

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL**
450 Civic Center Drive, Richmond, CA
February 1, 2018
6:30 p.m.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Marilyn Langlois, Chair	Andrew Butt, Vice Chair
Nancy Baer	Jen Loy
Claudia Garcia	Michael Huang
David Tucker	

The regular meeting was called to order by Chair Langlois at 6:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Marilyn Langlois; Vice Chair Andrew Butt, Commissioner Nancy Baer, Jen Loy, Claudia Garcia, Yu-Hsiang (Michael) Huang, and David Tucker

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planning Staff: Lina Velasco, Director of Planning & Building Services Richard Mitchell and Attorney Shannon Moore

MINUTES:

Chair Langlois states that there are no minutes that need to be approved.

AGENDA

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Langlois states that there are no Consent Calendar items.

BROWN ACT – Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, suggests the Commission consider a spa be located in downtown Richmond. He also suggests that a bookstore/café be constructed in Richmond because there are none located in the City.

BRANDY FAULKNER talked about the BAART Methadone Treatment Clinic and the proposal to move it to the town of El Sobrante. She would like to know if a traffic study will be provided and where in the code does it talk about the proximity of opioid treatment facilities to residential areas, daycare, and schools. Chair Langlois suggested that Ms. Faulkner contact the staff after the meeting in regards to those questions.

LANCE MORGAN talked about the Conditional Use Permit for the Methadone Clinic that is proposed to move to 3563 San Pablo Dam Road. He would like to know why it needs to be

moved to a different location and that the new location is not ideal for this type of clinic because it is not near transit or a police station.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC (Trails for Richmond Action Committee), gave a quick update on the Bay Trail including a quick summary of two out of ten current projects that are happening at this time. It's been approved to connect the East Bay and the North Bay via the bridge. Also, work has progressed on the Ferry to Bridge Complete Streets Project Grant. The grant will help connect the Richmond Greenway to the Bay Trail from Second to Richmond- San Rafael and to close several gaps along the trail between the Richmond Ferry Terminal and the Richmond San Rafael Garrard bridge.

NEW ITEM

- 1. PLN16-732: The Quarry Residential Project** PUBLIC HEARING to consider a recommendation to the City Council on the certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the requested General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification from Parks And Recreation to open space and medium density residential, the rezoning from PR (Parks And Recreation) to PA (Planned Area) district, a Vesting Tentative Map (VTM), and the Design Review Permit (DR) for the proposed Quarry Residential project. The project consists of up to 200 condominiums, a club house and pool, as well as road, bay trail and other improvements at 1135 Canal Blvd. (APN: 560-330-043). Project information is available online at www.ci.richmond.ca.us/quarry-residential-project. Richmond Cove 1, LLC, owner; New West Communities, applicant Planner: Lina Velasco Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Certification of the Final EIR and Conditional Approval of GPA, Rezoning, VTM and DR to City Council

Chair Langlois provided an overview of meeting procedures for speaker registration, public comment, and public hearing functions. Since this item is a recommendation to the City Council, there is no appeal date.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Lina Velasco introduced Crescentia Brown from Environmental Science Associates (ESA) who was the City's consultant who prepared the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Rob Reese from Fehr and Peers who assisted in the traffic analysis and Mark Spencer from W-Trans did a peer review for the traffic analysis as was requested by the Planning Commission.

Ms. Velasco stated that the action that is to be taken by the Commission is to send forth a recommendation to City Council regarding certification of the final EIR, a recommendation regarding the General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification, the rezoning, the vesting tentative map and the design review permit.

Ms. Velasco gave a brief summary of the project locations which is located within the Point Richmond Neighborhood within the Brickyard Cove area and it is the site of the former Canal Quarry. She also gave a brief summary of the overall project concept including a description of the proposed condominiums, improvements to the Bay Trail, preservation of open space, the construction of a clubhouse, landscaped areas, infrastructure, utilities and traffic safety improvements to Seacliff Drive.

