

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**

May 8, 2024
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt - Brian Carter - Vita Rey

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt and Vita Rey

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Hector Lopez, Virginia Morgan and Rae Alberts, and Heather McLaughlin from the City Attorney's Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 08, 2024

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Rey) to approve the minutes of the April 10, 2024 meeting, as submitted; approved by a voice vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: None

MEETING PROCEDURES: None

PUBLIC FORUM

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

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

CONSENT CALENDAR

1.CC	PLN24-009	MONTGOMERY RESIDENTIAL ADDITION
	Description	(CONTINUED FROM APRIL 10, 2024) DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,050 SQUARE-FOOT TWO-STORY ADDITION IN THE REAR OF THE EXISTING DWELLING, INCLUDING A DECK GREATER THAN 4 FEET IN HEIGHT.
	Location	5861 KNOBCONE COURT
	APN	435-300-016
	Zoning	RH, SINGLE-FAMILY HILLSIDE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
	Applicant	MONICA MONTGOMERY (OWNER)
	Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ
		Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Butt) to approve PLN24-009, Montgomery Residential Addition, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended nine Conditions of Approval; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: 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, May 20, 2024.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. PLN22-084	HOMEWOOD SUITES HOTEL
Description	CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A DESIGN REVIEW AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN <u>±</u> 80,000 SQUARE-FOOT FIVE-STORY HOTEL WITH 103 ROOMS ON A 1.69-ACRE VACANT PARCEL. THE PROJECT WOULD ALSO INCLUDE LANDSCAPING, STORM TREATMENT AREAS, AND 81 PARKING STALLS THROUGHOUT THE SITE.
Location	3101 GARRITY WAY
APN	405-290-054
Zoning	CR, REGIONAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
Owner	510 HOSPITALITY LLC
Applicant	HILLVIEW CONSTRUCTION, INC.
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ
	Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated May 8, 2024, for Design Review Permit approval for the construction of a five-story hotel with 103 rooms on a 1.69-acre vacant parcel on Garrity Way in the vicinity of the Hilltop Mall on a site formerly occupied by a Chevy's restaurant, which had since been demolished. The site was relatively flat in front and gradually sloped down to the east and north and became very steep thereafter in the north. The project would also involve the approval of a Conditional Use Permit by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lopez described the surrounding uses as a variety of commercial and residential uses, including two hotels. He identified the variety of components of the proposed hotel including an outdoor seating area, a fitness room, and a conference room among other amenities. Vehicular access to the area would be provided from two driveways off Garrity Way. He reported that the project met all the requirements of the zoning district.

Mr. Lopez clarified that the DRB had reviewed the project in study session on March 22, 2022 and several issues had been raised at that time related to the outdoor seating area, the color scheme and the Porte Cochere that was not harmonious with the structure. He stated that almost everything of concern had been modified, although there was still some concern for the windows on the second floor facing Garrity Way, which needed to be better aligned. The color scheme also remained a concern in that more natural colors were preferred. Approval of the application was recommended.

Mr. Lopez responded to comments and confirmed there would be a one percent for art

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

component to the project, although the art had yet to be identified,

Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

DANA DEAN, Hanson Bridgett, representing 510 Hospitality LLC and the Patel Family, introduced Dillon Patel, Project Manager Ron Patel of Hillview Construction, and the representative from Design Sell, the architectural and design team. She explained that the first application had been made in March 2022, and she had appeared with the DRB in March 2023 when the DRB had requested a number of changes, which she summarized at this time. She stated they had worked hard to incorporate the discussion points that worked not only for the DRB but for the construction team and their standards for the hotel.

GWEN JARICK, the Project Designer, provided a PowerPoint presentation and described the changes that had been made and the colors that had been proposed, and offered a printout of what had been proposed after the changes had been made. She spoke specifically to the windows referenced by Mr. Lopez and explained that a change to the windows would affect the customized room that would have to be approved by the hotel and franchisee, and she pointed out what had been done to address staff's concern without requiring that approval from the hotel and franchisee. With respect to colors, she explained in response to Boardmember Butt that the colors would not be as dark as shown on the plans.

