

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond CA 94804

June 24, 2020
6:00 P.M.

All Participation Via Teleconference

Due to the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, Contra Costa County and Governor Gavin Newsom had issued multiple orders requiring sheltering in place, social distancing, and reduction of person-to-person contact. Accordingly, Governor Newsom had issued executive orders that allowed cities to hold public meetings via teleconferencing. Due to the shelter in place orders, all City of Richmond staff, members of the Design Review Board (DRB), and members of the public participated via teleconference. Public comment was confined to items on the agenda and limited to the specific methods identified on the agenda.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Brian Carter
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Brian Carter, Jessica Fine, and Michael Hannah

Absent: Boardmembers Macy Leung and Karlyn Neel

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Jonelyn Whales and Emily Carroll, and City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER: *“Good evening Chair Livingston, Boardmembers. I have some comments to go into the record: 1. If you recall when the owner of USA Carpet came to talk with the Board about the expansion of El Tapatio, I do not remember the applicant had spoken with the North and East Neighborhood Council in regarding the expansion; 2. I do recall when Doug Griffin came to talk with the Board about the Aspire Academy project, Fairmede Hilltop had some concerns regarding traffic along Hilltop Mall especially in the afternoon. I must advise the Board that anytime when projects come before any appointed body, that the applicants has to meet with the neighborhood councils to provide any input. Sincerely, Cordell.”*

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

City Council Liaison Report

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, July 6, 2020 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. PLN18-219 | JERUM TWO-STORY DWELLING |
| Description | (HELD OVER FROM JUNE 10, 2020) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±2,240 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING IN THE TISCORNIA ESTATES SPECIFIC PLAN AREA. |
| Location | 523 SANTA FE AVENUE |
| APN | 558-184-005 |
| Zoning | TISCORNIA ESTATES SPECIFIC PLAN |
| Owner | FIRST GROUP INVESTMENTS, LLC |
| Applicant | BRAD GUNKEL |
| Staff Contact | JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated June 24, 2020, for a two-story 2,900 square foot single-family dwelling and attached garage on a large corner lot of 17,100 square feet located at 523 Santa Fe Avenue in Point Richmond in the Tiscornia Estate Specific Plan (TESP) area. The project was exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to a recent court case, McCorkle Eastside Neighborhood Group v. City of Helena (2018), 31 Cal. App. 5th 89, not required because the scope of the City's discretionary authority was limited to design review.

James Atencio added that projects subject to design review did not require an exemption based on this case law.

Ms. Whales explained that the parcel was surrounded by Bishop Avenue and the vacated area of Santa Fe Avenue. Following the street vacation, the right-of-way reverted back to adjacent property owners. The General Plan designation for the site is Hillside Residential. The TESP was designated for the development of allowable land for single-family dwelling units and there were some three-story sections which included a basement (uninhabitable pursuant to the California Building Code). The proposed design would be a modern contemporary style to conform to the surrounding dwellings in the neighborhood.

Ms. Whales reported that the DRB had held a study session on September 25, 2019 for the applicant to receive comments and suggestions to refine the design to meet TESP development standards. During the study session, the DRB had offered six recommendations: 1) conform with TESP downslope massing; 2) collaborate with Vice Chair Hannah to redesign the structure to lose the inverted monolithic massing; 3) provide a base above the garage that is terraced to reduce vertical mass on the elevation; 4) change the proposed color schemes for the dwelling; 5) redesign the driveway; and 6) limit parking along Bishop Avenue.

Ms. Whales described the lot coverage and setbacks for the downslope lot with a maximum building height of 30 feet, and she pointed out the development guideline that materials and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

colors should blend with the natural landscape and be of wood with a fire-retardant characteristic in earth tone colors, and include landscaping.

Boardmember Carter asked if the driveway for the main access from Santa Fe was prohibited, and Ms. Whales explained that it was not prohibited and was the preference of the applicant.

