

## POINT MOLATE DESIGN GUIDELINES

### RESPONSE TO HPC COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS & QUESTIONS

May 22, 2020

Revised and Expanded: June 3, 2020

Comments apply to the April 17 Design Guidelines Draft.

Responses and actions noted below in red text.

**Note:** the following contains the combined comments from the HPC Subcommittee for the Point Molate Mixed-Use Development Project (PLN20-057).

**Note:** Comments by Commissioner M. Hibma follow Commissioner Pavlinec's and are followed with an (MH).

#### GENERAL

- 1) Include the Design Review Process for Winehaven development, i.e., review requirements - Administrative vs. HPC, DRC review, approval and appeal processes . . .

Response: Defined in the PAD. All alterations and new construction in the Winehaven Historic District require HPC review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness. Outside the historic district, development must undergo development plan review.

- 2) On each page title add 'HISTORIC DISTRICT' to '4.0 WINEHAVEN VILLAGE & HISTORIC DISTRICT.'  
Response: Agreed and completed.

- 3) Add an Appendix to the stand-alone document including: a. the National Register Nomination [for the Character Defining Features and general info on the history]; b. Historic Resource Structural Assessments and Recommendations; and c. Historic Resource Evaluations. (MH)

Response: We respectfully suggest this action is not desirable since reference documentation may be revised in the future. Rather, we strongly urge referencing the appropriate documents and agencies in the text and providing links to web sites where appropriate. This will ensure the applicant is always referencing the most current materials.

- 4) Add appendices that contain copies of (a) the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; (b) Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings; and (c) Section 15.04.303.120 of the Richmond Municipal Code. The current Design Guidelines document includes in-text hyperlinks to these documents. Over time hyperlinks change, lapse, or are removed making these documents unavailable. Including these documents as appendices ensures they will be accessible to planners, applicants, and the public. (MH)

Response: Documents will be provided in the Appendix to the City, and the City shall determine the best way to make the documents available to the public. At the time of design and construction, final or updated versions of the appended documents will prevail.

5) Document needs to adopt one name for the Winehaven Historic District and apply it consistently to prevent confusion. The current version of the guidelines includes at least four different names for the area within the NRHP-listed boundary: “Winehaven Village”, “Winehaven District”, “Historic District” (both upper and lower case), and “Winehaven Village Historic Parcels”. (MH)

Response: Agreed. Naming conventions have been established.

- "Winehaven Historic District" used as the Section title and to describe the boundary as defined on diagrams/by the NRHP. Used when referring to the District rather than the place.
- "Winehaven Village" used to describe the place, character, or where using the full District name would seem awkward.

6) Document (or the use permit) needs to address the potential for vibration damage to 110+ year old concrete and masonry buildings from project-related activities. Some elements of a vibration management plan to proactively minimize construction and ground borne vibration-related damage could include (but not be limited to):

- a) Pre-construction surveys/assessments (like an HSR);
- b) ongoing monitoring during project activity;
- c) Repairs are complaint with Secretary’s Standards;
- d) no pile-driving;
- e) caisson-drilling piers to install new or to reinforce existing foundations;
- f) installing seismic reinforcements; and
- g) concrete saw cuts instead of jackhammering, and etc. (MH)

Response: There is a CEQA mitigation measure that protects against adverse vibration impacts on historic resources. No change to the guidelines.

7) Recommend copy editor review document to polish the document. (MH)

Response: Agreed. Submitters will complete additional reviews and edits.

## SPECIFIC - BY PAGE

### IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC DISTRICT

Page 15, 16 – Maps: Add Historic District to the Maps. 'The Village & Historic District'

In general, recommend that the Historic District be called out more often and in more locations throughout the document for general identification and familiarity.

Response: Agreed and completed. Maps now include the boundary.

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: Occurs throughout document

Page 17: Add Historic District to Title 'Winehaven Village & Historic District'

Response: Agreed.

Document Updated: No

New Page #: TBD

### GARAGE DOORS ON SMALL STREET FRONTAGE LOTS (modify)

Page 42, 44 and 46: Illustrations are misleading. Guidelines call for front loaded double car garages with 16' wide garage doors, and illustrations show single car garage doors. Modify illustrations and change

standards to be consistent with guideline goals for pedestrian oriented and walkable street frontages which a one car garage door with tandem parking can accomplish.

