

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

August 10, 2022
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
Marcus Christeson
Macy Leung

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Jonathan Livingston called the regular meeting to order at 6:07 P.M.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Boardmembers Kimberly Butt and Marcus Christeson

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano and Jonelyn Whales, and Stephanie Vollmer from the City Attorney's Office

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 27, 2022

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2022 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Carter, Hook, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Christeson.)

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MEETING PROCEDURES

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

PUBLIC FORUM

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

The following comment was offered by email:

CORDELL HINDLER: "Good evening Chair Livingston, Boardmembers and Staff. I will remind the Board that any projects being considered, the applicant MUST communicate with the applicable Neighborhood Council to receive feedback. Sincerely, Cordell."

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE

The appeal date for actions taken by the Board at this meeting will be no later than 5:00 P.M. on Monday, August 22, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. PLN22-194	TARGET STORE EXPANSION
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±8,100 SQUARE-FOOT ADDITION FOR STORAGE AND EMPLOYEE SERVICE AREAS, AND TO CREATE A DRIVE-UP SERVICE AREA. THE PROJECT WOULD INVOLVE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING GARDEN CENTER.
Location	4500 MACDONALD AVENUE
APN	517-280-015-2
Zoning	CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, COMMERCIAL EMPHASIS
Owner	BOULDER BRIDGE III DEV CORP
Applicant	JOHN DIETRICH, TARGET STORES
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated August 10, 2022, for the Target Store in the Macdonald 80 Shopping Center and the applicant's proposal to expand the storage and employee area of the store by demolishing the existing 12,000 square foot garden center and relocating the customer pick-up area to the west side of the building. An 8,100 square-foot addition would replace the garden center, to be used entirely for indoor storage. Other tenant improvements included infilling the windows and adding an employee door for ingress and egress to the customer service area. Solar beacons and signposts had been proposed to provide uniformity throughout the space and 24 parking stalls would be restriped and designated as a customer pick-up area.

The expansion would complement the existing architecture of the store and Target intended to provide a seamless transition from the existing façade and front elevation to the proposed addition. Target's branding color scheme for its retail stores would be reflected in the new signage, materials and colors. The exterior of the building would remain primarily a cement masonry unit composed of varying panels and the walls would be painted a tan color to match the existing building. The new wood panels and trim would be painted in complementary colors to match the current Target building colors. The roofing material would remain the same color. Additional landscaping would be added to the northern elevation along Macdonald Avenue and architectural panels would be added to the exterior of the building. The existing landscaping and proposed trees would provide a mature landscaped area along Macdonald Avenue.

Staff had requested that the bioswale be spruced up with vegetation plantings to provide a well-defined and mature landscaped area along Macdonald Avenue. The applicant revised the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

landscape plan to improve the building's exterior along the northern elevation. The proposed project complemented and complied with all the development standards of the zoning district. Ms. Whales responded to comments and explained that there would be no requirement for public art in the application given that the size of the building was actually being reduced and the requirement for public art had not been triggered. She noted that the existing spherical bollards on the front façade would be repainted red to match the color scheme of the exterior building walls. As to a lighting plan, the existing lighting would be retained although the applicant would have to respond to details of that plan with respect to the addition.

JENNIFER KIRBY, Kimley-Horn and Associates, was available to respond to questions, as was JOHN DIETRICH representing Target Stores.

MICHAEL KOUVARIS, Project Architect, presented the proposed remodel of the Target store intended to improve the customer experience and to provide better, newer and cleaner finishes throughout the store. The vacant garden center would be removed and rebuilt in place to reutilize that area of the property. The remodel would respond to the change in shopping habits in recent years. There would be drive-up stalls on the property for customer pickup with or without the need to get out of the car, and to help with those efficiencies Target would change the internal layout to create storage space at the front of the store. For safety, the drive-up stalls would be moved more to the front. There would be some Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) stall revisions as well with a landscape component in the front with bio-retention. All existing trees would remain in place with additional shrubs. Faux wood material would be placed on the addition and wrapped onto the existing building and be tied in uniformly. As part of the expansion, the Macdonald Avenue façade and the northwest corner of the building would be refreshed consistent with the remodel of the store that had been completed in 2020. While the footprint of the building would be decreased, the interior square footage would be increased by 8,100 square feet versus the open air garden center.