Vice Chair Hannah verified with staff that there had been discussions between all involved as to how best to come off the road and how best to site the house on the lot. As a result of those discussions, Bishop Avenue had been deemed to be the front yard.

Chair Livingston asked if there was a soils report on the property as required by the TESP to allow the DRB to look at specific standards and criteria to guide the site grading, the drainage, and the foundation design.

Ms. Whales reported that the soils report was on file and it was specific to the site.

Chair Livingston stated he had repeatedly asked for the soils report to allow the DRB to understand the recommendations from the geotechnical report with regard to the proposed design and how it conformed to the actual recommendations from the soils engineer.

Ms. Whales explained that the soils report would be reviewed by the Engineering Department.

Chair Livingston added that there had been numerous requests by the DRB's Subcommittee for further elaborations related to details on roof drainage, window trim, metal cladding, and soffit design, and he asked if those requests had been submitted to the applicant and whether there had been a response to those requests.

Vice Chair Hannah commented that he had not received any more information as a result of those requests.

Ms. Whales advised that everything that had been requested as a result of the study session had been provided.

BRAD GUNKEL, the applicant, reported that after the study session last year he had worked to address the recommendations from the DRB, as follows:

- To provide a materials board, which he displayed on his screen at this time;
- To change the white stucco on the house to a light grey or something other than a white, which had been done;
- To show the grade elevations and building heights in the sections, which had been done;
- To show a rendering from farther down Santa Fe Avenue for more context, which he displayed on the screen at this time and which had been included in the plan set;
- To create a backup space at the driveway next to the garage, which was outside of the TESP and which could be taller, and he displayed the proposal where the retaining walls would be taller;
- To provide a landscape plan, and in particular to provide terraced landscaping at the base of the house so that the house would appear to grow out of the hillside and to cover the crawlspace walls, which he also displayed;
- To remove the outward jutting wall of the east elevation of the garage and play with the materials to better accentuate the existing step back, and he was to work with Vice Chair Hannah to address that request and showed the changes that had currently been

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

- made; and
- Had worked with Planning staff, Engineering, the Fire District, and the TESP to address all the guidelines and requirements.

Mr. Gunkel identified the key parameters of the downslope lot and reported that the maximum height above street level was 12 feet with a 30-foot maximum height above grade. He stated the proposal easily complied with that requirement and easily fit within the required envelope.

GREG JERUM, the property owner, was available to respond to questions.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

LYNN SIGNORELLI, a Water Street resident, read a letter from JANET LYONS, a neighbor who had hearing issues. Also a Water Street resident who passed the site daily, Ms. Lyons expressed major concerns with the location of the home sited at the top of the property at the intersection of Bishop Avenue and Washington Avenue with the only access from Bishop Avenue, a limited, narrow street already dangerous to navigate. She noted there were no sidewalks and both roadways were used by cars, pedestrians, and dog walkers. Bishop Avenue was a two-way street but not wide enough for two cars to pass and no room for on-street parking, and there was limited visibility when entering Bishop from Washington Court. She referenced the City's vacation of the Santa Fe portion of the property and stated that the vacated portion should have been used to help provide better access for any development of the property to avoid overloading the inadequate upper street. Due to a public safety concern, she asked that the design not be approved as submitted and requested that the home be sited lower down on the lot, be set back more from Bishop Avenue, and that access to the house and garage be provided from Santa Fe Avenue.

Ms. Signorelli stated that she agreed with most of Ms. Lyons comments. She also noted an understanding that no building could occur in the TESP, and Chair Livingston provided some of the institutional knowledge of the TESP from 1986 and identified the lots that had been designated as buildable lots.

Ms. Signorelli commented that there had been no notification of the subject hearing in the neighborhood other than through a paper notice "placed on a stick" in the neighborhood. She urged a better noticing process to better inform the public.

Ms. Whales advised that staff had sent out notices to those living 750 feet around the project site.

