

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multipurpose Room, Civic Center Building, Basement Level
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804
May 10, 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 6:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eileen Whitty; Vice Chair Ray Welter; Boardmembers Jonathan Livingston and Mike Woldemar

Absent: Boardmembers Meredith Benz, Brant Fetter and Tom Leader

Staff Present: Planners Roberta Feliciano, Jonelyn Whales, Hector Lopez, and Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 22, 2017

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 14 which states "Mr. Atencio stated that he had obtained input from Engineering staff and their recommendations to have a sidewalk along San Pablo Avenue which is part of the Complete Streets project." He asked and confirmed Mr. Atencio did state this in the record.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Livingston) to approve the Minutes of February 22, 2017; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Livingston, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader)

March 22, 2017

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the Minutes of March 22, 2017; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Livingston, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader)

April 12, 2017

Chair Whitty stated she and Boardmember Livingston were the only Boardmembers that could approve these minutes, and Boardmember Fetter will be present at the next meeting. She recommended holding over the minutes to the next meeting.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

Boardmember Woldemar commented it has been helpful to receive minutes on recent meetings, given comments from Boardmembers for the Making Waves project and he asked that this practice continue.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Woldemar) to approve the agenda; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Livingston, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader)

Public Forum – Brown Act

BRUCE BEYAERT, TRAC, provided the following update on the Bay Trail, stating they have over 34 miles of Bay Trail in Richmond thanks to a recent opening by EBRPD. He presented a map showing 7 active projects which involves completing another 5 miles through the end of next year. He recognized the several private and public sector projects, cooperation and conditions of approval placed on projects which help to accomplish these additions.

Boardmember Livingston commented there is a concrete building at Ferry Point and he asked if there were potential development plans to connect with trails.

Mr. Beyaert said EBRPD is preparing a land use plan amendment to Miller Knox and they are looking at what will be done with the two buildings. An EIR will be done and he understands the proposal to retain one of the two buildings and he will provide an update.

City Council Liaison Report – None

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Whitty announced that there were no Consent Calendar items and asked and confirmed members did not wish to place any items 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, May 22, 2017 by 5:00 p.m.

Public Hearing(s)

- 1. PLN17-032 NASHER RESIDENTIAL ADDITION**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM APRIL 26, 2017)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,506 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.
Location 3022 JO ANN DRIVE
APN 414-084-012
Zoning RL2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
Owner ABDUELLALAH NASHER
Applicant MOHAMMED SUBHANI
Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANOR Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO MAY 24, 2017**

Chair Whitty stated this item is held over to May 24, 2017.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

2. **PLN16-739 DELIVERANCE TEMPLE NEW CLUBHOUSE**

Description **(HELD OVER FROM APRIL 12, 2017)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ± 2000 SQUARE FOOT CLUBHOUSE AT THE DELIVERANCE TEMPLE APARTMENTS.

Location 4312 POTRERO AVENUE
APN 509-370-028
Zoning RL-2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
Owner CBG RICHMOND LTD
Applicant JENNIFER BECKLEY
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonelyn Whales stated this item was heard in the past and said staff is available to respond to questions of the Board.

Boardmember Livingston referred to the landscape plan which indicates is available on Sheet 1.1 for revised site plan. Ms. Whales stated the applicant provided the scope of the one area and not the entire site.

Boardmember Woldemar said he was not present at the last meeting and asked for an explanation why there is not additional landscaping around the building. Also, he asked whether landscaping will be irrigated, noting there is an indication for xeriscape landscape design and the City's ordinance requires irrigation.

Justin Krieger, General Contractor, explained the site is very tight with a lot of concrete. They plan to eliminate the concrete, build the community center in the central courtyard, and because of the handicapped path of travel they have limited room for landscaping. What is shown on the site plan A-A.1 is a maximized plan.

Boardmember Woldemar pointed to the north side of the new building showing all concrete and to the south is all concrete. He said there is 48" and asked why the applicant has not proposed landscaping in these areas. Mr. Krieger said currently there are no handicapped units at the property which he pointed to. The path that travels around these areas has very little room, leaving issues with the path of travel and deferred to the designers of the project.

