

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL  
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA  
February 28, 2007  
6:00 p.m.**

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Eileen Whitty, Chair  
Jonathan Livingston  
Don Woodrow  
Robert Avellar

Michael Woldemar, Vice Chair  
Ted J. Smith  
Diane Bloom

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Whitty, Vice Chair Woldemar, Board members Avellar, Livingston and Woodrow

**Absent:** Bloom and Smith

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Lamont Thompson, Mary Renfro, Lina Velasco and Richard Mitchell

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Minutes of April 26, 2006, May 10, 2006, May 24, 2006, June 14, 2006, December 13, 2006 and January 10, 2007:

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Livingston) to accept the minutes of April 26, May 10, May 24, 2006; unanimously approved.**

Vice Chair Woldemar said his June 14, 2006 ended at page 8, and confirmed this was an error.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Livingston) to accept the minutes of June 14, 2006; unanimously approved.**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Livingston) to approve the minutes of December 13, 2006 and January 10, 2007; unanimously approved.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Lamont Thompson said there was a request from the Redevelopment Agency to move up Item 9 to be heard first and noted Item 1 was rescheduled to a later date. Chair Whitty said approximately 12 architects from Moscow would be arriving around 6:45 p.m. and she asked that Item 6 be heard while they were present or after the first item.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve the agenda, as amended by moving up Item 9 and hearing Item 6 after that item; unanimously approved.**

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Chair Whitty** gave an overview of the Consent Calendar, procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. She said any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, by Monday, March 12, 2007 by 5:00 p.m.

Chair Whitty noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of Items 7 and 8. Vice Chair Woldemar asked to add Item 2 to the Consent Calendar, as it was recommended for hold over to April 11, 2007.

Items requested for removal were Item 7 (public).

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve the Consent Calendar Items 2 and 8; unanimously approved.**

### **Consent Items Approved:**

- 2. DR 1103246 – 16 Building Trade Studio Live/Work Units on Ohio Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval of 16 live/work units, 27 parking spaces, a driveway, and landscaping on five parcels (Parcels A through E) totaling ±46,250 square feet. Parcel A is located on the northwest corner of Ohio Avenue and Eighth Street (APN: 538-410-021), and the contiguous Parcels B, C, D, and E are located on the north side of Ohio Avenue between Eighth Street and Harbour Way South (APNs: 538-420-004, 538-420-022, 538-420-001, and 538-430-018). Light Industrial (Knox Cutting Specific Plan) Zoning District. Raymond Knox, Helga Gruber, Kathy Rogers, Alexa Wilkie, Beth Gerstein, Karen Bowen, Tom Lawrence, Karen Sprague, and Kyle and Natalia Reicher, owners; Kathryn A. Rogers, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 4/11/2007.
  
- 8. DR 1103676 – Addition to Single-Family Residence on Dunn Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±472 square foot addition to the existing single-family residence located at 1530 Dunn Avenue (APN: 530-180-005). The project includes raising the roofline of the existing residence to convert the attic into living space. SFR-3, Low- Density Residential Zoning District. Marisol & Julio Rodriguez, owners; Brenda Muñoz, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

### **Items Discussed:**

- 9. Macdonald Avenue Street Improvements - DISCUSSION** of the design phase of improvements for Richmond's historic downtown segment of Macdonald Avenue from 19th Street (near BART Overcrossing) to Garrard Boulevard (Richmond Parkway). C-B, Central Business; and C-1, Neighborhood Commercial Zoning Districts. City of Richmond, owner; Craig Murray, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: No Formal Action – Provide Comments Only.

**Chair Whitty** noted the item was for discussion only for the Board to provide comments to the Redevelopment Agency on the design phase of improvements for Richmond's historic downtown segment. **Lamont Thompson** noted Alan Wolken would make a presentation and introduce the design team.

**Alan Wolken**, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, said a number of years ago the Macdonald Avenue Economic Revitalization Plan process began which looked at streetscapes, economic initiatives that could take place along Macdonald Avenue, such as the recently approved high density infill project, public improvements along the entire length of Macdonald Avenue which was broken up into segments; the historic middle, residential, civic area, urban retail. Looked at by the team was a variety of streetscape improvements that could be made to enhance public activity and to be a catalyst to bring private development into the area. The Redevelopment Agency began the first segment from San Pablo to 39<sup>th</sup> Street, brought plans to the Board to discuss how they would re-align Macdonald Avenue, use bulb-outs, traffic calming, signage, street lighting, and landscaping.

He said since the last Board meeting, east Macdonald had been completed with street lighting, public art, realignment, median landscaping, bulb-outs, and decorative sidewalks. At the March 22, 2006 meeting, the second phase was brought to the Board which incorporates more traffic calming, diagonal parking, removed medians, widening of sidewalks, street furniture, decorative sidewalks, custom bus shelters and new traffic signals.

He noted they wanted to discuss the entire length of the second phase, which would be broken down into two segments. There are a number of City projects intended for further west on Macdonald Avenue that they are hoping to move forward before starting the streetscapes, and said John Gibbs from WRT would focus on the first piece of it, from Harbour Way to 19<sup>th</sup>. He said the public art component which Donna Graves was working on called, "Memories of Macdonald" was being integrated into the project, they are looking to create opportunities for art in the area, there has been a lot of public outreach, they are looking at a gateway at the west end of Macdonald, and WRT was showing locations for some of the more standard types of art that the National Parks Service would like to see, such as markers in the sidewalks. Donna Graves would be coming before the Board at a later meeting to talk about some of the art elements.

In addition, the planning process was going on at Nevin Park. He said they have a landscape architect looking at redoing the park with the Iron Triangle downtown merchants and this would be integrated with the streetscape work.