Response: Language added to Design Guidelines in Section 3.3 for all applicable building types as follows:

*"Within the Winehaven Historic District front loaded garages should be single car doors, a maximum of nine (9) feet wide. Tandem parking within the garage is permitted."*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, 3-11, 3-13

NOTE: Street front loaded two car garages are inconsistent with the Guidelines. See quotes from 3,5, 3.11. and 3.13 below. Modify the standards to require tandem garage parking to reduce the two car garage door taking over the first floor public facade of a block face, which requires side entries to residential as is noted in the guidelines. At a minimum, require 50% of one car garage doors (tandem) on each block facade alternating with two car garage doors to provide relief from a full block frontage of garage doors. This applies to: 3.3 Small Lot Detached Homes, Front Loaded; 3.3 Single Family Attached Town Houses, Front Loaded; 3.3 Single Family Attached Duplex, Front Loaded.

Response: Language added to Design Guidelines in Section 3.3 for all applicable building types as follows:

*"Within the Winehaven Historic District front loaded garages should be single car doors, a maximum of nine (9) feet wide. Tandem parking within the garage is permitted."*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, 3-11, 3-13

**GUIDELINES THAT DON'T SUPPORT 2 CAR GARAGE DOORS ON NARROW FRONTAGES:**

3.13 - 'Garage doors should not overwhelm the façade (NOTE: and specifically the first floor facades which are most integral to pedestrian orientation and walkability) of the residence and their width is controlled in the Point Molate zoning code. They should not be the primary feature on the façade of a home and overwhelm or crowd area for well defined entry to the house.'

Response: Language added to Design Guidelines in Section 3.3 for all applicable building types as follows:

*"Within the Winehaven Historic District front loaded garages should be single car doors, a maximum of nine (9) feet wide. Tandem parking within the garage is permitted."*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, 3-11, 3-13

3.11 – 'Private Frontages help define the character of the public realm and contribute to the walkability of a neighborhood through the activation and interaction they sponsor.' (NOTE: first floor wall of garage doors do not provide interaction)

3.5 - Height, massing, and articulation of buildings and facades establish building scale and reinforce a human-scale, pedestrian-oriented environment. (NOTE: first floor wall of garage doors do not provide pedestrian-oriented environment)

Response: Response: Language added to Design Guidelines in Section 3.3 for all applicable building types as follows:

*"Within the Winehaven Historic District front loaded garages should be single car doors, a maximum of nine (9) feet wide. Tandem parking within the garage is permitted."*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-5, 3-7, 3-9, 3-11, 3-13

#### ROOFS – EAVES (modify)

Page 60 – 3.6 Roofs – Eliminate or reduce images that show no eaves. Encourage eaves, especially on the weatherside of buildings.

'• Roof eaves may be open (exposed rafters) or closed (soffit) and should be designed to complement to building architecture and provide passive shading and cooling.'

NOTE: Many illustrations show no roof eaves. Concerns: Eaves are a necessary functional feature, especially on the weather side of buildings.

- No possibility for passive shading and cooling;
- Roof eaves do an important job in keeping water away from a wall and window systems, siding and foundation;
- Eaves protect the building from moisture;
- Eaves increase building longevity and prevent frequent maintenance and poor building appearance – early siding rot, moisture in the walls and window systems.

Response: Language added to Design Guidelines Section 3.6 as follows:

- *Roof eaves may be open (exposed rafters) or closed (soffit) and should be designed to complement the building architecture and provide passive shading and cooling.*
- *On more contemporary buildings, roof eaves may be tight to the building face complementing the modern building form.*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-22

#### STUCCO (clarification)

Page 64 – Add below as last sentence under 'Stucco'.

*'Stucco could be used for a portion of a building but shall typically be blended with more commercial materials.'*

Response: Language added to Design Guidelines Section 3.10 as follows: *"Stucco is appropriate for residential use, and may be used in combination with appropriate materials for a commercial building."*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-26

#### CEMENT FIBER BOARD FINISH (clarification)

Page 64 –Modify: Add last sentence.

