

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

July 8, 2020
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, except as provided for in the public forum, and limited to the specific methods identified on the agenda.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Brian Carter
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Brian Carter, Jessica Fine, Vice-Chair Michael Hannah, and Karlyn Neel

Absent: Boardmember Macy Leung

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Community Development Director Lina Velasco, Planners Roberta Feliciano and Enzo Cabili, and Senior Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

Community Development Director Lina Velasco described the format of the meeting and the public's ability to speak during the web-based meeting.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

M.J. PAUL, Omega Pacific, a lighting supply firm in Richmond for 30 years, spoke in support of the Point Molate project as an important part of the firm's future.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC (Trails for Richmond Action Committee), referred to TRAC's mid-year report which reported that the City of Richmond had started construction on the Goodrick Avenue Trail to connect the Point Pinole Regional Shoreline with Richmond as well as Yerba Buena Island in San Rafael. He also reported that 56,000 people had crossed the new Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Trail since opening in November 2019, and funding was being sought to provide protected bikeways for three miles of trail from Harbor Way South, Cutting Boulevard, and Hoffman Boulevard. He added that TRAC had a new website.

City Council Liaison Report

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, July 20, 2020 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. PLN20-057 | POINT MOLATE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION OF A MAJOR DESIGN REVIEW OF THE PLANNED AREA PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED PLANNED AREA REZONING FOR THE POINT MOLATE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, WHICH INCLUDES 1,452 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, 453,774 SF OF NON-RESIDENTIAL USES, OPEN SPACE INCLUDING RECREATIONAL AREAS, PARKS, TRAILS (INCLUDING A 1.5 MILE PORTION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY TRAIL), VISTA OVERLOOKS, AND OTHER SIMILAR SPACES OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. THE PROJECT ALSO INCLUDES INFRASTRUCTURE AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT. ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION IS ONLINE AT http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/3757/Point-Molate-Mixed-Use-Project |
| Location | 2100 STENMARK DRIVE |
| APN | 561-100-008 |
| Zoning | PR, PARKS AND RECRETION; CG, COMMERCIAL GENERAL; IL, INDUSTRIAL LIGHT; AND OS, OPEN SPACE |
| Owner | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| Applicant | WINEHAVEN LEGACY LLC |
| Staff Contact | LINA VELASCO AND ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS |

Lina Velasco presented the staff report dated July 8, 2020, for a public hearing where the DRB was charged with making a recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding the major design review of the proposed Planned Area (PA) Plan and the proposed Design Guidelines for the Point Molate Mixed-Use Development Project. She explained that as part of the proposed project General Plan Amendments (GPAs) had been proposed and had been provided for comment and discussion as part of the DRB's previous study sessions. The entire property would have a Planned Area District (PAD) zoning with an H-Overlay over the Winehaven Historic District and an S-Overlay denoting the shoreline band. As part of the PAD plan, zoning subdistricts had been proposed and had been described in the PA plan and in the Design Guidelines. The PAD included the PAD zoning, a zoning map, a large lot tentative subdivision,

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

and included development standards and regulations along with different infrastructure components.

The Design Guidelines would evaluate future development projects for the various planning areas described in the PA plan. Pursuant to the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC), a major design review was required of the PA plan by the DRB, which was the DRB's charge at this time. The PA plan was a master plan vision for the project to guide the development and future review of project components. The DRB would review future projects for areas outside the Winehaven Historic District and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) would review projects in that district.

Ms. Velasco described the major components of the plan, maximum number of residential units, the different types of residential units allowed, commercial and non-residential uses allowed on the site, master landscape plan concepts, architectural standards, grading standards, and development regulations, along with the reservation of lands for public uses such as parks, a fire station, a police substation, a master circulation plan, and a master utility plan.

Ms. Velasco also described the components of the Design Guidelines. Key issues raised at the last study session were to ensure that the plans included a strong framework for public open space, making sure that the shoreline park was unencumbered by infrastructure components, a strong desire to see the development clarify the differences with respect to Point Richmond and Point Molate, that the development be pulled closer to the knoll area to allow additional open space at the shoreline, a desire to see adequate parking, that new development be laid out to be sensitive to the topography and the environmental constraints of the site, and a request to reduce the amount of grading by working with the topography. In response to those issues, she described the changes to the PAD text and edits to the Design Guidelines, and reported that the concept plan had been modified and cross sections had been added. The required findings for the PAD had been identified in the staff report.