**Boardmember Avellar** said on 12<sup>th</sup> Street, it shows the street and he confirmed with Mr. Wolken that on the north side, 12<sup>th</sup> Street was being vacated and it would be part of the plaza for the A.F. Evans project.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** questioned who did the final design approval on any given segment, and **Mr. Wolken** said as part of the process WRT was sending their plans into Craig Murray of the Redevelopment Agency, who then forwards the plans to Tony Norris, Rich Davidson, and the Fire Department due to the project's public works nature. Those individuals would look at street widths, travel lanes, diagonal parking and travel times, and final approval would go through public works and the Fire Department.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** confirmed that the informational meeting was the only public process for approval, there was no approval by the Design Review Board of the project or the public art component. **Mr. Wolken** said they are taking the design to the neighborhood councils and community, but there was no real formal public approval process. **Vice Chair Woldemar** hoped that as the design review ordinance got re-worked, it would clearly address itself to these kinds of public projects which he felt were as or more significant than private projects. He also congratulated Mr. Wolken on what had been done on eastern Macdonald, particularly the art on the poles.

**Mr. Wolken** said staff was hoping to bring the west end art forward within the next month, noted there were some dramatic pieces, and were working with the Planning Department to schedule these types of projects to the Design Review Board for input.

John Gibbs, WRT, said he was available to answer questions, noted they provided additional color graphics, and introduced Dane Johnson from BKS, the lead engineers on the project. He briefly discussed the differences between east Macdonald and the downtown portions, said they were moving the medians down the center of the street, it would become two lanes in each direction with a turn lane at the intersection to alleviate back-up, sidewalks are widened, bulb-outs are provided at the intersections, there are markings in the crosswalks, pedestrian access is improved with lighting, the light level is provided at the pedestrian level, and cast iron fixtures were used for historic purposes which was not unlike the original Macdonald Avenue fixtures. He felt that as development comes along with new levels of investment, more refinement can be added.

He said they focused on lighting and pedestrian safety, they are retaining existing trees along the sidewalks with added trees in the downtown, they provided a mixture of species, worked to incorporate landmark elements along the streetscape, such as a marker at the Harbour intersection because it connects out to the waterfront and into north Richmond. The furnishings extend the theme from the rest of Macdonald Avenue, they are upgrading news racks and consolidating them into a standard element, providing bike racks, and are not providing tree grates but large enough cut-outs with decomposed granite. They are also working on expanding some of the art themes out into the paving and areas around the markers.

**Chair Whitty** questioned if any of the other streets, such as 11<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, or 8<sup>th</sup> Streets would also be addressed, and Mr. Gibbs said the first phase would extend from 19<sup>th</sup> to Harbour, and at Harbour they would include all four corners, or the entire intersection.

**Boardmember Woodrow** felt crushed stone would collect debris and hoped that there was some other way to provide trunk guards and something other than decomposed granite. Mr. Gibbs said the granite was a compacted surface and has been used successfully in other cities, noted there was still some flexibility in the budget and it may be something they still could consider.

**Boardmember Woodrow** said the work finished between San Pablo Avenue and 39<sup>th</sup> Street turned out well and took a long time to do. He asked how long the project might take, and Dane Johnson with BKS Engineers said they had issues on east Macdonald which would also be addressed with the west Macdonald portion and hopefully this would not happen again. One big issue was the City's sanitary and sewer and storm drain system. They felt they would not lose as much time because of prior coordination with the consultant for the east end.

**Boardmember Woodrow** questioned the presence of kiosks which was something the Board had recommended, and Mr. Gibbs said this was an element that needed a program behind it to make it viable. Regarding timing, Dane Johnson said the design effort was to be completed in April and out to bid in the summer or fall, with construction taking place 90-120 days from then for this phase of the project.

**Boardmember Woodrow** said if this part and the next part carrying it out to Richmond Parkway was done, this would leave the area from 39<sup>th</sup> down past 23<sup>rd</sup> and over to 16<sup>th</sup> yet to do, and he questioned what where those plans. **Mr. Wolken** said staff was would be finishing the RFP the next day in order to release it for design consultants, then it would be out about 60 days with responses this summer. They would then go through what they are doing now to be ready for that next phase afterwards. He said they have money budgeted for this phase, but ran into additional costs for east Macdonald regarding substandard infrastructure. He anticipates the

west end to be also a challenge. They want to ensure there was adequate funding and said the Agency would hopefully be doing a bond this Spring and be able to have funding to complete the next two segments of Macdonald Avenue.

**Boardmember Bloom** questioned what the best solution was for under-planting a tree and felt it was a question in terms of public projects. She felt it was nicer to have more plants, liked the acorn fixtures, has specific plant concerns, agreed to email her specific comments and felt the Chinese Elm tree had gorgeous bark, but was messy. Mr. Gibbs said the Chinese Elm was deleted from the list.

**Boardmember Bloom** questioned if pruning or maintenance directives would be included, and Mr. Gibbs said there was a landscape maintenance contract for the first two years, acknowledged the first 5 years of a tree's life was critical, and felt it was a good idea. He said they could add this, but it would need to be a separate piece as a maintenance practice.

**Boardmember Bloom** referred to a vulnerable plant species as disease-prone, suggested something with red foliage or other broad leaf species and asked for more work on the planting palette.

**Chair Whitty** referred to the crosswalks and lighting for safety, and Mr. Gibbs said the in-ground mounted lights were not currently proposed, said the public works staff feel they do not address safety in the long-term, but as a driver he liked them and felt it would need more exploration with public works.

**Chair Whitty** hoped there would be signs that say, "no bikes or skateboards" and Mr. Gibbs said there were "no bike" signs; however, they were providing bike racks in walking facilities in the downtown. He felt that skateboarding, while not a crime, would be looked at if it was defacing public property.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** questioned what "street printed textured pavement at crosswalks" was and Mr. Gibbs said it was a product being used extensively in cities; a colored imprint that is fed into asphalt which makes color and texture patterns within the crosswalks. **Vice Chair Woldemar** questioned why it was used here and the exposed aggregate used at east Macdonald. Mr. Gibbs said the product was not readily available at that time, it was not proven at the design stage at the east Macdonald project, but has become much more common, popular, and acceptable. He said public works can go out and repair it depending on the pattern used, and he felt more feedback was needed from them on this question. He said it was not banded with a concrete edge but would still provide the white thermal plastic boundary on the outside edge. **Vice Chair Woldemar** said he was skeptical from a downtown image point of view as to whether this was the right material or not.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to the light fixture and questioned whether it was proposed to go from the BART tracks to Garrard, or back up from there. Mr. Gibbs said within the overall segment of 19<sup>th</sup> to Garrard, there were two aesthetic zones established, with Nevin Park being the hinge points and the transition between them. The historic fixture would extend from 19<sup>th</sup> or from the BART entrance down to Nevin Park, and a more multi-storage fixture would occur in the residential, but this has not yet been determined.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said there intends to be yet a different light fixture at the civic center district, he wondered how many different ones would be used along Macdonald Avenue and questioned what would tie the avenue together. He questioned what was happening along the adjacent developments, and asked if those developments had been reviewed to know that their designs were compatible with the new designs. Mr. Wolken said he received two sets of plans; one for MetroWalk and for the senior housing by Nevin Park. The consultants reviewed those