'• Painted or stained wood in clapboard, lap, butt jointed, board and batten or shingle applications are appropriate. In commercial settings, painted or stained wood may be used in accent locations. Smooth cement fiber siding that resembles wood is also permissible. *Textured cement fiber siding to resemble wood grain is not permitted.* '

NOTE: Textured board tends to collect dirt more easily than smooth and detracts from appearance, requiring more frequent maintenance.

Response: It is not clear from the comment if the concern is wood-grain texture itself or keeping materials clean. We have added a statement to say in effect that materials that are easy to clean should be used.

Revised Text: *“Materials that are easy to clean are preferred.”*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: TBD

#### CONCRETE AND TILT-UP (clarification)

Page 64 – Add clarification and direction.

• Concrete and tilt-up panels may be used in limited applications. Board-formed concrete is preferred. Use exterior structural components and details, and exterior rhythmic modulation and recesses, to provide a higher standard of visual interest and articulation than typical historical use of this utilitarian building construction method.

NOTE: While tilt-up has historically been used for more utilitarian uses and embodies a utilitarian appearance, articulation and visual interest can be accomplished and should be encouraged.

Response: Sections 3.0 and 4.0 provide guidelines regarding design and articulation of buildings at Point Molate and apply to all material applications.

In Section 4, the following text will be added: *“Concrete and tilt-up panels may be used in limited applications. Board-formed concrete is preferred. Use exterior structural components and details, and exterior rhythmic modulation and recesses, to provide a higher standard of visual interest and articulation than typical historical use of this utilitarian building construction method.”*

Document Updated: Section 3: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

Section 4: No

New Page #: TBD

#### DOORYARDS (addition)

Page 69:

NOTE: Add guidelines/standards for fence height and fence transparency requirements in order to avoid tall sidewalk fence walls that prevent pedestrian oriented frontages.

Response: The Guidelines describe residential fence requirements. Refer to Design Guidelines section 5.4 as follows: *“On residential lots, fences are limited to 4’ height in front yards and 6’ in side and rear yards. Fences over 6’ height require building permits”.*

For the mixed-use portion of the Winehaven District, guidelines will be added regarding the design attributes of fencing as follows:

Revised Text: *“Fencing is discouraged within the mixed-use portions of Winehaven Historic District to facilitate public access throughout the District. Fences may be allowed under the following conditions: 1) protection of public safety (e.g. to protect against changes in grade); 2) protection against degradation of a resource (e.g. natural areas or vulnerable historic resources); or 3) visual screening of service or utility areas (e.g refuse areas).*

*Height: Conditions 1 and 2: Fences will not exceed 42”.*

*Condition 3: Height will not be less than 48” (4 feet) nor greater than 72” (6 feet)*

*Transparency: Condition 3: Fencing shall have a visual transparency not more than 10%.*

*Materials: Materials shall in all conditions be complementary to the building material palette defined for the Historic District.”*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: TBD in Section 4.0

PORCHES (addition)

Page 70: Under Porches, add Entry Doors

NOTE: Add guidelines for residential front entry doors to encourage selection of a well-articulated pedestrian-friendly, inviting door, with color, hardware, glazing integrated with architectural character. Do not permit solid blank doors.

Response: Examples of more articulated doors have been added to the Design Guidelines.

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-25

CORRECTION?

Page 78, 2nd column, first bullet, Historic Rehabilitation, Last Sentence:

Create opportunities throughout the site for interpretation and learning about the City's history-Point Molate's history.

Response: Changed to "Winehaven's history"

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-4

HISTORIC RESOURCES STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (addition)

Page 80

4.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS\*

NOTE: Add \*footnote referring readers to Appendix and Historic Resources Structural Assessment and Recommendations.

Response: Added "(see documents listed in section 4.0 for additional information)"

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-6

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION DOCUMENT (addition)

Page 84

4.3 HISTORIC BUILDING DESCRIPTIONS\*

NOTE: Add \*footnote referring readers to Appendix and National Register Nomination document.

Response: Note: We believe this comment refers to section 4.3, not 4.4. Added "(see documents listed in section 4.0 for additional information)"

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-10

BUILDING 63 (addition)

Page 87

NOTE: Under Building 63

Add ' - Symmetrical Building Form'

Response: Agreed and completed.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-13

HISTORIC EVALUATIONS & STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS(additions)

Page 89

NOTE: Add following two bullets:

- Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading or building permit, prepare Historic Resource Evaluations and Historic Resource Structural Assessments (See Appendix) for future historic building rehabilitations to record existing conditions, identify individual character-defining spaces and features, and outline historic treatment recommendations. Historic Resource Structural Assessments shall be prepared by a licensed Materials and Structural Engineer with experience and specialization in historic preservation.

