people.

Ms. Velasco explained that Terminal 4 was currently farther north on Stenmark Drive past Point Molate at the tip of Point San Pablo, the former whaling station that had been closed. The area around the tip was known as Terminal 4 and the city was partnering with the Coastal Conservancy to remove the dilapidated wharf and the structure on the wharf, and restore the Bay in that area. Farther north on the other side the city had conducted a pilot project and was currently partnering with the Coastal Conservancy to raise money to complete that project. She stated the area had been proposed as Open Space in the General Plan and only public recreation would be allowed. She did not anticipate industrial traffic in that area although the EIR had anticipated the potential that the two projects could occur at the same time. As a result, that potential truck traffic had been addressed in the environmental document.

JIM HANSON expressed concern for the amount of development proposed for a small space and urged consideration of the fact that Point Molate itself would dramatically change as a result of the proposal, which would extend development into the hills contrary to the General Plan.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

Mr. Hanson requested that Figure 3-10 from the EIR, which offered a realistic view of the level of development, along with the grading plan, be made a part of the presentation. He suggested the project looked wonderful from the south shore but asked the DRB to look at the community plan in the EIR. He concurred with the concern for potential congestion of the site and the connections to I-580. He urged leaving spaces for people who did not have a lot of space to get away to. He also asked Mr. Kindel to make available the rendering that followed Page 82 of the EIR to be able to look at that more closely since it offered a view of how the character of the site would change.

Boardmember Hannah requested to be provided with the referenced sections of the EIR.

SONYA KARABEL asked about the relationship between the PA District plans and anything that would be in the final Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA), particularly with respect to the uses proposed for the site, such as food and beverages, and the restrictions that might be involved.

Ms. Velasco explained that the City of Richmond was the property owner of Point Molate and had an exclusive right to negotiate with Winehaven Legacy LLC to sell portions of the property to be developed under a DDA, which process was occurring concurrently with different city staff members. Typically the DDA would refer to entitlements required to enable the project, which would be subject to conditions in the entitlements that had been approved. She explained it was more for the land sale while the land use regulation would be through the PA plan and the rezoning.

PAUL CARMAN noted that Suncal had stated that 1,100 units would be built on the hillside first which would determine whether developing the 1,000 houses in Winehaven and he asked how that could be. He also noted it looked like the shoreline in the plan had not been designed to take into account climate change because as the water line increased the eel grass would need to be able to move up the hillside to accommodate the higher sea level and the plan had not been designed to allow that to occur.

Ms. Velasco stated in terms of the 1,100 units that a phasing plan had been proposed at a master plan level and the PA plan would accommodate a range of density, which staff had analyzed with either a residential heavy buildout or a commercial heavy buildout, although the actual number of units to be developed had yet to be determined. As to how to design Winehaven as residential or commercial heavy, the intent was to support one or the other. In regards to shoreline and climate change sea level rise and its impact to the project, the site would be evaluated to be able to accommodate at least three feet of sea level rise. In general, the site was not in an area of significant impact due to sea level rise. The issue of sea grass and the like had been analyzed in the EIR document.

There were no other speakers.

Boardmember Carter suggested the concept was pure with a seamless integration of the built environment with a dynamite natural environment looking to reintroduce the human component. He suggested the beautifying theme of the whole development should embrace the relationship with the natural environment, creating a more natural habitat, increasing the biodiversity and alternative energy production and expand on that to include community agriculture, particularly through the stormwater element and make that a focal point of the project.

With respect to access to the upland trail and the focus of the Bay itself, Boardmember Carter referred to the hills above the development, suggested they were exclusive, and asked how the distribution had been conceptualized in terms of housing type and density.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

Boardmember Carter suggested consolidating the single-family houses into one of the other housing types, increasing the density and allowing more release of the natural areas. He was attracted to multi-family density as being more efficient leaving a large amount of the natural area to be enjoyed communally. He acknowledged the vivid illustrations of what the character of the proposal might be but he wanted it to relate to Richmond and offer a strong grasp of the soul of the development and how it fit into the context of Richmond's history and the future of the community and the planet as a whole.

Ms. Emmons responded to the comments and the site sensitive aspects of the guidelines and stated the developer team had worked to include the opportunity for, in particular, the way that the development would work with the landscape, opportunities described in the guidelines for the sustainability elements, opportunity to reduce energy use and energy sources, all within the Design Guidelines. She saw the proposal as the next generation for Richmond using industrial sites that were grounded in the place with the Point Molate background and the remarkable built context that was Winehaven along with the pre-history of the site. She noted that as the development moved forward some contemporary architecture would evolve shaped by the next generation and for the creation of spaces that people could use, with a focal point on public access.

Chair Livingston suggested that the developer embrace some of the comments of community agriculture and an eco-district in the public spaces and to lend some identity to the district with the next generation in mind.