AMANDA LUCAS, who lived a couple of streets over from the project, asked about the existing trees and the other natural plantings and asked what existing landscaping would be preserved in the plan. She also expressed concern for a lack of noticing of the application.

Mr. Jerum stated that the Monterey pines on the lot had been evaluated by an arborist who had indicated that the trees were all at some level of dying; they could be retained or removed; some neighbors had urged their elimination; and the TESP and Point Richmond in general discouraged tall trees because they obscured views. He stated the trees had been designated for removal in the plan. The landscape plan would include drought-resistant plants native to the area, and when developed the site should look more natural than it currently looked.

PAULA LEVINE, 245 Washington Court, Richmond, noted that the court was a one-way street, she had received a notice in the mail, and she was concerned about the safety of the site given

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

the congestion in the area. She wanted the house to be relocated so that the entrance was lower on Santa Fe Avenue as opposed to being accessed from Bishop Avenue.

Emily Carroll read into the record written comments from:

MARK ADAMS, 261 Washington Court, Richmond, a practicing professional geologist, submitted a detailed letter expressing concerns related to access from Bishop Avenue, adherence and conformance to the TESP, and slope stability in general and specifically to Bishop Avenue.

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, reported that he had reviewed the Jerum drawing and it had his support.

Chair Livingston referred to letters from the public in the staff report, verified with staff that those letters had been presented to the members of the DRB, and that the DRB members present had read those letters. When told that there were no more speakers to be heard, he noted his understanding that the next door neighbor, Steve Skates had indicated he would call in to offer comments.

Mr. Gunkel advised that Mr. Skates had contacted the applicant and advised that he was in support of the project.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Carter expressed his support for the direction of the project, the splitting of the two masses, and the material and composition which was well balanced, but noted the initial question of why the applicant had chosen to develop on top of the site.

In response, Mr. Gunkel reported that the proposal had always been at the general location from the earliest design and the placement had been to take advantage of the views.

Mr. Jerum added that it was his intent to live in the home for a long time and while not initially considered as two volumes, the home had been proposed at two volumes to have the garage on the same level as the living level to eliminate a driveway almost twice the length of the proposed driveway, and to avoid the need for a three-story home allowing the creation of a more desirable floor plan and to break up the massing.

Vice Chair Hannah explained that in California, the property owner of a corner lot or a lot facing one street with another in the rear had the ability to pick the front, rear and side yards, which governed how the whole lot would be developed. Given the inside corner lot where any side could be picked, and with two street sides, he suggested it would be irrelevant why something had been sited the way since it was the applicant's choice if consistent with all requirements.

Boardmember Carter referred to the studio above the garage and asked for the context of that space in relation to the neighbors across the street, and Mr. Gunkel stated the key driving factor for the TESP and the relationship of the garage and height of the studio had been shown in a diagram of the south elevation related to the requirement that no portion of the house be 12 feet above the immediately adjacent portion of the road. The house across the street was on an upslope lot and the base of that house was at the roof level of the subject home.

Boardmember Carter stated that fact should be emphasized to show that the view corridor would not be impacted.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

The DRB agreed with the need to identify the whole site section to show that the proposal fit within the height limit of the TESP, and Vice Chair Hannah requested for the benefit of the DRB and the public that staff and the architects verify that all of the volumes in every site section conformed to that requirement.

Boardmember Carter referred to the east elevation of the garage and asked what modifications had been made from the initial proposal, which Mr. Gunkel provided. Boardmember Carter asked if there were any opportunities to have a shift in the vertical plane of the stucco elevation to recess the portion of the studio, pop out the garage, or somehow break up the face. He suggested the materials were working well together but suggested that the clear anodized aluminum for the fascia might be too bright for the roofline and recommended something with a more natural patina, a CORE 10 or copper, something more fitting within the context of the neighborhood of a structure that fit in well with nature. He urged consideration of something that would weather well over time.