Ms. Kirby responded to Chair Livingston's question related to the area of the bioswale at the street where there were existing underground storage tanks. A new survey had identified underground piping from the original design that would be retained to avoid changing the existing drainage system.

Boardmember Hook verified with the project team that the planting for the bio-retention area would be native grasses and mostly juncus, carex, sedges, and rushes, and those plantings would be in line with local stormwater treatment regulations. She proposed the addition of several plantings that did well in Richmond, and when asked by the Chair stated she would summarize her recommendations in writing and present that summary to the Chair.

One of the applicant's representatives stated they were balancing how to pick bullet proof plants for something that also jived with the redwoods, and would go more native if they had the opportunity and find something that was longer lived, a better performer that also had some nice blooming interest.

Vice Chair Carter asked about the vertical fins and Mr. Kouvaris stated the exterior walls of the addition would be CMU, metal studs covered with an EIFS or stucco, a feature on the exterior to offer some verticality in the cluster of trees to enhance the front of the store. The Vice Chair also asked for a sample of the Nichiha cement board product to be used on the façade.

As to the glazing, Mr. Kouvaris stated there had been an issue with some existing displays and most would be addressed with the elimination of the garden center. One would remain visible at the front corner of the front façade and would be covered with faux wood since it had been

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

problematic to maintain.

Vice Chair Carter sought ways to soften that corner and reduce it to a pedestrian scale and Mr. Kouvaris explained that area would be storage and typically those fixtures would be pretty tall. With all the trees in front it would be less obvious from the road and if there was a concern some other treatment could be considered.

Vice Chair Carter suggested the potential of adding some horizontal fake sunshades or something to break up the volume or potentially to add landscaping or a component to reinforce the corner, which was the most prominent feature of the building. He recommended the integration of the site with the corner of the property and recommended more landscaping for that area of the project

Ms. Kirby explained that there was an existing pavement pattern at that location along the driveway, from an aerial view in the shape of the Target bull's eye, that bled out into the existing plaza area with two small seat walls on either side of the driveway entering in, and there was no intent to eliminate any of those features in the final condition. She added that they also relied heavily on and would maintain the existing landscaping.

Chair Livingston asked about the lighting plan and location and Ms. Kirby stated the site lighting had not been proposed to be changed and would remain as is, and Mr. stated with respect to the addition that lights would typically be placed over the doors of the building for employee security. Chair Livingston supported appropriate security lighting.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Ms. Feliciano identified the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

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

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Carter stated the proposed design was crisp, clean and well considered which would address his concern for the scale of the building on the north side.

Boardmember Leong liked the submittal as is, supported the comments related to more lighting if possible, and Boardmember Hook also supported the proposal and supported more landscaping if possible.

Ms. Kirby advised that some additional scones could be added along the building façade to provide more illumination along the Macdonald Avenue side of the building.

Chair Livingston emphasized that lighting no brighter than 3,000 K would be allowed and the light bulb itself must be shielded. He verified the DRB's acceptance of the Nichiha product that Ms. Kirby pointed out was a material that Target had used nationwide, which looked good, and which was a good performer across different weather patterns.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to approve PLN22-194, Target Store Expansion subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with nine Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 10) The landscaping in the bioswale to substitute lantana (a non-native) for Santa Barbara daisy (erigeron karvinskianus) or loembrasia or

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

diverintium bellium and add ferns (polystichum) and efferlactis; and 11) Add lighting on the north side of the building, shielded, no greater than 3,000 K and no higher than 12 feet; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Christeson.)