Ms. Emmons stated there would be a space for public space connectors between the Promenade and along Stenmark Drive and up into the hills which could include community gardens and provide access, visibility, and connectivity to a robust trail system, not just in the Promenade neighborhood but in the valleys, neighborhoods, and east/west connectors.

Boardmember Carter also noted that such a scheme would provide a wildlife corridor with natural movement from the hills to the Bay and back and forth, offering a safe connection.

With respect to the distribution of densities, Ms. Emmons stated they had been encouraged to consider additional densities with buildings at a potential of five to eight stories, and also provide access and parking, looking at a structured parking program to accommodate the higher density, as an example, and had also looked within Winehaven to complement the organization of the village structure and create a main street portion of Stenmark to open up at the powerhouse plaza, especially at the bend in the road where a former fire station had been situated and which could potentially be resituated in the future. She noted they had been challenged by the DRB Subcommittee to consider that area and potentially accommodate the potential for multi-family with a consistent density as opposed to a gradient density. Generally, they were creating a core around Winehaven and providing for an element at the Point to take advantage of a pre-eminent view and a flat area to develop more economic development or an increased density, and the drum lot in the remediated area would also have its own restrictions in terms of some of the garden area and take advantage of that flatter, more shallower area to cluster the density.

Boardmember Hannah explained that the Subcommittee had been working on those issues, and emphasized the need to strike a balance of densities across the whole terrain. He suggested one of the ways to make the development be successful and to address the potential that the single-family homes on top of the hill were too exclusive might be to develop a bit denser at the top of the hill. He noted that the Point and the big buildings on the Point could be an exclamation mark where a higher building might be considered. He emphasized the need to strike a balance of density along the whole proposal.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

Chair Livingston referred to the buildings at the Point and the Subcommittee's discussions that there might be a need to get into the Design Guidelines the stepping back of massing similar to Levi Plaza.

Boardmember Hannah agreed and noted that Levi Plaza in San Francisco had engaged with the landscape and offered gateways, view corridors, and overlooks through different apertures of the building, with a series of courtyards, platforms, and steps down, which could be considered a precedent for the main dense buildings at the Point with an urban quality. He urged a watchful eye over the massing of the development culminating in the climax of the Point. He stated that architects believed that using slightly denser efficient buildings that did not sprawl would be the best way to develop eco-sensitive developments and he suggested the project cried out for that but stated the community and the Bay Area could embrace the industrial look and the history of Richmond. He referred to a 3-D model being developed by the developer team that could help identify the density.

Chair Livingston pointed out the Subcommittee's discussion of stepping low at the waterfront and stepping up to the Point.

Boardmember Neel supported the amount of outdoor activities the proposal would encourage. She suggested there was a lot missing in terms of too specific guidelines that would have to be addressed to offer a good design, and the first part of good design would be public safety which was missing from the guidelines. There was also a risk of building close to the refinery, the bridge, the heavy traffic, and the safety of the area as a result. She wanted to see how the public would be kept safe with the design of the roads, the buildings, and an evacuation plan when built next to a refinery. She suggested the design to get in and out of Point Molate would be one of the greatest challenges. She wanted to get into the history of the winery, one of the largest ever, and wanted to see the guidelines celebrate history. She encouraged a reconsideration of the names to avoid confusing the citizenry, and recommended names associated with the Winehaven history. In terms of color palette and tactical design, she recommended moving away from the white stucco since it would be hard to keep clean due to the soot from the refinery. She loved the wood and the Sea Ranch nod, encouraged looking at a better definition of Design Guidelines of what would be done in the historic areas and others, wanted a cottage to be turned into a restaurant, liked the black signs on the white, did not like the loud colors, agreed with not putting a road on the shoreline, worried about animal displacement, and with respect to the units proposed at the Point suggested it was low to the water. The main takeaways for her would be the design of buildings, roads, public safety, and the history, and she emphasized that the Design Guidelines were critical.

Ms. Emmons clarified that the branding and naming had not been done and suggested it would be a great contribution to the guidelines to talk about the naming and to highlight the tie to history in the naming of streets, parks, and other places.

Boardmember Butt stated the project was looking good. She referred to TRAC and the Bay Trail and did not see how the Bay Trail and the two-lane road could co-exist. She supported the Bay Trail only, if possible, and recommended consideration of a one-lane road. She was concerned about some of the height being allowed in the guidelines, noted the height of some of the buildings closer to the water seemed to be too high for her, and suggested there was a lack of entry and a lack of place and presence with monolithic larger structures right on the road entering into the village area. She suggested it was modern and stark entering into the historic district. With respect to the Design Guidelines' reference to "historic resource evaluation" she recommended it be a "historic resources report." She asked how the city, at this point, could ensure that the project included the preservation of the historic buildings to be sure that the buildings would not be left derelict.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

In response, Ms. Velasco clarified that the DDA would have requirements and performance standards including those for the Winehaven Historic District.

