

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

March 24, 2021
6:00 P.M.

All Participation Via Teleconference

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, Contra Costa County and Governor Gavin Newsom had issued multiple orders requiring sheltering in place, social distancing, and reduction of person-to-person contact. Accordingly, Governor Newsom had issued executive orders that allowed cities to hold public meetings via teleconferencing. Due to the shelter in place orders, all City of Richmond staff, members of the Design Review Board (DRB), and members of the public participated via teleconference. Public comment was confined to items on the agenda and limited to the specific methods identified on the agenda.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Jessica Fine
Macy Leung

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Jonathan Livingston

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Brian Carter, Michelle Hook, and Macy Leung

Absent: Boardmember Jessica Fine

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Jonelyn Whales and Roberta Feliciano, and City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

Roberta Feliciano described the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, called in to offer public comment but his comments were not audible.

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

APPEAL DATE:

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, April 5, 2021 by 5:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. PLN18-304	KIM SINGLE-FAMILY AND ACCESSORY DWELLING
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A VACANT PARCEL ON SKYVIEW PLACE.
Location	SKYVIEW PLACE (ADJACENT TO 5731 SKYVIEW PLACE)
APN	433-492-003
Zoning	RH, RESIDENTIAL HILLSIDE DISTRICT
Applicant	CLARISSA AND KENNEY KIM (OWNER)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated March 24, 2021 for the construction of a new single-family residence on a vacant infill parcel, a 25,500 square foot flag lot in the Greenbriar neighborhood bordered by 5751 Skyview Place to the north and 5759 Skyview Place to the south. There was currently a six-foot chain link fence surrounding the perimeter of the site that was relatively flat on the northeast location with an abrupt slope at the southwest. The applicant proposed a new 3,209 square foot single-family dwelling on the lot containing four bedrooms and five bathrooms, with a two-car garage.

The application had previously been considered by the DRB when recommendations had been made to improve the design by modeling the home to the topography of the site, providing a different color for the roof, retaining a landscape architect to assist with the selection of plantings, considering thinning the windows for the rear of the property with more space between, revising the plans to show the color of the metal roof, and providing a drawing from a civil engineer to show the drainage on the property.

Ms. Whales stated that since that July 10, 2019 meeting, the applicant and staff believed that the DRB's recommendations had been satisfied. Based on the DRB's recommendations and requests from the adjacent neighbors, the design of the dwelling had been modified. She recommended that the applicant replace the base rock currently in front of the dwelling with pavers to match the flag lot entrance, as shown in staff recommended Condition 7.

Chair Livingston commented that the design was completely different from what had previously been submitted to the DRB.

Ms. Whales responded to comments from the DRB and verified the setback of 10 feet from the adjacent property. She also noted that structural plans and foundation plans had not been submitted to the City but would be submitted to the Building Department for plan check.

Because the proposed colors were not visible on the electronic copies of the packet used by most members of the DRB (other than by name), Ms. Whales and Chair Livingston identified the proposed colors as a burnt sienna color for the metal roof (Desert Brown), a burnt umber for the windows and doors (Dark Bronze), and a light tan for the exterior siding (Alabaster).

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

KENNEY KIM, the owner, stated that he and his wife had worked hard to address the concerns that had been expressed by the DRB, staff and the neighbors, and had made significant modifications to produce a simple design.

Mr. Kim reported that he had received an email this date from the neighbors. He described the neighbors' comments as insightful and reasonable, and he had responded to all of the concerns.

Mr. Kim described the comments from the neighbors with respect to an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and stated there would be no ADU. He referred to Plan B-1 and identified the drainage plan that would drain to the concrete swale where water would flow down to the street. With respect to the existing driveway and curb, he stated the curb would be 12 inches tall on the north side of the driveway before the gate and six inches on the south side of the driveway. In terms of the fence, the fences would be opaque and would be planted with vines that had been chosen to be drought-resistant. As to the geo-tile, he stated that base rock would be 11 inches thick with 1.5 inches of sand and pavers approximately 2.5 inches thick.

Chair Livingston clarified with Mr. Kim that the chain link fence surrounding the property would remain. He also confirmed that Mr. Kim would accept the staff recommended Condition 7.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Ms. Feliciano described the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

WILL KLUTE, President of the Greenbriar Neighborhood Council, stated the neighbors in general were pleased with the design improvements and overall appearance of the house, and were pleased to know that there would be no ADU even though the information from the City was contradictory and had indicated both that there would, and would not, be an ADU. Noting that there was to be a two-car garage, he asked if there would be additional parking on the site given that the property was at the end of the cul-de-sac with no on-street parking.

