

# MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

January 26, 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  
Michelle Hook  
Jonathan Livingston

Brian Carter  
Macy Leung

Chair Livingston called the regular meeting to order at 6:03 P.M.

### ROLL CALL

**Present:** Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, and Michelle Hook

**Absent:** Boardmember Macy Leung

### INTRODUCTIONS

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** December 8, 2021 and January 12, 2022

Chair Livingston referred to missing language on Page 7 of the December 8, 2021 minutes from some of the speakers related to the Richmond Yacht Club presentation, and requested that the audio recording be checked and that the minutes be returned to the DRB for consideration.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve the minutes of the January 12, 2022 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)**

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

#### Public Forum

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022**

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

Bruce Beyaert, Chair of Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC), highlighted the status of Bay Trail projects and reported that the Point Molate Trail was fully funded and construction would soon start on 2.5 miles of new trail from the Richmond San Rafael Bridge to the Winehaven Historic District; W.R. Forde would be starting construction in a couple of weeks on a two-way protected bikeway from the Richmond/San Francisco Ferry Building on Hoffman and Cutting Boulevards, extending to Garrard Boulevard; and the City was applying for Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds to complete funding for continuing the trail and pedestrian improvements from Cutting and Garrard Boulevards through the Point Richmond Historic District to the Richmond/San Rafael Bridge Trailhead at Castro.

**City Council Liaison Report:** None

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** None

### **APPEAL DATE**

Any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, February 7, 2022 by 5:00 P.M.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>PLN21-261</b>	<b>ESPINOZA SECOND-STORY ADDITION</b>
	Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW TO CONSTRUCT A ±820 SQUARE-FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
	Location	827 McLAUGHLIN STREET
	APN	523-031-024
	Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
	Owner	SERGIO ESPINOZA
	Applicant	GUSTAVO OROZCO
	Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ      Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated January 26, 2022, for a second-story addition that would also involve reconfiguring the floor area of the first floor for a proposed total of three bedrooms and two-and-one-half bathrooms. The second phase would involve the conversion of the existing garage into an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), which under the City's newly adopted regulations would require a building permit but would not be subject to a Design Review Permit.

The DRB had reviewed the application at its December 8, 2021 meeting and had provided feedback to the applicant to break down the front façade of the second floor to reduce the building mass and had offered suggestions to accomplish that, to extend the sill of the second-floor window located in the bedroom and match the living room window of the first floor, to install a small window next to the main entry door, and to install cement siding on the entire upper floor and not just on the street façade.

Mr. Lopez stated the applicant had incorporated the changes, as requested, and recommended approval of the application.

GUSTAVO OROZCO, the applicant, had no further comments other than to affirm that the proposed changes had been incorporated as requested.

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022**

Ms. Elias re-identified the format of the web-based meeting and the public’s ability to speak during the meeting.

The public hearing remained open from the December 8, 2021 meeting. No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public at this time.

Boardmember Hook expressed her hope that the neighbors were aware of the proposal.

Boardmember Butt stated the revised drawings were much improved.

Vice Chair Carter concurred and had no further input to the discussion.

Chair Livingston had no further comments and closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN21-261, Espinoza Second-Story Addition; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with nine Conditions of Approval; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)**

- 2. PLN21-021 NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDING**
- Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±4,500 SQUARE-FOOT PREFABRICATED BUILDING ON A VACANT PARCEL
- Location 600 SOUTH 31<sup>ST</sup> STREET
- APN 549-204-002
- Zoning IL, INDUSTRIAL LIGHT DISTRICT
- Owner JOHNNY DA SILVA
- Applicant GUSTAVO OROZCO
- Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez reported that the item would be continued to a future meeting.

- 3. PLN21-358 NEW DISTRIBUTION CENTER AND ADDITION**
- Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN 8,800 SQUARE-FOOT (SF) NEW WAREHOUSE, AND AN ADDITION OF 5,400 SF, AND A LOADING DOCK.
- Location 733 HARBOUR WAY
- APN 560-231-003, -004, -012, -013, AND -015
- Zoning IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
- Owner DEBORAH OSBURN
- Applicant GORDON WONG
- Staff Contact LYDIA ELIAS Recommendation: **PROVIDE / RECEIVE COMMENTS**

Lydia Elias presented the study session staff report dated January 26, 2022 for the Clé Tile warehouse site on a developed parcel of 1.15 acres located along Harbour Way South, which consisted of multiple parcels that would be merged into a single parcel. The site also included Ellis Street, an alley that ran between the properties that would require approval of a street vacation. There were currently seven structures on the site primarily used for storage with one building used as a warehouse for ships. The site, within the Marina Bay neighborhood, was surrounded by light industrial and industrial water-related uses including the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad track; Golden Gate Meat Company and the Golden Gate Bistro;

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022**

Harbour Way South; Speed-ox, a welding supply store; and Lexfloor, a flooring manufacturer. A letter of support had been submitted to the DRB by the Marina Bay Neighborhood Council.

