

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

May 25, 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 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Boardmember Macy Leung

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano and Jonelyn Whales, and Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 23, 2022; April 27, 2022; and May 11, 2022

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Butt) to approve the minutes of the March 23, 2022, April 27, 2022 and May 11, 2022 meetings, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEETING PROCEDURES

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

PUBLIC FORUM

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC [Trails for Richmond Action Committee], provided a detailed update on the Be Trail Kind sign program for the Bay Trail intended to clarify the rules and requirements for the use of the Bay Trail consistent with the Trails Are Common Ground national initiative to make trails safe, inclusive and respectful for everyone. He noted that the section of the Bay Trail with the highest traffic and the most conflicts was between Point Isabel and Harbour Way South.

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, June 6, 2022.

Roberta Feliciano identified the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1.	PLN21-021	NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDING	
	Description	(CONTINUED FROM MAY 11, 2022) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A PREFABRICATED BUILDING ON A VACANT PARCEL.	
	Location	600 SOUTH 31 ST STREET	
	APN	549-204-002	
	Zoning	IL, INDUSTRIAL LIGHT DISTRICT	
	Owner	JOHNNY DA SILVA	
	Applicant	GUSTAVO OROZCO	
	Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated May 25, 2022 for a project that had been in process for some time, and explained that the applicant intended to construct a warehouse on the site to store landscaping tools, equipment, machinery, supplies and materials inside the building for his landscaping business. She stated the building guidelines allowed heights up to a maximum of 55 feet for the zoning district. The warehouse had initially been proposed at 32 feet in height but had been reduced to 26 feet to be more compatible with the surrounding structures. The zoning also allowed a front yard minimum setback of zero for the front, sides and rear yard unless the site abutted a residential zone. In this case, there was an existing non-conforming residence adjacent to the south property line but there were no abutting residential zones. The applicant proposed to provide a side yard setback greater than zero on both sides of the building and a setback of 15 to 19 feet on the south perimeter adjacent to the existing residence. As a result, there would be a significant distance between the residence and the proposed industrial building.

Ms. Whales also reported that the zoning district required that 10 percent of lot area must be landscaped and a minimum of 830 square feet of landscaping was required, although the applicant had proposed over 900 square feet of landscaping comprised of six trees, 54 shrubs and nine plantings along the perimeter, and there would be plantings along the southern property line to screen the existing home. For parking, the applicant was required to have 2.5 parking spaces based on the warehouse size and two parking spaces had been designated in the rear of the building with two parking spaces to be available inside the building.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

At its September 22, 2021 meeting, the DRB directed the applicant to meet with the surrounding neighbors to discuss their concerns regarding perimeter fencing, building height and off-street parking. The applicant had traded emails with both neighbors on the north and south property lines over the past six months and had redesigned the plans to accommodate their concerns.

Ms. Whales described the changes that had been made to accommodate the neighbors. Staff had asked Chair Livingston to review the changes with respect to their adequacy and the Chair had found that the changes were adequate based on the recommendations discussed at the last DRB meeting. She recommended approval of the application subject to the required findings and statements of fact along with the staff-recommended conditions of approval.

Ms. Whales responded to questions from the DRB and explained that the drawings had been corrected to show the accurate height of the adjacent building; the adjacent single-family dwelling and other contiguous single-family dwellings were located in an industrial district and had apparently been constructed prior to the change of zoning some time ago; more landscaping was being provided than required; and C.3 stormwater regulations were not required for the small lot.

GUSTAVO OROZCO, the applicant, highlighted the process and revisions through the DRB's prior comments and concerns along with the neighbors' comments and concerns, and expressed a desire to move forward with project approval. He clarified that the color palette had not previously been discussed other than the DRB's desire that the color match the color of the roof to the side walls. If the gray that had been proposed was not acceptable to the DRB he stated that could be changed.

Mr. Orozco explained that he had been in touch with the neighbor to the south who had expressed concerns given the different uses. He noted that the northern neighbor was an industrial use and there were no concerns. When asked by the Chair, he stated that there was general acceptance of the fence on the property to the north while the fence would be changed on the southern boundary from six feet high to an eight-foot wooden fence to increase the privacy to the residential neighbor, and along with an increase in landscaping on that boundary that could reach 30 feet in height would create a privacy barrier between the two uses.