Ms. Velasco stated that the current General Plan Land Use Classification is Parks and Recreation. Neither the City or the Parks Department have shown interest in acquiring the land

and developing it into a park so a request has been made by the applicant to change the land use from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density Residential. The rezoning would be a combination of Open Space (OS) and Planned Area District.

Ms. Velasco showed a series of maps showing the site plan. Approximately 12.1-acres will be open space and 6.3-acres of the site would be residential. The entrance to the residential would be located on Seacliff Drive with a secondary emergency access located towards the north of the site. A Vesting Tentative Map proposes approximately sixteen residential parcels that would be divided into condominiums. There would also be ten open space parcels that would be maintained by the Homeowners Association.

The Design Review Board reviewed the application in December and they recommended unanimous approval subject to added conditions. All recommendations are reflected in the Planning Commission's set of plans in the agenda report.

Crescentia Brown, ESA, voiced that in the spring of 2017 the City released a Notice of Preparation that started the environmental review process and preparation of the EIR. The City released the draft EIR in late summer/early fall which the public was invited to comment on. The comments were collected and the Final EIR was prepared for the Planning Commission to review.

Ms. Brown gave a brief overview of CEQA and the EIR regarding the direct guidance and process which is to inform people about the potential environmental impacts of the project, disclose all potential project impacts, avoid and/or reduce potential impacts of the project through alternatives or mitigation measures and engage the public in the process.

The final EIR includes two components, the draft EIR and the responses to comments. Ms. Brown chose several chapters to focus her presentation on. One was Chapter 2 which talked about modifications to the project and if there are any changes to the impacts on the environment because of those changes. Also, in Chapter 2 it shows any editorial changes to the text of the draft EIR. Chapter Four shows all of the responses to the comments that were received from the public. Many comments were grouped into five areas because they were based on a common theme. Traffic and traffic safety was one of the larger topics that the public was concerned about. Chapter Six is the required Mitigation Monitoring And Reporting Program for the EIR.

Ms. Brown states that none of the revisions that were made to the project or the analysis of those changes resulted in any changes to the findings that were identified in the draft EIR.

Rob Reese, Fehr and Peers, discussed the transportation analysis of the EIR that his company was responsible for. The analysis looked at existing conditions, consideration of roadways, transit, traffic safety, pedestrians and bicycle facilities. All of these conditions were studied generally during peak hours. One existing condition that was noted and confirmed was that drivers were going up to 40 MPH down Seacliff Drive when the posted speed limit is 25 MPH. Several suggestions that the public made were analyzed and not advised to be used such as increasing the speed of Seacliff Drive, widening Seacliff Drive, adding a roundabout, adding a left-hand turn lane and other suggestions that are listed in the EIR master response section under traffic.

Mr. Reese stated that there were a lot of comments and concern about traffic safety along Seacliff Drive and also around the driveway. The analysis of those two concerns was that the

impacts of traffic and the traffic safety impacts were less than significant. Mr. Reese states that the sight distance long Seacliff Drive is more than adequate and safe for the driveway. The project sponsor independently looked into solutions to address the speeding on Seacliff Drive and they have proposed to install speed feedback signs and traffic calming measures such as new striping. A guardrail and centerline striping recommendation were added after the traffic analysis was done. Traffic has been assigned to Canal Boulevard because that is the quickest way to get out of the community from the driveway located on Seacliff Drive.

An important note is that five years of collision data is what's used in Richmond to analyze the safety of a road. Seacliff Drive was constructed to City standards in 2003-2004, it's designed per Caltrans standards as well and is posted as a 25 MPH street. Since the installation of a stop sign on Seacliff Drive and Canal Blvd., there have been no collisions reported.

Mark Spencer, W-Trans, states that W-Trans was asked to do a peer review from the City and to analyze community proposed improvements in regards to traffic issues. Mr. Spencer states that all the practices and procedures that were written up in the EIR in terms of traffic analysis were all professionally done and followed all guidelines. Also, that the EIR has satisfied all the concerns about traffic safety and the placement of the entrance to the project.

