

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD SPECIAL MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
December 17, 2025
6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Brian Carter
Karlyn Neel

Ben Kellman
Vita Rey, Chair

Chair Vita Rey called the special meeting to order at 6:03 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Vita Rey, Vice Chair Ben Kellman and Boardmember Brian Carter

Absent: Boardmember Karlyn Neel

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planning Manager Avery Stark, Alison Lenci, ESA; and Senior Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

There were no changes to the meeting agenda.

MEETING PROCEDURES

The meeting procedures were as shown on the agenda.

PUBLIC FORUM

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

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE

The appeal date for actions taken by the Board at this meeting is no later than 5:00 P.M. on Monday, December 29, 2025.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

1. **PLN25-0267 1135 CANAL BOULEVARD QUARRY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT**
- | | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF A PROPOSED PLANNED AREA PLAN; MAJOR DESIGN REVIEW; AND VESTING TENTATIVE MAP FOR 76 SMALL LOT SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES, SUBJECT TO RICHMOND MUNICIPAL CODE SECTIONS 15.04.810, 15.04.805, 15.04.803, AND 15.04.703. | |
| Location | 1135 CANAL BOULEVARD | |
| APN | 560-330-043 | |
| Zoning | OS/PA-OPEN SPACE / PLANNED AREA | |
| Owner | RICHMOND COVE 1, LLC | |
| Applicant | TODD FLOYD | |
| Staff Contact | ALISON LENCI | Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Avery Stark acknowledged the receipt of a number of comments from the public regarding the procedural process around the public hearing notice, and confirmed the public hearing notices had been sent in accordance with the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC) and all the City's legal obligations to provide notice had been met. He also acknowledged the desire for greater noticing boundaries and stated he would continue to work with the City Attorney's office to strengthen the public engagement and communicate to the community how to sign up for the Planning Department website to access notices when posted. He had also connected with the City Manager's office to ensure that members of the City Council received all meeting agendas.

Mr. Stark introduced Alison Lenci of ESA to present the 1135 Canal Boulevard Quarry Residential Project.

Alison Lenci, Environmental Science Associates (ESA), presented the staff report dated December 17, 2025, for the request for a Major Design Review application for the development of 76 small lot single-family homes on one parcel that consisted of 18.4 acres located on Canal Boulevard south of the intersection of Canal Boulevard and Seacliff Drive within Point Richmond. The property was bounded by Seacliff Drive to the south and east, vacant property to the north and south, Canal Boulevard also to the north, the Miller/Knox Regional Shoreline Park and the East Bay Regional Park District's (EBRPD's) open space area to the west and north.

Ms. Lenci explained that the City had approved a previous version of the application in 2018 for 193 condominium units at which time the City had certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). In 2022, an Addendum to the EIR was certified for a proposed revised project under a separate entitlement application. That analysis found that the previous EIR adequately addressed potential impacts associated with the proposal. The previous entitlements expired in 2024, and the applicant submitted a new application in 2025. The DRB's action would be a recommendation to the Planning Commission. A California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination was not required at this time. Based on the Planning Department's review of the application materials and with no changes, the proposed revised project did not require subsequent environmental review.

Ms. Lenci highlighted the proposal to subdivide 6.3 acres of the project site into 76 residential parcels ranging in size from 2,068 to 3,081 square feet, develop seven additional common interest parcels, and construct 76 detached single-family homes. Each residential unit would have a private two-car garage with a total of 152 off-street parking spaces, and 30 guest spaces would also be provided in designated locations. Ten percent of the units would be affordable to Moderate-Income Households. The project proposed four new privately maintained streets with an emergency access road to connect to "A" Street and Seacliff Drive, along with landscaping,

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

installation of enhanced lighting especially at the intersection of the project driveway and Seacliff Drive, and improvements to the Bay Trail

Ms. Lenci stated the applicant also proposed three different design styles that were variations on coastal architecture; Southern, California, and Contemporary cottage styles with three different floor plans for each of the Cottage styles. All floor plans included a bedroom versus a loft option. All three design themes would be two-story structures for a total of nine distinct home styles, with each style having three specific style options. She presented examples of those styles and options and the colors and materials boards for each of the three styles. The project also included landscaped common areas and would provide enhancements to a section of the Bay Trail.