Ms. Dean's presentation identified the current orientation of the building on the site, the courtyard facing the water views, the landscaping, and the steepness of the slope in the rear, although less steep along Blume Drive. She pointed out other features of the proposal including the retaining wall, the floor plan of the ground level, the fitness center flanking the courtyard, the Porte Cochere, and the proposed brick that would be pulled around a good portion of the building on the ground level along with the use of Geolam material in the front over the arch entry. There would also be a fence, as required. She identified the accent color changes and stated that some had been in response to the DRB's previous comments.

Boardmember Rey expressed some concern for the colors and sought more clarification. She supported the use of the black color holding down the corners and stated it looked good overall but she wanted to be reassured of the actual finishes to be used.

Chair Carter thanked the applicant for making the changes as discussed and stated the proposal had improved from the first iteration. He spoke to the crème colors versus the grays and the design elements mixed in and asked why that had been done, and Ms. Dean explained that the change of color and design had been done to break up the massing due to the five stories.

Chair Carter asked if a solid color could be considered while acknowledging the moves that had been made from a volumetric standpoint.

Ms. Dean stated that could be discussed if the DRB felt strongly about making such a change and she noted that right now the grayish tone popped out slightly. While they would love to keep the colors as proposed, if a change would help get the proposal approved, they would consider it.

Boardmember Butt had no strong feelings in that regard.

A member of the team commented that a change in where the color would be located could be addressed simply but changing the colors was a bigger concern because it had to fit within the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

scheme of the franchisor.

Chair Carter clarified that there would be no need for a change given the fenestration and the accent panels next to the windows, but he suggested just using the white without the gray.

On the continued discussion of the windows, the development team clarified that changes to the windows would affect what was allowed in the interior and would be costly in terms of getting approval. Due to the customized furniture involved, approval would be required from the franchisor. It was noted that the windows could be moved over about a foot.

DANIEL NATHAN-HEISS, a Richmond Annex resident, suggested that building a hotel would be good for Richmond and would bring much needed jobs, especially in the building trades, but the project would not support teachers, delivery drivers, parents, or recent college graduates who wanted to move back to Richmond. He suggested it was time to build small businesses, jobs, housing, modernized infrastructure, sidewalks and streets that were clean and free of potholes and cracks. He suggested that 103 housing units, not hotel rooms, should be constructed and he vehemently opposed the project. He urged the DRB to say no to the project but yes to housing.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Butt clarified for the benefit of the public speaker that the DRB did not oversee the Conditional Use Permit and she urged the speaker to speak to his issues before the Planning Commission.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Rey) to recommend approval of PLN22-084, Homewood Suites Hotel to the Planning Commission, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended 11 Conditions of Approval, along with the additional DRB condition, as follows: 12) Shift the window in the front-framed elevation slightly to the left towards the center of the frame by about a foot to reduce the swath up the middle; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

3. PLN23-309	BAY HILLS COMMUNITY CHURCH	
Description	CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR THE PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING CHURCH AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 33,700-SQUARE-FOOT CHURCH WITH SANCTUARY, OFFICES, PARKING, AND LANDSCAPING.	
Location	4555 HILLTOP DRIVE	
APN	426-330-002, 426-330-009	
Zoning	RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT	
Owner	BAY HILLS COMMUNITY CHURCH	
Applicant	RONNIE TURNER	
Staff Contact	VIRGINIA MORGAN	Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Virginia Morgan presented the staff report dated May 8, 2024, and clarified that while the agenda had shown this item as a Design Review Permit only, the DRB was actually to review the application with a recommendation to the Planning Commission for approval. She explained that the application had previously been considered by the DRB in study session on February

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

28, 2024, when the DRB's major feedback had recommended a better connection of the structure to the site, adding a sense of permanence, and incorporating more design elements to the structure as an identifiable place of worship. She noted there had been one community comment at that study session.

Ms. Morgan stated the applicant had a lot line adjustment application currently in process to create a total parcel area of 4.9 acres that fronted Hilltop Drive and abutted an undeveloped lot to the north. The site was developed with an existing church and parking area with natural landscaping to the north. The proposal would demolish the existing church and parking area and construct a new parking lot and a new church behind it.

