

# MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 8, 2017

## DESIGN REVIEW BOARD SPECIAL MEETING Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level 450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804

January 11, 2017

6:00 p.m.

### BOARD MEMBERS

Eileen Whitty, Chair  
Meredith Benz  
Tom Leader  
Mike Woldemar

Ray Welter, Vice Chair  
Brant Fetter  
Jonathan Livingston

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

### ROLL CALL

**Present:** Chair Eileen Whitty; Vice Chair Ray Welter; Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Brant Fetter and Jonathan Livingston

**Absent:** Boardmember Tom Leader and Mike Woldemar

**Staff Present:** Hector Lopez and Jonathan Malagon

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – None

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**ACTION:** It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 5-0-2 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Livingston, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Leader and Woldemar).

**Public Forum – Brown Act** – There were no speakers.

**City Council Liaison Report** – None

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty announced that there were no Consent Calendar items and she asked and confirmed members did not wish to place Items 1, 2 or 3 on the Consent Calendar. She announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, January 23, 2017 by 5:00 p.m.

### **Public Hearing(s)**

1. **PLN16-615 NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE**

Description **(HELD OVER FROM 12/14/2016)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW RESIDENCE ON A VACANT PARCEL.  
Location ALAMO AVENUE  
APN 561-191-049 AND 561-191-050  
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL  
Applicant SCOTT MENDEZ (OWNER)  
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO JANUARY 25, 2017**

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to hold over PLN16-615 to January 25, 2017; approved by voice vote: 5-0-2 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Livingston, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Leader and Woldemar).**

**2. PLN16-286 NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE**

Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A VACANT PARCEL  
Location 217 VERNON AVENUE  
APN 561-152-015  
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL  
Owner VINTAGE INVESTMENT PROPERTIES  
Applicant PANFILO ARMAS  
Staff Contact JONATHAN MALAGON Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonathan Malagon presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for design review approval and stated the applicant revised the project in response to comments. Boardmember Livingston had offered feedback focusing on the front elevation and offered three options, which are attached to the staff report.

Boardmembers had the following questions and comments:

- Asked and confirmed there was some room to adjust the 20 foot front setback, given new zoning requirements of a 15 foot setback.
- Asked to move the garage out a bit and make some revisions to the design.

The public hearing was opened and Chair Whitty called upon the applicant who made himself available for questions.

Mr. Armas, Vintage Investment Properties, applicant, introduced himself and said he was a structural engineer and licensed contractor.

- Boardmember Livingston asked why the roof pitch was chosen as 4 ½ x 12 and Mr. Armas stated they simply preferred this slope.
- Boardmember Benz questioned the detail on the sliding windows and Mr. Armas explained the pattern at their tops. She referred to sedge as a plant material which she said needs a lot of water and she recommended a plax species.
- Chair Whitty asked the applicant to change the foam window trim to painted wood window trims and Mr. Armas agreed.
- Chair Whitty asked to consider installing a horizontal fence versus vertical fencing and Mr. Armas stated the fence has already been installed and agreed to do horizontal in the front.

