

# MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

April 27, 2022  
6:00 P.M.

### All Participation Via Teleconference

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, Contra Costa County and Governor Gavin Newsom had issued multiple orders requiring sheltering in place, social distancing, and reduction of person-to-person contact. Accordingly, Governor Newsom had issued executive orders that allowed cities to hold public meetings via teleconferencing. Due to the shelter in place orders, all City of Richmond staff, members of the Design Review Board (DRB), and members of the public participated via teleconference. Public comment was confined to items on the agenda and limited to the specific methods identified on the agenda.

### BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt  
Marcus Christeson  
Macy Leung

Brian Carter  
Michelle Hook  
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the regular meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

### ROLL CALL

**Present:** Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Marcus Christeson\*, Michelle Hook and Macy Leung  
\*Arrived after Roll Call

**Absent:** None

### INTRODUCTIONS

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Livingston advised that Item 5, PLN17-236, Powerplant Park Design Review Permit had been continued to the May 11, 2022 meeting and Item 6, PLN21-444, Brickyard Cove Residential had been continued to a future meeting date unknown. He also recommended that Item 2, PLN22-042, Two-Story Deck be moved to the Consent Calendar and made a motion to that effect, which motion was seconded by Vice Chair Carter and carried unanimously by hands raised.

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

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022

**Public Forum:** None

**City Council Liaison Report:** None

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

<b>2.</b>	<b>PLN22-042</b>	<b>TWO-STORY DECK</b>	
	Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A DECK GREATER THAN 4 FEET IN HEIGHT FROM THE GROUND (8 FEET PROPOSED).	
	Location	1239 SOUTH 58 <sup>TH</sup> STREET	
	APN	508-390-008	
	Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT	
	Owner	AREZKI AMEZDAT	
	Applicant	WILLIAM COBURN	
	Staff Contact	LYDIA ELIAS	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

The application had been removed from the Consent Calendar to allow the neighbor, Ian Carey who had called into the meeting, to learn more about the application.

Lydia Elias presented the staff report dated April 27, 2022, for a public hearing to construct a deck greater than four feet in height eight and a half feet from the ground on a 7,800 square foot parcel on South 58<sup>th</sup> Street in the Richmond Annex neighborhood with an existing one-story residence constructed in 1950 of approximately 1,100 square feet in size on a 15 percent downslope parcel. The deck would be 183 square feet and be located in the rear of the structure. The development scheme included a remodel of the interior of the existing structure subject to a building permit, with a ministerial review of a future 725 square foot detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to be processed at a later date in a separate permit.

The deck, a simple stained redwood structure, would be set back 54 feet from the rear property line and over 20 feet from the side property line. The proposal complied with the applicable setback requirements of the RL-2 Zoning District. Given the topography of the site and the location of the deck, it would not likely affect the privacy of adjacent properties nor would the proposed shielded light fixture. The proposal would enhance the appearance of the property, increase the livability of the home, be done in compliance with the setback requirements, and would not significantly reduce views or privacy to the adjacent properties.

Ms. Elias recommended approval of the application subject to the findings, statements of fact and conditions of approval.

WILLIAM COBURN, the applicant, stated the remodeling of the home and the reconfiguration of the deck would provide access to the backyard of the home and provide outdoor space adjacent to the living space eight and a half feet from the ground, with a stair to the considerably sized back yard. Screening on the south side of the property would screen people on the deck from the neighbor and screen the proposed ADU in the rear yard. He responded to questions and described the deck railing as redwood 3.5 feet tall, with redwood pickets and a six-foot redwood lattice screen wall on the south side.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

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

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022

IAN CAREY, a neighbor of the subject site, asked about the highest point of the structure, and Chair Livingston verified that the finish floor of the house would be roughly the finish floor of the deck and the bottom of the kitchen window would be the top of the hand rail.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Hook) to approve PLN22-042, Two-Story Deck; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with five Conditions of Approval; approved by hands raised: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Christeson.)**

### 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, May 9, 2022.

Ms. Elias reported that Boardmember Christeson had joined the Zoom meeting at this time.