Ms. Lenci stated the project proposed a new Planned Area Plan, a new Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map and Major Design Review, with a recommendation to the Planning Commission with respect to the design of the project. The project conformed to the density range of the Medium Density Residential land use application of the project site. The project was substantially consistent with the Vesting Tentative Map in the Planned Area Plan previously approved in 2022 under PLN21-327, and complied with all applicable Zoning Code requirements, General Plan policies and Planned Area findings as well as the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Lenci explained that the applicant sought waivers to five development standards related to minimum lot size, lot width, and front, interior and rear setbacks. Ten percent of the units would be available to Moderate Income Households and the City had granted the waivers to allow the project to be built as designed. The City certified EIR in 2018 was part of the project approvals as was the City certified Addendum to the EIR. The project was substantially consistent with the previous project under PLN21-327 and there were no changes to the project relevant to the EIR.

Ms. Lenci stated the applicant had discussed the project with the Point Richmond Neighborhood Council. Two letters had been received from the public and had been provided as part of the agenda packet and posted online. All property owners within 300 feet of the site had been notified of the public hearing and 13 letters had been received and provided to the DRB.

Ms. Lenci reiterated the DRB was conducting a public hearing related to the design of the homes and would make a recommendation to the Planning Commission, which would conduct its own public hearing and make a decision on all the entitlement requests related to the DRB's recommendation; the Vesting Tentative Map, the Planned Area Plan and the CEQA determination. The Planning Commission's decision would be appealable to the City Council. She recommended the DRB consider the design of the project and the new Planned Area Plan and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission to approve the new Planned Area Plan as well as the property design and the 56 staff recommended conditions of approval. The DRB could make changes and schedule a follow-up meeting or recommend approval with changes.

TODD FLOYD, the owner/developer, stated the property had been acquired in 2016 and he had worked hard to get a residential project developed. In 2018, there were 193 units for a condominium project that ultimately could not be developed, and after COVID and other world changes the project type had to be revised. A single-family detached product had then been proposed and there were a number of builder/partners that would work with him to get the project done. The project had been approved in 2022, and there had been challenges in the market at that time and the entitlements had expired. He was proud of the project and had worked closely with the Trails for Richmond Action Committee (TRAC) to improve the Bay Trail and were proud of the proposed improvements to the area and proud to be able to bring affordable housing to Richmond. He referred to small modifications that had been made in earlier discussions to improve upon the project from 2022.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

MARCIA VALLIER, the landscape architect, stated the development area was a small portion of the overall site, with 6.3 acres to be developed while the remainder, which was the whole hillside, would be protected.

Ms. Vallier presented the overall layout of the project with the Bay Trail along the frontage, 76 single-family homes, three to four bedrooms, two-stories, three architectural styles and with a maximum height of 28 feet. There would be 18,000 square feet of open space. She displayed the typical housing, noted the common open space in the center, and a naturalistic oak woodland type planting, along with a stormwater control area, tupelo trees along the frontage with crepe myrtles to the center of the open space. The change to the approved plan would be an increase in the amount of visitor parking. Every unit would have a two-car garage and parking would be interspersed among the area and the units. She referred to the core area with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) stalls and electric vehicle (EV) charging stations, a play area in the center, mailboxes and a large open space in the center. The other change was that the crosswalks had been moved from the area of the driveways.

Ms. Vallier referred to the intent to create a naturalistic tot lot with rock climbing, site furnishings would be wood and metal to complement the homes, and there would be three different kinds of fencing. Lighting would be low level and dark sky compliant. She pointed out a connection to the EBRPD with a small trailhead avoiding Canal Boulevard. The palette would be a coastal palette.

JILL WILLIAMS, Principal with KTG Architecture and Planning, explained that the refinements to the approved plans were subtle and were in response to some of the feedback provided. She noted that some shingle siding had been changed out to horizontal lap siding, a green coloration had been changed out, and some life had been provided with some of the variations in the play between siding and stucco. The body colors would be light and most of the trim was light. Framed windows would be provided, pilasters highlighted entrances into each of the homes, and some trellises had been removed to provide identity to each of the homes. She highlighted some of the window sill details and noted potted plants at one time had been shown in the renderings but were no longer desired and the drawing had been clarified. She presented the rear elevations which were enhanced, stated the site plan in the packet called out those enhancements, identified the shadow lines of the sill treatments, and noted the wrap of the siding around the units on all sides.

Boardmember Kellman referred to a previous study session and asked about changes to the staging area at the trail end.