Tina, Regional Manager, applicant, explained they are installing a brand new playground area, there is a small resident garden area and they will improve this, along with a 2,000 s.f. clubhouse and office. They will extend patio areas for handicapped access and it is a very limited space.

Boardmember Livingston provided a drawing to the applicant, stating there is plenty of room to plant trees and commented that what is submitted is not a landscape plan.

Ms. Whales stated the applicant has a limited budget and the building was constructed in the 1970's but the Board can condition this. Tina stated the intent is to have water conservation with plants requiring very little water.

Boardmember Livingston stated on the drawings a specification was not included for the roof. He asked that the roof be specified along with the stucco finish, such as light sand. Mr. Krieger said the intent was to match existing buildings around it.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

Vice Chair Welter stated he was not at the previous meetings, and said there is a ridge vent shown and he confirmed it would be hidden. He said the plan was entitled Temple Apartments and not Clubhouse and there are two site plans.

Ms. Whales explained the reason for this and Vice Chair Welter asked that the other title be removed from the set. He also echoed Boardmember Woldemar's concerns about landscaping, stating there is plenty of room for ADA access and wider planters, especially in the south portion, and he would like to see this return.

Mr. Krieger stated he would appreciate approval for the building and he asked if the landscaping could be confirmed with staff. He confirmed with Chair Whitty that the roof is a 40-year architectural asphalt shingle which is a Weatherwood color.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Woldemar motioned and Boardmember Livingston seconded to approve the building portion of PLN16-739 based on staff's findings and recommended conditions, with one additional condition on the building; that the stucco finish be a fine sand finish. Further, that the applicant return to the Board prior to the issuance of a building permit with a proper landscape plan including additional trees, shrubs and groundcover based on a sketch provided to the staff along with complete irrigation plans.

Attorney Atencio questioned if the Board was approving the permit or was the Board trying to separate the permit. Boardmember Woldemar stated the applicant can submit the building plans for plan check. Vice Chair Welter added that the Board is approving the permit but with the condition they must return with the landscaping. Mr. Atencio noted in the new zoning code, the City has specifically prohibited this from occurring; that no other condition of approval can impose further discretionary review by the project by the DRB.

In proposing a solution, he suggested imposing a condition to return but it would not be a discretionary review but one to confirm the applicant has complied with the condition.

Discussion ensued by Boardmembers regarding their desire to have the landscaping return to the Board, and Mr. Atencio suggested the applicant submit the landscape plan to staff who will forward it to boardmembers and request comments prior to its finalization, and only the landscape plan is returned to the Board as a follow-up requirement.

Boardmember Woldemar withdrew his original motion.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Welter) to approve PLN16-739 based on staff's findings and recommended conditions, with one additional condition that the stucco finish be a fine sand finish. Further, that the landscape plan will return to the Board prior to its finalization; approved by voice vote: 3-0-3-1 (Ayes: Livingston, Welter and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader; Abstain: Woldemar).

- 3. PLN17-095 JOHN HENRY HIGH SCHOOL OUTDOOR RECREATION AREA**
- | | |
|-------------|---|
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A ±14,200 SQUARE FOOT OUTDOOR RECREATION AREA FOR JOHN HENRY HIGH SCHOOL LOCATED AT 1402 MARINA WAY SOUTH |
| Location | 1402 MARINA WAY SOUTH |
| APN | 560-181-060 |
| Zoning | CM-5, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE, ACTIVITY CENTER |

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

Owner MARINA WESTSHORE PARTNERS LLC
Applicant AMETHOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Staff Contact ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Chair Whitty stated the Board has reviewed the project in the past and made suggestions which were addressed by the applicant.

Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that the proposal was consistent with the previous proposal.

Boardmember Livingston referred to the specifications for the steel cantilevered tent structure that the steel is not hot dipped galvanized.

Marcia Vallier, Applicant, confirmed the 20x20 structure is hot-dipped galvanized and powder coated. She said this is a structure from USA Shade and all posts and gates are powder-coated in a color and their process is they galvanize it and powder-coat over it.