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

<b>1. PLN21-053</b>	<b>ACCESSORY BUILDING</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 655 SQUARE FOOT DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDING.
Location	2420 FOOTHILL AVENUE
APN	549-132-005
Zoning	RM-1, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	KEN YANG
Applicant	HENRY YEUNG
Staff Contact	LYDIA ELIAS
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Lydia Elias presented the staff report dated April 27, 2022, and advised that the DRB had previously considered the application. The application was for a 655 square foot detached accessory building on a 9,600 square foot parcel on Foothill Avenue on a site characterized by unique topography of a knoll form at the top of a small hill. The site included an existing two-story 1,900 square foot single-family home located on the western portion of the site approximately 10 feet from the property line that had been built in the 1920s in a simple Mediterranean style. The site was located in the Cortez Stege neighborhood. An 800-foot detached secondary dwelling unit had recently been constructed in the rear of the site. The current application was to construct a new 655 square foot accessory structure to be used for a media room and be located on a relatively level portion of the site. The proposed structure met all the zoning requirements of the RM-1 Zoning District.

Ms. Elias advised that the project had been presented to the DRB on June 23, 2021 and had been continued to a future date subject to comments from the DRB to provide a landscape plan as a separate sheet in order to clearly identify the trees that would remain and those that would be removed; to include a materials samples exhibit to demonstrate the proposed materials; to include a project north arrow along with the true north arrow so the plans could be better understood; to illustrate the concrete slab and retaining wall properly behind the structure; to provide a proposed section to show the accessory structure, accessory dwelling unit and primary dwelling to provide more detail on the in-between spaces; and to include a project description to

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

clarify the exact usage of the media room/accessory structure.

Ms. Elias reported that the applicant had incorporated most of the comments and had worked with staff to correct any drafting errors and provide more details on the proposed structure. The structure was low profile, simple, and would serve its purpose as a media room, and match the materials of the existing stucco home. The project was consistent with the zoning requirements and she recommended approval of the project subject to findings, statements of fact and conditions of approval.

Chair Livingston welcomed new DRB member Marcus Christeson to the DRB.

Chair Livingston referred to a large tree on the property that would screen the property from the street and noted it was an existing tree that the DRB had hoped to save, although the plans had shown that it was now slated for removal. He commented that it was probably best to remove that tree to avoid a fire hazard.

Both Ms. Elias and Hector Lopez explained in response to the Chair's remarks about the tree that there was nothing in the record to reflect a discussion of retaining the referenced tree. A Google Map identification of the tree in question found that it was probably a cedrus deodora.

Boardmember Christeson verified with Mr. Lopez that there was no limitation to the number of buildings that could be located on a property.

KHAOULA, the designer, explained that the owners intended to have a separate 655 square foot one-story media room with laundry hook-up, sink and powder room, in style and materials to match the existing home.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

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

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

In response to the Vice Chair who noted that the proposal offered a becoming design and who asked about the roof and gutter design, Kahoula described the design of the roof with gutters that would be directed into the landscaped area.

Boardmember Butt had no questions but suggested that a new tree be planted.

Boardmember Hook recommended that if the cedrus deodora was removed, ceanothus or Yankee Point could be used as ground cover, or a tree such as an oak, a tulip tree, or other native trees could be considered.

Chair Livingston referred to the elevations and asked for clarification whether it was the intent to paint over a plywood wall with stucco paint or provide an actual stucco wall, and Khaoula stated the stucco would match the adjacent home. She agreed to provide a three-coat cement plaster stucco wall.

Chair Livingston asked that the 2 x 4 fascia on the edge of the roof, as shown on the plans, be upgraded to 2 x 6.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN21-053, Accessory Building, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with seven Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 8) That there be quercus agrifolia 24-inch box planted somewhere in the front of the house in the general location of the existing tree to be removed, and that associated landscaping on both sides be ceanothus, Yankee Point or equal; 9) The finish of the house is confirmed to be a three-coat cement plaster; and 10) The fascia to be primed cedar 2 x 6; approved by raised hands: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

<b>3. PLN19-375</b>	<b>SECOND STORY ADDITION</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING STRUCTURE.
Location	223 25 <sup>TH</sup> STREET
APN	515-291-007
Zoning	CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE DISTRICT
Applicant	NANCY CONDOR (OWNER)
Staff Contact	ALEX LOPEZ-VEGA
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Alex Lopez-Vega presented the staff report dated April 27, 2022, for a project that had previously been considered by the DRB for a second-story addition to an existing structure on 25<sup>th</sup> Street to include a new residential dwelling unit where the existing residential unit on the first floor would be removed and the office space extended. The new residential unit would include four bedrooms and two bathrooms and be accessed from the rear of the structure.

