

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING Richmond, CA 94804

February 10, 2021
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

Brian Carter
Michelle Hook
Jonathan Livingston

Chair Livingston called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. and introduced new Boardmember Michelle Hook.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt, Brian Carter, Jessica Fine, Michelle Hook and Macy Leung

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Hector Lopez, Roberta Feliciano, and City Attorney Shannon Moore

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 27, 2021

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Fine/Carter) to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2021 meeting, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Leung and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: Hook; Absent: None).
--

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

Roberta Feliciano read the following letter from CORDELL HINDLER into the record: *Good evening Chair Livingston, Boardmembers and city staff, I have a couple of comments for the record. 1. I would postpone the projects until the virus gets lifted and as well the public is able*

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

to return to the meetings. 2. Also I would like to extend a welcome to Michelle Hook. Sincerely, Cordell.

Ms. Feliciano described the format of the web-based meeting and the public's ability to speak during the meeting.

City Council Liaison Report: None

CONSENT CALENDAR: None

APPEAL DATE:

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, February 22, 2021 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. PLN20-278	THIRD-STORY ADDITION
Description	PUBLIC HEARING FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A THIRD-STORY 1,750 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION, TO AN EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING.
Location	1376 SOUTH 50 TH STREET
APN	560-033-048
Zoning	RICHMOND BAY SPECIFIC PLAN, T5 MAIN STREET OPEN (T5MS-0)
Owner	STEVE OLIVER AND JOSH OLIVER
Applicant	KAVA MASSIH ARCHITECTS
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated February 10, 2021, for the request to renovate an existing building and construct a new third floor to expand existing offices in a two-phased approach. Phase 1 would consist of reconfiguring the existing floor plan for office space on the two floors of the building, and Phase 2 would involve the construction of the 1,750 square foot third-floor addition that would include offices and a small outdoor deck at the south and west façades. He described the industrial style of the building and the surrounding uses of light industrial warehouses and other light industrial uses, stated the request complied with all the development standards of the T5 District including building height, and there was no floor area ratio (FAR) requirement in the T5 District. Approval was recommended.

Boardmember Fine verified with staff that the address in the staff report, which had shown 149 South 50th Street, was incorrect and that the correct address was 1376 South 50th Street.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

KAVA MASSIH, the project architect, described the light glass and metal addition in contrast with the solid base of the current two-story structure. He stated that new openings would be made into the existing concrete block wall to add more light into that portion of the building.

STEVE OLIVER, Oliver & Company, stated the company was currently located one block to the east of the subject site. The intent was to make the site the firm's future headquarters.

Boardmember Fine clarified with staff and the architect that Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) parking would be provided; landscaping in the form of trees would be added and be part

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

of the final submission; the existing CMU was currently painted light (off-white) green with darker green trim and somewhat translucent green spandrels; and the lower roof on the larger portion of the warehouse building would include any needed additional mechanical equipment. Boardmember Fine expressed her support for the office layout as proposed as opposed to an open format.

Boardmember Carter supported the modification to the main building to create a more inviting main entryway and asked if the massing of the roof deck could be integrated more in line with the existing entryway. In a discussion with the applicant, Mr. Massih expressed a willingness to consider a metal awning over some of the openings in the existing building to also go over the entryway which could serve as the entry canopy.

Boardmember Carter recommended that the deck be made shallower to avoid extending so far out to the street and hug the building more to be kept at roughly the same square footage, decrease the length of the cantilever, and balance it better with the entryway.

Mr. Oliver explained that the deck was intended for limited use.

Boardmember Carter also recommended that the sun shades over the windows be made somewhat thicker, although Mr. Massih explained that he preferred the thinner powder-coated aluminum or steel so that the addition would be lighter in contrast to the heavier base.

Boardmember Butt liked the approach and the light building and asked if any fenestration had been planned for the blank wall on the east elevation, and Mr. Oliver noted that while the building was too close to the property line on the east he was willing to consider fenestration on the north side of the building.

Boardmember Butt asked about the exterior metal cladding next to the CMU, and Mr. Massih advised that clear anodized with some metallic or light gray color could be used. He suggested that one way to deal with the east elevation could be to change the exterior metal cladding into the glass, which would be obscure and create a livelier look than just metal. He also recommended using the same spacing of the mullions as those on the south side, to be wrapped around.