Boardmember Livingston stated the specifications state it shall be corrosion resistant for 1,000 hours which is only 40 days. He noted if not hot-dipped galvanized it will rust. Vice Chair Welter noted number 4 does not state anything about 1,000 hours; however, it does not indicate it is hot-dipped galvanized.

Boardmember Woldemar asked that a condition be added in for this. Ms. Vallier agreed and said they have used these structures on the shoreline at other schools and they have not seen any rust, but will ensure it is part of the specifications, along with the wire as being stainless.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period, and there were no speakers.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Whitty/Welter) to approve PLN17-095 based on staff's 4 design review findings and staff's 7 recommended conditions with the additional condition that the shade structure and all gates shall be hot-dipped galvanized steel and powder-coated, and wires shall be stainless; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Livingston, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader).

- 4. PLN16-743 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING**
Description **(HELD OVER FROM APRIL 26, 2017)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±182,000 SQUARE FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS ON A ±10.55 ACRES VACANT PARCEL.
Location 912 HARBOUR WAY SOUTH
APN 560-260-013
Zoning IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Owner IPT RICHMOND LOGISTICS CENTER LLC
Applicant JUN LEE
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez noted that this project was reviewed by a DRB subcommittee.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

Boardmember Livingston stated it was mentioned in the staff report and discussed by the subcommittee that the applicant indicated that on the southern portion adjoining the railroad track that landscaping was being omitted because the railroad went by the land. He asked if it was proper for the Board to assume a sale of property would negate part of the design.

Mr. Lopez said he did not have this information and Mr. Atencio stated the Board could not be guided by that statement at this point given it was speculative.

Vice Chair Welter noted this was located on page 6 of 12, comment 15.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to page 4, Item No. 11; regarding peninsulas sticking into the parking area separating "x" number of spaces from the next number of spaces, he asked how many peninsula with trees must be provided for the number of car spaces. It indicates 5, but he thinks the ordinance requires 6.

Mr. Lopez said for every 5 parking stalls, one tree must be provided.

Boardmember Woldemar said after the applicant's responses follow a series of questions, on page 6 of 12, a series of recommended further enhancements are listed. He asked if staff could go through these at some time in order to receive clarification for the project.

Boardmember Livingston referred to development standards of 46,000 square feet of existing lot size which he did not believe was correct. Mr. Lopez clarified it was 10.55 acres and said it should be 460,000 square feet.

Chair Whitty referred to the revisions of a different type of fencing, higher parapet at the two corners, trellises and a more vibrant color scheme and asked if staff discussed these with the applicant. Mr. Lopez said no, but the applicant added all except for a perimeter fence.

Chair Whitty stated a letter was received from TRAC and asked if they were in concurrence. Mr. Lopez stated his understanding is slight modifications were approved by TRAC and they will speak to this. She said they ask for a two-way bike trail, 6 foot wide for each lane with a 2 foot separation from the roadway, for a total of 14 feet.

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

The applicant noted that the right-of-way dimension they got from their civil engineer is 9 feet and not 10 feet. They clarified with Mr. Beyaert that a 6 foot wide sidewalk with a 3 foot landscape area would be acceptable.

Chair Whitty asked to talk about landscaping along the railroad track.

The applicant cited mis-clarification on what was considered to be deeded which he pointed to and he was not sure if those discussions would continue. The question on the southern property line was to make it 10 feet versus 5 feet but it really affects the access and functionality of the building, and this change could not be made.

Teresa Goodwin stated the request was to add additional landscaping here and they questioned why put in landscaping which is difficult to maintain in such an area.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

Boardmember Livingston asked why the southern area by the railroad tracks cannot be planted. He commented there is a swath of gravel and garbage on the railroad property, then a concrete wall and then asphalt which will be seen from the road. The building is also about 30 feet up.

Boardmember suggested reducing some square footage of the building as an alternative. The applicant said they would have to look at downsizing the building which is problematic. He asked if there was anything else they could do, and Ms. Goodwin asked about vines to break down the mass on the south elevation.

Mr. Lopez asked that the Board consider the building is about 100 feet from the street so there is a lot of setback.