The single-family residence of approximately 1,200 square feet constructed in the 1940s was situated on a 4,100 square foot parcel located on 25<sup>th</sup> street between Bissell and Macdonald Avenues that in the past had been converted into commercial offices with a small residential dwelling unit in the rear. The building had a unique style characterized by a metal mansard roof which appeared to be a second-story deviating from the residential character of the street. The property was located in the Richmond Village/Metro Square neighborhood and within the commercial mixed-use district where the predominant land use was low-density residential.

The DRB had reviewed the application on January 27, 2021, which had been continued to a future meeting for the applicant to address design issues where the entire second story was recommended to be set back nine feet from the front property line to be more consistent with the prevalent front yard setback along the street, a disabled parking space to be provided on the street, the front portion of the building to be raised to the same level of the rest of the building, the composition asphalt shingles to be considered instead of the traditional three-tab composition roof, and instead of the culture stone, the applicant was asked to use horizontal Hardie lap siding up to the belly band so the entire bottom commercial floor identified as different from the top floor.

Mr. Lopez-Vega reported that the applicant had incorporated the modifications into the design. He stated the overall design of the front elevation was simple and was embraced by a hip roof with a recessed porch to create a balanced composition. The exterior materials were Hardie shingle siding for the second floor and horizontal 6-inch Hardie plank for the first floor. All proposed windows were white vinyl and would provide an apron and a 4-inch trim. He explained that the proposed materials, horizontal siding for the first floor and Hardie shingle siding for the second floor appeared unusual, and staff had recommended the use of stucco on the first floor or that a consistent exterior material be used throughout the building.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

The removal of the culture stone was also recommended along with an increase in the height of the railing on the front porch on the left side. In addition, the front staircase should provide handrails on both sides of the stairs, and the applicant should consider replacing the pittosporum in the front yard with a variety more suitable for a small space.

Mr. Lopez-Vega recommended approval of the application subject to the findings, statements of fact and conditions of approval.

Boardmember Butt asked about the staff comment on materials and Hector Lopez stated it was unusual to have siding on the first floor and shingles on the second floor, and he suggested there should be consistent material throughout the building or that a base, such as stucco, be used to improve the appearance of the structure.

Chair Livingston asked Stephanie Vollmer whether there would need to be a deed restriction so that the lower floor maintained its commercial status without being switched to residential, which would be non-compliant.

Mr. Lopez stated the zoning district would allow residential but the only issue would be parking for the dwelling unit and he did not know whether an additional parking space would be allowed. He clarified that a tandem parking space was allowed for one unit. He also commented that if there was an ADU, which could be no more than 800 square feet of floor area, a parking space would not be required. The DRB's review at this time was for a project that contained ground floor commercial, which might require a restriction that did not allow a residential use.

As to whether an ADU could be allowed on the first floor, Mr. Lopez-Vega clarified that the floor area of the first floor was 1,300 square feet in size. An ADU could not occupy more than 800 square feet.

Stephanie Vollmer stated that could be considered but given the new state laws that were very pro-housing, she did not know the impact of a deed restriction forcing it to remain commercial on the ground floor when an ADU, which would not be subject to a parking restriction, could be created. She recommended more research into that possibility.

NANCY CONDOR, the property owner, suggested that stucco could be provided on the first floor if desired by the DRB, and the Hardie wood could be used for the second floor because the first floor would be commercial and the second floor would be residential.

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

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

Boardmember Butt questioned Ms. Condor's suggestion for a change in materials and whether it had been based on staff's recommendations or whether she had a preference. She also asked about the proposed exterior colors.