Mr. Orozco clarified that the eight-foot fence would be redwood, the front gate had been proposed to be one foot lower but could be matched at eight feet if necessary to match the fence height and it would be constructed with an Ipe material. He noted the fence could be six feet tall with a two-foot lattice if desired by the DRB.

Boardmember Hook asked about the screening for the fence, supported the plant palette, and recommended flipping the colors of the dark body and light trim for the building.

Boardmember Christeson suggested the darker color might be an advantage by reducing glare from the sun to the adjacent house.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

MANOOCH KHAJEH, Richmond, stated that he had submitted comments to the Board, verified that the Board had received those comments, and explained that there were four contiguous residential houses immediately to the south of the project and seven contiguous residential properties directly across from the project. He referred to the Richmond Municipal Code Section 15.04.8056.040 where the DRB may only approve a design if the requirements of that section did not overwhelm or adversely impact adjoining properties and respected prevailing setbacks and a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

scale of neighboring buildings and how they related to the street. Mr. Khajeh noted that the houses had 20-foot front setbacks while the proposed warehouse with its zero front setback, two driveways and no street parking was not compatible with the houses. He urged the DRB to ensure that the building met the scale of existing housing and he had requested changes to minimize the impacts to that housing, although none of his comments related to impacts had been addressed.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Chair Livingston supported the fact that a darker color of the warehouse would keep the reflection down and Boardmember Christeson stated that a darker color would also make the building look smaller.

Boardmember Butt recognized the bizarre pattern of development in the neighborhood with giant warehouses and tiny houses, and with respect to color concurred that the darker color was preferred.

Boardmember Hook agreed about the colors and with respect to landscaping supported the plantings that had been proposed. She recommended a combination of north facing jasmine vine, clematis, and hardenbergia. She also expressed some concern with the building setbacks.

Vice Chair Carter accepted the proposed colors and asked if any thought had been given to make the bollards match the building color itself rather than using bright yellow for the bollards. He was sensitive to the concerns of the neighbors but based on the zoning understood the different uses, and with respect to the fence stated the fence and gate should match in height. He had no problem with the pattern change if the front fence operated more as a gate.

Boardmember Butt suggested it would be nice if the fence was all horizontal and given that the fence in question separated the industrial from the residential uses she suggested it should be as nice as possible.

Chair Livingston understood Mr. Khajeh's concern that the fence mitigate sound and suggested a solid eight-foot high fence would do more in that regard.

Vice Chair Carter suggested going horizontal and wrapping the fence around the front; a solid eight-foot fence on the gate as well as on the side with lpe on the front and redwood all the way along the side.

By consensus, the Chair re-opened the public hearing to ask Mr. Khajeh his preference for the fence.

Mr. Khajeh stated his concern was the potential noise created by operating heavy equipment on the site and while he supported an eight-foot tall solid concrete fence, he could accept a combination of concrete and wood fence, a solid horizontal fence, or a full lpe fence.

JOHNNY DA SILVA, the property owner, described the proposed fence with 4 x 6 posts and noted he could not get the boards for an eight-foot fence. He stated a concrete fence would be different and require deeper footings for both sides for safety and it would be much more expensive, and an eight-foot tall concrete fence would require deep piers on both sides. He preferred 4 x 6 posts with 1 x 8 redwood to produce a solid wooden fence. He did not recommend a horizontal fence and because the wood would shrink and create a number of gaps, he proposed an eight-foot tall board-on-board redwood fence retaining the horizontal lpe at the front.

The DRB had no problem with that and preferred the solid wood to the lattice/wood combination.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

Chair Livingston re-closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Carter suggested that the contrasting color to the Charcoal Gray body of the warehouse be Ash Gray instead of the Desert Sand shown on the plans.