Boardmember Livingston suggested coming at 150 feet with evergreen trees 25 feet on center. Ms. Goodwin asked if shrubs could be considered and Boardmember Livingston said he would prefer trees but asked other boardmembers.

Chair Whitty suggested clumps of grasses that grow about 6 feet tall.

Boardmember Woldemar gave the following comments regarding the site plan:

- Regarding planting, he asked what is proposed for the north and south property line fencing. Sheet A-1.1 indicates that for a significant portion running east to west is going to be black vinyl covered chain link fence. The remaining portion is not indicated.
- Why are driveways so wide in both north and south driveways. If they were 2-3 feet narrower, it might make truck traffic easier.
- He noted the chain link fence is called out as 8 feet and asked and confirmed there was no barbed wire.
- He could not find anywhere the elevations for the gates for the trucks.
- In the north corner is a refuse area adjacent to a screen wall which is on the public side. The 3-D elevation was from the southern rather than the northern end and he suggested the refuse area be moved away from there.
- On page A-4.1 it illustrates a refuse area and a man entrance as opposed to getting to it through gates, is covered, but he did not agree with its location. He also asked what the colors of it were.
- In Detail E is a parking space cross section. It does not appear to have any tire stops, but they were shown for handicapped spaces. He preferred cars overhang the walkway or planting area where possible.
- A section in the new zoning ordinance indicates the requirement for a 5 foot sidewalk against a building and 3 feet of landscaping. He asked that there be a walkway and, irrespective of where the office entrances are located, he would have enter the office via the parking lot or in landscaping. The building might need to move to the rear a bit or the setback is changed.
- Sheet SL-1 is the lighting and the pole lights across the front of the building appear to be in the middle of parking spaces. This will also trigger how many peninsulas there are in the parking lot.
- It was not clear what color the light fixtures and poles were, and asked that they be compatible with the architecture and not necessarily black.
- Regarding the landscape plan, along the southern side there should be trees, shrubs and vines along the entire wall. He asked for tighter tree spacing on the north side and there should be shrubs and vines along that.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

- In one case on the north side is another property owner's parking lot. Trees are 60-70 feet apart and he asked that they be closer together.
- He asked to see what the diagram is for the bike path, mounding of the landscaping section of the front zone of the project.
- He asked to see additional locations where pedestrians and bikes can enter across the parking lot.
- The ordinance requires parking be continuous with peninsulas with trees at every 5 parking spaces. There are some in there which are considerably longer than that, and with the lighting plan and this, it will change the parking layout along the entire front side.
- He recommended in the planting list, all plants be 15 gallon materials. There are some places at the entrances where 24" box trees would be appropriate.

Boardmember Livingston gave the following comments regarding the site plan:

- He said it was suggested in subcommittee that berming be incorporated into the front to screen cars but this has not been addressed, given there is 290 feet of bio-swales along Harbour Way South. He asked to move the bio-swales from the front to the side of the site and integrate the berms here. Boardmember Woldemar noted that the landscape plans for both of these areas need to be revised to reflect the size of the bio-swale areas.

Ms. Goodwin stated she spoke with their civil engineer and she asked if there were other ways to accomplish what the Board is looking for as far as landscaping instead of re-designing the site.

Boardmember Livingston suggested permeable paving in front and berm from the middle of the site south. For the middle of the site north, permeable paving can be used with an underground collection system to make the grades to the north.

Boardmember Woldemar also suggested a wall across in lieu of mounding and to integrate the wall into the mounded portions with a slight backup against. Ms. Goodwin said she would prefer landscaping versus concrete and Boardmember Livingston reiterated there is no room for mounding.

Boardmember Woldemar stated this could be achieved with raised planters and just as important is the cross section through the zone as it relates to the bike path given there may not be enough room once the buildings are moved back a bit.