Ms. Condor advised that she would agree to the staff recommendations. As to the colors, she expressed a desire that the second floor be brown and the first floor be beige.

HECTOR OROZCO, the Project Architect, responded to questions from the Vice Chair and verified that the post in the front corner of the building would be 10 x 10, the material for the railing

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

would be galvanized metal or painted metal, and the window trim would be white, as stated on the plans.

Mr. Orozco also noted that the plans should have shown the materials and colors and more complete plans would be provided. He added that the large picture windows would be aluminum framed (commercial grade) with powdered coated white windows and all windows would match. The culture stone would be more oval than square and be more traditional. He agreed with the Vice Chair's suggestion that the design was towards the Craftsman and agreed that more of a horizontal dry stack might be more appropriate to fit within the larger context.

Boardmember Leung liked the materials and colors that had been proposed, Boardmember Christeson also liked the colors as did Boardmember Butt, although she noted that the colors displayed by staff were not the colors the applicant had stated as preferences.

Chair Livingston expressed concern for possible changes, particularly if the ground floor was changed to stucco. He identified a number of drafting errors, supported a complete application with a colors board, confirmation from the property owner of what was desired, window fenestration more consistent with the rest of the house, and if the building were all stucco the cultured stone might need to be eliminated. He wanted the materials to be identified on the drawings and he sought agreement on the colors, which would allow time to look into the issue of zoning and a potential deed restriction.

WENDY, Nancy Condor's daughter, clarified that Ms. Condor liked the color palette that staff had displayed, and Ms. Condor confirmed she liked the vision on the exhibits and did not care about the color. Her interest was gaining approval to be able to proceed with the project.

Mr. Lopez clarified that the proposal had been in process for some time, the site had been boarded up, people had been trespassing into the property, and Ms. Condor had been concerned about fire.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Carter was comfortable with the design overall and liked the suggestion of adding a vertical mullion to the picture windows, along with the confirmation of a general palette of colors. He could support stucco on the first story subject to more detail and could support the project at this time subject to conditions.

Boardmember Butt agreed and noted that her only materiality question was the use of the stone. She supported the use of Hardie board all the way around for the commercial ground floor. She was pleased that the property owner had proposed the improvements which would improve the street. She supported the elimination of the stone and suggested that the designation of a color scheme and a clarification of the window divisions would allow her to support the project at this time. She suggested the issue of any deed restriction related to residential on the ground floor was a planning issue and not a design issue.

Boardmember Hook and Boardmember Leung were supportive of approval at this time subject to the comments with respect to color, and Boardmember Christeson stated that as long as earth tones were specified the exact colors need not be identified in that the colors earlier described were acceptable to him. Boardmember Butt added that if stucco was desired the DRB should see a return of the design.

On the discussion of the exterior materials, Ms. Cordor clarified her preference for the Hardie

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022

materials as submitted and the DRB agreed, with the exception of the DRB's desire to eliminate the cultured stone.

Mr. Orozco clarified that the Hardie shingle siding would be Benjamin Moore Pearl and the same for the horizontal, with the use of Summer Wood, an earth tone for the trim which could be made white, and Pearl Gray for the Hardie plank both horizontal and Hardie shingle.

Chair Livingston recommended a darker color for the top floor with no painted trim around the windows which should match the siding. The fascia trim could also be Summer Wood.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Livingston) to approve PLN19-375, Second Story Addition, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with eight Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 9) The cultured stone at the base of the ground floor is removed and replaced with the horizontal Hardie plank; 10) The trim color shall be white; 11) The upper level to be Olympic Storm Gray or equal with the Hardie siding lower part an Olympic 911 or equal; 12) The windows to be divided into a tri-partied configuration; approved by raised hands: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