Mr. Floyd referred to working with Mr. Beyaert of TRAC in 2018, and referenced an area where a staging area would be created at the trailhead where people could park, and an area for a potential future restroom. He referred to the old service road when the area had been a quarry and the proposed staging/trail head parking improvement with access to Seacliff Drive.

In response to Boardmember Kellman with respect to traffic on that road, Mr. Stark stated the purpose of the DRB was to focus on the on-site improvements and the discussion of traffic, CEQA, and other operational things were the purview of the Planning Commission, and any comments related to parking and traffic would be carried forward to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Floyd advised that they were very conscious of the issues with respect to Seacliff Drive and the concern of some about the speeding in the area. He suggested the construction of the development would slow traffic down and traffic calming measures would be employed to address traffic issues and make it safe for the residents who would have to use Seacliff Drive to get in and out of the development.. He added that all the conditions of approval directed towards safety and traffic calming measures for CEQA had been planned for the originally proposed 193 units and those same measures would still be honored for the currently proposed 76 units.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

Boardmember Kellman liked the design, suggested the minor changes were well done, did not love the small lots, but recognized the balance with the density and he would like to have seen more parking.

Boardmember Carter also liked the design and was pleased that the lot would be developed. He referred to the minimum strip between the sidewalk and the garage door and questioned whether there were any safety strategies to ensure that pedestrians using those sidewalks would be safe when a car wanted to pull out. He asked about the landscaping plans for Parcel C.

Ms. Vallier explained the desire that Parcel C could be used as an open grassy space for kids to play and to throw a ball for a dog, and there would be benches and trash cans, and a number of such zones throughout the development. With respect to the Bay Trail, she expressed the desire to replace and reinstall the sign at the corner of Canal Boulevard.

Boardmember Carter noted the change in color for the pedestrian pads and stated it was a nice touch. He suggested that could be done perpendicular to the long road in the back to break down the scale and provide a more walkable feel.

Ms. Vallier pointed out on the plan where that could be done.

Boardmember Carter spoke to the prominence of the garage doors and suggested that the ones with the lights worked better as a front-of-house element. He suggested those were the most successful elevations. He also confirmed with the development team that the units would be made solar ready, and that the stormwater would be C.3 compliant.

Chair Rey thanked the applicant for meeting with the DRB to go over the design that she characterized as more successful, calm and relaxed. She appreciated the development of the site, that the applicant was working with TRAC to develop the bike trail, and echoed Boardmember Carter's safety concerns about the narrow driveways. She appreciated the extra visitor parking understanding that there was no street parking on Seacliff Drive. She asked about the proposed landscaping at the entrance.

Ms. Vallier identified that landscaping at the entrance with the use of crepe myrtle trees, wildfire plants and flowering shrubs within the stormwater basins. She added that the five-foot buffer strip between the Bay Trail and the three-foot decomposed granite strip would include a low groundcover and on up the hill to an oak woodland. Drifts of a colorful grass would be added. Along the frontage there would be horizontal fencing and the good neighbor fencing would have a strong horizontal top with the vertical.

Chair Rey wanted to ensure that the planting plan would ensure good line of sight to ensure safety.

Chair Rey opened the public hearing.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, noted the project had done a great job improving and widening the Bay Trail but he asked for changes to two conditions of approval. To Condition 24, he requested a correction to the reference to another condition, and to Condition 25 he requested a change to replace the existing panel for the Bay Trail orientation map and stated that TRAC would create a new visual image suitable for fabrication as a replacement.

BRIAN LEWIS was glad to see the applicant return. He spoke to the requirement to notify property owners within 300 feet of an application and stated there were no homes located within 300 feet of the project site. As a result, he requested that the City go beyond that distance and reach out to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

the community most impacted. Referring to what had initially been a fire road, he stated it was a secondary road now used as a main thoroughfare and he noted a car had recently driven off the edge, the TRAC sign on the Bay Trail had to be replaced because a car had driven through it, the site line was diminishing down toward Canal Boulevard, there was a blind curve, and he urged the DRB to consider how the design affected the entrance.

Mr. Lewis requested a protected turn lane and better lighting on both sides of the road. He did not complete his comments within the allotted time and stated written comments had been provided.

TERRY LENKY, a Brickyard Cove resident who frequently used Seacliff Drive to get from her home to the rest of the community, urged that driveways be made deep enough so that cars could park in the driveways, which would make it safer for those on the road. She requested more guest parking. She encouraged the City to eliminate Seacliff Drive in front of the development and go straight to Canal Boulevard because it was not safe, encouraged the developer to help the City get emergency access through the area, and asked about the plan for hillside slumping which had been a major problem in the environmental documents. She agreed with the request to extend the perimeter of notification and also wanted the Planning Department to talk more about CEQA.