Boardmember Fine asked when the minutes from the June 10 DRB meeting would be available; expressed concern that the City Council Liaison to the DRB had not attended meetings and due to the scope and interdisciplinary nature of the project encouraged the City Council Liaison to be part of the process in the future; questioned the completeness of the staff report and attachments; suggested the design review criteria had not been made in terms of scale, massing and site plan of the project and the criteria had not been incorporated into the plan; and expressed concern with the lack of grading plans from BKF Engineers and how the buildings related to the topography.

Ms. Velasco stated that the grading plans were part of the Vesting Tentative Map (VTM) and BKF Engineers had not yet proposed mass grading of the site. As a result, BKF had pulled back the detail from the planning areas and would only show grading for the Stenmark Drive area. She added that each site would be developed and designed at a later date as part of a land plan to be approved by the DRB. She clarified that it had been determined that the lift station could be eliminated.

Chair Livingston agreed with the need for the grading plan and asked if the grading plan could legally be eliminated at this point from the PA process, to which Ms. Velasco stated that the grading plan would not be eliminated, although there would not be significant grading shown for the various subarea districts until those areas had been fully planned and designed.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

Boardmember Fine noted it had been challenging to receive public comments two hours before the meeting and receiving WRT revisions less than an hour before the meeting. She asked staff to be more thoughtful of last minute presentations in the future.

Vice Chair Hannah expressed concern with the lack of meeting minutes. For the record, he wanted to distance himself from all of the comments in the staff report from Page 2 to Page 13 since there had been confusing language which seemed to tell the public that the DRB had come up with findings and statements of facts that were inconsistent with the DRB Subcommittee and regular DRB meetings he had attended. He stated the DRB had offered comments and he had seen no changes to the design to reflect those comments. He stated therefore that the documents were incomplete and he was still awaiting responses to the DRB's comments and to the concerns expressed by the members of the public who had submitted comments and concerns. He reiterated and emphasized for the public record that he had nothing to do with the findings, statement of facts, or any of the information in the staff report from Page 2 through Page 13 and awaited the development team's responses.

Ms. Velasco stated that the applicant team would walk through the changes that had been made and had been included in revised pages shown as Attachment 6 to the staff report. Staff had been working with the applicant team on the narrative in the Design Guidelines and the PAD, which would provide direction to future development proposals to reflect the principals and ideas that had been brought forward. She stated that the illustrative drawing itself had not been changed. In terms of findings, it was typical of staff to prepare draft findings and the DRB had the ability to modify those draft findings.

Boardmember Carter noted that the grading plans had not been included in the package which was one of the public's greatest concerns related to the on-site sewage treatment plant and other elements. He echoed the concerns for the need to evaluate the DRB components of the project.

Boardmember Butt expressed concern that the posted public agenda was incorrect in that the Point Molate item was again shown as a study session as opposed to an action item.

Boardmember Neel asked again about safety, about the two-lane road in and out, about the zoning, about the scale of the project, the public's ability to participate and express concerns, public spaces in the development, and celebrating the history of the site, all of which would have to be addressed before she could support the project, and being asked to make a recommendation to the Planning Commission when there were so many things in flux. With respect to completeness, she stressed the City should be held to the same standard it held its citizens.

In response, Ms. Velasco stated the road proposed for the site would still be a two-lane road but in the exit out there would be three lanes with a dedicated lane to the right turn onto the I-580 on-ramp to San Rafael, and one lane dedicated to go in the other direction.

Chairperson Livingston referred to Page 6 of the staff report where the Planning Commission was to review the VTM. He requested that statement be changed to reflect that both the DRB and the Planning Commission were to review the VTM. He also noted there was no revised VTM in the documents that had been submitted. He also objected to Findings B and D under Required Findings for the PA Plan on Page 7 of the staff report and stated contrary to those findings the subject site was design related and the DRB should be added to that review. He also asked whether the General Plan Maps would be updated to include the VTM, and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

emphasized the need that the maps be consistent. He requested readable scalable drawings for not only the Promenade and the Point but also the Winehaven Historic District, requested an appropriate landscape plan with as much detail as available, and needed more complete zoning data and a complete draft Zoning Code.