Regarding architectural comments:

- Boardmember Woldemar said the City's ordinance requires the applicant provide a generic sign program and this is missing.
- The gate elevations need to be included in the packet plans.
- In subcommittee he made note of the long front elevation and the need to be more expressive with vertical elevations or "sky edge" and movement of front to back with offsets. He suggested more articulation and to reconfigure both ends of the building for end items and to move inward and create an office elevation with wings on either side of it. He distributed a sketch to the applicant and said if additional office or R&D spaces were needed in the future, the end wings could serve as entries.
- He was comfortable with the materials but not the way they were organized.
- Boardmember Livingston referred to the note there is a canopy on one of the buildings which is a steel tube. He asked if tempered glass could be added with supports above it. Ms. Goodwin said at the doors they put a transom panel which may not be indicated, but

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

this is required by the California Green code. It is painted metallic and is a nice look which brings the mass down and adds a cover over the doors.

- He pointed to busy horizontal lines on the west elevation and smaller ones to the right of it, and he confirmed this is a wood palette planter against the wall.
- He questioned where signage would go. He noted Shafer lighting is down the road at the Cannery and asked if they could do some laser cut aluminum bolt lock with signs that has art deco historical aspects which would match the anodized windows.

Chair Whitty referred to the need for a different type of fencing material other than chain link fencing around the perimeter of the site. The Board talked about the 8 foot black vinyl chain link on north and south side fencing. Boardmember Woldemar said it only extends to the gates and no fencing adjoining the railroad property. Ms. Goodwin said there is a concrete screen wall with pilaster details to match the building.

Mr. Lopez presented the color board and Chair Whitty confirmed that Boardmember Benz gave him color samples she preferred and the Board supported the colors.

Chair Whitty suggested keeping the public hearing open and she asked Mr. Lopez to work with the applicant on the items needing revisions. Mr. Lopez suggested another subcommittee meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar summarized items as the whole cross section across the front to include the bike path, C3, raised berms, walls, raised planters, and other solutions which is affected by the parking against the building. He suggested the building slide back or suggested adding more square footage on the back side. The pattern of the front façade needs more balance and work and referred to his sketch or some other iteration. There are landscaping issues, the need for information and graphics relating to signage, gates and lighting. He noted several members are off of the Board after June 14th.

Chair Whitty opened the public comment period.

Public Comments:

BRUCE BEYAERT, TRAC, stated Harbour Way South is a key part of the Bay Trail connecting the community. Right now on Harbour Way South all they have in addition to 5 foot wide sidewalks is a bike lane on one side of the road and sharrows on the other side. This project installs a separated bikeway along the frontage north which will be a marked improvement for safety and connection. TRAC is excited to see this incorporated into the project.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the front solution for the project and asked when TRAC would approach the people in front of the Ford Building to do the same thing and others especially given the ferry terminal.

Mr. Beyaert agreed it would be a great precedent to set to require this for all of these areas, and he said it works here because in the South Richmond Transportation Connectivity Plan, it calls for eliminating parking on the front of the property which allows the bike lane to fit in. It does not change the curb but it eliminates the parking and bike lane and replaces it with a two-way bike lane.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Whitty) to continue PLN16-743 to June 14, 2017 for the applicant to address Board comments; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Livingston, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader).

5. PLN16-385 MAKING WAVES ACADEMY EXPANSION

Description **(HELD OVER FROM APRIL 26, 2017)** PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO EXPAND THE MAKING WAVES ACADEMY CAMPUS. THE PROJECT CONSISTS OF RENOVATION OF EXISTING CLASSROOM FACILITIES; EXPANSION INTO ADJACENT PARCELS TO BE INCORPORATED AS PART OF THE MASTER PLAN; AND CONSTRUCTION OF THREE NEW CLASSROOM BUILDINGS, TWO GYMNASIUMS, OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL AREAS, ASSOCIATED PARKING, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.

Location 4075, 4123, 4131, 4175, AND 4301 LAKESIDE DRIVE, AND 2900, 2925, AND 2975 TECHNOLOGY COURT

APNs 405-371-034, 405-371-035, 405-371-010, 405-371-032, 405-371-033, 405-371-025, 405-371-013, AND 405-371-014

Zoning IL, INDUSTRIAL, LIGHT

Applicant MAKING WAVES FOUNDATION, INC. (OWNER)

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

Chair Whitty stated the project was before the Board on February 22, 2017 and the Board voiced several questions and comments and it was continued to this meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar noted his comments are those which remain to be discussed, based on his review of items addressed on an April 6th set of plans.