<b>4. PLN20-276</b>	<b>WILSON SECOND DWELLING UNIT</b>
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND DWELLING UNIT OVER AN EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE AND PROVIDE AN ADDITIONAL OFF-STREET PARKING SPACE IN THE FRONT YARD.
Location	2364 BROOKS AVENUE
APN	515-020-007
Zoning:	RM-2, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT
Applicant	TERRY WILSON (OWNER)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated April 27, 2022, for a Design Review Permit to construct a second dwelling unit over an existing detached garage located in the rear and provide an additional off-street parking space in the front yard at 2364 Brooks Avenue in the North and East Neighborhood. The garage would also be extended to allow for a new recreational room at ground level. The proposed second dwelling unit would include one bedroom and one bathroom for a total of 760 square feet. The 6,500 square foot parcel contained an existing single-family residence with a driveway along the western portion of the site providing access to the garage in the rear. The residence, a bungalow style, was approximately 1,284 square feet with three bedrooms and one bathroom constructed in 1920. The property was relatively flat and was adjacent to a single-family residence and a duplex in a neighborhood of primarily single-family one-story structures and a few two-story residences.

The project complied with the zoning requirements in terms of parking but needed an administrative use permit to allow for a third parking space to be located on the front portion of the property and the front yard portion of the landscaping would be removed to accommodate that parking space. The proposed second dwelling unit would be partially constructed over the existing garage, the new upper level would provide a 5-foot side yard setback from the nearest property line. Currently, the existing garage structure was located within 2.5 feet from the side property line and was considered a non-conforming structure under the Zoning Ordinance. The building height of the existing structure was less than 14 feet and the portion within the 5-foot setback less than 9.5 feet in height. The current structure was conforming. The applicant's

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

objective was to keep the footprint of the existing garage for a more efficient access of vehicles entering and backing up to or from the garage. It was noted that if the garage was demolished to comply with the 5-foot side yard setback, the angle to access the garage from the driveway would be reduced.

There was also a covered porch in the rear of the main dwelling unit which would further impair access. The applicant had indicated that the roof of the garage would be removed but the existing walls and foundation would be upgraded to support the new upper floor, which would be permitted provided the extent of replacement or upgrade did not exceed 50 percent. The building design was simple and was consistent with the existing building in the front with detailing to be compatible with that building.

Mr. Lopez recommended approval of the application.

Responding to questions, Mr. Lopez noted that four findings had been recommended to approve the parking in the front and one finding identified the need to incorporate landscaping in the front. In response to the question of whether the requirement for the third space could be eliminated, he stated to waive the requirement for that parking space would require a variance from the Planning Commission. He clarified that while a structural plan had not been submitted a letter had been submitted from a structural engineer to advise that the foundation could be upgraded to accommodate a second floor. He also clarified that while the driveway was long and more than two cars could park in the driveway, the code allowed only two tandem spaces necessitating the widening of the driveway to accommodate the third parking space. There was concern that the widening of the driveway would diminish the already small front yard.

Chair Livingston referred to second stories built over existing single-story structures and the concern for the stability of existing foundations, and Mr. Lopez explained that he had followed through with the Building Department and had been advised that while it would be more expensive to build over an existing foundation it could be done.

TERRY WILSON, the applicant, property owner, and a general contractor, stated that he would do the work on the 1920s house which had interesting details. He added that the garage door was iconic and he would maintain the size, shape and detail of the existing home while planning for beam, post and pad reinforcements where necessary, with additional pier walling to reinforce the walls that remained. He planned to leave all walls and plate heights as is. He identified knee brace details on the house and the existing garage that would be carried out through the new addition. While he characterized the parking as tricky, he proposed an 8 x 16 compact space to allow side-by-side parking spaces in the front, which would be convenient. He stated that shrubbery would be added to the front and he planned to screen with rhododendrons on the west side and a Japanese maple where the new parking space would be located.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

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

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

Boardmember Butt expressed concern with the proposed third parking space and noted it was unfortunate that the City's regulations appeared to be counter-intuitive at the subject location. She suggested the cars parked in that space would hang over the sidewalk. She added that she was pleased to see the letter of support from a neighbor along with a letter of support from the

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

North and East Neighborhood Council. The addition appeared to be well-designed, although she questioned the need to retain the existing foundation of the garage. She had no issues with the proposal other than for the parking.

Chair Livingston asked if the DRB could recommend to the Planning Commission that there be no additional parking in front.

