

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Richmond, CA 94804

March 23, 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 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Community Development Director Lina Velasco, Planner Roberta Feliciano, and Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 23, 2022, March 4, 2022, and March 9, 2022

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Hook) to approve the minutes of the February 23, 2022, March 4, 2022, and March 9, 2022 meetings, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

Chair Livingston stated that he would review the minutes from the December 8, 2021 meeting with staff in the near future.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Livingston advised that Item 1 on the agenda, PLN22-020 Industrial Warehouse would be continued to a future meeting.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

Public Forum

Roberta Feliciano identified the meeting procedures, the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

From an email: CORDELL HINDLER, *Good evening Chair Livingston, Board members and staff. I do have some comments for the Board. 1) I would like to welcome Marcus Christenson to the Design Review Board; 2) I am reminding the Board that any projects that are being considered, the applicant must communicate with the neighborhood council to provide feedback on the project. Sincerely, Cordell.*

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE

The appeal date for actions taken by the Board at this meeting will be no later than 5:00 P.M. on Monday, April 4, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. PLN22-020 | INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE |
| Description | (CONTINUED FROM MARCH 9, 2022) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±14,000 SQUARE-FOOT WAREHOUSE IN THE REAR OF AN INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY. |
| Location | 1200 HENSLEY STREET |
| APN | 561-280-012 |
| Zoning | IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT |
| Owner | MCLAUGHLIN CHARLES T TRE |
| Applicant | ANTHONY TABACCO |
| Staff Contact | JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONTINUE TO FUTURE MEETING |

As earlier reported, the item had been continued to a future meeting.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 2. PLN21-327 | QUARRY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT REDESIGN |
| Description | (CONTINUED FROM MARCH 9, 2022) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A MAJOR AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED PLANNED AREA PLAN TO MODIFY THE HOUSING TYPE FROM MULT-FAMILY TO SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED, WHICH WILL REDUCE THE OVERALL NUMBER OF UNITS FROM 193 TO 76. MAJOR DESIGN REVIEW FOR THE PROPOSED HOUSE PLANS, WAIVER OF CERTAIN DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR A PROJECT ELIGIBLE FOR A DENSITY BONUS. THE PROJECT ALSO INCLUDES A REQUEST FOR A VESTING TENTATIVE MAP TO SUBDIVIDE THE SITE INTO 76 SINGLE-FAMILY LOTS AND 7 COMMON-INTEREST LOTS. |
| Location | 1135 CANAL BOULEVARD |
| APN | 560-330-043 |
| Owner | RICHMOND COVE 1 LLC |
| Applicant | NEW WEST COMPANY |

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: **RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION**

Lina Velasco presented the staff report dated March 23, 2022, and provided an overall summary of the project for consideration of a recommendation to the Planning Commission of a major amendment to a previously approved Planned Area Plan (PA), density bonus for the purposes of requesting waivers, and major design review for the proposed house plans. The original project had been approved in February 2018 by the City Council and included the certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the land use from Parks and Rec to Medium Density Residential and Open Space, to rezone the property to Planned Area Plan (PA) and Open Space, approval of a Vesting Tentative Map and Design Review for a 193-unit subdivision. The current application was for a revision to that original project. The current General Plan land use is Open Space and Medium Density Residential; the entire project site is 18.3 acres and only a portion would be developed with the remainder to be maintained as Open Space consistent with the current zoning.

Ms. Velasco presented the overall site plan with the house plans and the different elevation styles proposed for the project with three floor plans and optional additional bedrooms. All of the buildings would be two stories in height, include two-car garages with variations on the coastal architecture style. She presented examples of the house plans. She also reported that the PA plan was intended to be used for large sites to facilitate planned development, typically included some deviations from the base zoning regulations, and in this case a major amendment was required because the number of units was less than the minimum stated in the originally approved PA plan. The project was consistent with the range of Medium Residential Density and closer to the lower end of the range. The project was eligible for a density bonus since the applicant had agreed to provide on-site inclusionary units where 10 percent of total units would be restricted to incomes at the Moderate Income level, which was 120 percent of the area median income for Contra Costa County. Projects eligible for a density bonus could also pursue waivers or concessions. Waivers were being requested in this case to achieve the density needed for minimum lot size, minimum lot width, front, rear and side yard setbacks.