and provided comments back to staff, said BKS was also working with the 12<sup>th</sup> and Macdonald project so he felt there was good coordination between the adjacent areas.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to creating a downtown district, said the idea of kiosks made a lot of sense, felt programming was needed, but because there were a number of new projects going on in the segment he felt the kiosks could be used as identification for the projects. He also felt the intent was to establish a downtown district and asked if anyone had discussed traffic signs or the creation of a special street sign for the district. Mr. Gibbs said it had been discussed particularly with the landmarks group.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to the metal panels that were illustrated on CLL-6, said he did not quite understand them and hoped they were not anything like the ones along Marina Way adjacent to the Transit Village. Mr. Gibbs said the metal screenings serve as a function to keep people out of the plantings and are part of the language with the downtown. He did not highlight them because they are a flexible item. The landmarks group may be providing them with some content that they can then address, such as their transparency, their image or message, etc.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said as he looks at the bench, the light fixture, the trash enclosure and cans, they have an old time metal work feel to them and suggested that the panels could be some decorative iron work that could pick up and continue on with some of that downtown character.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** felt there should be tree grates and not decomposed granite because no matter how well the decomposed granite was done, a year from now it would have compressed or blow away. He felt grates were used very successfully on other local jurisdictions and on east Macdonald, and requested they be coated. He also felt the trunk guards should be used which would continue with the whole metal work character established for the downtown area.

**Boardmember Avellar** supported the use of kiosks and echoed fellow Boardmember comments.

**Boardmember Livingston** questioned how Mr. Gibbs rationalized the design of the bus shelter after comments about not wanting galvanized modern elements competing with the light standards. Mr. Gibbs said the intent of the bus shelter was a hybrid element--galvanized yet painted dark, and use of a simple exposed structure to bring out the honesty of both materials. He felt it picked up on the historic industrial heritage of the city.

**Boardmember Woodrow** questioned if it would take about 15 years to get the entire project done from San Pablo to the Parkway, and Mr. Wolken felt they were hoping to have it done within 10 years. **Boardmember Woodrow** felt the project was planned from beginning to end, it had a style in it that the City did not have in the past, and he felt it would be a big plus and thanked everyone for their work.

Mr. Gibbs said they agree with all comments, they will make sure the tree grates and guards were implemented and agreed strongly with providing a clean look.

**Chair Whitty** thanked the design team and said they would look forward to continued refinement of the project.

#### Greetings from Russia

**Chair Whitty** welcomed representatives from Russia and Ledger Hodges, liaison to the group.

**Mr. Hodges** said his guests come from various cities throughout Russia in an exchange process of architects and would be here for 2.5 weeks. They come and see how the development and community process works and how architecture is done in the United States.

**Chair Whitty** asked for them to be seated closer up front in order to see some of the exhibits and encouraged their participation in the meeting process.

**6. DR 1103502 – Construct Light Industrial Live/Work Buildings on Marina Way South - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct seven light industrial buildings ranging in size from ±5,400 square feet to ±14,000 square feet and a community building located on the west side of the 900 block of Marina Way South, between Wright Avenue and Regatta Blvd (APN: 560-260-003). The project will include the development of 64 independent light industrial units with 49 of these units as live/work units. M-2, Light Industrial Zoning District. David Spatz, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Direct Applicant to Make Additional Revisions and Return to the Board for Review.

**Chair Whitty** briefly described the Board's task of making additional revisions and direction to the applicant and return for further review.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said normally when an item before the Board goes to the Planning Commission, a decision must be made in one hearing. Therefore, they must ask applicant if they are amenable to having the item continued to a date certain or they must vote on it this evening, and questioned why this project was any different than that process.

**David Barbary** said the main difference was that the project came in a separated form. In mid-2005 the applicant went through the CEQA process for a mitigated negative declaration. Also, the traditional processing did not occur in line with the environmental review. The project also has additional information such as the parcel map that needs to be provided by the applicant in order for it to go to the Planning Commission.

Regarding the one-time Board review, staff had tremendous concerns about the Permit Streamlining Act and things they needed for their project review. He said by separating out issues and having the environmental work go first, they did not have the time delay. Also, the other issue was that the environmental review analyzed a project that was not fully composed, and it now had more conceptual elements, felt it was more appropriate for the Board to look at the full project and provide direction to the applicant. In addition, he felt the Board would hold a lot of discussion and given the number of comments, it would be a lengthy process. So, staff preferred going into the discretionary hearings and determine either a supportive or non-supportive position so that all components could be analyzed by the Commission.

Therefore, staff was asking for direction of support or of change and revision from the Board. Mr. Barbary said if the Board did not feel the project had the merit to move forward, staff should be directed to compose findings not in support of the project. Should there be enough merit for the project given necessary changes, the Board should direct staff to look at a changed project and return for a formal hearing.

Mr. Barbary said the staff report also had an attached letter from TRAC regarding trail issues, and at the request of Boardmember Woldemar, additional project information was included. He also said there was one typographical error at the top of the page in the percentage of landscaping. The proposed project actually provides 31%, the standards in the Knox-Cutting plan require 15%, and this was more than double the requirement.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Barbary said the project includes development of 64 independent light industrial units with 49 of the units as live/work units. The applicant has gone through extensive environmental review, noted reference was made to the addendum sheet which shows changes, he asked the Board to look at all elements to determine whether the project meets their satisfaction and to provide direction to staff and the applicant on how best to proceed. He said one of the largest concerns had to do with the masonry block construction of the building. Some of the 3-D renderings did not match the color in the material boards and specific attention should be drawn to the awnings and a large band, which were intended to be Sierra White rather than the gold/yellow colors the rendering might show.

