

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**

October 10, 2018
6:30 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Meredith Benz
Michael Hannah
Karlyn Neel

Kimberly Butt
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:11 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, and Michael Hannah

Absent: Boardmembers Meredith Benz, and Karlyn Neel

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Jonelyn Whales and Hector Lopez; and City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 26, 2018

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston) to approve the minutes of the September 26, 2018 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Benz and Neel).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that the Fairmede-Hilltop Neighborhood Council had not been pleased that the Aspire Richmond Technology Academy application had been approved even though there had been concerns the building was not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible, and there had been no traffic study, among other concerns. On another matter, he requested a future agenda item for the McDonald's Façade Renovation project given that there had been no communication between McDonald's and the North and East Neighborhood Councils or the 23rd Street Merchants Association. He emphasized that as a courtesy all applicants were to communicate with each applicable Neighborhood Council.

City Council Liaison Report – Mayor Butt was not present.

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, October 22, 2018 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. PLN18-178

Description

ROMERO SECOND-STORY ADDITION

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE.

Location

2525 HUMPHREY AVENUE

APN

527-200-017

Zoning

RL2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT

Owner

ADA M. ROMERO

Applicant

BRENDA MUNOZ

Staff Contact

ROBERTA FELICIANO Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated October 10, 2018, for a 5,000 square foot parcel located on Humphrey Avenue in close proximity to Richmond High School. The property owner requested permission to construct a 483 square foot addition in the rear of a single-family home that would consist of a master bedroom and bathroom on the second floor. The application complied with all zoning requirements, building height, setbacks, maximum lot coverage, and residential floor area, and approval was recommended. In response to questions, he explained that the original building had been constructed in the 1940s, there was no landscape plan, although there was existing landscaping and a couple of trees would be added in the rear with a street tree to be installed in the front of the property.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

BRENDA MUNOZ, the applicant, responded to questions related to the proposed exterior materials and acknowledged and agreed with Boardmember Hannah's recommendation that the entire two-story volume needed to be all new siding, and the belly band needed to be much bigger, at 10 inches minimum, with trim transition between the old siding on the first floor and the new siding.

Boardmember Hannah verified that the applicant would use the same gutters and downspouts as the existing gutters and downspouts.

Boardmember Butt sought assurance that the siding would match and the vertical trim would help the transition between the new and the old siding.

Chair Livingston recommended the 3,000k lighting standard, with the lights to be shielded.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Butt) to approve PLN18-178, Romero Second-Story Addition, subject to the 4 DRB findings and 10 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 11) All new addition siding to be Hardie siding at the new addition and below the first and second stories; 12) Increase the belly band from 6 inches to 10 inches minimum; 13) Add a vertical trim transition piece from the old siding to the new siding at the first floor preferably behind the downspout; 14) Gutters and downspouts to match existing, painted GSM; and 15) All

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

exterior lighting to be 3,000k or less and be shielded; approved by voice vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Benz and Neel).

Chair Livingston advised the next item would be continued to the October 24, 2018 meeting.

- 2. PLN18-177 NEW LIGHT INDUSTRIAL FACILITY**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT AN INDUSTRIAL BUILDING OF ± 1,600 SQUARE FEET ON A 10,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location SOUTH 33RD STREET
APN 549-212-004
Zoning IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
Applicant DILSA BALTAZAR (Owner)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONTINUE TO OCTOBER 24, 2018**

- 3. PLN18-117 YARAMALA RESIDENCE**
Description PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,800 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING ON A ±5,900 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location 637 13TH STREET
APN 534-161-024
Zoning RL2, SINGLE FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner JILANCHI FAMILY TRUST
Applicant KRISHNA YARAMALA
Staff Contact JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Jonelyn Whales explained that the applicant was not present. She presented the staff report dated October 10, 2018, for a new 1,800 square foot single-family home with a two-car garage on a 5,000 plus square foot lot that backed up to the railroad tracks, and was located within the Iron Triangle neighborhood. The lot had previously been occupied by a single-family residence and garage that had been destroyed by fire in the 1990s. The proposed application for the irregularly shaped parcel met all the applicable zoning standards. She noted it was not yet known whether an encroachment permit for sidewalks would be required given that there was no sidewalk on the property. She recommended approval of the application subject to the conditions in the staff report.