Concerns were raised by nearby neighbors as part of the original project with respect to speeding on Seacliff Drive, and the project has incorporated into the plans the agreed-upon safety improvements which have been carried forward in the conditions of approval. The safety improvements intended to address the speeding concerns were described.

The project was presented to the DRB at its March 9, 2022 meeting when a number of public comments were received. The DRB had voted to continue the item to the current meeting to allow the applicant to address the DRB's comments, which included consideration of smaller house plans, potentially a duet building or housing typologies that could offer a wider range of units and potentially lower the prices of the units; consider adding a community garden space within the subdivision or on adjacent City property; enhance the proposed Crest Trail staging area and landscaping by adding additional amenities and enhancements; consider integrating the proposed emergency vehicle access (EVA) with the new proposed Bay Trail segment; celebrate and pay homage to the former quarry's history on site by integrating into the landscape large boulders and/or other quarry elements; integrate a unique solar or equivalent sustainability element; and modify the massing of house plan 3b.

Ms. Velasco explained that the applicant has responded to the comments and have made a number of changes to the revised project plan including the integration of a community garden, boulders and play elements related to rock quarries, addition of electrical vehicle charging stations, stamped asphalt concrete to identify entrances as well as pedestrian crossways and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

other enhanced details along with improvements to the Crest Trail as well as the landscaping throughout the site. She presented a map and described some of the details to the area of the Crest Trail.

Ms. Velasco recommended conditional approval of the application based on the findings and statements of fact.

Chair Livingston reported that he had asked about the construction process and construction trucks and how it would impact Seacliff Drive. He suggested the only possible staging area would be the City's enhanced landscaped area, which would impact some of the timing, some of the trails, and some of the development. He asked Ms. Velasco whether there was any access agreement that had not been disclosed in the Vesting Tentative Map with the property owner to the south (Kinder Morgan), and asked how that site would be accessed if blocked in.

Ms. Velasco stated that Kinder Morgan had received notice of the original application along with the current modified application and the City received comments early on. There was a pipeline along the frontage that ran along the Bay Trail and there had been a request to limit the improvements in that area. She stated that access of the property had not been requested and a condition could be added, if necessary, to ensure that the applicant provide access to the adjacent property. She stated the property would not be considered land locked since it has frontage on Seacliff Drive.

In response to the Chair as to the inclusionary units, Ms. Velasco reported that an analysis had been done and there were guidelines as to what costs were assumed, depending on household size. She reported that a two-bedroom inclusionary unit would be restricted to approximately \$437,000, a three-bedroom unit would be restricted to ~\$483,000, and a four-bedroom unit would be restricted to ~\$518,000.

Chair Livingston clarified that the public hearing had been left open at the last meeting.

MARCIA VALLIER, Vallier Design Associates, presented a rendering to show the modifications including the board form concrete retaining walls, the vines on the wall, and some of the other plantings that had been proposed such as a hedge of westringla and columnar carpinus betulus fastigiata, no mow fescue with some tumbling boulders with echlum and verben a bonariensis. She stated that crosswalks and specialty paving had been added in and among the development, pointed out the park area where the play equipment had been changed to climbing and stepping boulders, and a community garden with raised garden beds with compost bins at the end, to be fenced. Electric vehicle charging (EVC) stations would be installed in the major court area. She added that the birdhouse and the log climber had been retained.

