

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL**  
440 Civic Center Plazas, Richmond, CA  
November 9, 2011  
6:00 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Don Woodrow, Chair	Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Andrew Butt	Eileen Whitty
Robin Welter	Mike Woldemar

Chair Woodrow called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Don Woodrow, Vice Chair Raymond Welter, Boardmembers Andrew Butt, Robin Welter, Eileen Whitty, Michael Woldemar

**Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Kieron Slaughter, Jonelyn Whales, and Carlos Privat

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** - None

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that the recommendation on Item 1 should be changed to "Hold Over to a Date Uncertain."

<b>ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the Agenda, as amended; unanimously approved.</b>
--

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Chair Woodrow stated the Consent Calendar consists of Items 1, 2, 3 and 4. He asked if the Board or public wished to remove any item. He noted Items 1 and 3 were hold-over items. Vice Chair Welter requested removal of Item 2 and 4 from the Consent Calendar.

<b>ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to hold over Items 1 and 3 and to approve the Consent Calendar; unanimously approved.</b>
---

Vice Chair Welter noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within (10) days or by Monday, November 21, 2011 by 5:00 p.m. and repeated the appeal procedure after each affected item.

**Items Approved:**

**CC 1. PLN11-537 TOTI RESIDENTIAL ADDITION ON SIERRA AVENUE**

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND-STORY ADDITION WITH A BALCONY OVER A NEWLY RECONSTRUCTED GARAGE.

Location 5336 SIERRA AVENUE

APN 519-120-005  
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)  
 Applicant DEREK TOTI (OWNER)  
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO A DATE UNCERTAIN**

**CC 3. PLN11-573 MILL BEACH HOUSE EXPANSION ON OCEAN AVENUE**

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED ±840 SQUARE FOOT BEACH HOUSE EXPANSION.  
 Location 875 OCEAN AVENUE  
 APN 558-233-011  
 Zoning SFR-2 (SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)  
 Applicant DONALD MILL (OWNER)  
 Staff Contact LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 12/14/2011**

Items Removed from the Consent Calendar

**CC 2. PLN11-474 SURTI NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON TULARE AVENUE**

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,200 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.  
 Location 2927 TULARE AVENUE  
 APN 526-200-019  
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)  
 Owner FARHAT & SHAHJAHAN SURTI  
 Applicant MOHAMMED SUBHANI  
 Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report and described the project, stating the applicant proposes to demolish the existing dwelling and construct a 2200 square foot, 3 bedrooms and 2.5 bath home and the project meets the development standards for the SFR-3 zoning district. On August 18, 2011, staff met with the applicant and two members of the Zoning Review Board Subcommittee and reviewed the proposal, which was a two-story home with larger massing. Staff and subcommittee members made suggestions and the applicant modified the proposal to a one-story home, which is now before the Commission. The applicant went to the North and East Neighborhood Council as suggested and received a letter of support dated July 13, 2011. The letter of support was for the two-story proposal, but no subsequent letters have been received based on the revised smaller scale project. The applicant also contacted adjacent neighbors who signed a letter indicating they had no objections to the proposal. In conclusion, staff feels the project enhances the appearance of the property, is in compliance with the setback, height and regulations of SFR-3 zoning district, and recommends approval with the attached conditions of approval.

Boardmember Whitty referred to a photo which shows significant vegetation and trees in the backyard; however, on the drawing there are some small trees. She asked for clarification from staff. Mr. Slaughter directed her to the photo on Attachment 2 which shows vegetation. He said there may be the same amount of trees but the depiction of trees and shrubs used in the AutoCAD program were larger and he deferred the question to the applicant for further clarification. Boardmember Whitty pointed out that there is no landscape plan for the front yard. Mr. Slaughter said the applicant is open to suggestions for specific landscaping for the front yard. There is a street tree proposed and the applicant will consult with the Parks Department for a species list for other alternatives.

Boardmember Robin Welter echoed comments of Boardmember Whitty and said the Google maps might be outdated and the trees could be gone. She supported the submission of a landscape plan and the neighbor asked for at least one street tree which the applicant can apply through the City to obtain for additional landscaping. As far as other landscaping, she commented there is not a lot of additional room in the yard. She loves the porch, and recommended not concreting over the entire area to maximize landscaping to the greatest extent possible.

Vice Chair Welter said the letter from the neighborhood council references a renovation and not a new house. He asked and confirmed they were aware the house would be demolished. Mr. Slaughter said in certain areas it would be considered a renovation and other areas a new house. Because of the extent of modifications especially to the front setback, staff considers it a new house. He said staff held a meeting with the neighborhood council and no specific issues were discussed concerning the project. Staff also went to the RNCC on October 17<sup>th</sup> and distributed a project list, and no feedback was received.