Chair Livingston recommended with respect to the neighbor to the north a condition that the applicant shall have the north property line surveyed for review by the Community Development Director prior to issuance of the building permit to construct the steel building.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to approve PLN21-021, New Commercial Building, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with eight Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 9) The applicant shall have the north property line surveyed for review by the Community Development Director prior to issuance of the building permit to construct the steel building; 10) The south property line fence to be an eight-foot solid board-on-board redwood and the returning gate shall match the eight-foot height; 11) The bollards shall be painted to match the building; and 12) The building trim color shall be Ash Gray instead of Desert Sand; approved by a Roll Call vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Leung.)

Boardmember Butt recused herself from the next item due to the fact that her husband was an architect on the project. She left the Zoom meeting at this time and did not return to the meeting.

2. PLN21-260	POWERPLANT PARK
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW OF A CANNABIS CULTIVATION, MANUFACTURING AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY THAT INCLUDES GREENHOUSES, DISTRIBUTION AND PROCESSING FACILITY, AND SUPPORT BUILDINGS.
Location	VACANT PARCELS ON FREETHY BOULEVARD, WEST OF GOODRICK AVENUE AND RICHMOND PARKWAY
APN	408-220-023, -024, -025, -026, -039, -041, -042, -043, -049, AND -050
Zoning	IA, INDUSTRIAL AGRICULTURE DISTRICT
Owners	DOOMMAS ENTERPRISE LLC, RICHMOND DEVELOPMENT CO, AND JOE & HEIDI SHEKOU
Applicant	POWERPLANT PARK INC. (RICHARD TRIEBER)
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated May 25, 2022, for design review of the application from PowerPlant Park Inc. to construct a cannabis cultivation, manufacturing, and distribution facility which included 38 greenhouses, a nursery processing center and support facilities including a restaurant. She explained that in 2019 the applicant had received conditional approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a similar cannabis facility and the applicant had subsequently applied for a CUP amendment to reduce the scope of the original approval. In May 2022, the Planning Commission had conditionally approved the CUP amendment. She clarified that the zoning was consistent with the current General Plan. She displayed the site plan and noted the project would be constructed in three phases with Phase 1, Phase 1A and Phase 2.

Ms. Feliciano presented renderings of the proposed structure, noted that the Chair had submitted comments on the processing facility, which had been updated to use board-form concrete at the base with insulated metal siding and with a standing seam metal roof. The restroom building had

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

also been updated and would be a prefabricated building. Some of the key amendments to the original project was the removal of the site previously designated as Phase 3. It was anticipated that a new CUP and design review would be filed for that portion of the site. Seven greenhouses had also been removed leaving a total of 38 greenhouses, and a creative covered outdoor space had been added for staff. A very large building had been changed to smaller footprints, one in each phase, which had also been a recommendation of some members of the DRB. The two-story private restaurant was now in the waterfront as part of Phase 1A and contained a meeting room, office space and town hall on the first floor. Overall the project had been reduced by 87,378 square feet. She recommended conditional approval based on the findings and statement of fact along with the 117 conditions approved by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Feliciano responded to comments from the DRB and presented the actual site plan to identify the 148 parking spaces; noted that the applicant was the primary CUP holder and there would be tenants on the campus; verified that the restaurant would be private for use by the tenants; clarified the City of Richmond's public art ordinance and explained that the fencing design was part of that art requirement. She added that the one percent public art requirement could be provided to each of the phases based on the evaluation of each phase and the Richmond Arts & Culture Commission (RACC) and the Public Art Advisory Committee (PAAC) would review the art component. She reiterated that Phase 3 would be a completely separate project with its own design review and its own CUP, and while it might be part of the proposed campus it would be operated by a different operator. She also clarified that part of the original CUP was a review of water resource recovery and the applicant would have to secure stormwater permits and go through the stormwater plan check process.

When asked if a soils analysis had been provided, Ms. Feliciano reported that Wayne Leach of CSW/Stuber-Stroeh Engineering Group was the civil engineer for the project and some documentation had been submitted.

Chair Livingston recommended a percolation analysis to determine whether the bio swales would be feasible.