Ms. Vollmer advised that the required findings could not be made if the third parking space was precluded.

Mr. Lopez added that if the addition was an ADU, the parking would not be required. Since the proposed structure would be on the second floor over the garage, it would exceed the height requirement of no more than 16 feet for an ADU. While a variance from the Planning Commission was a possibility, he noted it would be expensive to pursue that possibility.

On the discussion of the third parking space, the treatment of the surface was suggested as an option to address the concerns. The DRB discouraged the use of concrete. Other options such as earth stone and other permeable surface options were suggested.

Mr. Wilson suggested that a retaining wall in the front only had to be moved over about 5 feet given that 12 feet currently existed. When asked if he would be open to other options for the surface of the third parking space such as turf stone with holes in it that grass could grow through, he confirmed his interest in potential alternatives.

Boardmember Leung underscored the need for the applicant to work with an engineer to address the reinforcements needed to support the second-story addition. She asked if the two panels in the garage door were windows and the applicant confirmed that was the case and he clarified that the garage doors were two swinging doors and he wanted to retain those doors.

Vice Chair Carter supported the design, characterized it as gorgeous, and stated it looked like a proper carriage house. He had no concern with the foundation since the Building Department would ensure that the foundation was appropriate to support the proposed addition.

Boardmember Christeson agreed that the issue with the foundation would be addressed through the City's process. He questioned whether motorcycle parking would suffice as the third parking space, and Mr. Lopez clarified that would not satisfy the requirement.

Vice Chair Carter suggested that the applicant might want to put the structure on stilts, jack it up, maintain the existing footprint, and build a new foundation, and Mr. Lopez stated there was a section in the code where that would be allowed provided the extent of replacement or upgrade did not exceed 50 percent of the replacement cost of the structure. He added that the Building Department would verify the extent of construction, inspectors would make sure that the approved plans were being constructed, and there would be additional checks and balances throughout the construction process.

Boardmember Hook reported that she had checked on options for other than concrete surfaces, and after her review she recommended turf stone by Belgard Pavers or equal.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Hook) to approve PLN20-276, Wilson Second Dwelling Unit, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with ten Conditions of Approval and**

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

additional DRB conditions as follows: 11) Replace the concrete proposed at the new parking space with permeable pavers turf stone by Belgard Pavers or equal; approved by raised hands: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

5. **PLN17-236** **POWERPLANT PARK DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT**  
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR DESIGN REVIEW OF A CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITY THAT INCLUDES GREENHOUSES, DISTRIBUTION AND PROCESSING FACILITY, RESTAURANT, AND SUPPORT FACILITIES.  
Location VACANT PARCELS ON FREETHY BOULEVARD, WEST OF GOODRICK AVENUE AND RICHMOND PARKWAY  
APN 408-220-003, -023, -024, -025, -026, -032, -033, -034, -039, -041, -042, -043, -049, AND -050  
Zoning IA, INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURE DISTRICT  
Owner RICHMOND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LLC  
Applicant POWERPLANT PARK INC., RICHARD TRIEBER  
Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: **CONTINUE TO MAY 11, 2022**

The application was continued to the May 11, 2022 meeting.

6. **PLN21-444** **BRICKYARD COVE RESIDENTIAL**  
Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN OF A 94-UNIT MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT.  
Location BRICKYARD COVE ROAD, VACANT LOT BETWEEN SEACLIFF ESTATES AND BRICKYARD LANDING.  
APN 560-340-043, 560-340-039  
Zoning RM1, MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT  
Owner PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.  
Applicant REPUBLIC BRICKYARD LLC  
Staff Contact LINA VELASCO OR ANDREA VILLARROEL Recommendation: **PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS**

The application was continued to a future meeting, date uncertain.

**Board Business**

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

Chair Livingston officially welcomed new Boardmember Christeson, who described his background and experience with a zoning board, with design and with other associated areas of development.

Chair Livingston highlighted the status of some previously approved projects.

Chair Livingston encouraged staff to ensure that all applicants submit more complete plans and color boards.

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON MAY 25, 2022**

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

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, May 11, 2022.