

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING**  
**Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level**  
**450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**  
August 13, 2014  
6:00 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Eileen Whitty, Chair	Robin Welter, Vice Chair
Brant Fetter	Brenda Munoz
Ray Welter	Mike Woldemar

Chair Whitty called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Eileen Whitty, Vice Chair Robin Welter; Boardmembers Brant Fetter, Brenda Munoz, Ray Welter and Mike Woldemar

**Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Jonelyn Whales, Kieron Slaughter, Hector Lopez, and Assistant City Attorney James Atencio

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** None

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Robin Welter) to approve the agenda; unanimously approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Ray Welter, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None).**

**Public Forum – Brown Act**

Cordell Hindler, Richmond, expressed interest in having a disco dance business in Richmond which he thinks will draw more people to town.

**City Council Liaison Report - None**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Chair Fetter stated there are to items on the Consent Calendar and he asked if Boardmembers or the public wished to remove any items from the Consent Calendar. A member of the public requested the Board remove Item 2.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Ray Welter/Woldemar) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Item 1; unanimously approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Fetter, Munoz, Ray Welter, Robin Welter, Whitty and Woldemar; Noes: None).**

Chair Whitty announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, August 25, 2014 by 5:00 p.m.

**Item Approved on the Consent Calendar:**

**Public Hearing(s)**

**CC 1. PLN14-001 SINGH TRIPLEX**

**Description:** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW ± 2,226 SQUARE-FOOT TWO-STORY RESIDENTIAL TRIPLEX ON A VACANT LOT.

**Location:** 5305 SACRAMENTO AVE

**APN:** 510-093-015

**Zoning:** MFR-1 (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)

**Owner:** DHILLON CHARAN & SHAKUNTALA TRE

**Applicant:** PRABHJOT SINGH

**Staff Contact:** HECTOR ROJAS      **Recommendation:** **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

**Item Removed from the Consent Calendar:**

**CC 2. PLN13-073 RICHMOND CENTRAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Description:** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CONSISTING OF 172 DWELLING UNITS THAT WOULD BE CONSTRUCTED OVER A PARKING PODIUM, AND RECOMMEND TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR THE ADOPTION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FOR THE PROJECT.

**Location:** 5620 CENTRAL AVE

**APN:** 510-053-032,-033, & -034

**Zoning:** C-3 (REGIONAL COMMERCIAL)

**Owner:** REA PARTNERS LP

**Applicant:** AMG & ASSOCIATES, LLC.

**Staff Contact:** JONELYN WHALES      **Recommendation:** **HOLD OVER TO 8/27/2014**

Chair Whitty stated the Board has no materials to refer to, but a member of the public removed the item from the Consent Calendar. Attorney Atencio explained that staff could provide a description of the project, continue the matter to the next meeting where materials would be available.

Ms. Whales gave a brief description of the project for a design review permit to develop 172 apartments at the old lumber site on Central Avenue. Staff held the meeting over only so the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council could meet with the architect. Staff completed the environmental review which was open for public comments from March 14<sup>th</sup> through the beginning of May, 2014. Staff will also be presenting these documents with the project plans at the Board meeting of August 27, 2014. There have been some discussions among the community that they were not noticed on the project.

Boardmember Woldemar stated he gave some notes on the project to staff and he stated it adjoins and is immediately inclusive of a portion of the City of El Cerrito and relates to its El Cerrito/San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan. Ms. Whales stated she has been working with El Cerrito City staff and they allowed Richmond to take the lead since three-quarters of the project is within the jurisdiction of Richmond.

Boardmember Woldemar also commented that parking is a podium solution with 3 and 4 stories of development on top of a concrete garage which is more or less on grade with some sloping.

He said it is a significant project and runs concurrent with other podium parking-like solutions that are coming to the City. Ms. Whales also noted there is a culvert next to the project.

Chair Whitty discussed traffic lights and congestion in the project area and confirmed that the Fehr and Peers are the traffic engineers on the project and Ms. Whales stated there are mitigation measures within the project to address traffic and parking.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

Eric Pressler, Richmond, said he owns some property on Santa Clara Street very near there and own a property on Belmont Street to the east and directly across the street from one of the driveways is located for this proposed project. He said this is the first notice of any kind he received from the City of Richmond or El Cerrito about the project. When he hears they have had an environmental comment period, he along with many people most likely did not receive notification. He voiced the following concerns about the project: 1) traffic congestion. He cannot imagine adding 172 units that will all have cars in the project; 2) density which is 20 units/acre or tripling the density of what is in the area; 3) schools and their distance from this project. Students will have to walk along Central Avenue which is a safety concern and will have to cross two, four-lane high traffic streets; 4) the 5 stories for the project which is completely different from the one-stories in the area; 5) delay in police services to the area; 6) mitigation of dust, construction noise in building 172 units; and 7) that the project is built to the property line and not setback from the street.