Commissioner Butt said the last time they met a part of the handout was literature with images of concepts for what might be done with the house and he confirmed this was from the residential design guidelines. He asked how those guidelines applied to this case. While he agrees there have been many changes to the design and this is a vast improvement, in his mind, it does not fit in linguistically with the neighborhood. Mr. Slaughter said he pulled out those guidelines when staff was treating this as an addition to give the applicant different options for massing and additions to a single story home. Afterwards, the applicant wanted to go a different direction and do a unique blend of a couple of styles. Staff treated it as a new house which provides an opportunity to introduce a new architectural twist to the area. But, if it was going to be the same house with an addition on the top and the rear, staff was suggesting the applicant follow the design guidelines.

Commissioner Butt said to be clear, there are no teeth to the guidelines but in the future they may be tied to specific historic areas. Mr. Slaughter agreed and noted staff strongly encourages applicants, especially when it comes to windows and doors, to stay within the guidelines.

The public hearing was opened.

Mohammed Subhani, designer, reviewed changes made to the proposal based on the subcommittee's comments.

Farhat Surti, owner, said in response to the previous question regarding landscaping, when they purchased the homes, the huge trees were not present, but in their plan eventually, they do wish to have plantings and not simply concrete.

Boardmember Whitty said she looked at about 2 dozen houses in the North and East neighborhoods to purchase, and there are many architectural styles in the neighborhood. She said originally the house looked like a ranch style and now the applicant has gone to more of a bungalow style, which is fine. She thanked the owner for agreeing to go to a single story.

Boardmember Welter reiterated the need for a landscape plan to be prepared for the front yard. Neighbors requested at least one street tree which she knows is difficult because of utility lines; however, whatever they can put in would be appreciated and she asked to ensure that neighbors are happy with it.

Boardmember Woldemar thanked the applicant for meeting with the subcommittee and making significant changes. He agreed with others that there should be a landscape plan, noted that the

site plan does not reflect there is a planter strip between the sidewalk and the curb and the plan should include that.

Regarding the rear yard, Boardmember Woldemar suggested a condition that would require preservation of as many of the trees in the rear as possible. Regarding the roofline, he said the house is on floor joists and they have established a 10-foot high plate line to the wall height so all interior walls are tall. Over the garage, they placed a shallow sloping shed room which seems to be completely out of character with the rest of the house. It was labeled a 1:12 composition shingle roof but he did not think this could be done with such a roof. It would therefore have a completely different appearance. He suggested raising the plate line of the garage to the same 10 feet so the garage will end up at 12 feet and can provide storage space. He also asked to tie the entire thing together in a consistent hip roof and he showed a sketch of what is basically a 4:12 or 5:12 full hip roof all around the house.

Lastly Boardmember Woldemar referred to the front elevation and said when the height is increased there will be a big stucco area above the garage door. What he has seen and observed in other plans is putting a band of windows above the garage doors. Also, the stairway is dead center onto the front porch but the entry door is over to the left. He suggested moving the front steps to the left and he provided another sketch. He complimented the applicant for carrying the brick wainscot all the way around the house which is something the Board looks for, and these are things he would like to propose as conditions.

Vice Chair Welter said he had concerns with the roof as well and agreed with Boardmember Woldemar's suggestions. For the brick wainscot that goes all the way around, he asked for something that it ends into like a cap. He agrees also with the porch and said by moving the steps over which also provides a usable porch to sit out on. He was somewhat confused about the windows and questioned and confirmed they were sliders. Also, he suggested that the closets are dimensioned at 1'8" which is tight and they are usually 2 feet. He encouraged the applicant to enlarge those a little bit and think about the powder room location, which opens onto the kitchen.

Commissioner Butt echoed comments of Boardmembers Welter and Woldemar.

Chair Woodrow questioned whether the sliding windows are framed in wood or metal, and Ms. Surti responded that the trim will be wooden and the windows are double frame and vinyl and not aluminum.

Boardmember Woldemar pointed out that some manufacturers make vinyl windows that have a wide section so they visually look more like wooden windows. He encouraged the owner to go in this direction, given the traditional design of the house. Ms. Surti added that they are proposing sliders because her mother will be living with them and it is difficult for her to open windows.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Butt) to approve PLN11-474 with the staff's recommended four findings, with staff's recommended 12 conditions, with the following additional conditions: that there be a complete landscape plan prepared that includes the front planter strip between the sidewalk and the curb and this be subject to review and approval by staff; that the applicant document the existing trees in the rear yard and attempts be made to retain as many as possible; to raise the garage plate height to match the existing house and to apply a hip roof with a minimum of 4:12 slope throughout the entire house; to add a pair of horizontal strip windows above the garage**

**doors; to align the front steps with the front door; and to add a cap on top of the brick wainscot surrounding the house; unanimously approved.**

