

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Richmond, CA 94804

November 9, 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 L. Christeson
Jonathan Livingston

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Leah Marthinsen

Vice Chair Brian Carter called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: None

The members of the DRB welcomed Leah Marthinsen to the Board.

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano and Hector Lopez, and James Atencio from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: No changes

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:

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

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

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, November 21, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. PLN21-468 | NEVIN PLAZA FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS TO AN EXISTING SEVEN-STORY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING. |
| Location | 2400 NEVIN AVENUE |
| APN | 515-261-001 |
| Zoning | CM-5, COMMERCIAL, MIXED-USE, ACTIVITY CENTER |
| Owner/Applicant | RICHMOND HOUSING AUTHORITY |
| Staff Contact | ROBERTA FELICIANO |
| | Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated November 9, 2022, and identified the request to modify the previously approved Design Review Permit for exterior improvements to an existing seven-story residential building at 2400 Nevin Avenue, otherwise known as Nevin Plaza, currently managed by the Richmond Housing Authority (RHA). The City Council had selected EAH Housing to redevelop and manage the operations of Nevin Plaza.

Due to budgetary issues, Ms. Feliciano reported that HKIT Architects, on behalf of EAH Housing, had proposed modifications to the previously approved façade improvements. Those modifications included the deletion of the cornice and sunshade elements; deletion of the plaster finish; replacement of the ground level stone tile with an accent color; painting the exposed wall-mounted conduit, AV boxes and conduit to match the adjacent wall color; painting the rustic split face block to match the wall color to provide additional interest to the color patterns; installation of a simplified infill panel versus The Bok Modern materials with the public art panels at screen fence locations to remain the same; increased planting areas and less hardscape in the courtyard space; provision of faux planting and turf on the seventh floor terrace; simplification of site furnishings at the courtyard; and verification that new dual glazed aluminum windows would be installed; the public art frieze to remain at the same locations with the frieze band accent and the entry trellis to remain.

Ms. Feliciano stated that staff had consulted with its financial consultant David Paul Rosen & Associates, which had recommended the removal of the cornice and sunshade elements and the plaster finish since those two items would equal approximately \$3.4 million in savings. While RHA and Planning staff had been disappointed with the proposed modifications, they supported the request to remove the items to allow a \$3.4 million savings, and supported some improvements to the existing residential building as opposed to stopping the project.

DAVID EGAN, Vice President of Real Estate Development and Construction, EAH Housing, described the unusual situation where the modifications had been proposed to the exterior of the building to be able to focus on and maintain a quality interior environment when fully renovated and operational. He asked the architect to identify the changes.

CHRISTOPHE LAVERNE, Principal with HKIT, the Project Architect, presented a summary of the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

main exterior modifications to the project that staff had identified.

Mr. Laverne spoke to the deletion of the cornice and sunshade elements on the building façade and the removal of the plaster finish and explained that the building had actually been found to be insulated and it was no longer necessary to use the insulating assembly plaster that had been proposed. He referred to a rusticated split-faced block that was at certain key elements such as the tops of walls and corniches and the two front building bays along Nevin Avenue that had been proposed to be painted and suggested a possible way to accent them with color. The stone tile that had been proposed to be installed over rigid foam would be removed, mainly along the front of Nevin and the courtyard and replaced with new accent colors.

Mr. Laverne added that the public art panels at the screen fence remained the same and a simplified infill panel would be installed versus The Bok Modern materials. The courtyard layout remained almost identical, although the central oval paved area had been removed, would be simplified, and turf would be allowed over that location. The site furnishings would also be simplified with a sturdy, curved outdoor product similar to the original design. The seventh floor roof area would be beautified with faux plantings and turf but residents would not be allowed in that area in that it was only a visual enhancement to the space. The same with the existing design where all the windows would still be replaced throughout the building with the installation of new dual glazed aluminum dark bronze windows and storefronts, which would make a vast improvement to the thermal comfort of the residents in the units and would help cut down on solar gain.

Mr. Laverne presented a slide show to compare the existing design with the proposed new changes and explained that the color scheme remained the same with two basic field colors using a light gray and a warmer gray with three accent colors in gold, rust and dark red used throughout the project. The scheme had been changed somewhat by using the light gray as the basic body color and along the base and where the stone had been the warmer paint color would be used and would be maintained along the base. New steel structures would be added to the new entry canopy which remained in the project with signage on top of the roof. The art panels along 24th and 25th Streets remained in the project and the mural frieze remained as well.