He referred to the large site plan, said the first 3-D rendering provides the best overall look of the project. He said the biggest changes were that as part of the mitigated negative declaration, alterations would be made to the right-of-way for a left turn aisle. Also, the original entrance feature had a larger lead to it, which was reduced. The intent was to provide a community environment for artisans and also place 64 incubator businesses within the units. The property is a remainder piece that was a railroad yard for some time, there was a previous railroad track on the southern portion of the site, and there is an active railroad line with smaller staging. He felt there was a lot more planning to do on the project and staff would like the Board to consider the merits of the project and provide clear direction as to whether they need to look at adjustments to buildings, site layout, design, etc.

**Boardmember Livingston** said in the mitigated negative declaration, he confirmed there was concern of the track trail on the southern property line, and Mr. Barbary noted the concern was that the property does not extend all the way to Harbour; it was 160 feet short of the roadway. He said there was discussion with representatives from TRAC about trying to get easements across adjacent properties, which would place staff in a very difficult situation. They have a tentative map and it could take dedication of trails with the map.

Also, the general plan identifies the area as potential trail linkage. There is a possibility of getting better improvements in another location, possibly Wright Avenue, which was in need of a paved bike lane, and he felt this could offset the impact to trails.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** noted that until today, the Board had not seen anything related to the mitigated negative declaration, and he said there were a number of mitigation measures that appear to be required and presumably would be incorporated by someone whenever the document was adopted. Mr. Barbary said the majority of the mitigations would translate into condition language. The one having the most impact has to do with sound; a sound wall was recommended by staff and other alternatives include mechanical ventilation, better window design, and the option for the bedrooms to be inward on the site.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** asked when the mitigation measures program would take effect and how it would get incorporated into the drawings from a design point of view. He noted that under hydrology and water quality, there was a statement, "the paved parking lot should include a permeable pavement surface to reduce storm water runoff from the site" as opposed to saying, "it shall". Mr. Barbary said there was a concern that the mitigated negative declaration had mitigation ahead of time that the City was really considering those types of standards, and they needed to move them to a status of suggested mitigation, which was different than hard mitigation.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** asked when the negative declaration got approved and then when would the Board have it available to help make design decisions. Mr. Barbary said the negative declaration would be certified by the Planning Commission during their approval of other discretionary items; use permit, tentative parcel map, exceptions and variances. He felt the real

issue was there were identified potential impacts and there were identified potential solutions, but it was all based on mitigation. The other part was the identification of responsible parties, timing for approvals, so at the time of issuance of permits, the mitigation would be required right away for the storm water pollution prevention plan. There would also be an enormous battery of conditions that would run parallel with that environmental review. Staff prepared a sample list of conditions in the staff report, so if there were specific conditions that the Board wanted to look for, direction, these could be provided by staff.

David Spatz, applicant/owner, briefly described the project, noted Jessie of Vallier Designs was present to discuss landscaping as well as their architect. He presented the 3-D site plans, said the site was completely flat with only a one foot change in topography, described the typical units of live/work and work only, said there were 25 foot driveways throughout, 154 outside parking spaces, 10 handicapped spaces, 25 foot setbacks required with an additional 10 foot setback on all sides of the property, as well as one private use area. He showed views from Marina Way, described elevations, said the typical unit footprint was 24 foot wide by 80 feet deep, with 20 foot wide by 7 foot high awnings projected out. He described the landscaping of a private patio, noted there was 1080 square feet of work area with 22 foot high ceilings, 4x8 foot skylights and 660 square foot spaces upstairs that would either function as a kitchen/living/bedroom. He discussed the building unit colors and size variations, a community center of almost 2300 square feet with two meeting rooms, an open gallery area with an office and handicapped bathrooms. He said they intend the project to be a community with 6-foot sidewalks all around.

Jessie, Vallier Designs, said they have provided more than twice the requirement for landscaping on the site with a low maintenance, drought tolerant palette of a variety of species that has been proven as appropriate and successful in the Marina Bay climate. She noted the planting plan included 125 trees, 14 of which were street front trees with varying scale and interest, 6 palms at the entrance, accent paving and signage which would provide a strong gateway to the community, 67 parking area trees which was also twice the required number, with two alternating species. There were 153 exterior parking stalls, 10 of which would be dedicated as ADA accessible and each unit also had 2 dedicated parking spaces in front of the units which are separated from neighbors by 20 foot long planter areas.

In the remaining open space areas, they incorporate 38 shade and accent trees of 3-4 different species. There is 12,200 square feet of open space which would function as an infiltration basin for a storm water management system which is planted with a mix of perennial and annual grasses and broad leaf plants. There were common areas of benches and tables for gathering and at the backside of each unit, there were semi-private areas separated with landscape screening. She said the site would be screened from adjacent areas by fast growing and dense evergreen vines on all three of the boundary fences.

Mr. Spatz noted there was an existing cyclone fence on the south side, they would envision the same for the north side, and there was a detail for the front fencing provided in the plans.

#### Public Comments:

Bruce Beyaert, TRAC, said the Richmond General Plan states that the City requires all new developments to provide public access to local and regional trails as planned. He noted the General Plan configuration has a planned Class I trail on the south side of the project and therefore asked the Board to direct the applicants to make revisions to the project to incorporate connection to the Class I trail. He distributed the Richmond Bay Trail map, said they have recreational and transportation routes, there are no bike lanes along Cutting, the project provides a diagonal route from Marina Bay South near Regatta to Harbour Way and they ask that it be included in the project. He said the Bay Trail was built one segment at a time and if the

trail was included in the project, TRAC could approach the Harbour Way Business Park to complete the last 160 feet.

**Boardmember Livingston** said he bikes and takes the Harbour Business Park and felt bicyclists could bike through the property. Mr. Beyaert said there would be no easement or official public access and he briefly described trail construction.