Ms. Morgan described the major changes to the site plan since the DRB study session that included an updated pattern and color palette on the exterior of the proposed church structure, design details at the welcome plaza area, signage was no longer being proposed and an updated lighting plan had been included. The proposed building, a sprung-form structure would have a fabric membrane supported by aluminum hardware, which membrane had been updated to incorporate a third rust color, and the clear daylight panels would now be proposed above the welcome plaza entry. The colored panels of the fabric membrane would be staggered to add visual interest on all four sides as well as an abstract graphic of lettering to make up "Bay Hills" along the front wall.

Ms. Morgan identified a low masonry retaining wall in rust red covering a small portion of the front wall of the structure, stated the welcome plaza would serve as the main entry to the sanctuary and include decorative elements such as exposed beams and a metal trellis, a floor to ceiling stained glass window effect created with colored film and there would be clear gazed storefront windows and doors. The entrance area would now include two cork oak trees in concrete planter boxes, benches for seating and bike parking. She described the elements of the plaza area to create a visually distinct area and noted that normal traffic flow would be allowed in that area.

Ms. Morgan also provided the detail of the exterior lighting that would also be distributed throughout the parking area, noted that 167 parking spaces had been proposed where 108 private spaces had been required and 59 spaces would be shared for public use. The project exceeded the minimum setback, the proposed landscaping would add about 13,000 square feet of landscaping to the property, primarily in the parking area, and exceed the minimum landscaping required. Nineteen trees would be removed within the footprint of the new structure and 66 new trees would be added in and around the parking area, exceeding minimum requirements.

Ms. Morgan added that two community meetings had been held, with a third meeting at Bay Hills Community Church where a concern for street front improvements had been raised and the applicant had shared the landscape plans. The project was exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as infill development and had a Historical Resource Evaluation. She recommended that the Board recommend Planning Commission approval of the project.

Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

RONNIE TURNER, the applicant, acknowledged the discussions at the DRB study session and the meetings with the neighborhood and stated they were pleased with the way the building looked. He acknowledged the placement of the building would be appealing to those passing by and the building would be screened from the adjacent residences by extensive landscaping

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

that would diffuse the height of the building from the street. He referred to a number of retaining walls around the building. He responded to questions from the DRB, noted a small development subcommittee of the congregation had met to discuss the design of the building, and as to why the elevations had changed stated the subcommittee had taken the DRB's comments in study session and had improved the presence of the structure by modifying the color scheme.

DAVID RENARD, President of RPM-Team, explained that the swatches of color in the corner of the plans, as opposed to the renderings, were close to the actual color that had been proposed, which he acknowledged were akin to the color of the Golden Gate Bridge.

On the question of how the trusses were connected to the slab, Mr. Renard described a post-installed anchor that was an aluminum substructure, very lightweight. He referenced a lot of constructability technology that had gone into a tension membrane building and described how the building would be constructed, along with the watertight technique that would be used, and also explained how the membrane would meet the concrete flatwork and how the doorway areas would be created.

Boardmember Rey liked the stained glass look of the windows but was anxious about the colors that appeared to be a little "Christmasy."

Chair Carter asked whether a new transformer would be required, where the mechanical equipment would be located and whether that equipment would be screened. He also noted that the entry plaza had been enlarged but it also served as a drive lane and he asked how it would be controlled on Sundays with gatherings. He also referred to a proposed terrace and asked for clarification of that aspect of the proposal, and asked if there would be play areas for children of the congregation.

In response, Mr. Turner confirmed that a new transformer would be needed for the building and the location would be towards the southeast; the trash location would be on the west side; the mechanical equipment would be screened, if needed; and the church crew would place tall removable cones in the entry plaza to cone off the drive lane and direct traffic prior to and after services. With respect to a proposed terrace, he explained that aspect had not yet been clarified but would likely not be an access for services and would likely be more of an emergency exit from that portion of the structure. He added that recreation areas would be phased in and there was quite a bit of acreage available to do other things given that the church was heavily attended by families with small children.