**CC 4. PLN11-551 KOROMA REAR YARD ACCESSORY STRUCTURE ON 33<sup>RD</sup> STREET**  
 Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL FOR A PROPOSED  
 ±432 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SITUATED IN THE  
 REAR YARD.  
 Location 662 33RD STREET  
 APN 518-180-015  
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)  
 Applicant AMADU KOROMA (OWNER)  
 Staff Contact LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonelyn Whales gave the staff report on behalf of Lamont Thompson and described the location and existing conditions on the property, stating that the applicant is proposing a 432 square foot accessory structure which is referred to as a shed in the rear yard. The shed meets all the requirements as far as the development guidelines. The proposal also complies with the regulation for an accessory structure in the rear of a dwelling. The proposal's height is met at 14 feet, the applicant has also requested electricity, a sink and a heater inside the shed in order to work in it, and staff has asked that he sign a deed restriction with the County that it will not be habitable in the future. In addition, the applicant conducted a study on surrounding accessory structures of neighboring properties, and staff provided this to the Board as an attachment. Staff recommends approval of the proposal.

Boardmember Whitty questioned the sump pump, and Ms. Whales said this is because of the sewer line, the sink in the structure, and its elevation. She asked if the applicant considered building onto the back of the house, and Ms. Whales deferred this question to the applicant.

Commissioner Butt questioned why the matter is before the Board, stating it seems like it would not require design review, and Ms. Whales said the square footage exceeds the minimum 250 square feet. She confirmed it did not need to go before the Planning Commission.

The public hearing was opened.

Amadu Koroma, owner, said the reason he is proposing to build the shed is because he needs more room for his family. It is an inherited property from his mother. When he and his wife came to the house, they realized it had enough room for themselves, but not enough if they have children. The basic plan was to move his computer room out of the house and into the backyard by building the accessory structure and free up a room in the house for a nursery. The reason why they did not want to add onto the existing house is because the house is inherited and she has already completed one remodel of the house and it did not seem feasible to add on anymore. To make it simpler, he and his contractor came up with the idea for an accessory structure. He will use it for media use and tele-commute purposes.

Boardmember Woldemar said the shed has a sink, no refrigerator or stove, and he asked if there could be a bathroom in the accessory structure. He asks because the applicant may want to have a toilet out there. Ms. Whales stated this is allowed, but no cooking facilities are allowed which would be in violation of the deed restriction.

Boardmember Robin Welter said she appreciates the fact that the applicant is thinking about drainage, confirmed that the lot was flat, and asked if the drainage swale would be a French drain system or grass swale. Mr. Koroma said he did not want a grass swale and Boardmember

Welter said for a grass swale he will want at least 2% grade. She would also recommend hard lining this and putting in a 4 inch drain to take all roof drainage out to the street, as well. She questioned and confirmed no trees would need to be removed to build the structure.

Vice Chair Welter said he thinks on the electrical plan A-2, the notes are probably a boiler plate note that the contractor kept on. There are many references to kitchens, tubs and showers, so since there is a recorded deed, he asked to revise the language.

Boardmember Butt confirmed that the owner could put an accessory dwelling unit in the rear, but this is a shed. Ms. Whales said this would infringe and would be under a different category because additional parking would be needed, as well as a fire wall. He also only has a 4-foot setback and would need to modify the proposal. Boardmember Butt suggested putting an exterior light over the door. Boardmembers stated it was in the plans, but not identified on the elevations.

Chair Woodrow asked how far below ground would the pump be. Mr. Koroma said it would be underneath the soil line and not visible. There may be an access box at the surface level for repair or access needs for snaking. Chair Woodrow asked how much the drain line must come up from the pump to where this connects in the house.

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that the house has raised floor joists with a crawl space, and said typically, they have come out from the street, chase back underneath the house, and the tail in is almost right at the bottom of the floor joist. It is about 18 inches from there to dirt. He does not have to worry about elevation because he is forcing the water with the pump to come across and up so it is about two feet underneath.

Chair Woodrow questioned whether a backflow device was needed, and Mr. Koroma said yes, and he described the location of the device tied into the pump and how the flow worked.

Chair Woodrow questioned if trash was stored somewhere on the lot or is it stored in the garage. Mr. Koroma said trash bins are located on the south side of the house, and he said they are not shown on the plans but described them.

The public hearing was closed.

<b>ACTION: It was M/S (Welter/Woldemar) to approve PLN11-551 with the staff's four findings and staff's 13 recommended conditions; unanimously approved.</b>
--

## **BOARD BUSINESS:**

### **A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements**

Ms. Whales reported the Retreat would be held Friday, December 2, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The location will be held at the Maritime Child Development Center on Florida Avenue.

### **B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements**

## **Adjournment:**

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m. to the next meeting on December 14, 2011.