James Atencio stated with respect to the agenda that a study session was noted under the recommendation but the public hearing had been identified in the description and that action had been recommended to the Planning Commission in the staff report. He stated the DRB could still move to take action on the item or the item could ultimately be continued.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

DAVID SOYKA, Winehaven LLC, SunCal, introduced Nicole Emmons to identify the changes that had been made since the last meeting on June 10, 2020.

NICOLE EMMONS, Hart Howerton, walked through the comments from the public, from the DRB, and from the City's consultant WRT in the context of the Design Guidelines. She referred to a response memo that had been made available to the DRB, highlighted those responses with exhibits, and identified a series of design principles that had built on a foundation of looking at the site from a site analysis perspective as well as a series of documents that existed for the site including a reuse plan, the City's visioning plan, and the General Plan. With respect to the specific design principles for Point Molate, she stated the goals of the project were: to create a place for all; ensuring public access to the shoreline; protecting beach sides; hillsides; open spaces; establishing view corridors; ensuring the development was pedestrian friendly, pedestrian oriented, and public oriented; and protecting and interpreting the site's cultural and environmental heritage given the history and pre-history of the site.

Vice Chair Hannah asked specifically what the development team had gotten from the tribes, reported by Ms. Emmons to be comments and materials as part of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). Vice Chair Hannah stated the DRB had not seen the community engagement and he wanted to see what the native peoples had provided.

Ms. Velasco explained that what was ongoing now was through the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, which allowed cities to engage with tribal governments on consultation. The City had completed consultation with one tribe and currently had ongoing discussions with others.

Vice Chair Hannah stated there should be some kind of documented summary. He referred to the comment to preserve 70 percent of open space and Ms. Emmons stated that would include the major infrastructure required to serve the site, wastewater and water which typically required an easement alongside a public right-of-way, incorporated into open space design and serving in some cases the public rights-of-way.

Ms. Emmons clarified that the utility easements, streetscapes and trails had been included in the 70 percent while public rights-of-way such as Stenmark Drive and other roadways had not been included in the 70 percent even though they were public serving.

Ms. Velasco noted there would need to be a couple of East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) water tanks which was similar to other allowances in other open space areas.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

Vice Chair Hannah stated it was those things that the DRB needed to be aware. He expressed a desire to see the responses to the public, not a presentation about the comments offered by the DRB.

Ms. Emmons highlighted the Design Guidelines tracing everything back to the design principles, the process of planning and design, and the responses to the DRB's comments with respect to the Design Guidelines, along with the analyses as part of the planning and design process. She presented sketches to clarify the responses

Vice Chair Hannah verified with Ms. Emmons that the images presented were not what was planned but was what could be planned, and all the imagery being provided were not specific and not the design.

The DRB agreed with the need to identify for the public that the drawings were for example purposes only and were illustrative interpretations of what could be done and should not be construed as what any developer or what any future project would be held to.

Ms. Emmons stated that Hart Howerton had included an explanation of what the illustrative plan was in relation to the Design Guidelines and in the PAD zoning, and she clarified the differences between guidelines and standards, noting that elements that started with "shall" were not interpretive. She emphasized there were a variety of standards and regulations that limited, not to mention the fact that the development area was limited to 30 percent of the upland area. She clarified that there would be low impact stormwater management design, grading standards included in the Design Guidelines, allowances and restrictions for building massing, the public vehicular access had been removed from a portion of the Loop Road and it had been determined that it could be converted to an emergency vehicle access (EVA) for fire safety and evacuation purposes. There had also been a revised stormwater approach, limited grading extent, a pedestrian promenade and an additional public zone along Stenmark Drive, limited building frontage along the southern end of Stenmark and the buildings had been set 40 feet back along Stenmark with step backs. The pedestrian promenade featured shade trees, seating, small gathering spaces and a pedestrian connection along the length of Stenmark.

In the Winehaven Historic District, the buildings north of and surrounding the power house had been set back and the revised zoning subdistrict at the bluff had been modified along with the request for higher density. Public parking lots had been added, rear yard setbacks had been increased, building massing and setbacks had been accommodated, view corridors had been established, buildings along Stenmark had been removed and other buildings had been shifted, and the history of the historic pier and its orientation had been reflected, among other modifications that had been made.

Chair Livingston referred to Boardmember Carter's comments related to a building typology that responded more to the natural environment, an eco-district, and Hart Howerton had been encouraged to create a design more in keeping with such a district. He asked where those design guidelines would help a future developer design that type of project the DRB requested.