Since the last meeting, Mr. Laverne reported there had been an artist's selection and he presented an example of the art that had been selected. At the art panels, the laser cut panel that was part of the art program would be in an aluminum frame and adjacent to that would be the perforated metal fence panels. He presented the renderings to show how the paint scheme had been changed and how it would look from each perspective to show the paint pattern. He added that a contrasting color would be selected for the signage, likely a lighter silver tone.

Chair Livingston asked that the materials for the columns, the bases of the columns at the entry and the canopy be described, and Mr. Laverne identified existing CMU piers of four columns that would be retained with a rusticated concrete base in the front where a steel structure would be added from the front bases to extend the canopy out further for a more prominent element, and with the underside of the canopy to have the wood Trespa finish.

The art panels (laser cut panels) would flank the entry with designs selected by a local disabled group of students who had created art designs and a graphic artist would reinterpret those designs which would be built into the art program. Adjacent to those designs, a perforated metal screen with views through would block off the recessed openings and an existing wood screen at the recessed openings with a trellis (metal blades removed and frame retained) would be painted with other elements in a darkish reddish brown to make things pop against the lighter base to carry around on 24th and 25th Streets.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

Mr. Laverne advised that the painting pattern had been simplified to help make the tiered bay system stand out.

Mr. Laverne identified the proposed materials, reiterated that the plaster finish and stone tile had been eliminated while under the current scheme the original color scheme had been maintained as had the dark bronze windows. He pointed out the changes to the courtyard and described the design of the walls in terms of color patterning. He also pointed out where stone would be removed and be painted instead. The layout would be the same, although the hardscape in the middle would be replaced with landscaping.

SALLIE HOLT, Keller Mitchell Landscape Architects, stated the central area would actually be GraniteCrete, a permeable DG-type of paving and not lawn. The 48-inch box oak tree would be retained in the center, the type of benches had changed and while the layout didn't change a few of the materials had. All the in-ground planting materials remained the same in low-maintenance, durability and color. Photos of the new benches were presented. The proposed changes had to do with taking out a small amount of stone and painting using the base color. The pattern of the painting and the colors remained the same from the original proposal.

In response to Vice Chair Carter, NANNETTE BEACHAM, Director of the Richmond Housing Authority (RHA), advised that the project would be transferred to EAH Housing and the public housing subsidy would terminate. The project would become a housing choice project base development receiving Section 8 subsidy and RHA would no longer own the property.

Mr. Egan clarified the land would continue to be owned by RHA and be ground leased to the partnership that would develop the project. The building and the improvements would be sold to EAH Housing.

WELTON JORDAN, EAH Housing, Chief Real Estate Development Officer and a Richmond resident, stated that low-income housing tax credits were being used on the property and it was a unique funding mechanism for low-income housing that was a competitive financing source. He described the process involved and explained that the proceeds from low-income housing tax credits would be put into the building. He added that in February 2022 when the project had been approved, the federal interest rate had been a quarter but was not at four, which had caused a number of issues with the financing. While EAH Housing had the best intentions to build, as proposed, after doing more research on the interior of the building and seeing some of the issues that needed to be addressed, and given the inflationary market and interest rates, EAH needed to focus on electrical, plumbing and structural issues first. He explained that everyone had been lined up finance wise and they were on a tight timeframe and needed to close the deal but needed to deal with the proposed changes with the DRB first.

It was clarified that D&H Construction in El Cerrito was the current contractor on the project and had replaced the original contractor.

Vice Chair Carter opened up public comments.

Roberta Feliciano identified 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 Marthinsen asked for confirmation that the exterior performance of the building would meet or exceed Title 24 requirements, and Mr. Laverne confirmed the building had met

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

Title 24 and the project had been submitted for permits. He noted that when the project had been considered by the DRB in February, EAH Housing had not known at that time but had subsequently discovered that the building had been insulated on the inside of the units with rigid insulation, which had changed the design. The stucco finish had been retained and what had currently been proposed would not be a big departure from what had been provided to the DRB. Mr. Egan reported that a condition of winning a competitive award for the tax credits was that the building must exceed Title 24 by 15 percent.