Boardmember Butt commented that the image was lovely but did not fit well within the site. She understood the community concern about the driveway.

Boardmember Fine recommended a better noticing process and given that members' worked with multiple jurisdictions suggested the DRB could come up with suggestions. She valued the neighbors' open-mindedness about the project, particularly with new landscaping more appropriate to the site. In terms of retaining walls and the relationship of the structures to the site, she had some concerns in that the project was all about the section and some of the footings, and the retaining walls felt like gestures towards what they should be as opposed to actuals. She wanted to see the actual height of the retaining walls and those that were a block landscaping component versus a concrete and steel retaining wall that would make her feel more secure about how the building would be situated on the site. She also had concern about the durability and robustness of the fascia and how gutters and downspouts would be integrated and if it would break up the beautiful clean lines throughout the project.

Boardmember Fine referred to a discrepancy between the natural wood siding versus the red western cedar, and emphasized that if not repeatedly maintained the project would look like a monochromatic gray building when weathered. She had concerns with the windows at grade and urged being cognizant about how those windows interfaced with the landscape. She also had concern with the light wells and how to make them drain properly.

Vice Chair Hannah summarized the DRB Subcommittee's discussions and the help he had offered to the applicant throughout that process that had resulted in two sketches that had been included in the record to sculpt the building at the base. He recommended that the applicant provide elevations that showed the landscape, as well as no landscape, given that landscaping was not necessarily guaranteed unless designed into the project. He clarified for the public record that the voluntary DRB Subcommittee process, with his help, did not constitute complete review of the applicant's requirements and needed approvals. He felt the building aspects were ready for review, but in reviewing the broader project and looking at the DRB's efforts to communicate with the applicant, the soils report, the structural, the public safety, the retaining walls, and other interrelated features of the project needed to be detailed. As such, he recommended that the applicant prepare full site sections from the roads all the way down to Santa Fe Avenue to show the reality.

Vice Chair Hannah noted the serious public safety/civic aspect where the DRB needed to be assured that what was shown was appropriate and safe given that the DRB was not qualified to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

make those determinations, and the design which he believed fit in with the TESP. He suggested that the applicant could also show some of the surrounding three- and four-story homes in those sections and he commented that proportionally the proposed home looked taller and more upright than it actually was. As long as the DRB was assured the home fit within the height limit, he stated that would be a non-issue. If built on Santa Fe Avenue, he explained that a three- or four-story home would have to be built, something much larger than what had been proposed.

Vice Chair Hannah recommended more architectural terracing at the front of the base and if there was a wood retaining wall, as shown on the plans, several layers should be provided to step down and ensure that healthy vegetation would come up like a skirt to cover the whole base. He recommended built-in wood retaining walls at the terrace to guarantee the plantings.

Vice Chair Hannah suggested that because the hillside coastal location was very unusual, it had special conditions and the actual requirements of the TESP had not been enforced. He referred to the soils report and verified with Mr. Gunkel that it existed, the house was not in a landslide zone, the geotechnical report had recommended piers given the steepness of the slope at the proposed location of the home, and piers had been proposed. Vice Chair Hannah stated that the proposed piers would stabilize the soils. He suggested that if the project met the TESP standards the public would be assured of that aspect although the safety of the road was another concern.

Chair Livingston stated with respect to the soils report that the DRB wanted to be able to assure the public of the safety of the road and that what would have to be done to secure the road would be done. He did not think that the details had been provided to make those assertions.

Vice Chair Hannah suggested the challenge of the project was the public safety component that the DRB could not take lightly, and while he characterized the applicant and his team as the most conscientious, thoughtful application team he had seen, the process was challenging. He asked the public to separate their feelings about the project to the design of the house versus the public aspect component.

Boardmember Fine stated the height of the retaining walls, particularly at the driveway, would be very important.