Ms. Emmons stated that some of those policies had previously been provided in response to comments, such as the sustainability approach, the stormwater approach attached to the staff report, and an emphasis in the guiding principles. She stated that all of Point Molate was, in and of itself, an eco-district by nature of the responsiveness to the framework established by the existing landforms and open space framework, and there had been planning for public realm and open space consideration of the massing, solar orientation, opportunities and encouragement for sustainability as well as some of the mitigation.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

Chair Livingston asked whether Ms. Emmons could point to anything in the illustrative site plan where there was an eco-district for such things as gardens, and Ms. Emmons displayed a diagram of the open space of natural drainage ways that were protected and stated that Hart Howerton was instilling in the plan and in the illustrative an east/west connector of a minimum size so there could be the opportunity to show how water moved throughout the site. She stated the illustrative showed three east/west collections in regard to smaller pocket parks. She added that the riparian and natural drainage ways were protected and there were opportunities for trails through those as well as highlighting with signage and native planting, along with the ability to organize differently depending on the ultimate layout.

Ms. Emmons noted a requirement for a break in street wall, in setbacks from the street, in step backs for those buildings and for east/west connections. She stated that section had been included in the exhibits and noted a much smaller change in grade in the southern portion of the promenade.

Ms. Velasco referred to Pages 2-35 and 2-36 of the Design Guidelines under the sustainability and climate action section that dealt with energy, water, transportation, Complete Streets, as well as agriculture and green infrastructure including providing street trees and encouraging community gardens, where appropriate, along with other green infrastructure features.

Chair Livingston understood there would be no presentation related to the Winehaven Historic District at this time and expressed concern that the PA plan included the historic district. He emphasized the importance of the recommendations from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), which had been offered to Orton Development. He stated the DRB should have those recommendations before it made any recommendation to the Planning Commission to make sure the DRB and HPC reviews were consistent.

JAMES MADSEN, Orton Development, stated there was a good plan with HPC and it had been pleased with the massing plan and a few changes had been made to the Design Guidelines. Included as part of that was a response to all the DRB's comments. He would provide a briefing to the DRB later, but Orton had no objections to the DRB's comments in terms of incorporating the plans, and had no concern emulating the pier and making a number of other changes.

Chair Livingston requested that those changes also be incorporated into the Hart Howerton plan.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Instructions were offered for anyone wishing to speak to the DRB.

PAUL CARMAN, Richmond, urged the DRB not to be pressured by a limited time schedule to review the proposal. With respect to open space, he referred to a deep ravine that he stated included remedial site 1, a permanent contaminated landfill that would have to be monitored for perpetuity, and which had been shown as open space. Given that area was contaminated landfill, he did not believe that first corridor should be counted as part of the 70 percent open space. With respect to the changes that the DRB had requested, he suggested the only revisions the applicant had made was that the Loop Road would be an EVA which he suggested could easily be reversed, the trailheads had been moved down but they could be moved back, and some parking had been added. He asked for clarity of what had been proposed by the bluff, noted the suggestion for higher density, and asked for clarification of the beach lot parking with respect to the lift station. He was concerned that the discussion of grading had been removed since nothing in the design had been changed.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

BRUCE BEYAERT, Chair of TRAC, noted that the presentation thus far had been of illustrative plans of how generalized statements might be interpreted by the Design Guidelines but what really counted were the specifics of the PA plan, the General Plan Land Use Zoning Amendments, the Vesting Tentative Map and the conditions of approval, and he displayed maps representing those specifics. He recommended: 1) The Bay Trail and shoreline park facilities shall be constructed as part of Phase I and completed prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy; 2) Neighborhood parks, pocket parks, and open space within developed areas shall not be considered in satisfying the requirement for 70 percent public open space; 3) Facilities for treating and handling stormwater and sewage from development areas shall not be sited on lands designated for park or open space uses; and 4) The Point Molate Bay Trail shall be extended to the Bay Trail spine at Stenmark Drive near the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge in order to provide pedestrian and bicyclist access to Point Molate from the East Bay via Point Richmond and the North Bay via the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Trail.

STEVE GRILLO, Performance Contracting, Inc., stated that he represented hundreds of local employees and knew how difficult it was to get a project such as the Point Molate project built. As a frequent visitor of the site and a strong supporter of the project, he stated the project would generate revenue in the community and create thousands of local jobs, and new housing including affordable housing.