Ms. Vallier identified a number of improvements to the proposed East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) Crest Trail staging area which would be repaved with parallel parking on the sides, an entry area with crosswalks for easy crossings for the trail, and a sidewalk going up to the trail as it comes in to the Crest Trail. She had spoken with Chris Barton of the EBRPD, who had requested bollards and a replacement gate. There was no desire for a restroom in the area given that it was a tertiary trail. The access (service) road would be paved with asphalt and with decomposed granite shoulders on each side. The native shrubs would be protected during construction and disturbed areas would be planted. She identified the existing vegetation that would be retained and the different natural shrubs that would be added. She also identified the area that would tie into the Bay Trail and the EVA, with a sidewalk and stairs going up to the EVA.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

Ms. Vallier stated she had also spoken with Chair Livingston and Boardmember Hook about the plant material (trees) in the bio-retention basin and the *nyssa sylvatica*, a Tupelo tree, *echluma* and *verbena*, and *mimulus*, coffee berry and wisteria hedge, with starts next to the stormwater plant that could be used in the basin. She added that *quercus agrifolia* had been included in the native and hillside planting list of species as requested by the Chair.

DAVID BURTON, KTG Architects, presented a modification to the elevation for house plan 3b, as requested, to replace the hip roof with a gable end roof with added brackets with a vent detail in the eave to reduce the massing and provide more vertical proportion and more interesting variety along the streetscape.

Ms. Vallier identified the major changes to the presentation and the drawing sets that had been resubmitted to the DRB, along with the presentation from the March 9, 2022 meeting for the benefit of the members of the Board who had not been present at that meeting. She presented the overall site plan, the typical unit plants, and the staging area.

TERRY MANLEY, New West Company, identified an email from Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC) related to the Bay Trail and TRAC's request for some clean-up language on Condition 26 related to interpretative signs, and stated he was in agreement with that request. TRAC had also requested clean-up language related to the staging area and he agreed to that language with one change. TRAC had requested that the work be done prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy and he requested that be changed to the 30th or 40th certificate of occupancy to follow along with the construction rather than be required on day one. With that change, he agreed with TRAC's request.

Chair Livingston found it difficult to think that the construction staging area could be moved to allow the construction of the Bay Trail segment associated with the project, and if that was the case he recommended a modification to Condition 42 to allow the project to be constructed, and before the last five or 10 certificates of occupancy the work could be done after the removal of the construction equipment.

Mr. Manley stated that space to stage was a premium and he agreed it would be helpful if Condition 42 could be modified to the 60th certificate of occupancy.

Boardmembers Butt and Leung both expressed a desire, when asked, to see the presentation that had been made at the last meeting when they had not been present.

Mr. Burton provided details of the three distinct styles for the project with a focus on coastal architecture. The California coastal cottage focused on areas of shingled exterior, wood detailing, brackets and traditional California details; the southern coastal cottage had light stucco exteriors of off white and darker trim around windows; and the contemporary coastal cottage would have contemporary details. There would be three distinct styles and with each style there would be three different color schemes which would allow 27 variations to break up the variety in the neighborhood. He presented some of the details that could be used in the three distinct designs and stated that along the streetscape to provide interesting detail the entries of each two units would be paired with trellis elements to announce a gateway or threshold with a landscape pattern that went along with the trellis elements.

When asked, Mr. Burton described the circulation pattern in the neighborhood, noted that all the houses faced onto a central drive off of Seacliff Drive, and explained that there would be sidewalks on both sides of the street to offer good pedestrian connectivity throughout the site into the central area, which included a tot lot play area and community gardens and beyond to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

the Bay Trail. He also pointed out the board form concrete retaining walls that would step up from the street in shorter lifts with drifts of landscape weaving through the walls to break down the scale of the rise. The board form concrete walls would pair with the wood walls of the private yards for the units offering a texture commonality between the two elements. The detail on the houses would be brought fully around to the back of the houses.

Boardmember Leung liked the use of the trellis elements and liked the landscape details. Boardmember Butt was disappointed to see a row of garages in the front of the houses and commented that the backside was more inspiring than the front, and that the front looked like the back and the back looked like the front.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Ms. Feliciano identified the meeting procedures, the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

KIERON SLAUGHTER stated he had submitted a letter to the DRB. He commented that the design was less than inspiring since the garages appeared to be the main focal point, suggested it would be a dead zone, had no problem with the landscaping but suggested the design was not a superior design that should have been provided given the much higher standards required by the PA zoning designation. He stated there was no mixture of uses and no mixture of design, and while he appreciated the architect's design to highlight the location of the front doors he stated that actually pointed out that there was a problem. He had recommended some Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures and noted that to approve a project with two covered parking spaces in 2022 when other cities were putting a cap on parking and to have a front of garages be the main focal point was a major concern to him. He requested that the design be modified with one-car garages with windows on the front and urged the architect to do better.