Boardmember Carter recognized that it had been pointed out that there would be quite a bit of structure between the road and the retaining wall and the relationship of the street side would be informed with more detail than had thus far been provided, and would go a long way to demonstrate the thoughtful design.

Chair Livingston suggested the form of the east elevation was out of context and the vertical versus the horizontal did not seem to follow the lyrical quality of Tiscornia. Referring to Sheet L-1 of the landscape plan, he noted the need to have a complete landscape plan. While natives had been included in the landscape plan, he recommended an aggressive slope stabilization erosion control plan with mulch and jute netting, especially in the section between the road and halfway down the steep slope in the high erosion areas. He did not think the applicant had gone far enough in the landscape plan to ensure the stabilization of the slope given the flow of the concentrated driveway water and roof water, as governed by the soils engineer. He also recommended that the lower part of the hill be planted with native trees.

Vice Chair Hannah suggested there was a missed opportunity and there should be wood-constructed low level terracing planter retaining walls immediately in front of the lowest point of the building where it meets the hill, to be shown on the plans.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

Chair Livingston looked forward to seeing the soils report. With respect to the elevations, he noticed that while the design had offered crisp lines, what had not been provided were the details such as the wing walls. He asked about the transition between the aluminum facing on a wing wall and the stucco, which detail also needed to be shown.

Vice Chair Hannah agreed and stated that the roof details also needed to be provided because they were non-standard.

Boardmember Fine agreed with the need for roof detail, the stair stepping of the foundation, and the foundation itself.

When asked about the type of cementitious panels that had been provided, Mr. Gunkel reported that Hardie panels would be attached to the face. He added that there could be a rain stream application.

Vice Chair Hannah noted he had no concern with the details and how they came together because it would be sorted out through the process given the experience and quality of all those involved but his concern was that when reality was applied to the project it would not meet the height limit. Using the clerestory as an example, he explained why he did not think the height limit could be achieved. He emphasized the need for details to make sure that what had been shown was achievable on a site drainage level, public safety level, depth of roof fascia level, soil stabilization level, and drainage management of the hill as well. He emailed an image that staff displayed to show Santa Fe Avenue and considerable more projection from the proposal than expected.

Chair Livingston expressed a concern with the aluminum in that the TESP did not want any shiny roofs and a fascia was part of the roof. He suggested it could be a dark bronze anodized aluminum or copper, but whatever was used would have to be toned down. He referred to Page A.2.3 and the set of stairs to the second floor level, which he suggested would not work, and the entry level would have to be adjusted. He emphasized the need to develop the garage façade with the right material such as Equitone, stated the garage door was all clear anodized as well and suggested all those areas would have to be replaced with a non-shiny material, and agreed with the need to respect the natural wood to avoid a monochromatic appearance.

Mr. Gunkel explained that there were a number of woods allowed in the wildland urban interface including the western red cedar.

Boardmember Carter commented that compositionally the floor to ceiling window would help illustrate it better because it seemed to conflict with the main entry. He suggested flipping that window horizontally to read better as a hall.

Vice Chair Hannah verified the discussion was about the recessed bridge and he suggested the depth of roof over the bridge was not realistic, and Mr. Gunkel stated they would be doing integral gutters. Vice Chair Hannah suggested that having floor to ceiling windows and getting a roof on top was not that realistic and he reiterated that following through on all the details would be required.

Mr. Jurem talked about the process and the points received from the Chair between meetings which he suggested was disorienting and confusing in that his understanding of the process was to go to the DRB, have a study session, get recommendations and work on those recommendations, which had been done with Vice Chair Hannah; however, he stated that now in the middle of the process there were more requests. He emphasized the costs involved and

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

noted that the cost had become excessive.

Chair Livingston understood the concerns. He referred to Sheet A.2-2B showing a stucco wall and verified with Mr. Gunkel that there would be some control joints.

Chair Livingston emphasized the need to show the foundation, grade beam and steps and integrate the control joints into where the logical line of the stepping of the grade beam would be. The façade needed to be broken up, the details needed to be provided for the gaps in the foundation along with the details for the shadow boxes and the drainage of those boxes.