JEFF KILBREATH, as a former Richmond Planning Commissioner, encouraged the idea that the whole point of the Design Guidelines was that they should be specific and protective since SunCal would do the initial work and then sell off parcels. He stated the scale and density of the project would have to be reasonable, wise, and balanced, which could not be addressed without a response to the comments from the public and the DRB in the SEIR, which could not be rushed. As to the issue of financial risk to the City, he noted that SunCal had indicated it could sell the 1,490 townhouses and condominiums at an average price of \$1.25 million, although he did not believe that would be the case. He expressed concern for traffic, safety, the 70 percent open space and the full protection of the southern property as well as the general feasibility of the project.

TOM HANSON, Business Manager for the Electrician's Union, reported that IBEW Local 302 had entered into an agreement with the developer to work on the project, and had made commitments to use apprenticeship and local hire. He urged the DRB to work with the applicant and move forward with the project to get people to work.

RICHARD WEISS, Weiss Associates, an environmental and engineering management firm, supported the project and was pleased that the developer was willing to comply and accept the requirements. He supported SunCal's plans for Point Molate, understood the project met all the goals of the Point Molate vision report, and that the proposal would help transform the property into an asset that would benefit local residents and businesses. He stated it was particularly important to approve the project now given the COVID-19 shut down and the need for jobs in the community.

RASHEED, on behalf of PT MOLATE 4 ALL, a coalition of local community and business leaders in support of Point Molate, referred to a letter submitted in support of SunCal's plans for Point Molate that had been signed by more than 135 local residents. The letter, included in the materials submitted to the DRB, was read into the record at this time.

SALLY TOBIN, Richmond, commented that she had been confused by the agenda language and by the terms of the resolution which had not been approved by the DRB. She referred to her letter to the DRB that had been included in the materials submitted, and did not support a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

change to the General Plan. She suggested there was an opportunity to daylight streams and stated that needed more work; referred to the grading diagram on Page 124 of the pdf which showed grading alongside Stenmark Drive which looked closer to the beach than the 100-foot limitation, which would require a permit from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC); and encouraged the DRB to set up strict requirements for grading. She also noted that a sand beach had been shown at Point Molate, although it was currently more gravelly, and when the tide went out it turned to mud which the eel grass needed. She suggested if the thought was to track in sand for a beach it would jeopardize the eel grass beds.

JOE FISHER, Fisher Realty, endorsed moving forward with the development of Point Molate.

AMANDA LUCAS, expressed concern for the lack of detail as to how the Design Guidelines would be achieved with no action item to break down the percentages of the open space from natural, to green lawn, to patches of grass, and while gardens were encouraged there was no indication or surety that would actually happen without a breakdown of how much or where. She wanted to see more specifics on everything. As a Point Molate visitor, she wanted to be in a natural, wild area and she wanted to see how that feeling could be preserved for the public. She was concerned with traffic given the one road in and out, wanted to see small local business in the mixed-use retail or commercial aspect, and given the 2018 plan suggested it might be outdated.

DAN TORRES, a business representative for Local 483, representing over 1,200 men and women who installed, tested, and maintained life-safety and sprinkler systems, echoed Mr. Hanson's comment that they were working with SunCal and had the opportunity to bring much needed jobs to the community. He supported the project and urged the DRB to approve it.

MATT HOLMES, the Executive Director of Groundwork Richmond, an environmental justice organization, explained that the City had hosted a youth summit at the site and he had been involved with the land and the project for some time. He noted the maps shared with the public and the feedback from the youth looked different from the renderings, and he had concern that gaps between buildings were being described as open space, and toxic ravines were being described as watershed. He stressed the need to strike a balance, supported the maps displayed by Mr. Beyaert, and stated the scope and scale of open space needed to be revisited.

BERYL, Richmond, expressed concern with the drainage and how housing could be constructed near the natural drainage. She did not see how the proposal could be approved without more details about the grading and how the area would be contoured.

JUAN BAUTISTA, Richmond, stated that more jobs were needed in the area since COVID-19 was shutting everything down and the project would mean more local jobs for Spanish families and the small businesses that were struggling. He looked forward to the jobs that the project would create in the future.

EDDIE BAUTISTA, Richmond, stated that the Hispanic community was creating business and needed more jobs in the area.