- Chair Whitty referred to the long hallway from the front door leading to the kitchen and living room. She asked the applicant to install skylights in the roof there and Mr. Armas agreed.
- Chair Whitty referred to the front door exterior light and suggested it line up with the two garage lights, and Mr. Armas stated the area is stepped and usually they line up the light with the garage frame. Chair Whitty withdrew her request.
- Chair Whitty referred to the half bathroom off of the living room and asked to move the garage forward and put the bath in with the laundry area. Mr. Armas stated if he can utilize the 5 feet, he will add 2 feet to the garage and distribute the other 3 feet to relocate the bath in the laundry room. Boardmembers stated this completely changes the plan, its massing, roof and the building gets stretched, and Chair Whitty withdrew her request.
- Chair Whitty asked for a shade tree in the front yard or a birch tree with three limbs.
- Vice Chair Welter stated the front needs work and he asked that the applicant get closer to Boardmember Livingston's sketches, such as the dormer. He said symmetry that is not working right, the side elevations show a gabled dormer in the back and the rear elevation shows a hip which he asked to fix and Mr. Armas stated he will keep it as gable.
- Vice Chair Welter said the stone base needs to return to something on the sides. He suggested bringing it back to the door at the garage on the left side, but he questioned if the applicant intended to install a gate on the left side. Mr. Armas referred to A-1.0 and pointed to the gate on the right side. In response to Vice Chair Welter, he agreed to turn it against something vertical which he will do at the right and left sides.
- Vice Chair Welter encouraged the applicant to use some native plantings in addition to rock and pebbles at the front, especially at the front entry and dormer.
- Vice Chair Welter suggested having the applicant review Boardmember Livingston's sketches and asked the applicant to respond to the massing of the pilaster columns and make them bigger. Boardmember Fetter expanded and said the applicant must choose what he will go with given a particular style and there is proportionality to each of those methodologies. An example is the tiny window in the dormer which does not fit the proportions of the entry. Mr. Armas stated he will work with staff on making more revisions to respond to the sketch.
- Boardmember Fetter noted that the headers on the windows do not match up with the doors around the entire building, voiced concerns with the window details especially the flashings and the way the windows are positioned which could cause water damage. He stated the Board expects a certain standard and practices followed in design and he and a discussion ensued between Boardmember Fetter and Mr. Armas.
- Vice Chair Welter referred to Detail 4 on A-4 and confirmed that the applicant did not include the scabbed on rafter tails because they were not sure if they were going to put that in, but could if the Board wanted it included.
- Boardmember Benz asked if the bottom stone base was on the original drawing, and Mr. Armas said no but staff recommended it and they included it.

Chair Whitty asked if the Board wished to move the project forward and condition it or continue the matter and ask the applicant to return with revisions. Boardmember Fetter said the applicant has a talented contractor who can do the job, but what is planned is not shown on the drawings.

The majority of Boardmembers voiced their desire to have the project return with revisions. Chair Whitty stated the items the applicant should return with include:

- Wrap the rock trim base around to the left and right sides up to a vertical area.

- In the front add the 2' projection of columns into the front yard and increase column width.
- Increase dormer width to be aligned with the entryway.
- Add decorative stone base to the columns.
- Add roof skylights over the long hallway and either add the rafter tails or not which is up to the applicant.
- Replace Sedge with Plax for landscape plan and remove half of the front gravel and replace with plants.
- Make the front fence 4' horizontal.
- Applicant to adhere to Sketch A.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Fetter) to continue PLN16-286 to the February 8, 2017 meeting with discussed changes to appear at that time; approved by voice vote: 5-0-2 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Livingston, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Leader and Woldemar).**

**3. PLN16-504 NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE**

Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED GARAGE ON A VACANT PARCEL LOCATED AT THE END OF CLIFFSIDE COURT.	
Location	CLIFFSIDE COURT	
APN	558-202-010	
Zoning	RL-1, SINGLE FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	
Applicant	JEFFREY REED AND JENNIFER MADDEN (OWNERS)	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Hector Lopez presented the staff report and described the scope, layout, and key elements of the request for design review approval of a new single family residence.

Boardmembers had the following comments and questions:

- Boardmember Fetter complimented staff and the applicant, noting the project was complicated and was done very well.
- Boardmember Fetter confirmed the design was based on Scenario 3. He thought Scenario 1 was more appropriate considering the usage of lots all around it, such as fair use of properties, access to lots and the distribution of rights for those lots and how setbacks are interpreted.
- Chair Whitty asked about the reference to development standards that have now expired. Boardmembers clarified it was not a specific plan.

Chair Whitty opened the public hearing and called upon the applicant.

JENNIFER MADDEN, Applicant, introduced her husband Jeffrey Reed, stated they are sculptors, contractors and builders for 30 years and gave a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation of the project and briefly addressed the neighbors' concerns of privacy.