BOB SPAMPINATO, 5763 Skyview Place, El Sobrante, stated that the elevation of the driveway and runoff would be moving past a paved surface and to the street level passing his and other property. The runoff would come from the smooth driveway with increased velocity and move out onto the cul-de-sac which would allow the particulate to drop in the center of the cul-de-sac creating a sand-trap appearance, especially during the pre-construction and construction stage since everything collected at that location. He wanted to be assured by all involved that debris collection would not occur post-construction.

CLIFF WATTS, 5713 Skyview Place, El Sobrante, remained concerned with the drainage in that the subject lot was a large lot with upslopes that would also collect water, and all the water from the site could only go down the driveway, which was flat from edge to edge with no gutter or curb and could potentially flow over into adjacent properties. He expressed concern with the potential volume of water. He also questioned whether vines would grow along the opaque fence.

Boardmember Hook referred to the previous planting list and asked if the proposed plantings had been recommended by the DRB.

Mr. Kim stated that most of the plants and trees had been recommended by Chair Livingston and some of those plants had also been recommended by his landscape architect. He added

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

that he wanted colors, wanted the home to be welcoming, and instead of using wood to create a barrier between the neighbors preferred plantings for screening purposes.

Chair Livingston pointed out that the current plant list was not the one recommended by the DRB.

Boardmember Hook wanted to see the DRB-recommended plant list and requested that some of those species be incorporated into the plan. She supported some of the plants on the applicant's current list and suggested the slope offered the opportunity to use more of the native plants and oak trees to stabilize the slope. With respect to the setbacks, particularly on the north edge of the property, she asked if the setback would be adequate and suggested it might be another area where water could be captured, potentially with a vegetated swale. She also recommended that the applicant provide the calculations for the drainage to ensure appropriate storm drain capacity.

Mr. Kim stated with respect to the setback that there would be 13 feet where 10 feet was required, which would leave plenty of space for vehicular movement. He added that he would work with the engineers to verify the appropriateness of the drainage plan.

Boardmember Hook also recommended planting to soften the edge on the north side and for on-site water retention. She suggested a five-foot planting area, if possible, along that north edge.

In response to Vice Chair Carter as to why the proposed architecture, which would be different in style from adjoining homes had been selected, Mr. Kim stated that he had admired single-story ranch style homes over the years that he had seen in Lafayette and Orinda. He suggested the proposed design offered a more upscale look because of the prevalent design in those areas, and he had worked with his wife who was a designer to create the design and color scheme that he had admired over the years.

Vice Chair Carter referred to the relationship of the driveway to the rear of the home and suggested that the applicant consider decks at the rear since that would break up the massing of the home, and Mr. Kim stated that they had been considering the same thing although that might have to be included in another phase to the project.

Vice Chair Carter verified that no window trim had been proposed. He recommended that window trim be considered as a more traditional way of dealing with windows, which would be important from a weather and constructability standpoint, and Mr. Kim accepted the recommendation for window trim.

Vice Chair Carter also verified that the fence between neighbors (5751 Skyview Place) was owned by the neighbor who also supported vines on the fence along with plants and trees to buffer the two properties. He suggested that the driveway be sloped slightly to allow the creation of a planted bioswale, and if eliminating the six-inch curb on the north side and planting the three-foot strip it would be possible to absorb some of the drainage. He also commented that the lighter the roof the better for energy savings.

Mr. Kim stated the roof would be much lighter than depicted in the photo.

Boardmember Leung referred to the edge between the subject property at 5741 and 5745 Skyview Place and suggested that keeping the chain link fence would allow views into 5741. As a result, she recommended that small shrubs or plants be planted in front of the fence towards

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

the subject property along the entire section of the fence, and Mr. Kim again described the vines that had been proposed and clarified that given the trees, there was complete privacy between 5759 Skyview Place and his property.

Boardmember Leung questioned whether fire apparatus would be able to access the property given the narrow 10-foot drive aisle, and Mr. Kim clarified that the fire truck would only come to the end of the current paver slightly toward the curve and there would be no issues with access. Boardmember Leung referred to the upper level windows on the north elevation in different shapes and sizes and recommended they be standardized. She also referred to the grading differential on the site and encouraged the applicant to have a structural engineer figure out the footing and foundation needs to make certain that the building would be structurally sound.

Boardmember Butt stated that everything had been reoriented and the current orientation was working much better than the previous iteration. She asked about the three different types of surface treatments for the driveway; pavers, base rock, and concrete.

Mr. Kim explained that there would be two surface treatments; pavers and concrete, which would allow his children an area to play on a flat surface. Pavers would now extend to replace base rock. When asked if he would extend the pavers to the area proposed to be concrete, he agreed to do so.

Boardmember Butt emphasized the need for window trim and supported a planting strip between the proposed home and the neighbors to create a buffer zone.