2. PLN22-020	INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 14,000 SQUARE-FOOT WAREHOUSE IN THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY BEHIND THE EXISTING 42,000 SQUARE-FOOT INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE.
Location	1200 HENSLEY STREET
APN	561-280-012
Zoning	IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Owner	MCLAUGHLIN CHARLES T TRE.
Applicant	ANTHONY TABACCO
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated August 10, 2022, for the request to construct a 14,000 square-foot warehouse at 1200 Hensley Street to be constructed behind an existing building at 1208 Hensley Street, both owned by Fox Marble to be able to expand storage capacity. A metal building 28 feet tall had been proposed and included corrugated metal siding as the exterior material. Two roll-up doors characterized the primary building façade on the west elevation. Adjacent to the roll-up doors would be an entry door for ingress and egress to the storage area of the structure. The applicant proposed translucent panels on the roof to bring natural light into the warehouse during the working hours of the day.

Ms. Whales reported that the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC) required general landscaping for buildings within an IL District to occupy a minimum of 10 percent of the area. The applicant had proposed a plant palette that combined deciduous and native plants and the area consisted of the on-site bio-retention basin adjacent to the proposed new building and the renovation of the street frontage landscaping to achieve the desired landscaping. While the site was currently non-conforming with respect to that requirement, the existing landscaping in front of the site was approximately 3,000 square feet and the requirement of 10 percent of the lot area to be developed in the rear of the site at 26,000 square feet had been exceeded given that the applicant had proposed 3,600 square feet of landscaping in the rear of the site.

A 30-foot separation had been proposed between the existing structure and the new material handling building. Bio-retention planters had also been proposed throughout the site to comply with the Contra Costa County Clean Water Program stormwater requirements. The proposed project complied with all development standards of the IL District including setbacks, parking, building height, and floor area ratio (FAR).

Ms. Whales stated the proposed project would provide the needed storage for the applicant's raw materials currently being stored outside.

ANTHONY TABACCO, the applicant, identified the straight forward project for industrial storage to store stone products currently stored outdoors. He clarified that the 30-foot separation was a substandard shed with no foundation, which would be demolished as part of the project.

Mr. Tabacco added that the owner had chosen to landscape the entire street frontage of both 1200 and 1208 Hensley Street. He explained that Sheet A9.0 had been added to the plans to identify the proposed lighting. The new building would be a simple metal building with minimal adornment, the lighting was only into the yard facing west and south and did not impact

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

adjacent parcels, and the site was surrounded by an opaque primarily CMU fence.

MARSHA VALLIER, Vallier Design Associates, Landscape Architect, identified the bio-retention basin behind the structure where all the drainage would go.

Ms. Vallier explained that the total project area was 25,778 square feet, which would require 2,578 square feet of landscaping to comply with the 10 percent landscape requirement, although almost 5,000 square feet would be provided given the landscaping to be added along the frontage. A dryland grass had been proposed around the bio-retention in the back which would be watered by fall, winter and spring rains. In the bio-retention basin itself carex, California fuschia, juncus, westringla and cercis occidentalis would be provided, and within the basin bromus carinatus, wildrye fescue and clover would be added to get it established.

Along the frontage, Ms. Vallier stated the fence would be replaced with a metal fence to match the existing gate that would remain open during the day and be closed at night. She explained they had to be creative as to where to place the plantings given the number of utilities in that area. The existing landscaping behind the frontage landscaping was ground cover and would remain, although the trees would be replaced with tall columnar maple trees to snake through the overhead lines and bring down the scale along the frontage. Three accent plants Dietes bicolor, Arctostapylos, and Westringla would be added.

Boardmember Hook verified that the metal fence would be black to match the existing gate. She was glad to see the use of the Iceberg Rose.

DRB members supported the landscape plan given the constraints of the site.

Chair Livingston referred to the lighting fixtures and specifically to the TWX2 LED luminaire as illustrated on Sheet A9.0, which did not appear to be a shielded light and which would have to be substituted for one that was shielded with the light directed downward, the City's lighting standard. Recognizing that the lights were for security, he recommended that the lights be dropped to 12 feet off of the ground.

With respect to the corrugated panels proposed in Polar White, Chair Livingston recommended that a different color be selected to reduce the reflectivity of the material. He recommended a gray or tan color.