**Chair Whitty** referred to the August 1994 map which did show the 160 foot gap, but said the updated map did not match what was shown. Mr. Beyaert said the trail was only incorporated in the Bay Trail plan and pointed out where the gap was in the 1994 plan in the northwest end of the property.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** questioned whether it was as simple as providing a 12 foot public access easement along the southwestern property line, and Mr. Beyaert said yes; that TRAC would ask the applicant to incorporate connection to the Class I trail into the plan.

Jim Cannon, Levin-Richmond Terminal, said it was previously stated that the railroad line has limited, small trains running on it but there were actually 4-9 trains everyday which was the main route from Richmond to Oakland and this would increase. Because of the crossing at Harbour Way, it was also in a noise zone. He said the Knox-Cutting Specific Plan designates the area as a transitional zone between the residential areas and the light/heavy industrial maritime industry and this was always envisioned. The plan states no residential uses would be permitted, conditionally or otherwise, which he felt was straight-forward; however, people would live and work in the units 24 hours a day. He also felt that if businesses failed in the project, people would convert the units to all residential.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said Mr. Cannon's discussion related to land use, said the Board was not privy to those issues and recommended he submit comments to the Planning Commission.

Jimmie Buckland, SIMS/Huyonen, said he works in a heavy industrial recycling facility close to the project, said there was no EIR for the project, felt there were no design features to protect the health and safety of residents and especially children, said large trucks pass the area regularly, felt the project was ill-designed given its location, and requested it be designed without the residential component.

Katrina Ruk, Council of Industries, said they would support a light industrial project but not the live/work aspect because of the residential component and they would be speaking to the Planning Commission of the industrial buffer zone language being put forth. She said there was a charter school proposed not far from the area and it was determined this was not a good place for the school and not within the zoning.

**Boardmember Livingston** said if any allegations were true, he questioned what actions would be taken by the applicant. Mr. Spatz said the focus of the environmental review was to consider the health and safety aspect of the project. He said the Ford Assembly Building has 99 live/work units directly across from the Port, noted the West Shore Marina Project was an all residential project at the base of Marina Way South, so they know it was possible for the area. There are concerns about traffic safety, vibration, noise, and tenants are automatically informed that this is an industrial area and they need to be aware of all factors. He said they require this be put on the deed for the property and if there was any future division or change to the property, residents are aware of the environment they were coming into.

Regarding the concern over the residential portion, the Knox/Cutting Specific Plan does have a specific section about live/work and it differentiates the difference between a residential project and a live/work project. Other projects are not considered standard residential and are not

required to have private or common open space. They do not have the same separation standards and intrusion into the industrial area was something the Planning Commission would review. He said the intent of the plan was transition from industrial uses all the way to Marina Bay, he felt the project would be reviewed according to that criteria at the time the Planning Commission considers the use permit. He believes they have done more than what was required and felt he had done more than what is done for larger project EIR's.

**Boardmember Livingston** referred to the southwest property line, said there was not one tree on the entire property line and questioned how Magnolia trees would do in the area because of the wind. Jessie of Vallier Landscape Architects said she would take his comments into consideration. Regarding street frontages, the trees were not right out on the sidewalk, but were set back and they are vegetated and somewhat protected.

**Boardmember Bloom** noted there was Flaxim on the list, it was a quick grower and she voiced concerns with the wind. Jessie said even though the area was very windy, some trees could be used and said the species would not be used in the street medians and central planting.

**Boardmember Bloom** said in the written description, there were no native plants proposed, which was an error from an earlier version, and confirmed they were using drought tolerant plants. She said when evergreen vines are proposed, the weather is unpredictable and she wanted them to keep this in mind. Given the architectural quality of the buildings, she felt it would be nice to put in some delicate foliage, given its location and sun, and like the Mellaluka trees and large multi-trunk shrubs rather than the broad leaf evergreen so much. She said she would be interested in what the entry pavement and eco-turf was, and Jessie said it was a brand name and was also called heritage seed or broad mix; that it was starting to be used extensively and mixes perennial and annual grasses with broadleaf plants. It allows the mix to provide green cover throughout the year, while some of the species going dormant and others still growing. They were a low maintenance, drought tolerant alternative that was more sustainable in comparison to traditional turf.

**Boardmember Bloom** asked about the grading and drainage, and Jessie said the general idea was not to do much grading on the existing topography, said they would build up the foundation of the building and then as the site drains, the parking and circulation areas would be designed to drain into those planters and infiltration areas. Mr. Spatz said there were 7 storm water areas and each area would drain into the retention area for storm water control.

**Vice Chair Whitty** noted the triangular area at the far end that would have mixed natives and grasses and she liked this area as a landscape retreat and asked if some wandering stepping stones could also be installed.

**Boardmember Avellar** questioned the location of the refuse areas and lighting. Mr. Spatz pointed out the area and owners would need to place bins outside their units. He questioned if the cyclone fence had slats, and Mr. Spatz said they were planning to match the cyclone fence with the existing fence on the south side, said it had no slats, but was covered with vines. Regarding lighting, they have not finalized the details. Regarding the area around the community center, **Boardmember Avellar** suggested planting an elevated berm or mound as well as around the grassy area. Jessie noted they could look at this, but much of it was designated as the infiltration area.

Regarding architecture, **Vice Chair Woldemar** said he would not talk about land use because this would be decided at the City Council level. He believes the application was incomplete; that missing was a grading and drainage plan, a lighting plan, fencing details, he felt the refuse location may not be large enough and suggested getting a will-serve letter from the garbage company. He questioned whether there would be 128 roll around cans and he did not

understand how they all could be picked up. He felt the screening of the refuse area and the meters at each unit would be important, questioned the private yard spaces and how they would be maintained, questioned if they would be individually maintained and where would be the green waste recycling containers, felt the drawings needed to respond to the mitigations, said there were no site plan dimensions anywhere, wanted to see more of a landscaped entryway, said there were no trees along the buildings facing north or southwest, he did not understand the logic about the location and the design element of the pyramidal roofs and questioned why there was not consistency with the central building. He felt the floor plan should reflect the pyramidal shapes and he suspected there may be too many units in the project, given the floor plan patterns presented.