Chair Livingston suggested that Boardmember Hook help merge the landscape plan. With respect to the south elevation, he characterized it as a harsh unarticulated flat plain that faced south with no relief from the sun, and he suggested there was an opportunity for a deck and for the roof overhang to be increased on the south side to provide shade and to break up the mass. He noted that some of the plans showed an overhang and some didn't. He supported overhangs and requested eave details prior to the next meeting. He also supported window trim.

Chair Livingston asked Mr. Kim to check with his civil engineer to calculate the water flow to the street to verify that the water flow would not overtax the system. He stated that factoring in the permeable pavers and bioswales there would be less runoff. He also suggested Mr. Kim verify whether or not the V-ditch at the bottom of the hill could be used for drainage, to be clarified prior to the next meeting.

Boardmember Hook recommended that the civil engineer verify the drainage plans, especially with respect to the stormwater collection in the cul-de-sac area, prior to discussing the landscape plan.

Chair Livingston noted that the location of the front door was not easily recognized. He also noted that the gable windows were fakes and might need to be turned into vents and there should be a consistent fenestration for the vents, although Mr. Kim explained that the pitched roof was open and the windows were intended to bring more light into that attic space.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Butt) to continue PLN18-304, Kim Single-Family Dwelling, to the next available meeting; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Hook, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Fine).

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 2. PLN19-049 | HACIENDA SENIOR APARTMENTS |
| Description | RECEIVE A PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT OF ON-SITE |

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

	PUBLIC ART TO THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD.	
Location	1300 ROOSEVELT AVENUE	
APN	534-370-028	
Zoning	CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, ACTIVITY CENTER	
Owner	RICHMOND HOUSING AUTHORITY	
Applicant	MERCY HOUSING CALIFORNIA	
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO	Recommendation: NA

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated March 24, 2021 for a presentation of the on-site public art for the Hacienda Heights Senior Apartments. She stated the DRB had approved a Design Review Permit on March 13, 2019 and one of the conditions of approval required the submittal of on-site public art. Since that time, the applicant had narrowed the artist candidates to five different applicants who had submitted video proposals. One of the conditions was also about the exterior paint. The paint strategy had been revised to offer a stronger base and with the addition of exterior structural braces that would help to modulate the exterior elevations. Part of the public art was also the fence facing Marina Way South.

MICHAEL KAPLAN, Mercy Housing California, stated the public art selection process had produced a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to Bay Area artists when interest had been received from 22 artists. A selection committee of Richmond residents, arts professionals and members of the development team had narrowed the list down to six artists, four of whom were from Richmond. Five proposals had been received and had been presented to the Iron Triangle Neighborhood Council last week when all five had been well received. Community surveys had been pursued and feedback from the DRB was requested. He stated the proposals would be submitted again to the Public Art Commission on April 13, 2021.

Ms. Feliciano played the five video proposals for the Hacienda Heights Senior Apartments from Lost Ones, Taraneh Hemami, Ron Holthuysen, Manwell Gali, and Eric Powell. She reported that the survey was due by March 19, 2021.

Boardmember Butt expressed her appreciation for all the thought that had gone into all the videos and the meaning behind them, commented that none had stuck out as being the right fit, but she liked the themes although some themes she liked more than the outcomes.

Vice Chair Carter liked some things about each proposal but commented that none had jumped out as being the perfect fit. His first choice was the Lost Ones, which was the most powerful because of the story behind it with the connection to land and how that fit into shelter and community and how the tall wall blended itself into a totem-type motif, as well as the way that theme had been tied in with what had been proposed for the fence. His second choice was from Eric Powell who had tied the design of the fence with the theme on the wall, and while it was hard to decipher the meaning he was trying to evoke with the primitive symbols that existed across cultures, he wondered whether that would translate as strongly as desired. He suggested it took time to engage with that proposal and would be difficult for the average passerby. His third choice was from Taraneh Hemami, which was a beautiful offering but that proposal along with his fourth choice from Ron Holthuysen who used the triangle as the generative shape was difficult to access on a pedestrian level. He liked that Mr. Holthuysen's proposal brought the light passing through the free-form panels and projected color on the surface but the composition and shapes were too scattered. He stated the Lost Ones was the most cohesive and accessible of the iterations.

Chair Livingston referred to former Vice Chair Hannah's analysis of an art component for the project, who had wanted the colors and patterns of the building to help break down the mass of

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

the building, make it fit into the scale of the community, and tie into the cultural diversity of the area. He commented that if an instruction manual was needed to understand what the art had to say about the city and the community, it did not work.