Mr. Tabacco expressed a preference for the use of the Polar White but would comply with the DRB's direction.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Ms. Feliciano identified the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

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

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

With respect to color, Boardmember Leung supported some variance in terms of shade but understood the proposed color matched existing properties and she could support the applicant's preference for Polar White.

Vice Chair Carter could also support a tan or other color but had no strong feelings with respect

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

to the building color.

Boardmember Hook commented that if the proposed color matched it would be acceptable.

Mr. Tabacco pointed out that the building was an open un-conditioned building and the heat gain with Polar White would make working conditions nicer.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Hook) to approve PLN22-020, Industrial Warehouse subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with nine Conditions of Approval and an additional DRB condition as follows: 10) Exterior light fixtures to be dropped to 12 feet with the light source to be shielded; approved by a Roll Call vote: 4-0 (Ayes: Carter, Hook, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: Butt and Christeson.)

3. PLN12-248	LIVABLE CORRIDORS FORM-BASED CODE
Description	(CONTINUED FROM JULY 27, 2022) STUDY SESSION TO REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS IMPLEMENTING THE RICHMOND LIVABLE CORRIDORS FORM-BASED CODE (FBC), INCLUDING ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS (AVAILABLE AT WWW.CI.RICHMOND.CA.US/2965/RLC-FBC).
Location	VARIOUS
APN	VARIOUS
Zoning	VARIOUS
Owner	VARIOUS
Applicant	CITY OF RICHMOND
Staff Contact	ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS

Roberta Feliciano presented the staff report dated August 10, 2022, for the Livable Corridors Form-Based Code (FBC) and reported that in 2020 the City had received an SB2 Planning Grant from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to update and integrate the FBC into the Zoning Ordinance. She identified the significant outreach from 2012 through 2016 where the City had gathered input. In 2016, the City had gone through a Comprehensive Zoning Update and the City Council had directed staff to integrate the FBC into that update. She displayed a Transect Zoning Map of the transect zones running through Macdonald Avenue, Barrett Avenue, 23rd Street and San Pablo Avenue and reported that this meeting was a study session to provide comments on the zoning text and map amendments to implement the Richmond Livable Corridors FBC and architectural standards, and to codify the FBC into the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Feliciano added that there had been several new state laws that required the City to have objective standards, which was one of the requirements that the FBC helped to address. There had been four meetings on this item with the DRB starting with a study session in December 2021, a special meeting in March 2022, a study session with the Planning Commission in January 2022, and a working session with the Planning Commission in March 2022. The staff report had outlined comments from the DRB and Planning Commission followed by staff responses.

Ms. Feliciano reported that an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance must be considered by the City Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission, and while a recommendation was not required from the DRB, staff had considered the importance of the review and comment from the DRB given that the FBC included architectural standards.

Ms. Feliciano responded to questions and described some of the substantial changes to the FBC. She noted that the Contemporary style had been moved to the beginning of the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

Architectural Guidelines since that was more likely what developers would use. She explained that the primary feedback was to include other uses besides retail on the ground floor and consider allowing residential and propose what a residential ground floor frontage might look like within an urban edge. She noted there were some zones where residential uses were allowed but during the working session it had been clear that it was not the desire of DRB members and Planning Commissioners that residential be allowed on the ground floor, but could be allowed behind an office, retail or other commercial use.

In addition, standards had been added to civic open space, some of the images had been changed, and a loft frontage type had been added that would allow residential on the ground floor along with different frontage types.

Vice Chair Carter noted that frontage parameters were some of the more important components of the FBC.

Ms. Feliciano identified the frontage types, reiterated that the loft had been added and there were a porch projecting frontage type (more residential) and shop front would likely be the most common in a mixed-use downtown setting. There were standards related to distance between glazing, transparency, awnings, and other miscellaneous factors; and she noted that industrial shopfront could potentially be common. The gallery type frontage would not be as common. There was also a frontage with terraces, and the loft frontage type that could allow or not allow residential on the ground floor. She offered potential examples of each type.