Response: Language will be modified as follows:

*“Prior to issuance of a demolition, grading, or building permit that would permanently alter the historic resource (except a permit for stabilization or environmental remediation), prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation for historic building rehabilitations to record existing conditions, identify individual character-defining spaces and features, and outline historic treatment recommendations. The Historic Resource Evaluation shall be prepared by a licensed Historic Preservation Architect with experience and specialization in Historic Preservation.”*

There also is a CEQA mitigation measure addressing demolition, which states, *“Do Not Issue Building/Demolition Permits for the Winehaven District Until HPC Approves: The City shall not issue demolition permits associated with demolition or construction in the Winehaven Historic District until the HPC has reviewed the application to ensure that the building proposed to be demolished is not a contributor to the Winehaven District.”*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-15

- Preparation of plans/documents and specifications, and management/supervision in the field for any proposed demolition, removal of historic features, remediation, alterations, repair or replacement of historic building materials or features, including brick work and signage, shall be by a licensed Materials and Structural Engineer with experience and specialization in historic preservation.

Response: Will modify bullet point to read: *“Preparation of plans/documents and specifications for any proposed demolition shall be by a licensed Historic Preservation Architect.”*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-15

**CORRECTION/CLARIFICATION**

Page 90

Under 'General Direction', 2nd bullet:

Use architectural design of ~~to identify~~ new buildings which should to complement the historic district's rich architectural history and natural setting.

Response: Added *“Design new buildings to complement but not duplicate the historic district’s architecture.”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-34

**RECOMMENDATION (to 1st bullet) ADDITION (2nd & last bullet) MASSING**

Page 90

Under 'Massing', first bullet:

In general, compose new buildings and structures of simple forms that correspond to their typology.

Response: Agreed and completed.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-34

UNDER 'MASSING', ADD 2ND BULLET:

For new buildings or structures adjacent to or framing historic resources such as the Power House (#13) and the Fire House (#63) use stepdowns, setbacks, voids and/or architectural massing features, in order to shape and transition the new construction to frame and highlight, and gesture a nod to the historic resource.

Response: Bullet point has been added that communicates this point. Language has been modified slightly to correlate with overall design guidelines tone and level of detail.

Revised Text: *“Use stepdowns, setbacks, voids and/or architectural massing features for new buildings or structures adjacent to or framing historic resources (such as the Powerhouse (#13) and Fire House (#63)) to cause the new construction to frame and highlight the historic resource.”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-34

ADD TO THE LAST BULLET UNDER 'MASSING'

Design the space between massing breaks as well articulated usable open spaces, passageways, or live-work outdoor work spaces. Avoid solid blank walls on facades that face these spaces. Use architecturally integrated art or features such as lighting and/or color to provide texture and interest.

Response: Massing breaks are typically small shifts in massing to reduce apparent scale. Courtyards and passageways are use areas rather than a facade articulation. Language added to Section 3.5 page 3-20 & 3-21 as follows:

*“Variety in both the facades of larger buildings and smaller buildings such as single family homes is strongly encouraged as follows:*

- *Massing Breaks shall extend vertically the entire height of the building.*
- *Create depth within the facade*
- *Utilize Step-backs*
- *Accommodate change in materials*
- *Variations in size”*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 3-20 & 3-21

ADDITION (clarification)

Page 92

Under 'Materials', Overview and Intent, 1st Paragraph, last line add *stucco (not original)*

Response: We generally agree and will address this point by noting stucco may not be original.

However, the developer reserves the right to use stucco, wood board, or a combination of the two in the final rehabilitation.

Revised Text: *“The cottage area, by contrast, uses an existing residential palette of stucco (which may not be original), clapboard, shingled roofs and painted wood.”*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-36

NATIONAL REGISTER NOMINATION DOCUMENT (addition)

Page 96

#### 4.8 Community Guidelines\*footnote

NOTE: Add \*footnote referring readers to Appendix and National Register Nomination document.