Ms. Madden explained that the lot has a permit from BCDC from 1977 when there was a subdivision of 13 lots. There is no design review board within the 13 lots to review them, and 12 homes have been built thus far. She discussed existing home construction and design of homes and said their intent is to build low and stay within the 35 foot height limitation and get

down to the beach. They have an amicable relationship with neighbors and Boardmembers recognized the extent to which the gesture is made.

Ms. Madden explained that the architects they are working with are engineers and the geotechnical report indicates hard rock and they can go down 10 feet before they build their final walls, spoke about excavation techniques, and they were trying to be respectful to neighbors about removal of the fill. The building allows so much more transparency of views and they will ensure the excavation process is not impactful.

Boardmembers had the following questions and comments:

- Boardmember Livingston stated the house is beautiful and not see often, and suggested on additional condition for a catchment wall at the bottom of the hill so soil does not go into the bay or beach.
- He noted the geotechnical report recommends the cliff be covered with gunite and they will then cover it with rock which is not on the plans. He asked and confirmed this will be done. Ms. Madden stated visually they do not own to the mean high water tide. If they were to put things in a pipe, it would erode the cliff below them which is not their property so it is better to disperse it over their concrete, and she agreed that the soils engineer will need to sign off on drainage. Mr. Reed added that they did a revetment modeling with some pockets for planting to re-finalize the planting on the cliff.
- Chair Whitty questioned drainage or runoff issues, and Ms. Madden said there was a 3'x5' slide in the middle of the lot and it is a concern which they will address. If they clad the cliff they would keep the beach from having off-fall, so they are not sure what they will do. She said two houses have lost 12 feet of land in one storm and one gunited the entire cliff two houses down from them and one put in large, blue granite boulders and stacked them 15 feet high which were done in an emergency situation.
- Boardmember Fetter said if the revetment is controlled and landscaped and on the sides is erosion controls. He asked how to control those edges. Ms. Madden stated their site has a cup and on both edges it moves forward so there would have to be quite a bit of erosion on the site before it even gets to the edge of their property.
- Boardmember Fetter asked if neighbors have indicated they have been satisfied, and Ms. Madden stated the neighbor preferred the other design but she indicated she would not fight it, but then sent a letter. She does not live in the house and her children now want to inherit it so she is in communications.
- Vice Chair Welter asked and confirmed with Ms. Madden that there is very little maintenance for the house and she discussed the multiple colors created looking like real rock.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

#### Public Comments:

MARTIN MCNAIR said he lives about 100 yards south of this project and voiced his support, stating the owner/applicants are very talented and he is delighted they will be moving next door to him.

ROBERT LANE said he lives and works in Pt. Richmond and felt Architectural Digest would love to see this house. He noted that the view outside of the neighbor's bedroom is incidental and should not be given much weight and he supported the project.

AMY BEAWREGARD said she is Jane Maxwell's daughter-in-law who will be 102 in June, said she has not known the applicants for very long and appreciates their work in discussing the project. The views of the lots are spectacular but they all realize that someone would build here and while the second floor window is minor, it still gives her a beautiful view at her pool level and second floor. She thinks the applicants have taken a lot of time and skill in coming up with a great plan and hoped it receives approval.

Boardmember Fetter said his only concern is the mean high tide and its proximity to the basement floor. Ms. Madden said their kayak room is 8 feet from the mean high tide and designed for water to come in. It is higher than a king high tide this year, but it may be too low 30 years from now. Their first floors are 21 feet and he believes they will be okay.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Whitty) to approve PLN16-504 with staff's 4 findings and 15 staff conditions, with additional conditions to 1) require construction of a temporary slough catchment wall at the base of the slope above the high water mark; and 2) all drainage plans to be approved and stamped by the soils engineer; approved by voice vote: 5-0-2 (Ayes: Benz, Fetter, Livingston, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Leader and Woldemar).**

## **Board Business**

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None**
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements** – Chair Whitty reported that she and Boardmember Woldemar met with the Lifelong Medical Center representatives in a subcommittee and they will be returning on January 25<sup>th</sup> with changes that look good, and she will not be present for that meeting.

The Board adjourned at 7:44 p.m. to the next meeting on January 25, 2017.