Boardmember Leung verified with Ms. Feliciano that the FBC would be presented to the Planning Commission on August 18, 2022, which would make a recommendation to the City Council. Since the City Council would be on recess in August, the first reading was expected in September 2022 with the adoption of the FBC in October 2022.

Boardmember Leung thanked staff for all the work with respect to the FBC and for considering the DRB's comments.

Boardmember Hook asked how landscape requirements would be implemented in the FBC, and Ms. Feliciano stated the Zoning Ordinance had a landscape component which would be applied to the FBC with respect to requirements such as 10 percent landscaping on site and one tree for every five parking spaces.

Ms. Feliciano explained how the RMC would be accessed to identify other requirements such as water-efficient landscaping, buffering types of landscaping, turf allowances, required on-site trees depending on the zone, street trees, and the like, all of which would still apply. She added that the landscape designer would need to specify proposed species and sizes.

Chair Livingston noted a potential for two competing design guidelines and asked where in the FBC it stated that the RMC also applied.

Ms. Feliciano explained that the transect zones only had architectural standards and the landscaping would still be part of the RMC. The FBC would be added as a chapter of the RMC and was not a separate document. She further clarified that the FBC would only apply to frontage types and building type. Everything else was in the RMC.

Ms. Feliciano added in response to the Chair with respect to integrating residential entry in a T5 or T4 area that while it had been considered during the working session, the members of the Planning Commission and the DRB had indicated no desire for residential on the ground floor and preferred any other type of active use to activate the street.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

Chair Livingston disagreed and noted the difficulties of renting retail space on the ground floor. He questioned whether a developer would even look at a piece of property if residential could not be considered. He stated there were no design standards to accommodate the new use and suggested it was antithetical not to even entertain residential. He suggested that the FBC should include residential even if it there was no interest in having it applied. He wanted to design something that fit the market.

Ms. Feliciano explained that concern had been addressed with the addition of the loft frontage type where residential could be allowed on the ground floor, with the caveat that on the ground floor there would be a home office or some type of owner-occupied active use.

Chair Livingston referred to a diagram he had prepared as an example for a city block within the T50 area, which was the same as a CM-5 and high-density area, and which offered the potential for whether entries could be developed off of secondary streets just off the main street to develop a building prototype that would be flexible enough in the FBC that it would allow shop space on the corners where restaurants or shops would normally go. Given current e-commerce, he questioned whether builders would build shopfronts on all those corners and he questioned the effectiveness of the FBC. He suggested the FBC lacked the diversity to accommodate the new paradigm and the FBC would not provide what was needed for developers. He otherwise liked the rest of the FBC but suggested that Opticos Design Group, the consultant that had prepared the FBC, address the issue of residential on the ground floor on activity corners.

Ms. Feliciano suggested it was not too late to address that issue and she asked what parameters would be involved.

On the discussion of residential on the ground floor, Boardmember Leung agreed with the need for flexibility in uses given the State of California's adoption of regulatory overlay of any type of property or development of existing uses needed to be overwritten to new uses. She stated there needed to be some flexibility in the event that the uses in the FBC needed to be overwritten. She liked the flexibility in terms of corner retail and referred to staff comments as to how to make the ground floor separate from the upper floor, although she sought clarification as to how that would work. She suggested there could be residential on the ground floor.

Boardmember Hook agreed, particularly given the situation with respect to the housing shortage and asked how residential could be implemented.

Vice Chair Carter had no prohibition about ground floor residential and suggested it would have to do with the proportions of glazing and materials in a multi-story building to make it similar to the typically commercial space used as a base. He wondered whether parking would end up taking up a significant amount of the ground floor anyway and asked if there were provisions in the FBC as to how to handle parking garages, for instance. He agreed that Opticos could figure out those issues.

Ms. Feliciano stated the FBC would not allow parking in front of the lots unless there was an application under state law where parking waivers might be possible.

Vice Chair Carter stated that ground floor residential should not be prohibited and a typology should be included in the FBC to offer guidance in that respect.