**Vice Chair Whitty** said she did not understand the logic of white awnings, felt a different color should be selected, really liked the cement block but it didn't seem to be celebrated, and she felt the architecture needed some work. She said it seemed like they could get into more texture with the blocks, there could be a tile footing around the buildings, and asked not to use the bright blue window reflection because it throws off the whole feeling of the place. She felt the environment was cement block with a lot of trees and felt the buildings needed work.

**Boardmember Livingston** said there was a lot of long and articulated facades on the building, the addition of the awnings and hip roof elements do not fix the problem and suggested taking a basic 9 unit building, developing a prototype pattern, take 2-3 unit types and vary the shape so that when they are assembled you wind up with an overall concept of randomness. He drew some ideas as a sketch that he gave the applicant which jogged the buildings in and out and up and down.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** asked the applicant to look at the Crossing project and noted it had won an award for its character.

**Boardmember Avellar** said he had the same comments about the roof, he did not see downspouts, and questioned the requirement for covered parking, given there was residential.

Mr. Barbary said based upon comments, staff would be putting together a comprehensive letter for the applicant to consider. Staff has some other suggestions; articulating the roofline and detailing the corners of the buildings which may be addressed by Boardmember Livingston's suggested sketch. He asked if the Board felt the project had merit or not, and asked if given changes, would the Board be amenable to supporting the project.

**Chair Whitty** wanted the project to return with changes and wanted to reserve the Board's decision.

**Boardmember Avellar** questioned the trail issue, and **Vice Chair Woldemar** felt this was an issue for decision by the Planning Commission. Mr. Barbary said the project did not have the full ability for staff to require a dedication of an entire right-of-way. There is a major piece of the path that was not there, the General Plan does not designate this as full bay trail, and the decision was appealed by staff and he overturned it. He said this was a proposed connector trail, felt the other alternative would be to approve the existing bike trails on Marina and on Wright Avenue to compensate for the fact that we do not have the commuter lane. Also of concern was the 4-foot chain link fence, pedestrian access, and the formation of what would be a landscape tunnel. He felt it would be easy to trap someone in the tunnel or block someone in. He said staff feels off sight improvements was a better solution and they would look more towards the Wright and Marina solution.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** felt there were two big issues that should be decided first--the use permit issue and the bike trail issue. He felt the project as is, needed a lot of work and would be denied

if action were being taken. Mr. Barbary said staff was open to this, but the concern would be timing. He recommended the Board not identify a date certain, for staff to move forward in addressing some of the bigger land use issues.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to leave the project in the hands of the Planning department, securing a Planning Commission and/or City Council direction relative to the land use and relative to the Bay Trail prior to coming back to the Design Review Board with full, complete design documents; and requested the item be held over to a date uncertain and for Planning staff to re-notice the item; unanimously approved.**

**3. DR 1102910 – Construct 11 Residential Condominium Units on Cutting Blvd. - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct 11 residential condominium units located on Cutting Boulevard between South 12th and South 13th Streets (APNs: 544-240-009, 544-240-015, & 544-240-014). MFR-2, Multi-Family Medium Density Residential Zoning District; Knox Cutting Specific Plan Area. Charles Q. Fields, James J. Walton, & Ed S. Wasniowski, owners; Charles Q. Fields, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

**Chair Whitty** gave a brief description of the request, noted a subcommittee met on the project, and the public hearing was left open. She confirmed with **Hector Rojas** that the Coronado Neighborhood Council reviewed the current project, but no correspondence had been received, that all color samples and materials were contained in a color palette brochure in the packet.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to condition 9, third sentence, which stated the color and materials would be “as selected by the Design Review Board” and asked what the applicant preferred. **Mr. Rojas** noted the applicants favored the color palette in the brochure was amenable to changes. **Boardmember Livingston** voiced concerns with the colors.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to the landscape plan and questioned landscaping other than the existing trees in the area between the curb and sidewalks. **Mr. Rojas** said there were several trees spaced 15-20 feet apart along the frontage with groundcover, and in the conditions of approval, the applicant and developer would maintain this landscaping strip and on the other side of 13<sup>th</sup> Street; however, there was no reference for the planter strip which could be added to the conditions.

The public hearing was closed.

**Mr. Rojas** confirmed the color palette was acceptable to the Boardmembers, as proposed.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Avellar) to approve DR 1102910 based on the 4 staff findings and 22 conditions of approval; unanimously approved.**

**4. DR 1103081 – Construct Two-Story Addition to Single-Family Dwelling on Chanslor Ave. - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±1,884 square foot two-story addition to an existing single-family dwelling located at 2514 Chanslor Avenue (APN: 515-380-020). SFR-3, Single-Family Low Density Zoning District. Larry White, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

**Chair Whitty** gave a brief description of the request, noted a subcommittee met on the project, and the public hearing was left open.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** asked how the parking was legal for the project, as there was no garage and the only space was a singular space. **Mr. Rojas** said part of the garage was converted into a bathroom and part of the proposal is to finish the conversion and legalize the conversion. The new conversion would involve a new bedroom. The applicant is applying for uncovered parking in the front half of the front yard in the 20 foot area, and stamped with concrete paving.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said there was only 17.5 feet which was substandard and he questioned how it was legal. **Mr. Rojas** said they would not recommend approval of the conversion. **Lamont Thompson** said the zoning administrator has a purview for garage enclosures and parking; however, this matter can go up to the Design Review Board and can be determined if the Board is amenable to approving uncovered parking in the front half of the yard. He said the Board can recommend the conversion be changed back to a garage.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** noted the property line was shown as the back of the sidewalk which was not typical and he questioned legality unless there was more space. **Mr. Rojas** said he did not physically measure the distance and could verify the distance. If it did not meet the 20 foot requirement, staff could request for an encroachment to satisfy the requirement. **Vice Chair Woldemar** said he would support this as long as the encroachment was not into the sidewalk area, which blocks public access. He suggested continuing the item in order for the staff to collect and the applicant provide additional information. He also felt the Board should also take into account the existence of the previous illegal conversion, noted there were roofline problems and drainage issues that were present and he suggested the applicant rework the roofline.

**Boardmember Livingston** said he met on the project and worked on the roofline, noting the neighborhood had varying rooflines and pitches. **Chair Whitty** asked the applicant to align the windows on all sides.