ANDREW BUTT, the Project Architect, stated there were extensive geotechnical reports for the project. He did not recall anything about percolation issues but noted it had been evaluated and discussed. With respect to the fence and the art design, he stated they thought it would be a good opportunity to integrate art into the project and would be easy to quantify to meet the one percent of the overall project cost requirement. The concept was a play on the Bay Trail and on San Pablo Bay. As far as parking, he stated the zoning was specifically carved out for a project like this where specific industrial agricultural zoning had been created as pseudo open space where structures could be dismantled if needed. The City's ordinance did not address the specific parking required for a cannabis operation and that requirement had been left up to the Zoning Administrator. Adequate parking had been proposed to accommodate those expected to be on the site.

Mr. Butt characterized the project as unique. He noted it had been a long process getting to this point but the project was so unique there had been efforts to make it something more than a mundane place for someone to grow cannabis. He referred to the restaurant, the design of the non-greenhouse buildings, and described the intent to set a high bar in the world of cannabis projects for a unique one-of-a-kind site in Richmond on the Bay.

RICHARD TRIEBER, the applicant, stated that originally when appearing before the DRB two years ago, the project did not look as good as it did now but given the input from the DRB and its Chair the project had been improved as a result. He stated they would take all the care in the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

world to make sure that the site had the aesthetic value the DRB had desired. The park had been planned as an integrated campus with all the important touchpoints in the cannabis world with multiple uses to integrate manufacturing, processing, retail, product lines, branding and the like to create a campus in the heart of the San Francisco Bay Area. He explained that staff would be paid well, trained well, be hired from Richmond, with money back to the City, and a foundation would assist different causes in the City of Richmond where the faith community, the arts community and the like would get money from the project with the intent to set an example for other projects to do the same.

PAUL from Vallier Design Associates commented that he was representing JC Miller who was not available at this time. He explained that a theme had been discussed a few years ago and Chair Livingston had supported a plant palette that would be kept low and natural next to San Francisco Bay similar to the natural planting along Wildcat Creek. The different plant palettes were displayed for the bio-retention areas, ornamental landscape areas, the tough environment near the Bay and the wetland environment, as well as the trees proposed in the parking area to provide shade. He pointed out the section of the Bay Trail that would be refurbished, the fencing and the artwork in the fencing to offer a nod to the adjacent wetland area with tules or reeds to reflect the natural environment, both to provide security and to comply with the required art element for the project. He stated there was a soils report and a geotechnical report had been done for the site.

Mr. Butt noted that the development team was familiar with the site and would follow-up on the issues raised by the Chair. He described the components of each of the three phases of the project, reiterated that the Bay Trail would be refurbished, described the greenhouse structures, acrylic ceiling structures that made up the vast majority of the project, pointed out the non-greenhouse buildings related to processing and distribution, the nerve center, the restaurant, and the various amenities provided for those working at the site.

Mr. Trieber stated that the greenhouses were visually stunning in that they were not the typical vegetable greenhouses. What had been proposed was state-of-the-art indoor buildings that were aesthetically extraordinary.

Mr. Butt also identified shared restroom facilities, off-the-shelf pre-fabricated restrooms in pre-cast patterns and the security elements of the project. He stated that most non-greenhouse buildings were straight forward with an agricultural aesthetic; simple forms with well-detailed articulated fenestration and a nice palette of materials that would be visually attractive from the Richmond Parkway. The restaurant would have a second level deck. Paint colors and surface treatment of the restrooms would replicate the other buildings. He pointed out the processing and distribution buildings in the center of the site, internal to the project that would not be visible from off-site, the trash enclosures placed throughout the site, and the pre-manufactured guard shacks on each portion of the site. There would also be two garden plots with raised beds, a picnic area and fire pits for the workers, and a dog park area. The signage plan that Mr. Butt described would be similar to national park signage. The material palette was described as a combination of vertical metal siding, standing seam metal roofs, board-form concrete, and wood composite siding and Corten vertical louvers.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Roberta Feliciano identified the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

BRUCE BEYAERT, TRAC, stated that TRAC was pleased with the project and the applicant had agreed to TRAC-recommended conditions that had been listed in TRAC's May 24, 2022 (4:54

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

P.M.) e-mail to Richard Trieber, with copies submitted to the members of the DRB. TRAC was pleased with the project, the fact the project would refurbish and repave the old sections of the Bay Trail on the western side of the project and along the frontage on the Richmond Parkway, and that the project would extend the trail north from Freethy Boulevard. He noted a number of comments related to paving and wanted to see benches along the northern part of the trail with backs on the benches. He urged the DRB to adopt TRAC's recommended conditions A, B, C, and D.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Hook had reviewed the proposed plant list and stated the direction earlier noted worked well. Referring to the site plan, she asked where the heart of the campus would be located. With respect to the fire pits, she suggested one large fire pit might be better than multiple fire pits.