Boardmember Hook suggested that the façade with the light stucco, now without the metal shield, felt a little bare and bland and she questioned whether there could be a mural in the future. She asked about the color of the GraniteCrete, and Ms. Holt stated the color would be a warm tone yellow.

Boardmember Hook also asked HKIT if there would still be heaters for the exterior, and Mr. Laverne stated that an electrical option had been considered but it had been cut for budget reasons.

Boardmember Hook also asked about the faux planting, reported by Ms. Holt to be synthetic turf and no other foliage had been proposed. Boardmember Hook expressed a preference for something more natural and suggested a decorative gravel instead of the synthetic turf with planters, and Ms. Holt stated they would look into that option. It was noted that a significant load placed on the roof would have to be cleared by the civil engineer.

Chair Livingston verified that the area proposed with the faux foliage would not be occupied. He asked about the warm tone yellow on the paving, and Ms. Holt stated it was called *Natural Gold* from American Soil and Stone and had a special GraniteCrete mixture mixed in with it.

Boardmember Butt seconded Boardmember Hook's comment about the fake turf and verified that area was currently roof material and the ballast was gravel but it was not very attractive, and Mr. Laverne stated that a new gravel pattern could be considered in conjunction with recommendations from Ms. Holt.

Vice Chair Carter recommended use of a smooth river rock as opposed to gravel, and Boardmember Butt agreed that would be her preference to fake turf and perhaps planters with real plants. She did not think that too much money needed to be spent in that area.

Boardmember Butt referred to the 24th Street side and noted that a sign for the Richmond Housing Authority had been shown on that side with the trellis entry, and Mr. Laverne explained that would all be maintained and the trellis repaired as necessary but would otherwise not be changed. The site walls at that location were the rusticated block and would be maintained and painted and the low wall and existing ramp would provide an accessible entry at that location. It was also clarified that the RHA sign would be replaced by some signage to acknowledge that the entry would now be the management offices for EAH Housing. It was recommended that the lettering on the sign be similar to the entry signage.

Boardmember Butt asked if the existing split-faced block had previously been painted to know how well it could take to the new paint and how durable it would be, and it was noted that the entire building at this point had been fully painted a peachy pink color and as the project was under construction color samples would be put on the building for the client to approve. Any color adjustment could be made at that point.

Boardmember Butt also verified that the cap at the edge of the roofing would be a uniform painted

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

color for all the cornice metal with the darker of the two grays.

In response to Vice Chair Carter, Mr. Laverne provided details for the art panels where the applicant had recommended that they be laser cut metal and that the art group pick a color out of the final color panel for the frieze and carry that into the art panels to provide some consistency. The darker red would be the frame of the system and the applicant had actually proposed the darker red to match the framework and offer a warmer look. The screen was 5.5 feet tall and off the ground by 3 feet. The window system would still remain the standard dark bronze.

Vice Chair Carter suggested the as-built proportions might be off on the rendering but Mr. Laverne stated there was no intention to create different sized art panels. He explained that the elevation on 24th Street was lower than 25th Street and the fence and art panels were already the same size given that they were lower relative to the ground plain. He also clarified that the openings were different on the Nevin side than they were on 24th Street. He commented that one of the art panels was hinged to allow access to the space for maintenance purposes.

Vice Chair Carter suggested the area should be spruced up, accenting the columns with different signage that could stand off the trellis, a simple sign appropriate to what he understood to be the management office.

Commissioner Hook verified with Ms. Holt that the large tree at the corner of Nevin Avenue and 24th Street would be removed because it was too close to the building but that corner would be appropriately planted with shrubs.

Chair Livingston asked about the exterior color and whether the soot in the area would drip down and streak the light colored paint, and he also asked if a window-cleaning apparatus design had been planned to maintain the building exterior, and Mr. Laverne was not aware of any existing window-cleaning apparatus.

Chair Livingston asked if there was a hardscape plan, and Ms. Holt stated that the sidewalk would be plain grade concrete with a medium broom finish to match the City standard and just portions of the sidewalk would be replaced where it needed to be adjusted for grade, although Chair Livingston stated that was not the City standard that would have to be met.

Vice Chair Carter referred to painting out the exterior conduits and was told by Mr. Laverne that Comcast had installed their system at some point on the exterior of the building and the applicant proposed to keep that system in place and paint it. As to whether those conduits could be moved to the inside corners, he explained they had looked into that but the high cost to relocate all the Comcast conduits could not be accommodated by the budget.