CLAUDIA GARCIA, a member of TRAC, stated that a letter had been submitted along with an email with recommended edits with respect to Conditions 21 and 27. She read the recommended changes to Condition 27:

Applicant shall replace, or salvage and reuse, the Bay Trail orientation sign panel and frame located at the corner of Seacliff Drive and Canal Boulevard with a 2x3 interpretative panel that shall be created and installed in a National Park Service low profile frame along the Bay Trail on Seacliff Drive prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. The location and design shall be done in collaboration with TRAC and be consistent with the design of Bay Trail interpretative panels installed along the Bay Trail in Richmond. An additional Bay Trail interpretative panel shall be added to the staging area, which shares the history of the site's former use as a quarry. This new panel location and design shall be done in consultation with TRAC.

For Condition 21:

The applicant shall fund and construct the staging area shown in Miller-Knox Trailhead and Improvement Plan L4 (in the project plans, dated March 16, 2022) prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the project working in good faith with the East Bay Regional Park District and the City of Richmond. A flush toilet restroom and a drinking water dispenser shall be added to the staging area provided that either EBRPD or the City of Richmond agree to maintain such facilities.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

Chair Livingston verified with Ms. Garcia that she was aware of the earlier change to Condition 26, which she stated was amenable to TRAC.

LISA JOHNSON, Richmond, stated she had submitted an email. She made a plea for the developer and the developers of the PG&E site and Terminal One to provide an emergency bypass road 260 feet in length, which could be a dirt road, given the large number of people who would occupy the area and to ensure the safety of current residents, and commented that she would be reaching out to the Police Chief and Fire Chief for their support.

Ms. Johnson also expressed concern for the safety of Seacliff Drive given the speed of traffic, concerns for the large number of construction trucks on Seacliff Drive especially considering the PG&E site. For the project to be superior she asked whether solar panels and battery packs on the walls could be provided.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Carter asked about the garage doors and the parking and how the applicant felt that fit in with the demands of the market.

In response, Mr. Manley stated it was vogue to think that no one would drive cars in a couple of years and there were locations where that was a relevant design feature, but not at the subject site. The top market consultants, the top architect and the top land planners and all the public builders in the market had indicated the need for two-story homes and two-car garages. He explained that the fronts of the homes had been enhanced to mitigate the front placement of the garages. He noted that the design offered a series of challenges and compromises to be able to come up with something that worked. The lots were compact lots, which were intended to keep the number of units up. He stated they had done the best they could to meet the market with a well-articulated architecture and a focus of what the project looked like from the edge. With respect to windows in the garages, he stated some would have windows and some would not and if all garage doors were to have windows he could agree to that.

Mr. Manley further explained when asked that the development would be production homebuilding, probably in releases of ten homes each, which had to do with the affordability, productions and efficiency, and which was why it was critical to stay with the one product line. He added that there were 27 different home variations and explained that the homes would be pre-plotted. Typically when a release was offered to the market the first few buyers would pick a model and elevations and the developer would select the rest of that release to maintain the integrity of the differentiation.

Mr. Burton advised that a preliminary plotting had been included in the presentation package to show how that would occur.

Vice Chair Carter asked if there was a way to pick particular houses on the important corner lots to wrap some of the fenestration and elements around those houses, and Mr. Burton suggested that Lot 8 and 63 could have wrapped around materials as well as on some of the other prominent corners where the side elevations had more enhanced architecture.

Chair Livingston asked about an enhancement of the rear of Lots 59, 60, 61 and 62, and there was some amenability from the developer to do that.