The new warehouse development would include the demolition of five existing structures, construction of a new warehouse during Phase 1, and an addition to that warehouse along with a loading dock during Phase 2. The new warehouse had street frontage at Hoffman Boulevard to store tile products and meet the increasing product demand of the business. The new warehouse addition would be connected to an existing warehouse with an exterior hallway in between. The exterior of the existing warehouse would be upgraded to match the new warehouse quality. Site improvements would include the replacement of the old chain link fence to comply with the City's requirements, a courtyard for employees, a new sidewalk on Hoffman Boulevard, sidewalk repair on Harbour Way South, trash enclosure renovation, and parking restriping. The overall design scheme included a surface parking lot of 13 parking spaces, nine of which would be located south of Structure 1 and four spaces west of Structure 2. Additionally, there would be new vehicular access from Hoffman Boulevard near the new warehouse, and a secondary access south of Structure 1 on Harbour Way South that would remain gated.

Ms. Elias reported that the project would comply with the building height, setback, and floor area ratio of the Light Industrial zone along with the applicable development standards as well as parking spaces, trees and sidewalks. The overall design scheme was described as simple although there was no inviting entry or focal point at the street corner. The main entry was proposed on a new courtyard on Harbour Way South. The existing and proposed warehouse would be connected by an exterior hallway and would include a fence and gate.

Ms. Elias requested that the Board provide direction on how to strengthen the relationship of the existing and proposed warehouse to the street. She added that an apparent architectural projection over the roof of the existing warehouse with a clerestory window should be considered to be added to the new building, and recommended a black wrought iron fence to replace the chain link fence. Additionally, rejuvenated landscaping along Harbour Way South was recommended along with more robust landscaping along Hoffman Boulevard.

Boardmember Hook verified with Ms. Elias that the required landscape and sidewalk improvements had been listed in the staff report and that Bay Trail improvements along Hoffman Boulevard were currently being clarified with the Engineering Capital Improvements Projects Infrastructure Manager with respect to conditions of approval.

Chair Livingston asked if the plans related to the bikeway required the relocation of the curb, and Ms. Elias stated there were currently no requirements for that, although she was waiting for plans to ensure that was the case. Chair Livingston emphasized the importance of knowing the location of the curbs in relation to the landscape plan. He also verified that while staff had discussions with the applicant about general revisions to the plan, those revisions had not been specific to the corner of Hoffman Boulevard and Harbour Way South.

Boardmember Butt verified with staff that the site was not historic.

GORDON WONG, GKW Architects, Inc., the project architect, questioned the ability to provide a bicycle lane along Hoffman Boulevard given the utility boxes in the ground and the power poles set in that area, which was why the mulch and planting had been proposed along that strip. He clarified that the planter strip would not shrink, and noted the intent to build a sidewalk along that edge of the property, replace the curb cuts, and remove some trees. He had worked with an arborist and Chinese pistache trees had been identified as a good fit for the area.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022**

Chair Livingston explained that the bicycle trail would be installed as part of the Bay Trail and an upcoming public speaker would address that issue.

MUNENARI HIRATA, GKW Architects, Inc., referred to the exterior material that had been proposed for the existing warehouse and the new addition, a two-color (Regal Blue and Regal White) flash pan metal siding.

Mr. Wong explained how the building would be repurposed on the existing frame through the use of AEP Span, a flush panel with reglets that came with permanent color, and had reveal lines and standing seams, used to retrofit commercial buildings. There was a variation of colors available. He clarified that half of the building would be brand new while the other half would be repurposed.

Mr. Hirata presented the proposal for the site and clarified that five of the seven buildings on site would be demolished as part of Phase 1 while keeping the ship repair building, with the new additional warehouse to be placed next to the existing warehouse, all part of Phase 1. Phase 2 would demolish the ship repair building and extend the additional warehouse and the loading dock. Site improvements as part of Phase 1 included sidewalk, landscape, parking stripes and trash enclosure. A break area would be created for employees between the new building and the existing building. He also presented the elevations for Phases 1 and 2, and presented 3-D views of the existing buildings along with the proposed buildings. His exhibits identified the metal siding that had been proposed and the wrought iron fence recommended by staff. He explained that the project had been phased to accommodate the immediate product need of the owner.

Mr. Hirata described the circulation of the 18-wheel trucks that would use the loading dock from Hoffman Boulevard as well as from Harbour Way South, and reported that the proposal was compliant with Fire Department regulations.

Mr. Wong clarified that the C.3 elements would be retained on site. He referred to the landscape plan and stated that umar or ulnar trees, and Chinese pistache would be the only trees planted, with three trees to be planted in the middle of the bio swale. The remainder of the site would be paved over with asphalt.

Since half of the site would be demolished, the DRB urged the applicant to check with staff to ensure conformance with the Zoning Code in terms of pavement area.

Vice Chair Carter suggested there was more to the context of the site beyond the existing buildings on the property lines and suggested the client would want to fit within the architecture and historic context of the place, He commented that the applicant could get that sense by exploring the area.