Vice Chair Carter asked if the conduits could just be moved at the entry, and Mr. Egan noted that while they could take a look at that there would not be much that could be done on the exterior of the building to hide those lines other than to blend them in and retain them as an existing feature.

Chair Livingston referred to scuppers from the roof, and Mr. Egan explained that was an overflow to identify a problem on the roof. He agreed with the inappropriate location and expressed a willingness to see if the scuppers could be relocated between windows.

Vice Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

Chair Livingston made a motion and recommended eight additional conditions of approval, one of which was Condition 24 to add an Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA)-

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

approved window-washing rail on the roof to keep windows clean for the residents and to allow building maintenance to be able to maintain the building.

On the discussion, Vice Chair Carter asked if the apparatus should be specified or if a condition for an Infrastructure and Maintenance Plan should be specified instead.

Ms. Feliciano verified that the DRB's approval would be to approve the Nevin Plaza façade improvements subject to the nine changes that had been identified in the staff report. She clarified that the staff report had identified the savings to the applicant of \$3.4 million for the first two recommended changes only, and had not included the other seven changes that would produce another reduction of \$400,000 in cost. She asked David Rosen to comment on the savings associated with the remaining changes to see if there might be enough savings to accommodate the added costs associated with the additional conditions requested by the DRB.

David Rosen, David Paul Rosen & Associates, concurred that the total cost savings associated with the nine items requested by the applicant had been estimated at \$3.8 million, and that the elimination of the first two items to delete the cornice and sunshade elements and delete the plaster finish would result in a savings of \$3.4 million leaving \$400,000 in additional savings beyond the staff recommendation. He had no idea what a window-washing system would cost.

Mr. Egan commented that most of the conditions seemed to be fine but with respect to Condition 24, he preferred the Vice Chair's recommendation for an Infrastructure and Maintenance Plan as opposed to putting a davit system on the roof. He preferred to be allowed to work out a management plan for the periodic maintenance of the building signage and windows. He understood that any plan needed to be OSHA approved.

Boardmember Hook asked about landscape maintenance, and Mr. Jordan explained that EAH Housing was a developer, property manager and service provider and had its own maintenance staff, service provision staff and outside management staff, and EAH would be responsible for maintaining the grounds, and Ms. Feliciano added there was also a condition that covered maintenance.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to approve PLN21-468, Nevin Plaza Façade Improvements, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 17 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 18) The yellow warm-toned permeable paving in the courtyard to be *Natural Gold*; 19) No fake turf on the roof and in lieu of that provide 1.50- to 2.0-inch rounded river rock dark gray in color; 20) All soffits to be Trespa Pura classic oak or equal; 21) Columns supporting the roof to be painted PT-5; 22) The cornice on top of the buildings, which is 24-gauge galvanized sheet metal be painted the PT-2 color; 23) All new concrete work shall match the City standard and shall either be an acid wash or a wash finish to create a safe, smooth but gripable surface, no broom finish allowed; 24) Add OSHA-approved window-washing and building maintenance program; and 25) Relocate overflow scuppers over windows; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook, Marthinsen and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

2. PLN22-031	NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT TWO RESIDENTIAL UNITS FOR A TOTAL OF FOUR UNITS ON AN 8,500 SQUARE FOOT PARCEL (TWO UNITS EXISTING).
Location	2349 ROOSEVELT AVENUE
APN	515-020-019

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

Zoning	RM-2, MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	TANIA WOODS-WILLIAMS
Applicant	ROBERT AVELLAR
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ

Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated November 9, 2022, for design review to construct two residential units on an 8,500 square-foot parcel on Roosevelt Avenue between 23rd and 24th Streets on property currently occupied by a one-story single-family dwelling and a detached two-story structure in the very rear of the large parcel. The two-story structure was the original garage with a residential unit on the upper floor. The garage had later been converted to storage use. The residential unit on the upper floor was part of the original construction. A driveway along the western portion of the site provided access to a paved area in front of the two-story structure and in front of the main house. The residence had been built in 1939 and included two bedrooms and one bathroom for a total floor area of approximately 1,000 square feet. A fire in 2011 damaged the building and it had been vacant and unoccupied since.