Boardmember Hook verified that the façade where the art would be placed fronted Barrett Avenue which had heavy traffic. With respect to design, she asked about the next step in the community engagement and how the art would be selected.

Mr. Kaplan clarified that the videos had been presented to the Iron Triangle Neighborhood Council which had provided feedback at the meeting and through the survey. The proposals would also be presented to the Public Art Commission on April 13 when feedback was expected verbally, through the survey, and from the community. The desire was to get as many comments, feedback and input from residents as possible, after which the comments would be taken to the selection community made up of community members from the Iron Triangle, and the selection committee would then make the decision.

Boardmember Hook suggested the concepts were all strong with the materials proposed and some of the art pieces brought cohesion around the whole building, although some of the designs did not appear to be fully developed. Once the design had been determined by the community, she stated it would come down to materiality and maintenance costs. She also noted that community garden space could be an added element to the next phase.

Boardmember Leung rated the proposals in order from Taraneh Hemami with the braids which incorporated affordable housing and different cultures, background and neighborhoods contrasting with the Iron Triangle neighborhood; Eric Powell because the materiality added dimension and depth on top of the building and would also be durable and add interesting symbolism, although she thought the railing was a bit much; then the Lost Ones which referred to the neighborhood and the history and was okay in terms of the railings and the treatment but was more contextual and not as inclusive of all cultures; Ron Holthuysen was interesting, dimensional and playful with two facades and was a very overt way of doing art; and Manwell Gali's treatment was interesting but in her opinion was out of scale and out of context.

Boardmember Butt asked how developed the proposals were, and Mr. Kaplan stated that the proposals were early concepts and while he expected the general theme would stand he stated there would be an opportunity to work with the artists and make adjustments based on the feedback from the community.

Boardmember Butt noted that all of the proposals were shown in a gray or muted tone and she verified that there would be a color scheme in that one of the goals for the art was to provide color. She stated the Lost Ones was a beautiful piece but it was muted without color. She was surprised that none of the proposals were straight-forward murals. She appreciated Taraneh Hamami's proposal and liked the story and the idea of the woven braids but did not understand how it would be applied. She wanted to see color that would enliven the space and enliven the building. She characterized Manwell Gali's proposal as bold but potentially too intense for the residents.

Mr. Kaplan clarified that when the proposal had been put out for artists they wanted to keep it open to the artists and their strengths with the desire to come up with something that had depth and durability in materials, such as something that could be done with a 3D printer in depth with a 3D component to the art pieces. There was no desire to prescribe what the artists were to come up with and some of the proposals had proposed metalworks, Fiberglass panels, Fiberglass

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON APRIL 14, 2021

translucent materials, and a range of different long-lasting material that would expand off the flatness of the building.

On the question of whether a straight-forward mural would be allowed and when told that had not been included in the RFQ, Vice Chair Carter clarified with Mr. Kaplan that the individual components of the mural could be laser cut or something out of a large piece of acrylic or cement board or Fiberglas layers on top of each other to create a graphic along with some dimensionality.

Vice Chair Carter suggested it would be cheaper to just use the building surface and paint a mural and take that cost savings and plug it into the materials of the fence or add another junior mural at the entry lobby. He recognized that was outside the bounds of the RFQ but might be something to consider.

Boardmember Leung noted that while a direct mural would be more cost effective, she understood the artists would be able to preserve their integrity based on the parameters of the RFQ and the proposal would look like a mural from afar by offering something more durable with a 3D relief. She recommended that the artists be able to preserve how they had approached their own individual art pieces.

Chair Livingston liked the Lost Ones because it captured the essence of the dynamic cultural arrival experience the DRB had originally hoped to get given the bland, big, concrete wall that housed people. He referred to the prior hearings and stated the DRB had attempted to weave some cultural identity of the area into the architecture to make it a place with the desire to capture the beauty of Richmond on the face. He liked the Lost Ones proposal since that was the only proposal that captured that essence, although the Eric Powell proposal had also tried to capture what the DRB had envisioned with his metalworks. He stated the art requirement was a great opportunity to help link the community together and he commented it was unfortunate that the DRB had been taken out of the process.

Boardmember Butt concurred that the Lost Ones proposal was what the DRB had been looking for in terms of size and boldness, and it fit on the wall. She appreciated the graphic and the scale but emphasized the need for color.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston acknowledged the retreat scheduled for April 23, 2021 from 1:00 to 4:00 P.M., a joint session with the Planning Commission to discuss the roles of the Planning Commission and the Design Review Board, Rules of Order, the Brown Act, a housing legislation update and other topics. Whether or not anyone else, such as the DRB's City Council Liaison, should be invited to the retreat was to be discussed. It was recommended that outside counsel be involved to talk about process.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8.45 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, April 14, 2021.