Response: Agreed and completed.

Revised Text: *The proposed project will retain all contributing historic buildings and their character-defining features (note: see documents listed in Section 4.0 for additional information).*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-16

#### REVISIONS

Page 91 and 99

DELETE on page 91: Use small buildings such as pavilions to enliven spaces near historic buildings that have limited opportunity to host active ground floor uses due to limits on changes to walls and other historic elements

REPLACE WITH: *Place small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around historic buildings to mitigate the low number of openings in some facades and activate nearby spaces. Minimize new small structures or pavilions to retain high visibility of the entire west facing and plaza facing historic building facades. Balance new small structures and pavilions with openings and use of space in Building 1, 6, and 10 to activate open spaces nearby. Limit new openings so that enough mass remains to keep the wall's sense of solidity.*

Response: Agreed. Language is suggested below to communicate this point and modified slightly to correlate with Guidelines' level of detail.

Revised Text: *"Site small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around historic buildings to activate nearby spaces. Achieve the activation of spaces while retaining the maximum visibility, mass and continuity of historic facades."*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-35

DELETE on page 99:

- Place small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around Building 1 to mitigate the low number of openings in some facades and activate nearby spaces.

REPLACE WITH: *Place small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around Building 1 to mitigate the low number of openings in some facades and activate nearby spaces. Minimize new small structures or pavilions to retain high visibility of the entire west facing and plaza facing historic building facades. Balance new small structures and pavilions with openings and use of space in Building 1 to activate open spaces nearby. Limit new openings so that enough mass remains to keep the wall's sense of solidity.*

Response: Agreed. Language is suggested below to communicate this point and modified slightly to correlate with Guidelines' level of detail.

Revised Text: *"Site small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around Building 1 to activate nearby spaces. Achieve the activation of spaces while retaining the maximum visibility, mass and continuity of Building 1".*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-19

#### REVISION

Page 103

DELETE• Place structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around Building 6 to mitigate the low number of openings in some facades and activate nearby spaces.

REPLACE WITH:

*Place small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around Building 6 to mitigate the low number of openings in some facades and activate nearby spaces. Minimize new small structures or pavilions to retain high visibility of the entire west facing and plaza facing historic building facades. Balance new small structures and pavilions with openings and use of space in Building 6 to activate open spaces nearby. Limit new openings so that enough mass remains to keep the wall's sense of solidity.*

*Response: Agreed. Language is suggested below to communicate this point and modified slightly to correlate with Guidelines' level of detail.*

*Revised Text: "Site small structures or pavilions as needed in the spaces around Building 6 to activate nearby spaces. Achieve the activation of spaces while retaining the maximum visibility, mass and continuity of Building 6."*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-23

CORRECTION/ADDITION

Page 105

Modify section to include 'Mixed Use' in front of Parking on first floor, west facing space.

*Response: Agreed and completed. Added "Potential mixed use"*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-25

CLARIFICATIONS

Page 106

1st bullet

Shape new development to highlight views and access to important elements and to preserve important elements of the historic buildings and site.

*Response: Completed with modification as follows.*

*Revised Text: "Shape new development to highlight views of, access to, and preservation of historic buildings and elements of the site."*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-26

2nd bullet

Use site development to activate public spaces and create new opportunities for enjoyment and understanding of the history of the Village, while maintaining high visibility, paths and clear access to the historic buildings and their features.

*Response: Completed with modification as follows.*

*Revised Text: "Locate new development to activate public spaces and create new opportunities for enjoyment and understanding of the history of Winehaven Village."*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-26

ADDITION

Page 107

4th bullet, last sentence

ADD:

Other small buildings and pavilions there and new openings in Buildings 1, 6 and 10 could activate spaces nearby. Minimize new small structures or pavilions to retain high visibility of historic building

facades. Balance new small structures and pavilions with openings and use of space in Buildings 1, 6 and 10 to activate open spaces nearby.

Response: Completed with modification as follows.

Revised Text: *“A new building between the southern end of Building 1 and Stenmark Drive could host retail or other active uses to activate the Upper Walk and the plaza. Other small buildings and pavilions there and new openings in Buildings 1, 6 and 10 could activate spaces nearby.”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-27

#### CORRECTION

Page 112

Eliminate building next to Winemaster's House.