Mr. Manley added that Lots 8, 58, 62, and 63 would have enhanced side elevations as a matter of course, while Lots 59 through 62 and 55 through 58 had rears similar to the Seacliff Drive

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

elevation. He had no objection to a requirement that those lots be wrapped.

Vice Chair Carter asked about solar installations and Mr. Burton explained that the construction documents would plot out the location of the solar in each of the styles. He added that by the time the project had been constructed there would be a new energy code that would go into effect in January 2023, when it would be pretty much mandatory that solar be installed in new construction.

Mr. Manley added that they had budgeted and intended to install solar on the houses in anticipation of the new energy code.

Ms. Velasco concurred that solar would be required by CalGreen and the project would also be subject to the natural gas ban and there would be no natural gas utilities as a result.

Boardmember Leung had no questions, understood the approach in terms of the market rate housing and the process in which the proposal had been brought forth in consideration of market and cost. She noted a drastic contrast in terms of color and variation. She asked about the electric vehicle chargers (EVCs) and how many there were on site, and Mr. Burton stated there would be two in the site plan in compliance with state requirements and typically the garages would be pre-wired for EVCs. Given the electrification requirements, Boardmember Leung encouraged the applicant to be mindful of sustainable electrical panels.

When asked about a dog park, Ms. Vallier advised that there were three turf areas along the longest roadway that would be open for a dog run.

Boardmember Butt emphasized the need for community and suggested that the garage doors all along the street discouraged the sense of community. She recommended ways to address that situation with potentially one-car garages or some other design change.

The applicants advised that a number of different site options had been considered to eliminate garages in the front, which would substantially reduce the density of the site. While a one-car garage had not been considered it was noted that one-car garages worked well with close by transit, which was not the case in this site, with limited access to transit, and still be able to create a marketable product.

Boardmember Hook agreed that shared common spaces provided open communication and neighborliness. She referred to the garages and verified with Mr. Burton that all the garage doors would have the same 16 panels. While she supported the addition of the boulders in the landscaping and the trail connections, she pointed out echlum candicans was a non-native species and recommended a different species that would not grow higher than the boulders.

Chair Livingston verified that the windows would be vinyl, likely white at this time given that anything else would be difficult to get given the supply chain issues.

With respect to the windows, Vice Chair Carter referred to Elevation 1a with the dark siding and trim which should have bronze window frames, although he understood the supply chain issues involved. He commented that the bronze was classier and would likely get a higher price point from homebuyers. He advised the applicant that the bronze window frames would not likely be any more costly than the white frames and that even with the supply issues the bronze frames were available.

Boardmember Butt emphasized that she was not anti-car but stressed the need for community

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

engagement and sought some strategy such as front yards and front porches to engage the community.

Chair Livingston agreed with the need to encourage a sense of community and the need for smart growth and the intent of the PA plan along with economic feasibility, which sometimes did not comport with land use regulations, and while it was appropriate for land use regulations to be aspirational in character care must be taken to ensure that aspirational conditions of the approval did not impose costs that economically made it infeasible for the land to be developed to its highest and best use. While he would personally prefer a different plan, he thanked the applicant for working with the DRB to make the plan better than it was when initially presented, and stated those efforts helped to move the project closer to the compliance required of the PA District.

Vice Chair Carter agreed with the aspirations of making the project a more present streetscape with porches and the like but given the constraints he suggested there could be modifications to the design. He recommended rather than a full two-car garage door, the door could be split into two different doors to break down the massive plain of the door itself and potentially use the second garage door space for activities that encouraged community engagement. He wanted to activate the use of the garage to more than the use of the automobile with the other half to be a workshop or something else to add more flexibility to the space. He also recommended a ribbon window placed high enough to maintain privacy and security to let in some daylight if someone was working on a project, which would also soften up the oblique view of the houses beyond a blank wall when walking toward the entrance. He also supported a diversity of housing types that would lead to a more diverse community, although as a realist he understood market forces and did not want to force a duplex housing type into the neighborhood.