Boardmembers commended the complete plans and had no comments on the application beyond the typical recommendations for complete details for gutters, downspouts, and lights.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Public Comments:

There were no comments from the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Livingston) to approve PLN18-117, Yaramala Residence, subject to the 4 DRB findings and 12 staff recommended conditions of approval, and additional DRB recommendations as follows: 13) Gutters and downspouts to be the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

typical vernacular for the style and be painted GSM; and 14) Exterior lights to be 3,000k or less and be shielded; approved by voice vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Butt, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Benz and Neel).

4. PLN18-162	GUNKEL NEW RESIDENCE
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN OF A NEW ±2,200 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON A VACANT PARCEL. EXISTING PARCEL WILL BE INCREASED IN SIZE TO MEET THE MINIMUM LOT AREA.
Location	527 SANTA FE AVENUE
APN	558-184-008
Zoning	RL-1, SINGLE FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (TISCORNIA ESTATES SPECIFIC PLAN)
Applicant	BRAD GUNKEL (Architect)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: RECEIVE COMMENTS-NO ACTION

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated October 10, 2018, and explained that the subject lot was one of the developable lots in the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan area, and while the lot was currently only 3,743 square feet in size, less than the minimum 5,000 square foot lot area requirement for the district, there had been an arrangement between the applicant and the adjacent property owner to purchase additional land as well as to acquire portions of Santa Fe Avenue the City had vacated in the 1980s.

Chair Livingston clarified that the minimum lot size requirement related to the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan and not to the RL-1 Zoning District.

Chair Livingston opened the study session.

BRAD GUNKEL, the applicant/architect, explained that the inspiration for the design had come from homes in the Tiscornia Estates area and others in Sea Ranch, and had incorporated all the requirements of the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan. Letters of support had been submitted by neighbors on both sides, by the Neighborhood Council, and by others in the area. He had met with multiple City departments and the Fire Department, and had designed a home that would be compatible in the neighborhood and ensure the privacy of adjacent neighbors with respect to window placement. He explained that the property had yet to close and the lot line adjustment could not be recorded until that had occurred.

Mr. Gunkel clarified the existing lot and the additional property that would be acquired to comply with the minimum lot requirement as to size, and the planned termination of Santa Fe Avenue with the design of a smaller than normal cul-de-sac. He presented the site plan and elevations of the proposed reverse plan that would terrace up the hillside, and explained that the proposed garage at 16.5 by 20 feet in size could accommodate two cars, but by zoning would fit one car given the specific standards of the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan.

In response to questions, Mr. Gunkel explained that the deck would be roofed with a roof and overflow drain with a sleeper system, with decking on top and all internal drainage. As to how the maximum building envelope had been determined, he explained that originally the Santa Fe line had been used. The house fit within the original setback envelope. He noted, however that once the City Attorney's Office had determined that the portion of Santa Fe Avenue vacated in front of the parcel would be part of the parcel, the lot line and setbacks had been based on the middle of the vacated portion of Santa Fe Avenue, the private cul-de-sac.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

Chair Livingston requested a copy of that determination by the City Attorney's office.

Mr. Gunkel described the other lots associated with the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan and reiterated that he had met with the other property owners, and multiple times with the Fire Marshal and the Fire Department with respect to an emergency vehicle turnaround at the end of Santa Fe Avenue when a number of options had been considered for the cul-de-sac. He noted a larger cul-de-sac would have required more retaining walls around the perimeter, and because the cul-de-sac was privately owned, the Fire Department liked the idea of having a portion of the lag of the turnaround on Bay Street. He added that the Engineering Department did not want to take over the ownership of the vacated portion of Santa Fe Avenue and preferred that it remain private property and be maintained by the property owners. The City Attorney's office had weighed in on a number of items related to the additional amount of land acquired as part of a lot line adjustment, and a determination had been made regarding the setback and other items.

Chair Livingston sought a clarification of the area of vacated Santa Fe Avenue that had been absorbed by the subject property, described by Ms. Whales as being determined by the Richmond Municipal Code which had been interpreted by the City Attorney. It was emphasized that the land involved was private.