Mr. Wong stated that any artisan piece could be added to the area between the two buildings but the client's concern was not to have the buildings be a showroom but a place to be able to transport the tile.

Vice Chair Carter emphasized the prominence of the site and recommended that the architecture evoke a sense of place of design sensibility, particularly since the applicant was a design company. He urged the applicant to revisit that issue with the owner. He encouraged the applicant to embrace the unique opportunity presented by the site and to harness the artisan spirit and resources to create a building that could represent the company well and represent the relationship to the entrance of the nationally recognized historic district with something thoughtful and deliberate but not necessarily expensive. He urged the applicant to grab the corner and to

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022**

use different materials or elements to distinguish the corner from the other facades with something that was a bit more special than the way it was currently shown. He offered to meet with the applicant or through the DRB Subcommittee to offer suggestions.

Boardmember Hook concurred and referred to the Lumber Baron as an example of what it had done. She also recommended that the applicant feed the design off of the Ferry to Bridge to Richmond Greenway Plan related to Harbour Way South to learn of the goals for that street, that the design of the old building could be separate from the new building, and that the wrought iron fencing could provide a bigger statement. She recommended the planting of another tree at the entrance for shade and referred the landscape architect to Richmond's Urban Forestry document to learn of trees that did well in the area. She recommended a more illustrative plan to identify the materiality and an overall sense of the site.

Boardmember Butt also referred to the numerous historic sites in that area, including the national Rosie the Riveter historic site within three blocks of the subject site and the importance of the Hoffman/Harbour Way South corridor as the gateway to those historic sites. She also emphasized the importance of extending the Bay Trail for bicycle and pedestrian use in the area.

Chair Livingston referred to the all-blue design and commented that it was something unseen in an industrial district, which he suggested accentuated the long-uninterrupted façade along Hoffman Boulevard. He did not support the design. He also noted that the two building forms along Hoffman Boulevard did not relate to each other and there was an awkward transition with the fence and the break room

Boardmember Hook sought more information on the tree species that had been proposed and had no problem with the Chinese pistache, although she suggested that the tree would need more space than being installed in the center of the bio swale.

Chair Livingston opened public comment.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, stated that TRAC's mission was to complete the Bay Trail in Richmond and TRAC was interested in the project, which was on the Bay Trail and which was the gateway to many historic sites along Harbour Way South. He stated that as with other projects along Harbour Way South, the property owner would have to contribute his or her fair share of funds to the City to allow the construction of the cycle track. He referred to a letter with exhibits that he had submitted and pointed out that the intersection was very busy, care had to be taken with driveway exits for safety, the sidewalks should be at least six feet wide on both frontages, noted a concern about fencing which should not be adjacent to the sidewalk and stated the building walls were close to the sidewalk at 10 feet on Hoffman Boulevard and right next to the sidewalk on Harbour Way South. He requested that the public spaces be more clearly dimensioned for sidewalk widths, setbacks from the buildings, and fencing.

Mr. Beyaert explained that the two-way protected bikeway was entirely on the city street right-of-way and one lane of Hoffman Boulevard would be closed for the cycle track. He expected the curbs to stay where they were which would not affect the design in terms of sidewalk and landscaping but noted that would have to be verified. He liked the sidewalk addition, noted that the project was an opportunity to do something to the site, supported the DRB's comments about the design, and suggested there might be some way to integrate Cle' Tiles with the building itself.

Chair Livingston and Vice Chair Carter urged the applicant to reach out to the DRB for comment, feedback and ideas.

Mr. Wong stated that all the comments he had received were feasible, although for the record he

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 09, 2022**

expressed frustration with the process and stated it would have been much better had he received some of the feedback prior to submitting all the detailed plans required.

Mr. Wong advised that he would return with a project that recognized the DRB's comments including the historic nature of the street.

On the discussion, Mr. Lopez confirmed that the submittal requirements were on line at this time when all kinds of information was required with no feedback from staff to offer clarification.

Chair Livingston commented that prior to his return, Mr. Wong should present some sketches of how he would manage to address the DRB's recommendations and he and the Vice Chair reiterated their willingness to help in that regard.

### **Board Business**

#### **A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:**

As part of the prior discussion, Mr. Lopez clarified that staff was still operating under COVID-19 restrictions but soon expected to be able to interact with customers. He commented that some cities had a pre-review prior to an actual application submittal in a two-step submittal process. On the further discussion of the situation with respect to PLN21-358 and the applicant's concern for the City's requirements for a study session, it was clarified that in this case the application involved not just design review but also a parcel merger and street vacation that did not involve the DRB but which was being processed concurrently. To avoid similar concerns, the DRB recommended that the Planning Department submittal requirements be modified to indicate that for the larger projects, design review study sessions were highly encouraged prior to application submittal.

Mr. Lopez identified the applications to be considered at the next meeting on February 9, 2022.

#### **B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements**

Chair Livingston asked the status of the exclusive study session that had been proposed for the Form Based Code and recommended that be done before the end of February.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, February 9, 2022.