Mr. Trieber explained that what had not been shown was that the area where the Bay Trail was located in front of the restaurant would include a hospitality area for patrons of the Bay Trail and for staff, with comfortable furniture and food carts. There were plans to improve the area to allow patrons to hang out and enjoy the Bay vistas from that point.

As to the restaurant, Boardmember Hook asked about the connections between the phases and Mr. Butt stated that because PowerPlant Parkway was a public road there was little that could be done as part of the project but there was a pedestrian gate at each vehicular gate adjacent to the guard tower. In terms of a pathway going from one to another phase, there was little detail available for that aspect at this time.

Mr. Butt added that there had been some direction toward vacating PowerPlant Parkway, which would allow more control of the site and there was a desire that the development team open up more possibilities to connect the two, essentially privatizing that road which was currently not the case.

Chair Livingston noted that one of the conditions required that the road be repaved, which might allow other improvements such as a special paving for connecting crosswalks, and Mr. Butt stated there would have to be sidewalks provided on both sides as part of the project.

Boardmember Hook asked if bike racks had been included in the plan, and Mr. Trieber explained that there was no traffic on that road which had been blocked off. Until recently there had been a gate, which had since been removed. There would be a shuttle service to pick up local employees and there would be very little vehicular traffic on the site.

Boardmember Hook recommended adding bike racks as an amenity and Mr. Trieber agreed to add a few locations for bike racks.

Boardmember Hook asked about the design for the picnic areas, the gardens and the dog park and the representative from Vallier Design Associates described those areas and the materials involved with concrete pathways, decomposed granite in between and plantings.

With respect to the community garden boxes, Mr. Trieber described the process where water and waste from the irrigation of plants would be collected in tanks, piped underground into another storage tank, and each greenhouse would get a plot in the community garden to grow vegetables.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

Mr. Trieber added that a full-time staff person would take care of the gardens and an automated system would feed the gardens. The garden plots would be raised up and the view from that area of the site looked out to the best part of the view of the Bay. He suggested it would be a gathering area and the community garden would serve a dual purpose by putting water runoff to use.

Boardmember Hook supported the project and the public amenities it would provide.

Vice Chair Carter also supported the project and verified that each phase had its own fencing surrounding it. He asked about the gate and the applicant spoke to a manned guard station.

Mr. Trieber referenced the proposed security and monitoring system and stated that access control would be huge in that someone could not get on to a phase of the park without going through security in that the site would be very secure, not in the military style, but there would be security for each phase and collectively for the 12 acres as well, and the guards would be armed. He confirmed that there would be sufficient space for the stacking of vehicles at the driveway.

With respect to the landscape plan, Vice Chair Carter requested clarification of the plantings for some of the specific areas, primarily low plantings requiring little water use, and he was told that behind all the greenhouses there would be a concrete pathway all the way around, or a street. The intention was to have that access for the other phases as well and the landscaping would not be installed directly adjacent to the greenhouses.

Vice Chair Carter referred to the roll-up doors and assumed they would be eight feet or more in height, and the applicant confirmed that would be the case. He asked where the entry proper to the restaurant would be located and that entry was pointed out on the plans, with entries from the Bay side. He asked how that would be identified from the parking lot and was reminded that the building was a private restaurant to be used for private events. The applicant indicated that some wayfinding signage could be provided.

With respect to signage, Vice Chair Carter had no issues with the monument signage and because Corten would be used it would be tied into the language of materials used on the other buildings. He appreciated the nod of the sign design towards national parks signage but would feel just as good if the sign was board-form concrete and a little bit more industrial in nature but could also support a stone veneer if the DRB preferred that element.