ALLISON LEHMAN, 380 Western Drive, Richmond, a nearby property owner, noted there had been a lot of controversy and conflict in Tiscornia. She questioned whether the cul-de-sac would reduce the square footage of the property, and expressed concern with the cul-de-sac and whether it would be appropriate for emergency vehicle access. She verified with the applicant that there would be no visible retaining walls associated with the proposal and wanted to make sure that the retaining walls would be less than 3 feet 6 inches high, and that the private driveway in the form of a portion of a cul-de-sac be built to City engineering standards.

Mr. Gunkel clarified that the property owners didn't need to build a bulb at the end of Santa Fe Avenue but had decided to do so. The bulb was essentially a shared private driveway.

DEL OLSEN, 301 Pacific Avenue, Richmond, encouraged the DRB to look at the swale in its entirety to better serve all interests. He noted the potential to develop four homes off the bulb, which he suggested would require a Subdivision Map, and which would require multiple driveways off of the bulb. With no off-street parking, he expressed concern parking would be pushed down the hill and create a negative impact in the neighborhood. He suggested there would need to be a 10-foot retaining wall on the uphill side of the bulb topped by a 42-inch safety fence. He also expressed concern with construction impacts to the sewer in the public right-of-way that served three homes and to the access to the dedicated open space area to the north. He supported the reasonable coordinated development of the area in the swale.

JERRY KEEFFE, 380 Western Drive, Richmond, stated that the Tiscornia Plan had always called out that Santa Fe Avenue would end in a cul-de-sac. He suggested the proposed bulb would be unsightly and emphasized that parking was always critical in the neighborhood.

Mr. Gunkel verified that no parking would be allowed all the way around even if it was a larger cul-de-sac. He added, when asked, that the property owners would be responsible for most of the cost of the turnaround. Any relocation of the sewer line had yet to be clarified. He also noted, when asked, that Bay Street had never been vacated and was a paper street owned by the City.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

Another neighbor identified only as Sally, commented that she had a concern for the whole area and urged that it be cleaned up to avoid wildfires.

Given that the public comments were not specific to the application, the DRB asked for a clarification of those who had spoken to identify the public contention. The speakers explained that they had no problem with the architecture of the proposed home or the proposed home itself, although there were neighborhood concerns related to the need for a Subdivision Map for the remaining lots off of Santa Fe Avenue, off-street parking, retaining walls, the proposed cul-de-sac, and the need to follow the rules and the spirit intended for 5,000 square foot minimum lots, along with the interpretation of where the building envelope started and how the 5,000 square foot minimum was determined. The speakers acknowledged problems with the Tiscornia Plan, which had no established lotting pattern and which had created continuing concerns of uncertainty with piecemeal applications and no coordinated approach. The speakers also expressed concern that the City had called for a cul-de-sac at the end of Santa Fe Avenue and had then vacated the land for the cul-de-sac, which had created the problem.

Mr. Gunkel explained that he had initially requested a variance from the City to develop a 3,000 square foot lot, although there had been concerns expressed by neighbors that even though there had been a variance elsewhere in the Tiscornia area, it could set a precedence. At that point, he had agreed to proceed with a lot line adjustment. At this point, he would be owning and maintaining that portion of the private driveway in front of the home and he stated it should be counted towards the total square footage, particularly since it would not change the design of the home. He added that there would be a minimum 10 feet between his home and adjacent homes. He also noted for the record that the property owner of the remaining lots, Steve Skates, had been involved in the process of developing the subject proposal.

Boardmember Hannah explained that while the proposed new home would now be the visible presence on the street, which the neighboring homes used to be, it would be no more impactful since it was buried into the hill and conformed to the Residential Design Guidelines. He suggested the application represented a lightning rod for a number of problems in the neighborhood it was not fair for the applicant to have to resolve, particularly with respect to emergency vehicle access, although he was encouraged to see a proposed development that took a step forward to take an all-inclusive solution that everyone could buy into.

Chair Livingston noted with respect to public access that the document had floated public access for connectivity purposes, and he suggested that stairs be considered and that the design of the emergency vehicle turnaround include steps up to Bay Street.

Mr. Gunkel expressed a willingness to fund steps up to the retaining wall but not all the way.

