

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
March 24, 2010
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Michael Woldemar, Chair	Elieen Whitty, Vice Chair
Diane Bloom	Andrew Butt
Otheree Christian	Raymond Welter
Don Woodrow	

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Woldemar, Vice Chair Whitty, Boardmembers Bloom, Christian and Woodrow

Absent: Boardmembers Butt and Welter

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales and Mary Renfro

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

He referred to the meeting procedural sheet for speakers and noted any decision approved tonight may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or Monday, April 5, 2010 by 5:00 p.m.

PUBLIC FORUM – BROWN ACT - None

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Woldemar recommended Item 1, which is recommended for Hold Over to April 28, 2010 be added to the Consent Calendar. Vice Chair Whitty asked that Items 2 and 3 be removed from the Consent Calendar.

Ms. Renfro requested amending the recommendation wording on Item 6; rather than Hold Over to a date uncertain, it should read, "Removed from Agenda" because it has not yet been scheduled. "The item will be re-noticed when it is next agendized."

Chair Woldemar said the Consent Calendar consisted of Items 1, 2, 5 and 6. Boardmember Woodrow requested removal of Item 3 and Item 1 was moved to the Consent Calendar.

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woodrow) to approve the Consent Calendar Items 1, 2, 5 and 6; unanimously approved.

Items Approved:

- 1. PLN09-125 RICHMOND PLUNGE PUBLIC ART ON E. RICHMOND AVENUE**
Description **(Held Over from 2/24/2010)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO INSTALL PUBLIC ART FOR THE RICHMOND MUNICIPAL NATATORIUM, A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE IN THE POINT RICHMOND NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT.
Location 1 E RICHMOND AVE
APN 556-170-002
Zoning PC (Public and Civic Uses)
Owner CITY RICHMOND
Applicant TODD JERSEY ARCHITECTURE
Staff Contact HECTOR ROJAS Recommendation: **Hold Over to 4/28/2010**
- 2. PLN10-012 HASAN FACADE IMPROVEMENT ON MACDONALD AVENUE**
Description **(Held Over from 2/24/2010)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL OF A FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT TO AN EXISTING BUILDING LOCATED ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.
Location 2229 MACDONALD AVE
APN 514-090-007
Zoning C-2 (General Commercial)
Owner HASAN DONALD H
Applicant WILLIAM PODESTO
Staff Contact HECTOR ROJAS Recommendation: **Conditional Approval**
- 5. PLN10-031 HOROWITZ SECOND-STORY RESIDENTIAL ADDITION ON VAN FLEET AVE**
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±102 SQUARE FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.
Location 5521 VAN FLEET AVENUE
APN 510-104-013
Zoning SFR-3 (Single-Family Low Density Residential)
Owner HOROWITZ DANIEL A
Applicant MATT KENNEDY
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **Conditional Approval**
- 6. PLN08-084 KAISER PARKING LOT**
Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FOR PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO A ±77,000 SQUARE FOOT TEMPORARY SURFACE PARKING LOT.
Location 727 MACDONALD AVE
APN 538-142-016
Zoning C-B (Central Business)
Specific Plan: CITY CENTER
Owner KAISER FOUNDATION HOSPITALS
Applicant ANITA WILLIAMS
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **Removed From Agenda**

Item Removed from Consent Calendar and/or Heard:

- 3. PLN09-132 VILLANUEVA WAREHOUSE ON S. 1ST STREET & MAINE AVENUE**
Description **(Held Over from 3/10/2010)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±1,750 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE.
Location S 1ST ST & MAINE AVE
APN 550-081-008
Zoning M-2 (Light Industrial)
Owner VILLANUEVA JOSE A & MARIA
Applicant BRENDA MUNOZ
Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER
Recommendation: **Conditional Approval**

Ms. Whales stated the project came before the DRB on January 27, 2010 at which time there were several requests made of the applicant relating to architectural features to the warehouse. These requests consist of relocation of the bathrooms, removal of the fence on the east and south elevation, installation of lighting to the front and side elevation, increase window sizes and placement of aluminum siding on the upper half of the structure. In addition, the Board suggested the applicant remove some of the parking spaces on the east side of the lot, provide awning details, show the placement of the building address on the front of the building, and install ADA curb cuts and sidewalks. Regarding landscaping, the applicant was asked to provide botanical plant names, change the proposed hardscape to decorative pavers, and add street trees on Main and South First Street. In addition to designing a picnic area, garden and provide dedicated space for refuse on site. She noted the applicant has provided all of these features as requested by the DRB. She said the applicant is present to answer questions regarding the project.

Boardmember Woodrow said one issue he requested had to do with the context; the nearby company insists on parking their trucks on the walk which detracts from the whole area. He said staff was going to check into this, and he questioned whether this has been followed up on. Ms. Whales said she could inquire as to whether this has been addressed by staff and will follow-up with the Board.

Brenda Munoz, Applicant, said they took back suggestions from the Board and she described updated elements incorporated into the project from the last meeting.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned and confirmed that both fences, along with the wire lattice would be powder coated in a copper color.