Mr. Butt noted that the stone veneer had been in the project for a long time and he suggested board-form concrete would be more in keeping with the rest of the building designs and the park itself and he had no issue with that change.

Mr. Trieber expressed the willingness to address the signage and referred to the creation of a 10-foot wood sculpted cannabis leaf which could be a piece of art and a sign. He added that he was open to any suggestions for the signage program.

Boardmember Christeson stated the project was impressive and the layout and amenities were similar to what wineries had done. He agreed with the full-time guards and with the signage and agreed that a wooden cannabis leaf would serve as a piece of art and a sign. He commented that Richmond was fortunate to have the proposal.

In response to Boardmember Christeson who asked about the storm drains on site, Mr. Trieber stated that a great deal of stormwater work had already been completed on the site, monitored by the geotech who had recommended a number of things. The soil had been bedded, fabric laid

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

down, lime-treated, and there would be a 12-inch concrete steel reinforced slab. He emphasized that the buildings would be erected with the utmost care.

Boardmember Christeson suggested that the drains should be marked as “rainwater only.”

Chair Livingston referred to the art at the fence and questioned its effectiveness, particularly in the area in which it would be located, although Boardmember Christeson commented that some wineries had done the exact same thing and art in fences in various places was very effective, especially when the wineries had a gate to match. He noted that three sections of the fence had been so designated.

Chair Livingston referred to Boardmember Hook’s earlier comment about the heart of the project and referred to an area of the site he described as the “catcher’s mitt.” He suggested that public art should be focused in that area and recommended that the public art be something sculptural in metal or steel at that location as opposed to being placed in portions of the fence. He also recommended a symbolic crosswalk in that area as a welcome to the project.

Mr. Trieber suggested that should be where the 10-foot cannabis leaf should be placed and it could be dressed up to focus attention, to also include landscaping surrounding it.

Mr. Butt agreed and reiterated that the art concept had to be approved by the RACC and PAAC. He pointed out how the fence could be run in that area that could also include some sculptural element to tie into the project.

Boardmember Hook recommended a parkscape as opposed to just landscape.

Chair Livingston referred to the restrooms and the processing building presented by Mr. Butt and identified some changes that he had recommended and offered an exhibit of those changes in comparison with Mr. Butt’s proposal. He asked the DRB for its comments on the two versions.

Vice Chair Carter supported the Chair’s recommendations for changes in the revised design and characterized it as simpler and more honest, and the addition of CMU would help with security; Boardmember Hook commented that the revised design was reminiscent of Sea Ranch; and Boardmember Christeson supported it as an improvement.

Mr. Butt accepted the revised design for the processing building.

With respect to the restroom, Chair Livingston did not recommend changing the plan or the function but given that it was one of the first buildings on the campus that was visible coming down the Richmond Parkway, he suggested it was out of context and recommended the use of one of the materials presented, either board-form concrete, wood or metal panels.

Mr. Butt recommended a board-form base with a metal cladding on the top.

Chair Livingston referred to the restaurant and pointed out the west elevation and the Corten panels, with a board-form concrete wall above with no support, and Mr. Butt stated the structural engineers had not yet been brought in and that design could change as a result. Chair Livingston recommended a canopy over the entry.

On the landscaping, the Chair noted the original intent to keep the plant palette to a minimum given its location on the side of the Bay where the natural plant materials were limited. He supported the Cyprus and the oaks and recommended being more sympathetic to the waterfront and what would grow naturally in that area. He supported a limited palette next to the water and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

Boardmember Hook agreed and suggested there were opportunities in the fire pit or gathering spaces for more garden type plantings.

Chair Livingston also commented that the tree species had not been called out in the landscape plan primarily along the edge of the Bay Trail and in the bio-retention areas. He asked whether there was a more applicable salt-marsh equivalent to the hydroseed mix that had been proposed, and the representative from Vallier Design Associates noted there were a lot of different seed mixtures for different areas and he would secure the right mix for the area. He noted that area would initially be irrigated and would need to be maintained.