Mr. Spencer voiced that based on an independent analysis that was conducted by his firm, he agrees with the recommendation that Mr. Reese had stated that several of the public suggestions about traffic calming and safety measures were not needed in this area; such as the left-hand turn lane, roundabout and the relocation of the driveway to the project.

Ms. Velasco stated that staff's recommendation is to adopt Resolution 18-06, recommend certification of the Final EIR and approval of the General Plan Amendment, rezoning, Vesting Tentative Map, and design review permit to the City Council. Staff is recommending modifications to the Conditions of Approval to include TRAC's request to delete 22 and replacement of former condition 34 with the new condition 33 with suggested language in TRAC's comment letter. The applicant agrees with those changes.

Commissioner Baer asked if the other two projects on Seacliff Dr., Terminal One and the Bottoms project, were included in the traffic analysis and Mr. Reese answered that yes, both projects were included in the analysis plus additional growth. Also, that there would be no need for separate turn lanes leaving the project because cars would not be waiting long enough to warrant having two turn lanes coming out.

Chair Langlois asked Mr. Reese about what his opinion was about adding two to four-speed bumps onto Seacliff Drive. Mr. Reese stated that speed bumps aren't expected by drivers and it can cause a safety concern if they hit them at high speeds. To Commissioner Tuckers question about why not adding signs stating speed bump ahead, Mr. Reese stated that it's not common or suggested to add speed bumps to rural roads and even with the signs people will not expect a speed bump on a rural road.

Mr. Reese clarified for Vice Chair Butt that the median striping approach would improve visualization of oncoming cars and the shoulder striping would make the lanes narrow to help with speeding. Mr. Reese stated that either method would help that curve by Canal Blvd. Also, the length of such striping is usually based on the community input and what they want and also the City's traffic engineer. Also, there is not enough traffic to warrant a three-way traffic stop to and from the subdivision.

Todd Floyd, New West Communities, applicant, briefly irritated the history of the parcel and how they acquired it. Mr. Floyd briefly listed off some of the benefits that the project can provide to the community. These benefits include a staging area and trailhead for the Bay Trail, to improve and expand the Bay Trail, bring in the more affordable housing for middle-income residents, and that there is a huge effort to work with the City to include housing that is priced for the City's Inclusionary Housing. Also, this project will bring an increase in revenue and an increase in local jobs.

Ken Ryan, architect for KTG Y, briefly voiced that there were six fundamental design principles used in the project design including open space, identity, visibility, connectivity, fundamentally and diversity.

Public Comments:

JIMI Z, resident and business owner at Point Richmond, stated that the Shea Homes project will also have an access road from Canal Blvd.. This additional road will relieve a lot of the traffic off of Seacliff Drive. Also, that he is for the project and for the proposed placement of the driveway into the project.

DAN TORRES is a business agent with the Sprinkler Fitters UA Local 483 and is speaking on behalf of Mechanical Crafts IBEW Local 302, UA Local 159 Plumbers and Steam Fitters, and Sheet Metal Workers Local 104. Mr. Torres reiterated the applicant approached the local companies and there is an agreement to hire local companies for the construction portion of the project. He also voiced that the Commission should recommend approval of the project to the City Council.

NIKI BURKS is the sales manager for the Shores and the Cove in Marina Bay. She states that there is a real need for housing in Richmond for middle-income residents and that this project can provide a good amount of housing in that price range.

BRADD NOVACEK works with Ms. Burks and believes that with the proposed project it will bring in more people to the area and also increase services in the area.

ADRIENNE ACQUSTAPKCG voiced that she is for the project and that Richmond needs more affordable housing. Also, that it's nice to hear that they are wanting to hire local people to work on the project.

JEFF LEE is on the land use subcommittee for the Point Richmond Neighborhood Council and he was also on the Planning Commission when the General Plan was being crafted. In general, the Neighborhood Council is in support of the project and they would not want speed bumps to be located on Seacliff Drive. Mr. Lee is satisfied with the investigation that has been done by the traffic engineers and he supports the staff's recommendation.