Chair Whitty suggested addressing Boardmember Woldemar's list of items, as follows:

DOUG GIFFIN, Campus, LLC, stated they had five major items as take-aways from previous meetings.

Boardmember Woldemar had the following comments:

- The project has made enormous steps and the applicants have been very cooperative. Subject to the City Attorney's conversation as to whether the Board can approve the project with conditions or continue it.
- He referred to page A-7.40 which is a guardrail. He asked what the retaining wall below it looks like.

Thomas Lumikko, Studio Bondy Architecture, stated the guardrail sits on the retaining wall, given there is enough of a drop. The detail for the guardrail is on 9-A-7.40 and it is shown on rendering views. They propose to match it for the site concrete in the color mix which has been included on Sheet L-1.05 on the landscape plan. One concrete color is a light grey and the other is the "special paving" color.

- Boardmember Woldemar confirmed the wall does not have the label for its color and suggested this be a condition of approval.
- He asked and confirmed that the applicant was not depending on the plan checkers to confirm what something looks like per the rendering.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

- An issue has been the walkway along San Pablo Avenue and suggested the Board discuss this to not be a requirement. Mr. Atencio stated he was not sure it is a requirement per Engineering but he would have to follow-up.

Chair Whitty said she requested the applicant be required to put in a sidewalk to go over the railroad grade and reach the corner, but it would lead to nowhere. She said on the other side there is a walkway which is used well, but not on this side.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that because of this, Vice Chair Welter had said the request for a walkway on the applicant's side did not make sense, and he asked how Boardmember Livingston felt. Boardmember Livingston said it is a school and a school route, and while most get driven, he thinks the City has responsibility to maintain the connectivity and suggested it be taken seriously. Vice Chair Welter said if there was no other path he would agree. Boardmembers discussed paths of travel from Hilltop and Boardmember Woldemar noted that students can use Lakeside instead of San Pablo Avenue. He did not think the sidewalk was needed, but suggested subject to Engineering and Public Works concurring, a sidewalk not be required. And, if not required, he said the entire area should be landscaped which the applicant has agreed to.

Mr. Giffin said he and Mr. Lopez discussed this and they plan to work with the Hilltop Landscape District to come up with a palette of landscaping they wanted. They plan to increase vine spacing along the wall and also wrote a draft condition of approval the Board could use.

- Boardmember Woldemar confirmed a row of trees would be added to the north side of the playfield. Between the next two buildings, he confirmed that landscaping here is shown on the planting plan along with two benches on both sides. He asked that the wall along San Pablo Avenue should include closed spaced vines so they fill in quickly.
- In front of the high school bus drop off, he confirmed this is an existing planting area which is also adjacent to the school administration windows.
- Boardmember Woldemar asked and confirmed that per the new zoning ordinance, peninsulas were not necessarily required. Mr. Lumikko noted that many of the parking rows run east/west and tree planting between the rows of parking creates the maximum shade.
- Boardmember Woldemar said there is still a conflict in notes along the southern most fence. He asked and confirmed the applicant is not proposing a fence for this side which is up along the storage building. Mr. Lumikko explained that the wall extends for 90% of the site and there is a small gap between the end of the main storage building and another building where they will connect it with a fence and this is called out on the planting plan which he presented.
- Boardmember Woldemar referred to his note to use more coast live oaks and fewer London plane trees, and he confirmed this was done.
- Boardmember Woldemar referred to the San Pablo side of high school building 2 and suggested parking be made to be compact spaces so green space could be achieved on the San Pablo Avenue side of the driveway. Mr. Giffin said they added a lot of trees where people could see them, but this is the back end of the building.
- Boardmember Woldemar said when putting the walkway on the elementary school side, there is a ramped area and he suggested secondary signage at the corner at the Parkway and San Pablo Avenue. Mr. Giffin said their primary concern is that parents might want to drop off kids on the Parkway versus waiting in the queue. The element is there for kids

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

who walk to school and for people who know the campus, as they do not want people dropping off along the Parkway. Boardmember Woldemar withdrew his request.