Boardmember Hook referred to a low marsh and a high marsh landscaped area and suggested the Bay Trail was building up to the high marsh and grass seed made sense. She proposed planting pickleweed or other low marsh plantings.

With respect to fencing, Chair Livingston supported Alternate B, which was supported by the rest of the DRB.

Mr. Butt commented that was also his preference and Mr. Trieber concurred and stated from a security standpoint the eight-foot fence was supported.

Chair Livingston referred to an area off the main road between the fence and the sidewalk and noted that landscaping was usually brought up to the sidewalk over the City right of way, and Mr. Trieber commented that the area was outside their property line but in the discussion it was clarified that the area had already been planted and if anything was damaged during construction the plants could be replaced.

Chair Livingston requested that the landscape plan include everything out to the edge of pavement, and Mr. Trieber reported that a crew would clear the over brush, weed everything and clean up the sidewalk next week and the project would provide some landscaping and include it as part of their maintenance.

Chair Livingston recommended a few oaks in their natural state in that area. He recommended that the care zone be extended out to the street and that quercus agrifolia and some baccharis and toyon be planted in that area. The applicant agreed to do that.

Boardmember Hook recommended several of the plants in the applicant's planting plan such as arbutus 'Marina' that could stand up to the harsher conditions.

Mr. Butt noted there was a buried pipeline in that area and the Chair urged the applicant to do what could be done given that constraint.

Chair Livingston stated with respect to signage that it was a great palette with the Corten and the board-form concrete. He agreed with the removal of the stone. He thanked the development team for doing such a great job.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hook) to approve PLN21-260, PowerPlant Park, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 117 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 118) TRAC's conditions as agreed to with the discussion with the development team listed in the May 24, 2022 (4:54 P.M.) letter to Richard Trieber and the DRB covering items A, B, C and D; 119) Shift from the prefab concrete walls to any material in the presented palette specifically for the restrooms, to be left up to the architect; 120) The landscape architect and developer shall consider a replacement for the public

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JUNE 22, 2022

fence art and in lieu create a public art focal point as discussed and as seen from the Parkway (between the PowerPlant Parkway and the Phase 2 landscape area), and encourage that invitation from the sidewalk to that site to be included in the landscape design; 121) Introduce enhanced paving at crosswalks when repaving the new street; 122) Provide bike parking in each phase; 123) The signage stone to be deleted and replaced with board-form concrete and Corten, board widths to be no more than 5.5 inches; 124) Inclusion of public pathways and wayfinding to the restaurant; 125) Introduce more pronounced entry element cover; 126) Include in the landscape plan the area along the Parkway from the extent of the property to the east to the southernmost point of the property, which shall be a special district of native plants to include plantings of coast live oak, baccharis, toyon, arbutus 'Marina,' and garrya elliptica and maintain that landscape strip; 127) Limit the plant material as much as possible in the salt marsh ecotone area to the restaurant and not to include eucalyptus or deodar cedar; 128) The fencing plan to be Alternate B; 129) Eliminate the fence art in lieu of creating a focal point or heart of the project; and 130) Include the new exterior elevation for Distribution Processing Building No. 122; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Carter, Christeson, Hook and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Leung.)

3. PLN22-058	PORT OF RICHMOND DISTRIBUTION CENTER
Description	(CONTINUED FROM MAY 11, 2022) STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN OF A NEW +202,000 SQUARE-FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE ON A 15.7-ACRE PARCEL.
Location	1411 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH
APN	560-270-060 AND 560-270-055
Zoning	IW, WATER-RELATED INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Applicant	IV1 1411 HARBOUR WAY S JV LLC (OWNER)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONTINUE TO A FUTURE MEETING

The application was continued to a future meeting.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

Ms. Feliciano stated that the final draft of the Form Based Code had been submitted to the DRB and was expected to be considered by the Planning Commission at its June 16, 2022 meeting.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Livingston noted that Terminal 3 would be submitted to the DRB in the near future and there were multiple overlapping layers of interests and approvals involved; the Terminal 1 project would be returning with an aggressive timeline; and he would be gone towards the end of June.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:37 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, June 8, 2022.