Larry White, applicant, agreed to return with re-aligned windows and the driveway issue resolved.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Woldemar) to continue DR 1103081 to March 28, 2007; unanimously approved.**

**5. DR 1103590 – Rehabilitate Historic Winter’s Building on 11th Street - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to rehabilitate the exterior ground level façade of the historic Winter’s Building located at 339 – 11th Street (APN: 540-091-011). The rehabilitation will include the repair and, in some cases, the replication of missing ornamental plaster work and storefronts. Retail/Office/Institutional (City Center Specific Plan) Zoning District. Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, owner; East Bay Center for the Performing Arts, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

## **EXTEND MEETING**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to extend the meeting to 9:30 p.m.; unanimously approved.**

**Chair Whitty** gave a brief description of the project and felt the applicant did an excellent job on the project.

**Boardmember Livingston** said on his drawings, he did not know how staff arrived at their findings because there were no notations on the elevations. He said there was no glass type,

aluminum color, cornice, plaster, and he did not know how he could vote on the item because there was no indication of the intent.

**Lina Velasco** said the original drawings talk about the restoration and plaster work which is dictated by the Secretary of the Interior's standards. She felt it was a matter of marking them on the plans and staff would make sure this is incorporated as part of plan check.

**Boardmember Livingston** was concerned about cornice, plaster and lighting on all elevations and felt it was very important on how it came off.

Alan Wolken, Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, noted a subcommittee met after they had presented the project to the Design Review Board with Boardmembers Avellar and Livingston present, the project architect, historical architect, Mark Holbert, Charles Duncan, who reviewed the plans. They spent a lot of time and effort walking through the product types of the three elevations from the storefront. He said the third alternative was supported by the applicant and staff, they listened to the need to bring down vertical elements as well as keeping the sensitivity of the original design of the building. He suggested the architects walk through the workings for the benefit of Boardmember Livingston.

He said staff was working on putting the building on the National Register, said an HPAC member was involved and noted the project met the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

The project architect briefly described the changes made to elevations and specific materials used for the project which included an electronic video wall, stone rustication, limestone base, cement plaster, opaque glass, and displayed three options for consideration.

**Boardmember Bloom** questioned signage, and the architect noted the way the name appears on the marquee was not an element for review at this time but agreed it should be congruent and aesthetically pleasing.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** questioned the size of the zinc frame system. Laura, a project architect said it was 8 inches by 1.5 inches and it was quite different than an aluminum system which was described. She said the light fixture is called out as a separate review item and provides for small twinkling.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** questioned if there was landscaping proposed for 11<sup>th</sup> Street, and questioned the urban forest management plan which was supposed to be applicable in projects. He noted the street tree program would be enhanced by virtue of this sort of remodeling and it was not shown anywhere.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said some of the lettering was bus-like vinyl graphics which was transparent and behind some of them were concrete walls. He asked what would be seen behind the glass and questioned the concrete wall color. Laura said the wall was the same color below and above and blended all the way through to bring it together.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** referred to staff statement #2, said the last sentence indicates that the HPAC indicated their support of the exterior alterations and confirmed it was the previous iteration. He said when they looked at the previous iteration they did have the benefit of reviewing construction drawings. He questioned HPAC member Charles Duncan's comments during the subcommittee meeting at the February 7<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Lina Velasco** said Scheme A was discussed and Mr. Duncan felt it would be appropriate to bring the project to the Design Review Board for review.

**Alan Wolken** said prior to the subcommittee meeting, they met with three members of HPAC. The alternative that the applicant brought to the meeting did not bring 3 alternatives, but alternative 1 wrapped the storefront all the way around from Macdonald down to the entrance to the East Bay Center. Staff then held the DRB meeting, there was discussion regarding rustication, bringing down the vertical elements, and then the subcommittee meeting was held where the 3 alternatives were developed and a new design was developed as a result, as shown tonight.

**Boardmember Avellar** said he was in attendance, felt they did follow the patterns down, and he felt Scheme 3A was more in line with what was preferred.

**Boardmember Livingston** referred to Scheme 3A, said the idea of continuing the window demonstration down to the ground was the one they all liked, said he did not have any cross sections or plans to refer to, but sees the intent.

**Chair Whitty** confirmed Scheme 3A was not the applicant's preference and Scheme 3C was. **Boardmember Livingston** said he liked the way it wrapped around in Scheme 3C, but he was troubled and felt the applicant's purpose was to advertise what was going on in the building instead of having the building tell us what it wants. He felt it was more of a decorative sign element than truly rehabilitating the building, and questioned whether the scheme overpowered the building.

#### **EXTEND MEETING**

<b>ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to extend the meeting to 10:00 p.m.; unanimously approved.</b>
---

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said he appreciated the art part of the idea, compares it to placing a glass pyramid in the middle of a super plaza surrounded by old buildings, but felt there should be some respect for some of the historic nature of the project. He acknowledged statements of the storefront system, said he just now reviewed the cut sheets, did not understand where the glass was relative to the frame but he did not care in the sense of the fact that it still was a storefront system. He felt if one did not know the difference between the zinc versus an aluminum color, it was the same width of an ordinary storefront system, and if he had to pick any of the schemes the solution that only goes a little way around the corner was the better of the solutions, or Scheme 3A. He very much felt that the detailing of the ground floor windows on Scheme 3A should parrot those that are above, i.e., if there is a backset, there should be a continued backset.

He said he was concerned that the art part of the project was overwhelming the rest of the building and asked if there could be another way to turn the corner on the building or another way to bring people back to the entrance on 11<sup>th</sup> Street. If he were asked to vote, he probably would vote no because he just did not feel it was the right thing to do.

**Boardmember Avellar** said he liked Scheme 3A with the detailed mullions. **Boardmember Livingston** said he liked Scheme 3A.