Chair Carter urged some master planning for the site to accommodate the required placement of mechanical equipment and trash, and to plan for future phases. He also recommended the strategic placement of slighter more mature trees at the street frontage with the smaller trees placed elsewhere in the site and allowed to mature, to give the neighbors more initial screening.

Boardmember Rey referred to the size of the proposed cork oak trees at the entrance and understood the intent that the trees would offer shade in that area but suggested the trees could get too big over time and obstruct the flow of the entry.

Mr. Renard described the motivation for the two cork oak trees to buffer outside views, although DRB members noted those trees would not buffer outside views but could obscure the design.

When asked, Mr. Turner stated that signage for the site would come later. At this stage, no fence had been proposed, although fencing might be considered later on.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

On the discussion of the trees at the entry, Boardmember Butt supported the retention of the benches that could also serve as protection from a vehicle; Boardmember Rey supported the benches and some low planting with the elimination of the trees that over time could block the entrance; and Chair Carter agreed with the seating elements and low landscaping with the elimination of the trees at the entry.

Boardmember Butt spoke to the overall elements of the color scheme, liked the colored glass entry, and wanted to avoid the appearance of an agricultural building or a circus element. She sought more refinement, especially on the ends, with clean lines in front.

Mr. Renard verified that the manufacturer offered twelve colors to choose from and the colors presented to the DRB had been chosen by the development subcommittee of the congregation. He also clarified that there were two manufacturers involved; one for the frame and one for the fabric.

Boardmember Rey liked the extra layer of color at the entry, liked the original color scheme that was a dark brown to green to beige color, and saw an opportunity for playfulness.

Chair Carter noted that the variation and height of the darker elements and the undulation was good because it offered more of a gathering event element and was evocative of the hills. He supported a darker brown earthtone base color.

Boardmember Butt agreed that the colors should be more grounded and refined, and commented that since the retaining walls were also red, it was a bit much.

The DRB discussed the colors that had previously been submitted with those currently submitted, reviewed the colors offered by the manufacturer and discussed the pros and cons of each, and expressed some interest in the Salem Blue color, although that color was not supported by the applicant or the design team.

The DRB recommended the replacement of the red color with a dark taupe at the base, and with the retention of the remaining colors as presented. It was also recommended that the design team come up with a mechanical screen design.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Butt) to recommend approval of PLN23-309, Bay Hills Community Church to the Planning Commission, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended nine Conditions of Approval, along with the additional DRB conditions, as follows: 10) Substitute the red color for dark taupe; 11) Remove the tree central to the entry plaza and retain landscaping and bench; 12) Screen the mechanical equipment; and 13) Provide minimum 15-gallon buffer trees along the street; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

4. PLN22-405 Description

CASTANEDA LIVE-WORK

REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±4,800 SQUARE-FOOT LIVE-WORK BUILDING WITH TWO LIVE-WORK UNITS ON A ±6,800 SQUARE-FOOT PARCEL. THIS PROJECT ALSO INVOLVES A REQUEST TO APPROVE AN ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT FOR ONE OF THE

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

	LIVE-WORK UNITS TO BE OCCUPIED BY AN IRON WORKS SHOP, WHICH IS CLASSIFIED AS A LIMITED INDUSTRIAL USE.
Location	SOUTHEAST CORNER OF WEST BARRETT AVENUE AND "A" STREET
APN	538-042-028
Zoning	LW, LIVE-WORK DISTRICT
Applicant	LUPE CASTANEDA (OWNER)
Staff Contact	RAE ALBERTS
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Rae Alberts presented the staff report dated May 8, 2024, and presented the request for a Design Review Permit to construct a new 4,800 square-foot live-work building on a vacant 6,800 square-foot parcel surrounded by a mix of uses that existed prior to the Live-Work designation in the Iron Triangle Neighborhood, with two live-work units, along with a request to approve an Administrative Use Permit for one of the live-work units, to be occupied by an iron works shop classified as a Limited Industrial Use.