JEFF VINES live in Brickyard Landing and spoke for several people who are against the project. Mr. Vines said that they are not against the proposed project but more against and concerned about the traffic issues this project will bring to the community. There is a strong opinion that the driveway entrance should be moved to Canal Blvd. Mr. Vines voiced that the left turn lane coming from the northerly direction is still very much wanted and that there is a left turn pocket for every single left turn off of Seacliff Drive and Brickyard Cove Road. He stated that there is no real way to predict what the traffic volume will be and if that left turn lane is installed ahead of time, then it will help manage the increase in traffic in the future. Mr. Vines would like to have

decision distance be a point of analyzation rather than measurements of sight distance. He would like to see the speed limit increased to 30 MPH, he agrees with the double yellow no passing lines, also to not put in the three-foot shoulder, and he agrees with the installation of the guard rails.

MICHAEL LEDERER, resident of Brickyard Cove, reiterated that a left-hand turn pocket would solve a lot of the concerns people have. Due to the two projects that are being built, the traffic will increase and if the left-hand turn pocket is not installed, Mr. Lederer believes more accidents will occur.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, is in support of the project but states that Seacliff Dr. is a dangerous road. He would like to see it a little wider and he is in support of increasing the speed limit to 30 MPH.

EILEEN MCDAVID is a 29-year resident of Brickyard Cove and was involved in an accident on Seacliff Drive. She would like to know if construction trucks would be using Seacliff Drive to access the site and how garbage trucks access the site. She would like to see signage for the blind curve that is on Seacliff Drive.

MARLO MARTIN voiced that there is a 10-20-foot embankment on the east side of Seacliff Drive and he is happy to see a recommendation for a guardrail to be installed. He also would like to see the guardrail extended to the entrance of the project.

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, explained some of the Bay Trail improvements that the applicant has proposed to do including the staging area and paving the trail down Seacliff Drive. TRAC supports Condition of Approval 33 and endorses the project.

Mr. Floyd voiced that they are confident with the engineer's findings that a left turn lane is not warranted.

Mr. Vines voiced that he agrees with the engineer's conclusion that speed bumps and a three-way stop sign area are not a good idea. He states that it's a minor request from the community to install that left-hand turn lane and that it would greatly improve the traffic issues in that area.

Commissioner Garcia stated that with the proposed improvements to the road in terms of adding the double yellow center line, narrowing of the road and a left turn lane do not mesh well. She asked Mr. Vines on what his opinion was on how to make that work. Mr. Vines suggested a gap in the double yellow line to allow cars to turn in and that the consensus was to not narrow the lanes. Mr. Reese voiced that their determination that a left hand turn lane is not warranted is based on traffic analysis whereas the rest of the left-hand lanes that are already located in that area are really from construction projects that changed a landscaped median into a turn lane.

Commissioner Loy restated what Mr. Spencer voiced that a left-hand turn lane would give people a false sense of safety. Mr. Spencer voiced that with a left-hand turn lane it could increase the already existing speeding issue of through traffic because they would not have to slow down for a person who is turning left into the project thus giving a false sense of safety. Richard Mitchell answered Commissioner Loy's question that the City would not be liable if they recommended something and then there is an accident.

Commissioner Baer wanted to know if the guardrail would be extended to the front of the project and Mr. Reese stated that guard rails are intended for curves and not straight sections of road.

The driveway is a T-intersection on a straight section of the road and a guardrail could cause more problems if it's installed on that section.

Ms. Velasco voiced that the City is working with the applicant, the Housing Authority, and the City Attorney to execute an inclusionary housing agreement but it hasn't been finalized yet.