Response: Agreed.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-32

#### ADDITION

Page 114

Bike paths clearly created and marked? Include language that addresses bike paths.

Response: Agreed. Language added.

Revised Text: *“Create on- and off-street bicycle links within Winehaven Village and to the Bay Trail.”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-40

#### MASTER SIGN PROGRAM (addition)

Page 120

Prior to issuance of any sign permit, design an integrated Winehaven Village Historic District Master Sign Program to achieve integrated commercial office, retail, live-work identification signage. This sign program should include standards for a unified appearance, addressing: location; color; sign type (wall, projecting, window, banners, awning, sidewalk, etc.); size of signs and size of lettering; materials, lighting, temporary and permanent signs; and review process for both the initial sign program and individual sign proposals.

Response: Response: Completed with modification as follows.

Revised Text: *“Develop an integrated Winehaven Historic District sign program including standards for appearance, location, materials, lighting, and review process.”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-46

#### SPECIFIC PAGE COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONER M. HIBMA

##### HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATIONS (REVISION)

Page 76; second paragraph, first line. Change the text to read Historic Resource Condition Assessment. Calling these reports a “Historic Resource Evaluation” implies that the status of the District or any of its individual contributing elements are historical resources under CEQA needs further investigation. It does not. Globally revise “HRE” to “HSR” = Historic Structure Report. NPS technical guidance on preparing HSRs is available here: <https://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/briefs/43-historic-structure-reports.htm>. (MH)

Response: It is not recommended to globally revise HRE to HSR. As discussed with and per the reference provided by the HPC, Historic Structures Reports are comprehensive and detailed efforts that typically precede and initiate rehab planning and design.

As much rehabilitation planning work has been completed to date, in lieu of requiring detailed, building-by-building HSRs and based on previous multiple resource historical projects, we recommend a customized, Historic Resource Evaluation report and have also clarified the intent and extent of the future HREs within the guidelines.

However, to allay concerns, language on this page has been modified to provide additional information and have clarified the contents of the Historic Resource Evaluation.

Revised Text: *“The Winehaven Historic District Design Guidelines are principally based on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and, specifically, the Standards for Rehabilitation (1) together with the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (2).”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-2

Ibid, third paragraph; first line. “Individual HREs will therefore take place as a part of future project implementation...”. Revise to make clear that these guidelines apply to any current and future projects within the District. (MH)

Response: Agreed. Word “future” has been deleted.

Revised Text: *“Individual HREs will therefore take place as part of project implementation and additionally based on the City of Richmond’s regulatory processes, specifically...”*

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-2

#### SECTION 4.1 PROJECT NARRATIVE

Page 78; first paragraph, first sentence. “...will provide an adaptive reuse of many of the existing historic resources in the site.” Please clarify what “most of the existing historic resources” means. Which will not be adaptively reused? (MH)

Response: The word “many” will be deleted. All listed historic elements will be adaptively reused.

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-4

Ibid, second paragraph, first sentence. “... (Buildings 1, 6, 10, 13, 17, 17, 31-60, and 63) as a mixed use...” Change “31-60” to “31-54, 56-60”. Building 55 is not a contributing element. (MH)

Response: Agreed and completed.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-4

#### SECTION 4.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Page 80; Subsection 4.2.2 Hillside Residential Buildings. First bullet point. Revise building numeration to reflect above comment. (MH)

Response: Agreed and completed.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-6

Ibid, page 80/81. Please insert copy of NRHP map depicting numbered buildings within the District showing which ones are contributing and which are not. (MH)

Response: Agreed. Caption will identify non-contributing buildings.

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-7

#### SECTION 4.4 HISTORIC BUILDING DESCRIPTIONS

Pages 84-87. Revise this section to reflect the building descriptions and character defining sections as laid out in the NRHP Addendum and include reference to a copy of the NRHP addendum to the appropriate numbered appendix to the Design Guidelines. (MH)

Response: The Winehaven DG document has accurately paraphrased the referenced document. It is not recommended to copy verbatim as the referenced document is still in draft form and may be further modified. Additionally, the Dept. of Int. documents are referenced here again.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-10

#### SECTION 4.5 HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Page 89; first bulleted item; first sentence. Text currently reads: "Include detailed building-by-building historic resource evaluations for future historic building rehabilitations...". Revise "historic resource evaluations" to "historic structure reports" per earlier comment. (MH)

Response: The Historic Resource Evaluations (HREs), as described in *Section 4.0 Introduction*, is the appropriate terminology for this documentation. The general content of a typical HRE is also defined in *Section 4.0*.