CODY DIXON, on behalf of PT MOLATE 4 ALL, drew attention to a letter in the packets in support of SunCal's plans from Richmond resident, small business owner, and prominent local workforce advocate SANDRA ESCALANTE, who could not join the meeting at this time. He read the letter on her behalf in support of SunCal's plans and stated that her firm, Laner Electric Supply Co., which employed local Richmond residents, would benefit from the thousands of local jobs the Point Molate project would generate, as well as from the homes that would be

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

constructed for families of all backgrounds. She requested that the Point Molate plan be approved to continue the opportunities for the local community work force.

Vice Chair Hannah reiterated that the community and the DRB felt they were not seeing the whole picture, everything seemed to be a bit incomplete, flexible and open, and various parts of the process had eroded some of the trust. He emphasized the importance of the comments from the public where most wanted the project to move forward and create jobs. He suggested the project could transform Richmond and be the gateway to the wine country but it had to be done in a sensitive community-engaged, environmentally-engaged way, and the public had been clear that more had to be provided with more commitment to everything.

As to the Design Guidelines, Vice Chair Hannah stated so much of what had been presented and so much of the process was nebulous at this point and he suggested the DRB was not being given the tools to approve a complete application and a complete design. He reiterated comments from the community that the interpretation of the open space was troubling and none of it had been addressed in that the actual broad brush strokes had not been filled out. He wanted to see a serious response to the community's issues and from the Native American tribes. He expressed dismay with the process given that so many aspects had been last minute, incomplete, nebulous and he wanted to see real evidence of community engagement. As a result, he could not support the project in that there were so many aspects that could be easily interpreted into a project different from the illustrative drawings.

Chair Livingston clarified that he, Vice Chair Hannah, and Boardmember Butt had comprised the DRB's subcommittee working with the developer team.

Boardmember Butt commented that she was not as dismayed as Vice Chair Hannah, but noted that part of the frustration was that there had been 20 years of public input on Point Molate, an EIR, a public process, and there had been public input outside of the DRB. Her main issue was the feeling that some of the Design Guidelines needed to be as strong as possible and where such things as "encouraging" community gardens would mean that community gardens would not likely result. She supported stronger language in places to help push the Design Guidelines to be a strong, defensible document and stressed that more definitive terminology was needed. If the calculations of open space could be reworked, she agreed that spaces between buildings and utility easements would not be counted as open space. People wanted as much open space as possible, wanted a transparent process, and agreed with the need for consistency with the General Plan. She asked staff for an update on the timeline and the path forward for the project. She added that she did not want to see garages on the front of houses.

Ms. Velasco stated that pursuant to the judgment the deadline was September 30, 2020 for City Council consideration of the project, and everything needed to be completed by that time. The DRB would have to complete its process by the end of July. She verified that the HPC had divided its process into two recommendations, had recommended approval of the H-Overlay, and had suggested specific comments to Section 4, the Historic Preservation Plan, including the comments from the DRB Subcommittee. The HPC would reconsider Section 4 on July 14.

Boardmember Carter noted the vision expressed in the documents so far, specifically the illustrative sections and photographs of similar environments were getting exactly to where they needed to be. To solidify that vision and make it more defensible would be to make the language stronger and have more "shalls" and "requirements" as opposed to "encouragement" and "suggestions." He stated every opportunity should be taken to clarify the vision as a requirement. With respect to the 70 percent open space discussion, he suggested it would be

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

helpful to have a schedule breakdown to show the different types of space included in the open space, which could also help to fortify the vision where none of the development area would be included in the open space.

Boardmember Carter recognized the community's concern for where the infrastructure elements would be located such as sewer stations and domestic pump stations, and wanted to see a before and after infrastructure plan. He suggested the applicant could think of some of the riparian corridors, community gardens, and other similar elements as part of the infrastructure. With respect to his request for an eco-district, he recommended a more defensible way to enforce that once the time came for build out. He noted that at least one riparian corridor had been delineated but suggested it could go further to set a formula that would more clearly define what that balance would be.

Boardmember Carter suggested that the site could become a special place in the Bay Area and it would be in everyone's interest to design a place that was completely unique to Point Molate for its ecological characteristics as well as its historical characteristics for the last hundred years, and thousands of years of Native American inhabitants. He noted the need to establish the boundaries for keeping the vision.