- Regarding colors of the aluminum storefront he thinks it is too grey, and he suggested going to a different color window frame such as a crisp white or red and use it consistently to match the program.

Mr. Giffin noted that the new fence along the Parkways with the art panels in it, the color is a blue. Mr. Lopez suggested the gate along the walkway match the panels and this is included in the condition and sheet. Mr. Lumikko said they also thought the colors would go better with a black fence which the Board agreed to.

- Boardmember Livingston recognized the level of native plantings.
- He said not addressed is a comment which has to do with the entry's first impression. The space between buildings is not dissimilar from space from other buildings so nothing distinguishes the entry.

Mr. Lumikko said they spent a lot of time trying to make the entry more dramatic and he referred to the rendering package, A.5-10 which he described as trying to find the right balance to discourage drop-off on Lakeside while providing an inviting walk on the sidewalk to the front of the school. They emphasized the link with a Spandrel glass panel and another piece of signage is visible from the pedestrian link.

- Vice Chair Welter suggested the tree at the entry not be there, given the corner could be seen. He suggested this as a landscaping solution.
- Boardmember Livingston also said the curvy walkway is more like a pedestrian scale and it downplays the entry as being more parklike versus institutional. Mr. Giffin noted they added pavement detail. Chair Whitty asked that the sheet be labeled Sheet no. 5.4-5 and not Sheet 4-5. Mr. Giffin agreed to remove or shift the tree.
- Boardmember Woldemar said the convincing argument for him is who they are announcing the entries to given parents will be driving and/or dropping kids off and Boardmembers briefly discussed the focus of the entry and noted it was 90% there. Chair Whitty suggested possibly painting the wall a different color to stand out as well.
- Boardmembers referred to the colors and except for Boardmember Woldemar, liked them.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the need for the DRB, as he questioned what the design of the landscaping will look like along San Pablo Avenue and asked how it will get plan checked. He said a drawing is needed or the Board needs to depend on staff. He questioned whether the Board should continue the project so those gaps can be filled in and identified.

Mr. Atencio suggested expediting the project and trusting staff to fulfill the Board's vision and to allow a successful outcome of the project. He spoke about an example of an appeal and issues regarding continuing projects versus conditioning the project.

Boardmember suggested continuing the project for two weeks and ask the applicant to prepare a landscape plan, annotate changes which can be incorporated into conditions and for the Board to approve it at that time, leaving nothing to doubt and nothing for staff to question.

Mr. Giffin said they have had a real challenge with this project and each review they are spending more money. He noted their planner had left and they are supposed to be demolishing the buildings on June 12th. They have done all drawings at risk and are ready to submit, and while two weeks does not seem like a long time they need to move forward to deliver in the fall of 2018.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 23, 2017

Mr. Atencio noted the project needs to go to the Planning Commission early June and he recommended a Boardmember submit remarks on plans and conditions of approval. Mr. Giffin asked for a way for the Board to approve it tonight.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested including a condition tonight to state that the frontage along San Pablo Avenue between the curb and wall shall be intensely landscaped and Mr. Giffin added that it also be per approval of the Hilltop Landscape District.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Woldemar/Welter) to recommend to the Planning Commission approval of the design review aspect of PLN16-385 based upon staff's recommended 4 design review findings, based on staff's recommended 13 conditions of approval with the following additional conditions: 14) that the landscaping between the existing wall and the curb along San Pablo Avenue be intensely completed or satisfied to include trees, shrubs, groundcover and vines; 15) that the walkway turn the outside corner on the high school office entry way to reflect the yellow color; 16) at the applicant's judgment, consider removing or relocating several of the entryway trees; 17) to open up the site line to the front entryway; and 18) that the applicant consider providing compact parking spaces behind the high school building which will be dependent upon car charging stations in the area; approved by voice vote: 4-0-3 (Ayes: Fetter, Livingston, Welter, Woldemar and Whitty; Noes: None; Absent: Benz, Fetter and Leader)

Board Business

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements - None**
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements –** Boardmember Livingston reported that he will view the Terminal One project on Friday.

Boardmembers briefly discussed DRB recruitment and member vacancies.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, May 24, 2017.