Chair Whitty commented that there was a woman who was at the meeting before it started who she told to return on the 27<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Pressler said if he had not come tonight, he would not have known the meeting was moved to August 27<sup>th</sup>. Boardmember Fetter noted that project applicant information is available on the City's website or with staff, and he also commented that the developer of projects typically make contact with the neighborhood. Ms. Whales explained that notices were sent out to owners within 300 feet and some owners have contacted staff about the project and the Board suggested moving on and stated the item will return on August 27<sup>th</sup>.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if it would be appropriate for the Board to change staff's recommendation about the hold-over date to some other date in the future because he did not believe it would be ready to come to the Board in two weeks. It still must go through a subcommittee meeting and neighborhood council review. Chair Whitty suggested setting the date for continuance to September 27<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Whales stated the developer is on a time schedule and they would like to schedule it for the Planning Commission before September 27<sup>th</sup>.

Boardmember Woldemar said if the project came before him in two weeks unless there were significant changes made, he would be arguing against it, regardless of the neighborhood's reactions. Ms. Whales stated the applicant is meeting tonight with the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council at 8PM at the Senior Center at 5160 Huntington Avenue.

City Attorney Atencio stated the Board has the ability to maintain the continuance to August 27<sup>th</sup>, choose another date or leave the date open-ended. Chair Whitty said knowing the site, unless the architecture is sound and complete, she could see some problems with the project and suggested holding it over to a future date past August 27<sup>th</sup>. Boardmember Woldemar asked that the item be held over to a date to be determined by staff, discussed when agendas are posted on the City's website, and the subcommittee process.

Boardmembers asked that a subcommittee be scheduled to review the project before the DRB meeting, that the neighborhood council's comments be submitted to staff and the Board prior to it being heard by the Board, and Ms. Whales confirmed.

## **Board Business**

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

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

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the resolution from the last meeting get signed and Ms. Whales said it needs to be signed by the Chair and she would retrieve it.

Boardmember Woldemar emailed Boardmembers and staff today a package of research material which outlines four cities' design review submittal requirements as well as two of the cities' zoning ordinance under design review that specifically lists what the submittal requirements are and a checklist. He asked for a volunteer to develop a matrix or chart all of the different items required by cities as compared to Richmond. Ms. Whales said staff usually looks at the population of other cities and Oakland Commission does not have a formal Design Review Board but instead have a subcommittee of planning members. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the cities have different submittal requirements for sizes and types of projects, and Ms. Whales stated Richmond has this already.

Boardmember Fetter suggested staff or an intern develop a matrix and Ms. Whales stated the City has summer interns who could probably work on this.

Boardmember Woldemar said another topic he has is the fact that Richmond used to have laminated parking placards which allowed DRB members to park in City Councilmember parking spaces when needed. Chair Whitty confirmed with Ms. Whales that after hours, staff or DRB members can park in City Council spaces and she asked which members would like laminated parking placards.

Boardmember Woldemar stated recently he and his wife went out to a late lunch at the old Boilerhouse and afterwards looked at the Ford Building where Any Mountain is, and they are selling items from the facility. He said it is an employee and/or invited friends' location who can visit the building and purchase items. He asked if members of the DRB could have business cards to identify themselves as a DRB member and Ms. Whales stated she will discuss this with the Director.

Boardmember Woldemar asked what happened with the Hilltop Drive pavilion project and Ms. Whales stated the applicant is still working on the design.

Boardmember Woldemar said lastly, he received a re-issued Draft Environmental Impact Report from a delivery service regarding the Shea project. He said this is a re-circulated draft and it seems to say it is a result of public comments and Board review. He said primarily his concern is that the Board is reviewing projects without the benefit of having the draft EIR in hand, and secondly, he recalls getting notices on this project's environmental material from the last 6-8 months but he received nothing on the Central Avenue project. Ms. Whales said this is because it was just finalized and said they are being sent out. Boardmember Woldemar said he is confused about how the process is working relating to environmental documentation and why the Board is not seeing the documents. Ms. Whales stated she will discuss this with staff.

Boardmember Woldemar said the Board has already approved the project and asked if the Board is supposed to comment on it. City Attorney Atencio stated there was no recommendation to date on the EIR and he said it will go to the Planning Commission, but the DRB could agendize it to provide comments if it wished or submit comments in writing.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that the Shea project is proposing going for the density bonus and will ask for entitlements from the Planning Commission for parking as well as actual heights of the building. She noted it is an affordable housing project and will come to the DRB for design.

Boardmember Woldemar stated there is a subcommittee meeting this Friday at 4:30 p.m.

**Adjournment:**

The Board adjourned at 6:50 p.m. to the next meeting on August 27, 2014.