Chair Woldemar said the wood fences look like dog eared board fences, and he confirmed they would be painted in a copper-like color to match the corrugated metal signage and outside lighting. Chair Woldemar asked Ms. Whales to ensure this is spelled out in the final written materials. Ms. Whales noted that this will become part of the permanent record.

Boardmember Bloom confirmed that the fence is not very old, probably 10 years old if not more. She confirmed the doors were indicated on the plans, driveway stamped pavement, as well as garbage cans. She asked for more work in terms of improving the quality of the planting presentation. She referred to number 1, which is not a tree but "Salvia" or a "perennial" and asked this be changed on the plans. She said the number 1 should be Salvia, the second, Regla and the third should be Huntington, which is orange. She cited improvements were needed in the way the table is set up, as there are no numbers in terms of the amount of plants to be ordered. She also asked for the English spellings of plants.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to the site plan and questioned the curbing on Maine Avenue and asked what the dashed curb line on First Street was signifying. Ms. Munoz said it means it is not there yet and there is no sidewalk. He asked what this would mean for someone in a wheelchair.

Chair Woldemar noted there is a photo of the corner in the plans, which shows there is no sidewalk along First Street. When the construction drawings for the project go to the Building and Public Works

Departments, they may have comments regarding this. It would be unusual for them not to require curb, gutter and sidewalk in be installed, or at least curb and gutter. If anything else, there will be a handicapped ramp there which is shown on the drawings, which will allow pedestrians to turn left onto the sidewalk going along Maine Avenue.

Chair Woldemar referred to the east street elevation, and said there should be an address next to the man door on that side because it is a separate tenant with a separate address. He asked that it be done in the same fashion as shown for the other tenant. On the plans, the downspouts are shown around the corner from where they would normally be; normally on the west and east elevations. They would slope out of the gutter and run down to the corner. The proposed recycled water boxes should be moved inbound so that they are not sticking out past the corners of the building. Lastly, he said based upon materials included in the packets, the proposed light fixtures are delightful and fit very nicely with the character of the project. He acknowledged the fact that they are going to be a copper color and cost about \$135 a piece and he felt there were too many of them. He suggested that on the west and east elevations, to put no more than four on each of those elevations which would provide more than sufficient lighting. As conditions are written, he asked that the applicant consider reducing them to no more than four. Other than those comments, he felt the project has come a long way from when the Board first saw it in January, 2010.

Chair Woldemar noted there were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to approve PLN 09-132 with staff's recommended four findings, the ten conditions, with additional conditions to clarify the name for number 1 on the landscape plan to a Salvia, Regla and Huntington; identify the quantity of plantings, there should be no more than four lighting fixtures on the east and west elevations, recycled water containers should be moved over 18 inches, and the downspouts should be properly placed off the roof; unanimously approved.

Boardmember Woodrow remarked that this project could be a seed for that part of the City. It will stand in sharp contrast to almost all other surrounding buildings in the vicinity. He also hoped the City will follow up with street tree planting and he thanked the applicant for the improved project.

4. PLN10-017 DECOMBE RESIDENTIAL ADDITION ON MONTANA STREET

Description: **(Held Over from 3/10/2010)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A ±360 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY REAR ADDITION AND CONVERT AN ±857 SQUARE FOOT BASEMENT TO A LIVING AREA WITHIN A SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE, A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE TO THE POINT RICHMOND NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT.

Location: 28 MONTANA STREET

APN: 556-153-008

Zoning: SFR-2 (Very Low Density Residential)

Owner: DECOMBE JEAN-MICHEL & MAUREEN

Applicant: SCOTT MCGLASHAN

Staff Contact: LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **Conditional Approval**

Boardmember Woodrow recused himself from participating due to his home being within 200 feet of the project. Ms. Whales noted that the project was held over and pulled of the agenda by staff because of improper noticing. She said this is the first time being reviewed by the Design Review Board.

Ms. Whales gave the staff report and a brief description of the project, stating it had been reviewed by the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee on March 3, 2010.

Recommendations were provided having to do with dual pane historical windows and the chimney should remain and only be repaired instead of replaced. The applicants are proposing to construct an addition on the main level by 7.5 feet which would allow them to have an additional 180 square feet on the main level. With the addition of the 180 square feet, this would also allow for habitable space in the basement level. She said currently, the basement is used for storage and the applicant proposes to finish the space with a bedroom, bathroom and recreation room.

Chair Woldemar referred to condition 14 which was formulated as a result of HPAC's review. It states, the chimney shall remain and shall be repaired, but if the severity of the deterioration requires replacement, the design must be matched. He said his understanding is not to try and duplicate what history did but to make a statement of its compatibility so that 50 years from now, someone else could determine that the change was done in 2010 and not earlier. He said at the same time, condition 12 asks for a piece of wood trim between the old and new to demarcate where the changes occur.