The project architect described the various schemes and their differences, felt the system allows for the building to be used for a specific use, and the intent was to be able to reverse the alteration back to its historical form without significant and major reconstruction. He said they were bringing Scheme A to the Board because they were told to revise the previous plan and return it and discussed his work and time on the project and previous historic projects that have successfully been done.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said he was struggling with what some of the other solutions were that would incorporate less art and more historic respect. He questioned why did the theory hold that the columns had to be storefront and glass. He asked why they could not be of plastic, and asked if they couldn't be of mirror or something different than adjacent glass with glue on vinyl and was trying to understand it in principle. The project architect said they have a constant sheer wall, voiced frustration and they were trying to make the project useful to the program while maintaining the building's historic aspects.

**Boardmember Livingston** said Charles Duncan weighed in on this in the subcommittee meeting and he liked scheme 3A as long as it wrapped down Macdonald all the way to the property line. He felt Scheme 3C was overpowering. The project architect noted that Charles Duncan went on record at the subcommittee to approve the first design. After the HPAC reviewed the project, Charles Duncan stated that "the character of the design is bold and he felt the project respected the historic character of the Winters Building", and the committee felt that it gave a rare and successful blend of contemporary and classical design. He liked the design that wrapped all the way down to the door. He went on to say, that the committee asked that the architect look at the order and pattern of the window subdivisions, which was done, and he did not recall anything at the subcommittee meeting to pull back the glass. He also said that the glass and design element was successful to the Secretary of Interior's standards, the work that had to be done to the sheer wall, and also for having a single identity; something that the building historically did not have.

**Ms. Velasco** said there were three alternatives for the Board to choose from. She said all three met the Secretary of the Interior's standards. In terms of the design for the windows that Boardmember Livingston referred to, the windows according to the original plans were not recessed, so they would not have to return the detailing, but she would need to make sure they met the Secretary of the Interior's standards.

**Boardmember Livingston** provided a sketch to Ms. Velasco and Charles Duncan, which they felt was consistent with Scheme 3A. **Chair Whitty** noted that all three designs were acceptable to HPAC, and she suggested the Board make a decision.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** said if he were to ask Ms. Velasco to plan check and review the construction drawings from the project, would she know the detailing of everything based on what was included in the staff report. **Ms. Velasco** said she would feel comfortable with them and also had a conversation over the phone, and said notes were on the previous plans. **Vice Chair Woldemar** noted that through the cross section through the side of the building, the rows of windows were recessed. He felt whether the new windows were recessed would not necessarily mean they were historically re-creating how it was detailed, or mean that one could not recess the windows.

The public hearing was closed.

**Boardmember Avellar** said he preferred Scheme 3A. **Vice Chair Woldemar** felt if there was a motion to approve for any scheme, he would vote no. He asked if anyone made a motion to approve, that conditions include landscaping on 11<sup>th</sup> Street, to include detail drawings, light fixtures and graphics so the application was complete. **Boardmember Livingston** said he and Boardmember Avellar liked Scheme 3A. **Boardmember Bloom** said she felt there was more work needed and could not support Scheme 3C.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** confirmed he could make a motion and vote in the negative to move forward.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve DR 1103590 based on staff's recommended 4 findings, based on the staff's recommended 10 conditions, with the following additional conditions; 11) that Scheme A be selected; 12) that as an informational item site details of all of the construction related to the exterior elevations be provided to the staff prior to the issuance of a building permit; 13) that precise lighting fixtures be submitted subject to the review and written approval of the Planning Director; 14) that additional landscaping be added to 11<sup>th</sup> Street consistent with the Urban Forest Plan; 15) that the approval of the plan is not to set a precedent for future applications coming into the City in an incomplete fashion; and 16) that the window representations on the 11<sup>th</sup> Street elevation between the entry way and the new glass façade be recessed at least a distance equaled to the recess of the windows above. Vote: Ayes: Whitty, Avellar, Livingston. Noes: Woldemar and Bloom. Absent: Woodrow and Smith. (Motion carries by 3-2-2)**

**7. DR 1103597 – Construct Two-Story Office Building on Cutting Blvd. - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±4,953 square foot two-story office building on a vacant lot located at 2901 Cutting Blvd. (APN: 549-071-025). Neighborhood Commercial (Knox Cutting Specific Plan Area) Zoning District. Helen H. Yu, owner; and Bob Wirth, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

**Chair Whitty** gave a brief description of the project and noted the item was requested for removal by an audience member. **Hector Rojas** noted a memorandum was before the Board which was prepared by Tanya Boyce, President of the neighborhood council, who felt the rear yard 6 foot high concrete block fence would attract graffiti and maintenance, and she recommended landscaping over the fence, which has been agreed upon by the applicant. He said the other issue related to signage, and Ms. Boyce felt a coordinated sign program should be considered versus individualized storefront signage. The applicant was amenable to this revision, as well.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** confirmed with Mr. Rojas that the applicant agreed to all staff conditions, as well as the two additional conditions.

#### **EXTEND MEETING**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Avellar) to extend the meeting to 10:30 p.m.; unanimously approved.**

The public hearing was opened.

Bob Wirth, applicant, requested moving the wall 18 inches instead of 36 inches due to the handicapped ramp in the parking lot. He agreed with all conditions, as well.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Avellar) to approve DR 1103597 based on staff's recommended 4 findings, based on the staff's recommended 17 conditions with the additional 2 conditions as referenced in the memorandum from staff, changing only Condition A to change the 3 foot dimension to an 18 inch dimension; unanimously approved.**

**Public Forum – Brown Act - None**

## **BOARD BUSINESS**

### **10. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff**

**City Attorney Mary Renfro** reported on February 20, 2007, Council directed staff to come back in April with a plan for administrative design review and exemption from Design Review. The ordinance will be heard on June 5<sup>th</sup> in order for the ordinance to become effective August 1, 2007. She said a new body would be created as a 9-member Planning/Design Commission. Her interpretation of the Charter would be the creation of a brand new body, with 9 seats appointed by the Mayor.

**Planning Director Richard Mitchell** reported they received survey information back on the design review survey, felt it was interesting to see the range of responsibilities from various cities.

**Vice Chair Woldemar** reported that the Civic Center Subcommittee continues to meet, are in the process of making final recommendations, and a Planning Commission meeting may be scheduled in March, there are a number of conditions the subcommittee will be making which would be somewhat controversial.

**Chair Whitty** thanked the Planning Department for working with her on Item 1; the General Plan Update Visioning Process report.

---

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.