Chair Livingston referred to conflicting staff responses to Commission/DRB comments in the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

staff report related to residential use on the ground floor, and Ms. Feliciano clarified that residential would be allowed on the ground floor behind some other use, which the loft type of frontage would bridge where a portion of the house would have more of an active use and still have a frontage that did not look residential.

Vice Chair Carter suggested the loft option would be good to include in the mix of different types and asked if there was a way to require someone who owned or rented to have a business license.

Vice Chair Carter supported something more flexible to allow residential but if there was a desire for those who had a business they should be encouraged to populate the site.

Ms. Feliciano stated a business license would be a tax collection issue and so far there were no uses tied to the requirement for a business license. She added that the live/work use was allowed in all the zones. She identified the transect zones within the FBC compared to the live/work zones, described where an administrative use permit would be required and where specific uses would be permitted, and pointed out where specific uses would be allowed on the ground floor in the T4N and T5N zones by right. She added that most single-family residential was allowed except in T4MS or T5MS, which was detached single family. In multifamily it would be allowed with a footnote for that use classification that uses on upper floors or behind an allowed ground floor use could be live/work. She characterized that as almost residential, and stated there was no limitation on the size of a residence other than through Building Code regulations.

Chair Livingston suggested that the depth of the use on the ground floor would limit residential development.

Ms. Feliciano stated that T5C was the highest density. A building type would have to be selected, one of which could be a courtyard type and she offered an illustrative example of what the courtyard style building could be. She clarified how that would work and clarified that a building type was different from a use.

Chair Livingston continued to express concern for challenges to residential development types on the ground floor.

Vice Chair Carter recommended keeping as many options available as possible for providing residential uses. He suggested that could be done tastefully and appropriately on the ground floor and suggested that Opticos could produce a frontage type to provide those options.

Ms. Feliciano asked if the DRB would support an all residential development in the downtown or in one of the activity centers.

Chair Livingston stated the residential component was too restrictive as presented. He supported all residential in the downtown as long as there were design guidelines to allow developers the tools to build housing for everyone and to encourage shopfronts. He reiterated that the guidelines were currently too restrictive.

Boardmember Leung concurred and she too supported an all residential option as long as there were design guidelines to make sure that it would be consistent with the facades and the streetscape. She asked if an all residential condition was approved in the downtown whether that could preclude the use of downtown retail.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2022

Ms. Feliciano clarified there was a possibility that allowing an all residential option could result in a project that would not include commercial/retail negating the desire to activate streets. She pointed out where the mixed-use and live/work areas were located and emphasized that residential on the ground floor would have to be allowed by zone in that spot zoning was not allowed.

Boardmember Leung stated with that in mind, she supported just having the downtown portion be commercial/retail.

Boardmember Hook concurred and understood the situation that an all residential designation could produce.

Chair Livingston supported the opportunity to allow developers to help Richmond grow which he suggested could not be done with retail.

Boardmember Leung commented that residential integrated with retail/commercial would be great and provide ease of access to mixed-use while concentrating retail and commercial could activate a site and residential could allow people to live around the area. Bringing residential into the downtown with mixed-use development would offer convenience but for a select few. Market and retail trends were cyclical and it was beneficial for a city to have diverse revenue sources and income streams from various uses, not just from residential. All residential could be problematic and if allowed should be high-density residential and not single-family units.

Vice Chair Carter supported flexibility and suggested the loft idea would be a good way to encourage a higher floor plate that might be more conducive to future commercial, gyms or grocery stores and give back to the live/work which should be live, or work, or both.

Ms. Feliciano suggested that residential could be allowed on the ground floor and in the T5C zone where only 50 percent of the buildings could be residential frontages to allow a building mix, similar to the proposal offered by Chair Livingston. She would ask Opticos to add that into the FBC only for the T5C area, which was the highest density, where the developer would have the option to have 50 percent residential on the ground floor. The DRB concurred.

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:** None
- B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements**

Chair Livingston referred to a couple of projects that had not gone well after DRB review. He emphasized the need to write clear conditions. He suggested that the minutes should be more carefully reviewed to ensure appropriate conditions of approval for appropriate implementation.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, August 24, 2022.