Mr. Gunkel stated they typically ran the building paper and plywood down over the foundation and held the siding up off of grade by about eight inches and would show the exposed portion of the foundation along the bottom.

Chair Livingston asked how the drainage from the roof would be brought down to the distribution manifold, and if the drainage was internal it should be included in the cross section and the fascia details. He recommended that the applicant build some wooden walls on the east elevation to help bring that composition more into general conformance with the TESP, and he wanted the east elevation to be scored with however the control joints would be handled and show how the stucco to aluminum joints would be on the ends of all the walls. He asked the applicant about the eave soffit material, reported by Mr. Gunkel to be wood and explained that it would be shown on the drawings.

Vice Chair Hannah asked staff to display an image of a 13-inch deep fascia that he used as an example to clarify his comments that when reality was applied to the project it would not meet the height limit. He reiterated that the public safety civic component had to be separated from the design, and he could accept every aspect of the design personally as a member of the DRB as long as everyone, including the public, could agree that it met the TESP plan. He reiterated that the reality could affect the height limit the applicant was working so hard to stay below and more information was required about the detailing.

Chair Livingston asked if the applicant could draw two sections through the garage; one section showing the adjacent neighbor and one section by the stair, and show the whole thing along with the structure below it. He suggested the two sections through the garage were required given the slope change. He recommended taking the worst possible scenario. He also recommended a third section to include the whole line drawing.

Vice Chair Hannah referred to a prior public comment that he and the Chair had been the primary speakers on the item and explained that while they were practicing architects, along with others on the DRB, which was a diverse Board of experts that covered the entire city and its range of structures. He stated his recommendations were to help the process.

Boardmember Butt agreed, noted that applicants were getting an insane amount of free good advice from experts as part of the process, but given the Point Richmond location everything would be highly scrutinized by the neighbors, and while she was also a practicing architect, she specialized in historic preservation and she looked to those other experts on the DRB who dealt with modern construction.

Boardmember Fine concurred and stated that all members of the DRB were allowed to speak and provide input.

With respect to the subject application, Boardmember Butt stated that changing the material on the fascia was important. Her biggest concern was what the retaining walls would look like,

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

what the stucco wall would look like, and with respect to solar panels where the DRB had no input given state law, she was concerned with the height and appearance of solar panels on the roof and how that appearance could be mitigated. She also urged the applicant to be cognizant of the primary public views which would be the street views.

Chair Livingston asked about the solar panels and Mr. Gunkel stated that solar panels were now required and were typically on the roof.

Chair Livingston stated that the DRB would like to continue the item. He reiterated the DRB's intent to help.

Mr. Gunkel acknowledged the feedback, suggested the overall design was working and the details would have to be followed through, and due to concerns related to cost he would start the building permit set and have a DD set for the next meeting.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Chair Livingston urged the applicant to contact the DRB with any questions related to the requested details.

Boardmember Carter requested head and jamb details for the windows as well.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Livingston) to continue PLN18-219, JERUM TWO-STORY DWELLING, to a future meeting approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Leung, Neel).

2. PLN20-008	RAMIREZ NEW DUPLEX
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY DUPLEX ON A 5,000 SQUARE FOOT VACANT PARCEL.
Location	4401 JENKINS AVENUE
APN	408-011-032
Zoning	RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	HOME RESCUE TEAM, LLC
Applicant	MANUEL RAMIREZ
Staff Contact	ENZO CABILI
	Recommendation: CONTINUE TO JULY 8, 2020

The item was continued to the July 8, 2020 meeting.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

There was no report from staff.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston thanked the members of the DRB for all the time committed to DRB evaluations. He reported that the Point Molate Subcommittee had met and had offered comments to staff that would be forwarded to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Adjournment

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 12, 2020

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, July 8, 2020.