Ms. Renfro stated that Lina Velasco is the City's historic expert, and she worked with staff and have read the Secretary of the Interior's standards many times. It was her understanding that there is not an inconsistency between conditions 12 and 14. Condition 12 is a demarcation between the old and the new, which is clear and what the Secretary of the Interior's standards seems to make as the distinction. For condition 14, chimneys historically fall down and are put back up and do not last forever. When the feature deteriorates, typically it is removed, but the condition requires reconstructing the old and strengthening it. So, she said the conditions do not suggest any false historicism. Chair Woldemar confirmed staff was comfortable with both conditions.

Chair Woldemar referred to condition 13, stating there are historic windows. The single glazing is pulled out and double glazing is used. Ms. Whales said the condition is to reduce noise pollution from the train. Chair Woldemar questioned how to do this without removing the windows. Boardmember Christian echoed the question, stating the goal over the long term is to upgrade the windows for energy reasons, and some are actually deteriorating.

Chair Woldemar said the historic wooden windows shall not be replaced, and the issue implied is that within the context of the old windows, they will put dual glaze in, which is impossible to do. Then the obvious thing is replacement with high end windows that sort of look like the old ones, they will be dual glazed, and they cost a lot. However, this is not what the condition states. Ms. Renfro agreed the condition was not clear, and she suggested rephrasing it with the idea to preserve the general look of the existing windows.

The public hearing was opened.

Maureen Decombe, owner, said the HPAC recommended they go to a specific contractor. She spoke with the contractor who echoed the sentiments that it is virtually impossible to do it, but that they could work with them to install wonderful windows that would look like the old ones.

Scott McGlashan, applicant, described the project improvements to increase square footage, adding a rear deck and noted they will update the drawings given the addition of any new windows.

There was no public comment.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Woldemar said with the exception of condition 13, the project is approvable. He suggested crafting substituted language for condition 13 because it is unrealistic to do what is proposed. The original intent may well have been wooden windows and not clad. He thinks the original intent would have been true divided light windows, and the idea of doing double glazing makes a lot of sense. He suggested changing the condition to state, "where necessary, the existing wooden windows shall be replaced with new dual glazed wooden windows to match the historic character of the original windows."

Mr. McGlashan said there are three sashes that are marked existing which are proposed to be replaced in drawing 3.3 on the west elevation. Chair Woldemar asked to change the condition wording. Ms. Renfro suggested, and the Board agreed with the following wording: "The sashes on the west elevation shall be replaced with new dual glazed wooden sashes of the same dimensions compatible with the historic character of the original windows."

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to approve PLN 10-017 based on the staff's recommended findings for Historic Structures, based on staff's recommended design review findings 1 through 4, and on the staff recommended conditions 1-14 with deletion and revision of condition 13 as follows: "The sashes on the west elevation shall be replaced with new dual glazed wooden sashes of the same dimensions compatible with the historic character of the original windows;" unanimously approved.

Boardmember Woodrow returned to participate in the remainder of the meeting.

BOARD BUSINESS

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Ms. Whales reported that staff planner, Kieron Slaughter, is the proud father of twins; Zachary and Sasha.

B. Board member reports, requests, or announcement

Boardmember Woodrow said hearing this case brings to mind that most of the people who buy homes in Pt. Richmond are not aware of the rules under which they must adhere to change their homes, which should be part of the sales disclosure. Ms. Renfro noted that HPAC is an advisory body to the DRB.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if the City could insist that companies make certain that a contributing structure is identified and a document could be provided outlining historic restrictions and limitations. Ms. Renfro said something could go through the Realtors Association, who could be approached. A mechanism that could be used is through recordation as a report on the title, which would mandate that they check with the City before purchasing the house.

Chair Woldemar questioned and confirmed that the zoning map indicates which homes are historic, and he supported contributing structures be recorded on the title. Boardmember Woodrow said some would see this as a benefit and others may see it as a limitation.

Boardmember Woodrow confirmed that HPAC has worked over the last three years on a survey and inventory of homes in all historic districts. Regarding whether they have discussed mandated buyer knowledge, Ms. Whales noted that each home must go through an appraisal, and this information is disclosed on the report.

Chair Woldemar announced that the Historic Preservation Awards Subcommittee has been meeting, nominations are available on the website, and the awards ceremony will be held in May. Last year there were 150 people who attended, there was free food, and it was a nice event.

Chair Woldemar questioned how the City was moving forward on the landscape maintenance bond issue, and Ms. Whales noted that staff was working and discussing how bonds are tracked and which department would be responsible for the program.

Chair Woldemar confirmed with staff that the project planner inspects the approved projects, ensures conditions are met, confirms landscaping has been completed as approved, and afterwards, bonds would be released. The Board continued to discuss how bonds are housed and agreed details need to be determined.

Chair Woldemar noted that he and Boardmember Bloom were contacted by Kaiser to meet prior to a Board meeting regarding their temporary parking lot. The Board briefly discussed Kaiser's plans for surface parking, their five year agreement, and future extensions. Boardmember Woodrow discussed installation of broadband cable through Google and hoped Richmond would participate.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m. to April 14, 2010.