Chair Rey asked about streetlights, and Mr. Stark stated the streetlights within the development site itself would be under the purview of the DRB, off-site improvements were part of the Vesting Tentative Map that would be considered by the Planning Commission. Details of City specifications would be reviewed by the Planning and Engineering Departments to meet qualifications for street lighting, planting within the street median or where there was an access or easement over the space. For the project itself, off-site improvements would only go to the surrounding area of the parcel itself and not to impacts or improvements a distance from the project site. It was also not something the CEQA document would consider in that CEQA no longer considered levels of service (LOS) as the model when considering traffic and congestion but rather looked at vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as an update to CEQA adopted three years ago to better assess the impacts of new projects on the network of driving.

Ms. Vallier presented the lighting plan, noted the lights would be 14 to 16 feet tall, pointed out the location of the lights in the development, identified a space near the entrance where an additional light could be added and highlighted the existing streetlights. She clarified that the service road would be locked off because it was an emergency vehicle access (EVA). She also commented that the lights on Seacliff Drive did not work.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Carter supported the project with adjustments to add a few more crosswalks and the additional light pole.

Boardmember Kellman supported the addition of the two changes requested by Mr. Beyaert of TRAC.

Chair Rey concurred with the recommendations.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Rey) to recommend approval of PLN25-0267, 1135 Canal Boulevard Quarry Residential Project to the Planning Commission based on the six Planned Area and four Design Review Findings and Statements of Fact with the 56 staff recommended Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 57) An additional lamppost at the entry to frame the entry road; 58) Add two more crosswalks to the northern street; and 59) Incorporate the TRAC recommended

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

amendments to Conditions 24 and 25; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Carter, Kellman, and Rey; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Neel.)

Mr. Stark advised that the item would proceed to the Planning Commission at a meeting scheduled for the week of February or March 2026. He also advised that through the RMC a formal request could be made to have the notification area expanded, although that would come with an increased cost, with the desire to better engage with the community.

Board Business

A. Adopt Revised Bylaws

Mr. Stark presented the recently approved Board Procedures and Bylaws and stated that after much discussion there was a desire to reduce the required number of DRB meetings from two to one for the efficiency of the Planning Department and to better manage the time and resources to be able to have the meetings. The goal was to have the DRB meeting at the beginning of the month with the Planning Commission to meet mid-month, which would then allow applications to move on to the City Council. The Bylaws still allowed special meetings, as needed. He referred to other amendments based on comments previously provided to move the Brown Act forum up on the agenda.

Boardmember Kellman noted the complaints related to the time required to approve applications and he verified with Mr. Stark that if needed additional meetings would be scheduled.

Mr. Stark stated the goal was to create an efficiency within the Planning Department. He added that the number of meetings cancelled last year equated to one meeting a month. He did not want to delay due process but explained that the City's current goal was to merge the Planning Commission and the DRB, and reconfigure the RMC, to take some of the more standard applications to be heard by the Zoning Administrator, or applications that would no longer require a public hearing and ultimately reduce the amount of staff time involved. On the downside, an applicant might have to wait 30 days for an application to be heard. On the positive side, it would allow staff more time to completely analyze an application. He reiterated that meetings could be added as needed. The Bylaws had also been amended to include Vita Rey as the Chair and Brian Carter as the Vice Chair, and there remained one vacancy on the DRB and he would continue to work with the Mayor to fill that vacancy.

Boardmember Kellman referred to the City's committee of residents with respect to surplus land and suggested there were members of that committee who might be interested in serving on the Planning Commission or the DRB. He also commented the DRB used to be comprised of seven members.

Senior Assistant City Attorney James Atencio clarified that the RMC currently stipulated that the DRB shall be composed of at least three and no more than seven members.

Mr. Stark clarified that the Planning Commission was a body of five members with the goal that there could never be a tie vote.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Rey/Kellman) to adopt the Revised Bylaws; approved by a Roll Call vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Carter, Kellman, and Rey; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Neel.)

B. Staff Reports, Requests, or Announcements: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE JANUARY 14, 2026, MEETING

C. Board Member Reports, Requests, or Announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:14 P.M. to the regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, January 14, 2026.