Boardmember Leung appreciated the fact that the design team had worked with the DRB Subcommittee. She liked the well thought out, organic proposal, and emphasized the need to keep the balance and connectivity of the different neighborhoods, not just facing outward but collecting inward through a larger plaza and to articulate them. She did not want to insulate the development from the city and emphasized that connectivity via view, pedestrian access or other kind of articulation would be important. Further emphasizing connectivity with the large plaza with steps and with some small retail, she recommended linkages between the project and outside towards the neighborhood or the Bay, with transit access, sustainability particularly given the large site, and the different topography along with the preservation of the existing nature. She urged being forward looking to consider the next steps in the Building Code to accommodate the next 10 to 20 years with a thorough and comprehensive sea rise study, and community access that would include children's playgrounds, more public art with murals or wind chimes at some locations to tie into Richmond's existing art history and art talent, affordable and inclusionary housing, a contingency plan for the development if not sold off successfully to ensure consistency with the plans, incorporating a visitor center or history signage to recognize the history of the area and of Richmond, a seamless bike lane or continuous bike lane, and some balance of jobs with housing.

Boardmember Fine referred to the reference to the site "as a place to get out to" although she noted that most of the site was currently not accessible, but she would love to be able to appreciate the full extent of the site, its beauty, history, existing and potential landscape. She reiterated the comments about density and massing and noted that it represented 30 percent of 276 acres with 70 percent of open accessible land remaining. She asked how often it would be a place to come home to and she suggested it was important to make it accessible and safe for everyone. An example was universal accessibility from the overlook to the great lawn, which universal accessibility would need to be provided throughout the project. She noted there were open questions about infrastructure, emergency evacuations, public transit, making it accessible to other neighborhoods, how the infrastructure would be paid for, and planning for disaster scenarios. She applauded the design team, recommended finding ways to make the project more realistic from a human scale, and recommended engaging with the community to weigh in on the project, to be through a formalized neighborhood council.

Chair Livingston noted the important factors of "a place to come home to" and "connectivity," and commented that the former City Manager had suggested in terms of a place to come home to that if there was no market and a place for people to go to get a quart of milk and no connectivity and pathways, there would be no community. To that end, he stated the design team had been asked to include a grocery store in the development.

Boardmember Hannah stated that he had a lot of input through the Subcommittee and he applauded the comments as things they had all been talking about; the massing, and the overall strength of the concept. He noted that the whole team had been open to everything and he reiterated that they all continued to try to strike the balance of the massing and keep up with the demands of the DRB, the public, and the city. He suggested that everything was moving in the right direction.

Chair Livingston concurred and requested that the Design Guidelines include the statement that all air conditioning units be on rooftops, be screened, or be in the rear of buildings, and be subject to design review. He agreed the historic district looked stark, wanted the historic resource to be exposed, and had sent a sketch to Howerton development where a possible grocery store could go in the bottom of a mixed use building in the downtown.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 10, 2020

The Chair suggested the project would fail without a grocery store. He urged thinking big about the uses that might locate in the project.

Boardmember Carter stated it was all about the massing of the buildings and the density, about negative and positive space. He supported more versus less dense development.

Chair Livingston highlighted the DRB's major points and concerns:

- Seriously consider the Bay Trail southern road and consider a one-way emergency vehicle access (EVA) road, and work on the main entrance being in the southern area south of the historic district that looped into the high-density residential out at the point;
- Preserve the Bay Trail environment as much as possible;
- Consider eco-districting community agriculture;
- Focus on density and avoid eating up vital open space;
- Address safety concerns including the safety of the Bay Trail (to be handled with the EIR);
- Incorporate history in the design;
- Avoid the use of white stucco due to refinery soot;
- Reinforce the memory of the old pier line as a way to celebrate history;
- Retain the historic flavor of the Winehaven Historic District;
- Provide connectivity in terms of a downtown, to include a grocery store;
- Provide community plazas, children's playgrounds in public and private spaces, high-density construction;
- Push the building mass up the bluff, such as at Albany Hill;
- Create a more natural environment; and
- Provide universal accessibility.

Ms. Emmons referred to the overlook down to the great lawn as recommended by the DRB and noted that a plan had been proposed to be integrated into the system of plazas and steps to bring everyone to the same place at each plaza level. There was another overlook at the bluff overlooking the Point with 270 degree views, and in addition to that the idea of a sea to sky stair, a more rigorous trail, there would be an option that would come up from the Winehaven Historic District and come up the back of the slope with a more gradual incline, and with immediate access off of the street up on the bluff with a pedestrian path. They were looking at multiple options to access the bluff overlooking the Point.

Chair Livingston noted the question as to whether the developer would help contribute to TRAC's desire to extend the Bay Trail into the southern section of the development, and Ms. Emmons advised that she could share the comment but could not speak to it.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

Ms. Velasco urged everyone to complete their census and to spread the word.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, May 13, 2020.