An existing three-foot high retaining wall in front of the property created a site that was relatively flat. The property was situated adjacent to a single-family residence and an apartment building next door. The prevalent development pattern along the street was primarily single-family consisting of one-story structures and two-story multi-family buildings toward 23rd Street.

There were two existing units on the lot and the applicant proposed to construct two side-by-side dwelling units that would be placed on the front of the lot approximately 10 feet from the front property line for a total of four units on the property. A new carport had been proposed between the main residence and the new structure. Each residential unit would provide two bedrooms and two bathrooms for a total floor area of 1,300 square feet. The site was located within the RM-2, Medium High Density Multi-Family Residential Zoning District with a Medium Density Residential General Plan designation and all the zoning requirements with respect to setback, building height, separation and open space would be met by the proposal.

Mr. Lopez explained that one of the unusual things about the zoning district was that either private or common open space could be provided. Decks would be provided in the rear of the new dwelling units. The building would be simple with a reverse gable roof facing the street and a porch and had been broken down to differentiate each residential unit and to line up with the geometry of the parcel. He described the design as well composed but sought direction from the DRB on several issues such as the carport that was situated between the existing structure and the new structure with parking in front of it, and with building projection on the southwest corner affected by the parking. He sought direction from the DRB as to whether or not the carport should be removed. In addition, the main residence had a porch located within the steps of the porch and within two feet of the carport and he recommended the relocation of the steps and moving the carport structure to the east to get more space and to avoid cars backing up to the street, which would provide a paved area that could be used for outdoor activities for kids. He asked whether that should be moved to the east. With respect to the former garage where a small window had been proposed, he proposed that window be larger. He recommended approval of the application and sought DRB direction on those issues.

Chair Livingston confirmed that no plans had been submitted for the carport to be constructed and he verified that no new fence would be constructed.

Boardmember Butt asked if the site had been included in the Prism Survey of Historic Resources around the Civic Center, and Mr. Lopez could not confirm one way or another.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

Mr. Lopez verified that the neighbors had been notified of the application and he reported that a letter had been received from a neighbor who had expressed concern that there was insufficient parking along the street. When asked by the Chair if there was anything in the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC) that required the screening of garbage cans, he could not confirm but commented that code enforcement had been pursuing a resolution of garbage cans left in front yards.

ROBERT AVELLAR, the Project Drafter, explained that there had been a carport on the property and given the fire it had been demolished. The new carport had been proposed essentially at the site of the demolished structure. He described the impetus of the design to match the existing neighborhood and he had tried to match the original architecture as much as possible along with the colors and materials of the original building, and had kept the two-story consistent with the two-story next door. His intent was to maximize the square footage without taking up too much land and to match the design of the existing units on the property. He had also staggered the buildings to match the angled street front. With respect to the existing buildings, he stated the owner did not plan on touching those buildings but the bottom of the two-story that had been used for storage would have a laundry added to accommodate both storage and laundry.

TANIA WOODS-WILLIAMS, the property owner, stated that the garbage cans would be placed in the back of the building and there should be sufficient parking to accommodate the new buildings.

Chair Livingston commented that after checking the RMC, there had to be a plan to show existing and planned garbage can locations and screens, as shown on the checklist for the plans.

Mr. Avellar stated that for the existing units garbage cans had been placed behind the stairs near the back of the units, and for the two new units the garbage cans could be placed next to the deck on both floors, to be placed on 3 x 6-foot permeable pavers to help meet the ground water requirements. He stated the site had a lot of existing concrete.

Chair Livingston asked for drawings for the carport and questioned whether or not the carport would be needed at all given that it blocked light. On the discussion, Mr. Lopez verified that covered parking was not required. As a result, the carport could be eliminated.

Boardmember Butt supported the removal of the carport and verified with Mr. Lopez that four parking spaces were required and four would be provided.

Mr. Lopez referred to a group open space area but noted that the project already met the open space requirement. He added that the landscaping was limited to the units in the front, to include street trees, although he suggested that a landscape strip could be provided east of the carport. As to the color scheme, the colors would match the colors and materials of the existing building. The windows would be vinyl.

Boardmember Marthinsen supported the removal of the carport. With respect to the paint color, she suggested there should be some variation in the color to break up the buildings and reduce the overall mass.

Ms. Woods-Williams explained that the color had been changed to a light gray.