Boardmember Fine suggested the key word was empathy and it underscored the complexity of the project. She reiterated some of the comments from the public speakers with respect to economic incentives from the City in the context of COVID-19, the much needed jobs particularly in terms of local hiring and a strong and diverse work force, the housing crises implications in the context of the project, the biology and riparian context of the site and the biological studies that needed to be made for the protection of eel grass, along with the drainage issues and actual open space as opposed to what had been portrayed in the guidelines. She emphasized the need to know all the different layers and all the different players along with the DRB's role in that context. She agreed there was a need for specific, protected guidelines and emphasized the importance of language. She could not support the project until that language was good, protected, and specific.

Boardmember Neel highlighted the major themes she had heard such as the Design Guidelines, more detail for the community, urgency of jobs, she wanted to see responses from the public comments and how that input had specifically informed the design. With respect to the Design Guidelines, she sought more actual designs than the illustrative exhibits that had been provided. She sought more completeness to allow the proposal to proceed and the jobs to become available, and she emphasized the concern for the constraints of a two-lane road and a safe evacuation route.

Chair Livingston noted that the comments from the DRB were compelling and encouraging. He had been disappointed with what had been received after hours of the DRB's time to help the development team match all the visions. In spite of that effort, he suggested the plan was devoid of articulate intent and it was difficult to know how to produce articulate intent in the next two weeks, particularly since the DRB's comments over months had not yet been fully addressed. He remained supportive of the idea of an eco-district, suggested the idea of not having a grading plan might be okay as long as the Design Guidelines were more specific. He agreed with the need for housing, and he emphasized that the development team needed to take all the comments from the public, the HPC, and the DRB seriously, take the WRT pattern, and find a way to make it all happen. On the Point and referencing the big building, he suggested there were very few design guidelines that would help a future architect sculpt a building that would make the City proud. He referred to the diagram of that area and stated it should not be in the Design Guidelines. He agreed with the other DRB member comments and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

those from the public, thanked the development team, and asked Ms. Velasco to summarize some of the high points of the WRT document that had just been received.

Ms. Velasco stated that the majority of the memo had been included in the staff report, some recommendations based on comments and feedback were to begin modifying the General Plan Map to show the future extent of the beach park expansion as well as some of the other General Plan Land Use Maps to show the boundary along the Point being pulled back to accommodate the expanded shoreline park. The buildings in the promenade included a step back requirement and some of that should be shown in the illustrative plans, including guidelines for creating a fine grain fabric at the Point to avoid a monolithic development. While flexibility was desired, revising the language was recommended to be more definitive around the issues of open space and the eco-district, with a more naturalized stormwater management plan showing precedent images for treatments along podiums and building frontages.

Chair Livingston stated that when the plan had been discussed with WRT, one of the graphics that was troubling to him was the promenade plan which was rigid and devoid of essence in that it was like every flat land development, which point had been made since January.

Chair Livingston explained that a new land plan had been proposed in a series of three land plans presented to the DRB at the June 10 meeting, at which time the DRB had selected one of those plans, and that plan had not been shown at the current meeting. He emphasized the need for the development team to take the comments from the DRB and synthesize those comments into a plan beyond the tight grid that had been presented.

Vice Chair Hannah stated that the response to his comment about the grid iron streets had included a response that the City of Richmond had lots of blocks which was why it was being done, and which he stated completely missed his point. He restated his point that the whole of the Point Molate area, the history of the urban fabric was like a necklace with pathways, tracks, and roads that had naturally formed over hundreds of years that ran with the contours of the topography. Along those daisy chains was development, which was usually on the uphill side facing the Bay, which was the urban fabric of Point Molate, not a grid iron from Europe. While the City of Richmond had grids, grids were foreign to the whole of Point Molate, which was a distance from the City, and which was unique.

Chair Livingston highlighted the comments from the DRB for stricter guidelines and stronger language, a more accurate open space count, the recommendations from Mr. Beyaert, no garages in fronts of houses, more clarification to solidify the vision, the comments on empathy, and the concern for a two-lane road.

Chair Livingston reported that the public hearing remained open.

Boardmember Fine reiterated the DRB's offer to be contacted if the development team had any questions.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Hannah) to continue PLN20-057, POINT MOLATE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, to the meeting of July 22, 2020 approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hannah, Livingston, and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: Leung).

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON JULY 22, 2020

There was no report from staff.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

There were no Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, July 22, 2020.