*A further intention is that the identified Winehaven historic resources will undergo future and individual Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) to include written and graphic documentation detailing historic resource significance; historic architectural, structural and material conditions assessments; and treatments for proposed retention, repair, rehabilitation, alterations and additions.*

*Individual HREs will therefore take place as part of project implementation and additionally based on the City of Richmond's regulatory processes, specifically the City's requisite Certificate of Appropriateness, which provide for the review of projects directly associated with Richmond's designated historic resources by the City's Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) per section 15.04.303.120 of the Richmond Municipal Code*

Document Updated: No change.

Page #: 4-14

Ibid, fourth bulleted item; second sentence. Text currently reads: "Demolition of existing construction or removal of historical significant features shall be limited and shall meet the Standards." Please provide examples, per the Secretary's Standards examples of demolitions that are compliant with the Standards. (MH)

Response: No change. The guideline is sufficient as currently written and the provision of examples is overly burdensome. Additional clarification added as follows:

Revised Text: "All Historic District contributing buildings shall be retained. Demolition of existing construction shall be limited and shall meet the Standards. Any demolition activities shall be conducted in a manner that shall be sensitive to and protective of Historic District contributors and/or their character-defining features."

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-15

Also, revise the sentence to read: “Demolition of existing non-contributing built environment construction or removal of historical significant features, such as – but not limited to – walls, pathways, retaining walls, sidewalks, railroad segments, and etc., shall be limited and shall meet the Standards.” (MH)

Response: The document has been revised to add “non-contributing” as requested. However, we suggest any list of examples would either need to be exhaustive or necessarily partial, so examples have not been added.

Revised Text: *“Demolition of existing non-contributing built environment construction or removal of historical significant features, such as – but not limited to – walls, pathways, retaining walls, sidewalks, railroad segments, and etc., shall be limited and shall meet the Standards.”*

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-15

Ibid, sixth bulleted item. Current text addresses new buildings constructed within the District. Please revise this bullet to also account for additions to contributing elements. Also please address Rehab Standards 10 and reversibility. (MH)

Response: Guidelines will be revised to read “New buildings and building additions...” and to conclude statement with “...”, and Standard 10, which addresses requisite reversibility.”

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-15

Ibid, seventh bulleted item. Current text mirrors EIR MM4.4-2; item f calling for updating the 1995 Historic American Building Survey (HABS) document of Winehaven. Please propose who will make that determination and when it will occur. If nobody is designated, then let it fall to the HPC. (MH)

Response: Because this duplicates EIR language, this bullet point will be deleted.

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-15

## SECTION 4.6

Page 91; map. Please revise “Plaza & Steam Generating Plant” to “Plaza and Powerhouse.” Also, please move this map further up onto page 90 or further up in the section. (MH)

Response: Agreed. Language has been modified to reflect concerns. Map location will be referenced.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-35

### SECTION 4.6.6 GROUND FLOOR USES.

Page 91; First paragraph, second sentence. Current text reads: “...the Lower Walk, the steam generating plant, and Stenmark Drive” to “the Lower Walk, the Powerhouse, and Stenmark Drive.” (MH)

Response: Agreed. “Steam Generating Plant” has been changed in all occurrences to “Powerhouse”

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-35

## SECTION 4.8 COMMUNITY GUIDELINES

Page 96; first paragraph, second sentence. Current text reads: “New additions and related new construction including commercial residential, and office uses, will be sensitively designed to make Winehaven Village...”. Revise sentence to read: “The design of new additions and related new

construction will comply with the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation to make Winehaven Village...". (MH)

Response: Reference to the Secretary's standards have been added to the first sentence.

Document Updated: Yes

New Page #: 4-16

Ibid, bulleted items. Add a bullet that states: "Total height of new construction within the District shall not exceed XXX feet." (MH)

Response: Height limits are addressed through zoning requirements and Section 2.9.2 of the Design Guidelines. No change to the DG.