Ms. Alberts explained that about six years ago there had been an approved Design Review Permit for a similar live-work application by the same applicant. That approval had expired and since then the zoning code had changed from Light Industrial to Live-Work. The development standards had also changed and the applicant had redesigned the project to meet current standards.

Ms. Alberts presented a rendering of the proposed building and reported that the first live-work unit was about 3,600 square feet in size with two-thirds workspace and one-third live space, with the second live-work unit at 1,200 square feet with a fifty/fifty usage of live and work. She pointed out the designated garage doors and parking spaces for each unit, with one on Barrett Avenue (Unit A) and one along "A" Street (Unit B), and stated the materials included corrugated metal roofing and siding with a tan stucco base and some stucco detailing along the side, with metal windows and doors.

Ms. Alberts also identified the proposed landscaping of 3,700 square feet that would include the sidewalk planting strips on both Barrett Avenue and "A" Street and along the front, side and rear yards of the property, which included nine London plane trees, shrubs and ground cover, pervious pavers along most of the building's perimeter, benches and an arbor in the front entrance along Barrett Avenue.

Ms. Alberts stated the project was in compliance with all zoning requirements. She referred to a build-to line requirement, which was a maximum setback on the front at Barrett Avenue that was not compliant, although the DRB had the ability to waive that requirement subject to three conditions. The applicant, Lupe Castaneda was willing to provide substantial landscaping, had created a courtyard area with benches and seating, and had added an arbor to create a welcoming design, which would allow a waiver of the build-to line requirement and which was part of the approval to be considered by the DRB. She stated the application was compatible with the neighborhood, the proposed landscaping would enhance the streetscape and she recommended approval subject to the findings and conditions, as shown.

Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

The applicant expressed a desire to make the area nicer and had been working with an architect to accomplish that desire.

Boardmember Butt liked the corrugated siding, noted the design fit the area very well, and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

asked about the windows, which were reported to be metal in a neutral gray, taupe or tan color. She asked why the corrugated siding had not been brought down to the ground and questioned whether the stucco base could be damaged over time. She was informed by Mr. Lopez that the original DRB approval for the live-work unit had imposed that design element as a condition.

Boardmember Butt liked the appearance of the stucco element but suggested concrete would be preferable to offer durability, and the applicant concurred that would offer a cool industrial look and be a stronger material.

Boardmember Butt recommended window panels/glazing across the top of the garage door on the north elevation to bring in light, and the applicant agreed. She also suggested that the two windows should be closer together.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Butt) to approve PLN22-405, Castaneda Live-Work, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended 12 Conditions of Approval, along with the additional DRB conditions, as follows: 13) Base material to be cast-in-place concrete with stucco above; 14) Garage doors to have glass or light at least on the north elevation (Barrett Avenue); and 15) Inset portions of the garage door bays on the west elevation to have a stucco finish and eliminate the metal panel insets; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Councilmember Soheila Bana reported that she had been appointed as the Council Liaison to the Design Review Board. She asked how she could help the DRB and whether she should be attending each DRB meeting.

DRB Members emphasized that there was a need for additional members in that the seven-member DRB was currently down to three members and the lack of an appropriate membership created serious concerns to be able to achieve a quorum, to be able to evaluate applications in a timely manner, to be able to utilize subcommittees that were normally used to evaluate the larger projects, and to be able to offer a greater number of comments, suggestions and recommendations.

Council Liaison Bana took this opportunity to offer a public comment since she had missed the public comment period. She stated that artificial turf was carcinogenic and she recommended that artificial turf be banned.

An unidentified speaker noted that while he had no objection to the item under the Consent Calendar, he had wanted to hear the item. The DRB described the process for Consent Calendar items considered first on the agenda and reported that Item 1, PLN24-009, Montgomery Residential Addition had been approved.

Boardmember Butt explained that she would be at a conference on May 22, the date of the next DRB meeting, but hoped to be back in time to attend the meeting. She also reported she would be out of town for the DRB meeting scheduled for June 12.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 10, 2024

Mr. Lopez explained that the meeting would be cancelled if there was no quorum.

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, May 22, 2024.