Boardmember Leung asked about the applicant's target market, which Mr. Manley stated was for everyone but if there was a predominant group in the location in the City of Richmond for the product it would be for the younger family with small children.

Boardmember Leung understood the need therefore for the two-car garages and had no issues in terms of the housing types that had been offered and the housing designs, but if the focus was on young families she noted the need for the product to be appropriate enough to allow those families to grow up in the home and to remain in the area. She also understood the amenities to serve such families, the access to the Bay Trail, and the need to make the project sustainable to avoid being wasteful in the future and to be mindful of the geo-efficiencies of sustainability.

Boardmember Hook questioned whether there had been any studies with respect to landscaping for a more porous edge to create some communication between the neighbors in the backyards, although she acknowledged that the development was extremely dense. If that was not something that would work she recommended something more in the front yard beyond the trellis connections. She agreed that a potential split to the garage doors should be explored to offer potential homeowners more options.

Boardmember Butt asked Mr. Burton what techniques or design strategies he had used in other developments in dense areas. She suggested the complex issue was the attempt to produce a suburban single-family housing project in a density that was similar to an urban area while the project was neither urban nor suburban.

In response to the idea of splitting the garages with potential windows on the site going into the entry to encourage more socialization on the streetscape, Mr. Burton stated a wider garage

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

would be needed to do that. Currently the garage was 20 feet wide with a 16-foot door and two-foot pieces of wall on either side, which would be needed for structural purposes for sheer walls and the structural stability of the front of the house. Without making the garage wider it would be tricky to split the garages.

With respect to the entry courts, Mr. Burton suggested those were places where there could be interaction between the two neighbors. A critical thing for community and walkability was the continuity of the pedestrian experience and continuous sidewalks would be created throughout the entire neighborhood to circulate to the central green space and throughout the neighborhood.

Ms. Vallier suggested with respect to the courtyards between the two units an option could be offered for either the trellis structure or a fence with a gate, or that area could be just a big open courtyard. She agreed there could be a lot of neighborliness in the fact that people with open garage doors would communicate.

Mr. Burton stated another area for socialization would be the mailbox areas which were co-located with the tot lot and community garden space and which would create a natural gathering space.

Chair Livingston asked if a French door could be added to the side of the courtyard, and Mr. Burton stated that could be done and there could be an option for a window.

Mr. Manley agreed that could be done as an option. He suggested the struggle was the notion that the community of 76 homes lacked soul and did not have the physical architectural and planning characteristics that other communities might have that allowed for social interaction. He commented there was not one project or one set of guidelines to be applied across the board. He did not expect that people would remain inside. He saw people getting their coffee meeting down at the edge of the property where the Bay Trail was located in small groups or taking a five-mile walk, he saw families getting together at Miller-Knox Regional Park for a picnic, and he saw people going into the beautiful leafy downtown village of Richmond and enjoying the shops, restaurants and bars. He had never looked at the project where the people who lived there would get everything they needed to get out of life just within that community.

Chair Livingston shared a sketch of the potential options for consideration.

Vice Chair Carter acknowledged that the applicant had done some impressive things with respect to the trailhead and the streetscape along Seacliff Drive, and was sympathetic to Boardmember Butt's concerns as well as some of the public speakers and he had thrown out some ideas to make the front of the garages more engaging. He suggested a French door at the site was a step in the right direction. He wanted to have that space be more flexible and wanted to see more engagement with the street and suggested if the garage door was split that would help a lot.

Boardmember Butt personally wanted a different project with alleys and garages on the back or something more integrated into the hillside but would not send the applicant back to do that. She stated there was nothing fundamentally wrong with the design if tweaks could be made to make it better.

Chair Livingston noted that he had submitted a sketch to the architect after the last meeting for a mix of unit types and he noted the applicant had argued that the fees paid for low-income housing should be plenty to encourage less wealthy people to afford the units, which he

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

suggested went a bit to what the Vice Chair wanted to do. While he also did not like the current layout, he stated the applicant had gone a long way to make the project a better project and it just fit into the category for him of being substantially compliant because of everything the applicant had done to add to the public amenities. Residents would use the park, which needed help, and the applicants had done a good job trying to help make Richmond a better place by developing that area, which had benefits and there was the option of providing much-needed housing on what was challenging property, and while not ideal the City and EBRPD would receive benefit from the project.