Boardmember Hannah pointed out that a smaller impervious area associated with a smaller cul-de-sac would produce less water. He suggested the neighbors work together to create stairs and come up with a vegetative terrace and turn it into a way for the neighborhood to get together.

Boardmember Butt expressed surprise for the discussion of a bigger turnaround given that the proposed home had a smaller footprint than the other houses in the area and she did not see it as a huge imposition. She suggested that the cul-de-sac was a small thoughtful intervention compared to what it could be.

With respect to the architecture of the home, Boardmember Hannah verified with Mr. Gunkel that the natural wood in the design would be rain screen redwood. He recognized the skillful

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

architecture, detailing, and design; was pleased with the materials that had been proposed which would provide a natural feel; noted the potential for some dissimilar metal details between the aluminum and stainless steel which would have to be watched closely to avoid deterioration if touching; clarified that the angled piece was stucco, which would have controlled joints; gutters would be all internal; the roof membrane would be a cool roof built up with a cool cap sheet to appear in color similar to the stucco, with a need to avoid glare; and expressed a concern that the Core 10 could stain the stucco. To be sure there would be no staining or other issues from the exposed metal components, he requested that every metal be called out in the submission.

Boardmember Butt asked if the redwood would be allowed to weather, and Mr. Gunkel explained that he liked the redwood to darken over a number of years but it would be sealed for a while.

As to whether there was any purpose to the angled element, Mr. Gunkel explained it was intended for privacy given the balconies off the master bedroom, as an architectural element to recognize the topography in a playful way, and to wrap the wood volume to frame the house..

Boardmember Butt wanted to ensure that the east elevation stucco finish did not read like a large concrete wall when looking down on the building. To address that concern, Boardmember Hannah suggested that the white be reconsidered and that the base be darkened to recede.

Chair Livingston suggested that bringing out one of the planes on the east elevation would address what he characterized as an arbitrarily harsh element, and bringing the bottom floor out would actually widen the aperture a bit.

Mr. Gunkel stated he could look at that elevation again and find a way to break the mass a bit and soften that side, with ideas to darken some elements and to climb up the hill a bit to break up the massing and mitigate that wall.

Sketches were drawn by Boardmember Hannah to show the applicant what the DRB had proposed, and Chair Livingston recommended that the applicant consider some sketches in response and submit them to staff who would provide them to Boardmember Hannah to allow a back and forth to consider some revisions. Boardmember Hannah noted that the wood was flush with the stucco on the middle floor and he recommended that it be recessed above or pop out, or that both be considered.

Chair Livingston liked the proposal that he described as beautifully detailed, and with some tweaks on the east side stated it would be successful. He thanked the citizens who had made comments and stated the city needed to hear their concerns so that when the rest of the cul-de-sac was finished the issues could be addressed. He commented that the DRB recognized that the particular lot would not change much either way and the issues should not impact one person with one lot, although he urged the applicant to work with the other landowners to address the issues with respect to drainage, and which needed to be considered for the whole subdivision to be engineered appropriately.

Mr. Gunkel described what the proposal would provide to improve the situation in the neighborhood and asked the other neighbors present if they could accept the proposal with the improvements to the turnaround and after approval by the Fire Department and other City Departments.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018

Some neighbors commented that they felt rushed to accept the proposal which they had not previously been provided.

Ms. Lehman requested a letter to confirm that the cul-de-sac had been approved and would work for the emergency vehicles, and with that she could potentially support the project, with a way to preserve the paths.

Mr. Olsen added that it was also important to preserve the aspects of the open space and to ensure a fairness in the application of the rules and regulations under the Tiscornia Estates Specific Plan.

Mr. Keefe did not like the turnaround, questioned its functionality, and did not support the 3-foot 6 inch maximum terraced retaining walls.

Boardmember Hannah suggested it should be the goal of everyone to beautify that element and make it the best it could be, to work functionally for life safety, and to not visually scar the neighborhood.

The discussion clarified where the proposed steps could be placed in the middle of the open space. The possibility of a neighborhood garden was suggested and the fact that the neighbors were working together to address issues of concern and to improve the neighborhood were applauded.

Chair Livingston requested a legal opinion on the installation of a community garden on Bay Street to help inform the neighborhood of what could be done.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements: None

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, October 24, 2018.