Page #: 4-16

Add a bullet that states: "New construction in excess of X number of stories will be sited at a minimum of XXX feet away from contributing elements." (MH)

Response: Massing and setback requirements of new construction will comply with the requirements of zoning documentation. No change to the DG.

Page #: 4-16

#### SECTION 4.8.3 NEW CONSTRUCTION

Page 107; second bulleted item. Current text reads: "Attempt to preserve important views, particularly the view from Stenmark Drive to the Bay as one approaches the site from the site." Revise sentence to read: "Prioritize preserving important views, such as the view from Stenmark Drive to the Bay as one approaches the site from the site." (MH)

Response: Will change the text from "Attempt to preserve important views..." to "Prioritize the preservation of important views..."

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-27

#### SECTION 4.10 LANDSCAPE

Page 116; Existing Landscape within Winehaven Village. Recommend stating that the current landscaping and plantings are not contributing elements to the District. (MH)

Response: Agreed.

Revised Text: The following text will be added: "*The current landscape and plantings are not contributing elements to the District*"

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-42

#### SECTION 4.12 SIGNAGE

Page 120; second to last bulleted item. Current bulleted text reads: "Anchor new signage when needed to exterior concrete where evidence of substantial previous anchorages exist." Please give examples of "when needed" and define "substantial." Recommend removing this bullet. Sinking new bolts in previously drilled concrete may further weaken the concrete creating secondary damage. (MH)

Response: Agreed.

Revised Text: Suggest the following text replace this bullet: "*All required sign anchors and fixtures shall be designed to minimize impacts on historic structure to the greatest extent feasible.*"

Document Updated: No

New Page #: Anticipated to be 4-46

## SECTION 5.0 LANDSCAPE GUIDELINES

Page 136; Section 5.2.2. Site Grading and Earthwork. Text needs to acknowledge potential for archaeological resources. Insert a reference to Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 and 4.4-5 in the Project EIR. (MH)

Response: Language added to DG's Section 5.2.3: *"Protect and preserve site archaeology identified by the City of Richmond."*

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 5-13

## SECTION 5.0 LANDSCAPE GUIDELINES

Page 142; 5.4 Signage and Lighting. Add a sentence in the text above 5.4.1 Signage that states: "Refer to Sections 4.11 and 4.12 for guidance on lighting and signage within the Winehaven Historic District/Winehaven Village." (MH)

Response: Reference has been added to Section 5.5 Signage and Lighting.

Revised Text: Refer to Section 4.0 for guidance on signage and lighting within the Winehaven Historic District.

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: 5-22

Landscaping as Interpretation? Considering that Point Molate once contained (at least) three shellmounds, this project may provide an opportunity to consult with Ohlone representatives about installing a mound-like structure on site (nearabouts the base of the lower walk or grassy field near the bay margin?) with signage and information acknowledging the Ohlone past and provide an opportunity for meaningful interpretation of the precontact-era Bay Area. (MH)

Response: Several references in DGs for opportunities to reference and educate about cultural history have been included or added. Including the following sections and diagrams:

- Section 2.3, page 2-6
- Section 5.1.2, page 5-7
- Section 5.1.3, page 5-9 and Section 5.3.3, page 5-15: References to interpretive trails on diagrams.
- Section 5.2.1: Culturally Historic Vegetation, page 5-11
- Section 5.3.6: Interpretive Signage Opportunities, page 5-16

In addition, there is a CEQA mitigation measure that requires the following: *The Applicant shall include the four culturally significant plants identified as TCRs (*Dichelostemma multiflorum*, *Dichondra donnelliana*, *Elymus glaucus* ssp. *jepsonii*, and *Grindelia stricta* var. *platyphylla*) in vegetation buffers (with interpretive signs) in an area within the Project Site that is open to visitors, including members of the Tribe. The Tribe must be able to harvest the plants if desired. In addition, the Modified Project shall construct and/or rehabilitate an uphill trail east of the proposed development that contains periodic interpretive panels, sitting areas, and learning exhibits that tell the story of the early inhabitants of the area. If allowed by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, interpretive panels with the Project Site's history should also be placed near the beach.*

Finally, tribal consultation is ongoing pursuant to CEQA requirements.

Document Updated: Yes, May 4, 2020 edition

New Page #: As noted above.

END OF RESPONSES