Vice Chair Butt thinks that it's a great project and that it can bring a lot of great things to Richmond. Vice Chair Butt voiced there are constraints to widening the road in order to install a left-hand turn lane with the ravine on one side of the road and a pipeline on the other. Robert Stevens, a civil engineer based out of Point Richmond, stated that two options were looked at for a left-hand turn lane. One option with the left turn lane on the east side of the road would require a 10-foot high retaining wall to be installed on one side of the street while the pipeline was untouched on the other side. The other option with the left-hand turn lane in the middle road would require a steeper slope into the property and may exceed the maximize allowed by the City's Fire Department. This option may require the pipeline to be lowered and a 5-foot retaining wall on the ravine for about 300-feet and so it's not recommended to add a left-hand turn lane.

Commissioner Huang asked Mr. Vines if the left-hand turn lane is for safety issue or more for convenience. Mr. Vines answered that he thinks it's mostly a safety issue and that the left-hand lane could be a deterrent for speeders because they are passing a car that is in the turn lane thus making them slow down.

Commissioner Tucker wanted to know what the reason was for reoriented Building Six. Mr. Floyd stated that the Design Review Board (DRB) didn't like the monogamous look of the buildings and to break it up, the DRB decided to rotate that building.

Chair Langlois asked that the speaker's question about garbage trucks and construction trucks accessing the site be addressed. Mr. Reese stated that the entrance has to be designed to City standards and thus it will be feasible for the trucks to enter and exit. Chair Langlois voiced that she appreciates the proposed staging area and Bay Trail improvements. Mr. Floyd stated that they feel great about the TRAC proposals and fully intend on doing what is asked in the Conditions of Approval. Chair Langlois loves that the project will be employing local unions. Terry Manning, applicant, stated they have an agreement with local mechanical, electrical, plumbing and sheet metal contractor unions.

The public hearing was closed.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commission about the transportation analysis, the EIR document, and the architectural plans for the project. There was a consensus on the Commission that the EIR was done very well, the project is well designed, they are happy with the work the developer has done to engage with the community. Also, that all their past questions and comments have been addressed.

Commissioner Baer wanted to add a Condition of Approval to include language stating that the applicant will include Inclusionary Housing. Chair Langlois suggested that it be noted to the City Council that this is an important issue for the Commission and it is voiced in the motion that the City Council check in on the progress of the Inclusionary Housing document that is being drafted. Commissioner Tucker voiced that he would like the orientation of Building Six to be kept in the same position and not be rotated.

Chair Langlois voiced a recommendation to City Council would be that staff is directed, in the future, to do a thorough General Plan Amendment process with analysis and community input prior to accepting any project applications that is proposing a General Plan Amendment for land use. It was voiced that since this request is not a part of this specific project, that it should not be added to the motion but Ms. Velasco stated that she would follow up with the Chair on her request.

Commissioner Baer voiced that a recommendation for City Council is to review the status of the Inclusionary Housing component of the application. Commissioner Tucker proposed to change Building Six back to its original orientation but Vice Chair Butt and Commissioner Huang voiced that they would not change the orientation of the building.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Baer) to recommend approval to City Council the certification of the Final EIR, the request for a General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification from Parks and Recreation to Open Space and Medium Density Residential, the rezoning change from Parks and Recreation to Planned Area District, the approval of the Vesting Tentative Map, design review permit for the proposed quarry residential project, and the proposed TRAC condition number 33 deletion of COA 22 with the conditions as proposed by staff; which was carried with the following vote: 7-0 (Ayes: Butt, Baer, Langlois, Loy, Garcia, Huang, Tucker; Noes: None).

COMMISSION BUSINESS

7. **Reports of Officers, Commissioners, and Staff – Mr. Michell** voiced that Ms. Velasco’s has been promoted to Planning Manager. Vice Chair Butt pointed out the fire that took place in the City and suggested that the Commission look at the CUP for Sims Metal building and review it to make sure the conditions for that project were implemented correctly. Chair Langlois requested that a link be added to the website under the Commissioner’s names to the current staff reports and agendas for the Planning Commission meetings.

8. **Adjournment** - The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m. to the next regular meeting on February 15, 2018.