Boardmember Christeson agreed with the need for contrasting color. He understood the parking had been provided as required, and with respect to landscape he stated that the plans were detailed and his questions had been answered. He supported the application.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

Boardmember Hook asked if the project was falling short of pervious and impervious areas, and Mr. Lopez stated there were opportunities to add additional landscaping in the area next to where the carport had been proposed. He spoke to the drainage and agreed there was a lot of concrete on the site.

Mr. Avellar stated that permeable pavers in different shapes or colors to match the brick around the original building could be placed in the area where the carport had been eliminated, with the rest to be grass or gravel. He clarified that he would have to meet the C.3 requirements during the building permit phase and if he did not meet those requirements he would have to create a flow-through planter. He suggested that some of the concrete leading to the rear of the property could be removed and replaced with permeable pavers.

Chair Livingston suggested there was no requirement for C.3 for anything under 10,000 square feet in size.

Boardmember Hook suggested if there was an additional area that needed permeable pavers it could be on the sloped driveway, and the area where the parking was located could be used as a play court or that permeable pavers could be added to the narrow strip of the driveway. She also referred to a 10-foot retaining wall and asked what the edge with the neighbor looked like.

Mr. Avellar stated there was no plan to change any of that. If the project engineer looked at the project and saw no plan to change it, it would not be changed.

Boardmember Hook referred to the curb condition along the frontage and asked what could be done to patch up the curb and help with the curb appeal of the property, to which Mr. Lopez stated that staff recommended Condition 6 would require the applicant to repair all damaged sidewalk and curb consistent with the requirements of the City Engineer.

Boardmember Hook encouraged the applicant to plant in the parking strip in front of the home to help provide more of a neighborly welcoming area.

Mr. Lopez clarified that a street tree would be required pursuant to the code for one street tree for every 50 feet of street frontage. He added that while two street trees would be better at least one had to be planted.

Boardmember Hook referred to the trees on the site and recommended that a tree that appeared to be dead be replaced with a Jacaranda tree.

In response to the Vice Chair, Mr. Avellar stated that the new fence at the street would be a standard redwood white picket fence, as shown on the plans. When asked about moving the parking pad to the east to provide a bit more turnout area, he expressed a preference to move the parking to the west to create more usable people space and suggested if moved to the east it would eliminate more people space.

Mr. Lopez recommended that parking be moved to the east to ensure an appropriate turning space. He referred to the common open parking area between the carport and the property line where the minimum setback was four feet.

Ms. Woods-Williams appreciated the intent to provide people space but did not think that sliver of property was in a particularly useful location but if pushing it all the way to the setback there would be some usable gathering space in front of cars, when parked that would be a much larger, more

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON DECEMBER 14, 2022

usable space.

Mr. Avellar stated that before there was a carport he had 14 feet to the property line but without the carport that space would be all open space for people to use. By moving the car pads to the east would make it more open for usable space.

Vice Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

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

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public beyond the letter that Mr. Lopez had earlier referenced.

Vice Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

Chair Livingston suggested that vines could be added to the west side strip where there could be 12 inches of plantable space, and Boardmember Hook recommended a series of vine species that could be planted in that area as well as for a potential landscape strip in front of the cars and the fence, with an area of four to five feet where other plantings could be accommodated.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to approve PLN22-031, New Residential Units, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with nine Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 10) Provide 3-foot by 6-foot screened garbage enclosure with permeable pavers underneath on each side of the deck; 11) Remove the carport; 12) Vary the color in the buildings to provide a slight subtle variation in the buildings; 13) Add a minimum of one foot of landscape strip between the retaining wall fence on the west side and add vines at roughly four feet on center with either star jasmine, passion vine or hardenbergia, or a mix; 14) Install permeable pavers where the carport had been shown and parking strips with landscaping and push the parking area to the east to be within five feet of the property line; 15) Add a Jacaranda tree and demo the half-dead tree to the east; 16) Provide planting strip between the fence and edge of permeable pavers and add either lemon tree or Mexican salvia to that planting strip; and 17) Add Mexican salvia to the frontage along Roosevelt Avenue; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Christeson, Hook, Marthinsen and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Livingston asked planning staff to agendaize the election of Chair and Vice Chair for the next meeting.

The DRB again welcomed Boardmember Marthinsen.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 P.M. to the regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, November 30, 2022.