Chair Livingston highlighted the added benefits the applicant would provide to the EBRPD, which had not been part of the original agreement, by developing and paving a parking area and a trailhead for EBRPD with curb and gutter, trailhead gate, and making that area into something the City could be proud of and improve the whole road. All the invasive species would be removed and the area would be replanted and the applicant would enter into an encroachment agreement with the City to improve that area. Because of that, he suggested that moved the project closer into compliance as a superior project.

Ms. Vallier identified the other revisions that had been made to the plans since the last meeting by removing some houses and parking to create a parklet, a community garden had been added, the look of the play area had been changed to offer a link to the hillside behind, and there were grassy areas for dog running and small parklets for children. When asked by the Vice Chair, she explained that the parking requirement was one parking space per five units which would have been 15 spaces, although 34 spaces had been provided and had been dispersed throughout the site with spaces specifically in front of the park.

Vice Chair Carter suggested the parking load could be reduced to increase the size of the parklet and the EV spaces could be moved over, and Ms. Vallier agreed that relocating the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and EVC spaces could allow the expansion of the park area.

The DRB supported that possibility and recommended the removal of five parking spaces. Mr. Manley agreed with that recommendation.

Chair Livingston brought up the rain catchment questions he had raised at the last meeting and asked about the feasibility of providing a storm drain water collection design sump to direct the filtered stormwater back to storage tanks above grade. He suggested above-grade storage tanks could be placed north of Unit 43 and west of Unit 17. He recommended rough plumbing so that the Homeowner's Association (HOA), if desired, could collect rainwater. He stated that would elevate the plan and offer needed sustainability if the HOA decided to pursue that option.

Mr. Manley suggested that additional responsibilities out of the regular set of obligations might be a concern to the HOA.

ROBERT STEVENS stated the laws related to rainwater harvesting were still being refined by the state. He suggested it might be possible to create a manifold on the water coming off of the hillside and that a 4-inch pipe could be installed and directed to a location where in the future the HOA might find it desirable to put above ground tanks, which would avoid the need to trench through asphalt in the future.

Chair Livingston referred to Sheet C7 and a sectional diagram for the bio-retention area where water would be collected and put back into the City's storm system at which point a sump could be installed to then be directed to a tank.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

Mr. Stevens suggested instead that the water be intercepted higher up on the hillside where the clean water was actually coming down the hillside and direct that water by gravity to the tank. He suggested that could involve a couple hundred feet of 4-inch pipe.

Mr. Manley stated that could be done.

On the discussion of the issues that had yet to be resolved with respect to the options related to garage doors, Mr. Manley expressed a preference for the optional French door given that windows in a garage door were not preferred for security reasons.

Boardmember Butt did not want to see all garages along the street but she supported the work being done on the road, more space for a park, and supported a French door to soften the appearance. She did not want all white vinyl windows. She supported moving forward with the project.

Vice Chair Carter was supportive of the French door option and the enhanced facades for the corner homes, and he supported a condition that the houses were required to have solar.

Boardmember Hook was supportive of the changes and additional conditions proposed.

Chair Livingston listed the additional conditions of approval beyond the 42 conditions recommended by staff, to be attached to the recommendation to the Planning Commission, as follows:

- 43. In addition to the 41 conditions of approval recommended by staff these additional conditions of approval will bring this application into substantial compliance with the Planned Area Finding (F) that the project is demonstratively superior to the development that could occur under the standards applicable to the underlying base district. The construction staging area shall be developed along the existing access road that will eventually become the Bay Trail extension. The applicant shall secure all City of Richmond encroachment agreements thereof. In the development of the staging area the civil engineer and the construction team shall survey the area needed and this area shall be plotted on a site plan map. The area shall then have a separate landscape plan that will amend Sheet L4 dated March 2022. This separate landscape plan shall be adapted to the staging area so after construction a plan to reestablish the natural ecotone is on file. This landscape plan shall be completed prior to the last five units being sold. This landscape plan shall be submitted to the planning staff prior to the application of the building permit. The staging area shall have temp power for construction and temp water for the establishment of new planting that will take five years to get established.**
- 44. No construction access shall be allowed to enter or exit on Seacliff Drive. All construction traffic shall enter and exist onto Canal Boulevard off East Bay Regional Park staging area. All traffic into the project off Seacliff shall either be sales or permanent residents.**
- 45. East Bay Regional Park Miller-Knox park entry improvements: new gate, public parking area, related paving, curbs, gutters and service road noted on Sheet L4 shall be completed prior to the final sale of the project and shall be completed by developer. All agreements to construct these**

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

improvements shall be completed with the City and EBRPD prior to building permit issuance.

46. Coast live oak specified on Sheet L4 shall be 24-inch box in lieu of 15 gallon, all other shrubs shall have a minimum of 5 gallons in lieu of one gallon on Sheet L4. Civil to specify one-inch PVC water supply line and valve and box to area shown on L4 for future use if wanted by future Homeowner's Association (HOA).
47. Civil to provide storm drain water collection design sump or equivalent to redirect filtered stormwater back to storage tanks above grade. Areas to be considered are north of Unit 43 and west of Unit 17. Design shall be installed and roughed in so that at the discretion of the HOA irrigation water can be collected if desired.
48. Wooden fences as seen on photos on Sheet L5 appear to be clear wood. Note for the record that the fencing shall be in substantial compliance with the photo and shall either be clear western red cedar, redwood or lpe. Posts appear to be select tight knot 6x6 cedar or redwood vertical 4x strong backs or blind posts at 32-inch on center, seems to be holding the horizontal board straight. Fasteners corrosion resistant, fence post base and fasteners shall be hot-tipped galvanized and board form concrete gaps shall be quarter inch.
49. Modified Vested Tentative Map dated 03-01-22 to conform to Conditions 42, 43 and 44 herein attached.
50. All garage doors shall show optional enhanced glass as suggested.
51. Two-inch window reveals per A5.1, detail No. 5 and Note on A5.0, detail No. 4 shall be two inches recessed and shall be used on these elevations. Those recessed windows are on certain elevations that have control joints. Those elevations are front of elevation 3C, rear enhanced 3C, front 3A, rear enhanced 3A, front 2C, rear enhanced 2C, front 2A, front 1C, and rear enhanced 1C.
52. All windows shall be bronze colored if exteriors are darker.
53. Downspouts shall be bonderized 26 gauge galvanized sheet metal painted to match adjacent material.
54. Gutters shall be 5-inch fascia-type 26 gauge painted to match exterior board trim color.
55. Roof ends shall be corrosion resistant.
56. Windows shall open so that planters can be used.
57. Add enhanced side elevations to lot 8 side, 65, 58 side and rear 59, 60, 61 and 62.
58. Solar panels shall be installed.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON May 25, 2022

59. Garage doors shall be varied in their panel door arrangements to match the architectural patterns.
60. Add French doors to the entry side of the garage, to be offered as an option; to be 6.0, 6.8 French door option.
61. Enlarge park and reduce parking and take away five spots per Vallier design sketch submitted on 03-23-22.
62. Entry enhancement plantings to be changed to non-invasive species.
63. Staff shall make best efforts to research and discuss with fire and emergency an emergency route as illustrated by Lisa Johnson, summary shall be noticed and introduced to City Council.

It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to recommend to the Planning Commission the approval of PLN21-327 Quarry Residential Project Redesign based on six Planned Area and four Design Review Findings and Statements of Fact, with 41 staff-recommended Conditions of Approval and the additional DRB conditions shown above for Conditions 42 to 63; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Livingston reported on some upcoming applications.

Community Development Director Lina Velasco spoke to the status of the Point Molate project.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, April 13, 2022.