In response to other questions, Mr. Massih stated that the existing theme of outlining the windows in a different color would not be continued since the windows in the addition would be larger and stand on their own. With respect to the thickness of the horizontal exterior cladding, he clarified the intent of the design to leave as much structure as possible behind after making the openings to avoid the need for seismic reinforcement.

Boardmember Leung expressed concern whether the exterior lighting would be sufficient for on-site security, and Mr. Massih explained that aside from what had been shown on the building there were roll-up doors which could be left where the big opening was shown behind the glass wall which would avoid the need for a huge light package on the building for security purposes.

Boardmember Hook verified that four or five trees would be required in the landscape plan. She emphasized the need for shade trees. She also asked about the chain link fence in the parking lot and asked if it could be enhanced to have a better relationship with the building.

Mr. Massih stated the proposed landscaping would have to be able to sustain the usual wind speed in the area and appropriate trees would be included in the next proposal submitted to the DRB. With respect to the chain link fence, it was his understanding that some of the area was

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

used for staging and pick-up and drop-off and that aspect of the site could be discussed to determine whether the chain link would be needed or whether it could be removed. He also clarified that site furnishings had not been considered for the frontage but could be considered in the next submittal to provide something more inviting for the frontage.

Chair Livingston liked the building and liked the base with the delicate top and the thin lines. He referred to the deck, suggested it seemed to be unrelated, needed to be integrated into the architecture better, and suggested the delicate cap could flow down the building using the contrasted fenestration to somehow create a sense of entry.

Mr. Massih suggested that one solution would be to thin the deck and pull it to the corner of the building on the south side so that both adjacent offices could have access to it.

Chair Livingston stated with respect to the lighting that fixtures congruent with the architecture needed to be specified, the LED lighting color could be no more than 3,000K, the rooftop equipment would have to be screened, and revised plans should be re-submitted to the DRB for its next meeting on February 24, 2021.

2. PLN20-256	SANCHEZ TWO-STORY ADDITION
Description	PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY ADDITION AT THE REAR OF THE EXISTING RESIDENCE.
Location	149 SOUTH 22 ND STREET
APN	544-061-014
Zoning	RL-2, LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	MANUEL SANCHEZ
Applicant	KEITH CHUNG
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES
	Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

Mr. Lopez presented the staff report dated February 10, 2021, and described the proposed construction of a new 572 square foot two-story addition in the rear of an existing residence to create an overall square footage of 2,300 square feet, in materials that would embrace the style and materials of the existing dwelling, which had a flat roof. The proposal met the requirements of the RL-2 District and approval was recommended. He noted that an existing rear patio cover would be demolished.

Mr. Lopez responded to comments and explained that the driveway was non-conforming and appeared to be shared with the neighbor, although not in any official way, and the house was probably constructed in the 1940s.

KEITH CHUNG, the applicant, reported that the property owner also owned the adjacent property and the driveway was being shared, the design conformed to the design standards, there was an intent to preserve the existing design, the addition had been tucked into the existing house, and the adjacent property and the property across the street were two stories tall. As such, the proposal should have minimal impact to the existing fabric of the neighborhood.

SANDRA SANCHEZ, the owner of the property, was available to respond to questions.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

Boardmember Butt expressed her appreciation for the attempt to maintain the original design of

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

the building, appreciated that the addition had been set back, but questioned that the parapet had been mimicked in the addition. She asked for a discussion of that component and recommended that it be simplified without the continuation of the arch and the decoration.

Boardmember Leung referred to the scaling of the mullions on the north elevation and asked if the windows in the addition would be different from the original building.

Boardmember Leung preferred that the existing double-hung windows in the original build be carried over into the addition, if possible. She asked that the placement of the vents be addressed in terms of location, to be less centralized, and recommended that everything be consistent and coherent overall.

Boardmember Hook noted that the replication of what was old versus new expressed the fact that it was new.

Boardmember Carter agreed that the arch over the second floor window on the east elevation did not have to be duplicated, although he recommended checking the sill height which might be too low. He also recommended that the window detailing on the second floor match the windows shown on the east elevation.

Chair Livingston liked the design, agreed that the window pattern on the existing house was nice and should be reflected on the addition, and also agreed with the need to simplify the design and eliminate the arch.

Boardmember Fine referred to the parking given that the carport would be removed and the driveway would be used for the required two designated parking spaces. She noted the windows on the neighboring property looked out onto the driveway and she suggested that the site plan needed some attention and improvement to address that, with the landscaping to be called out. She wanted to see something other than lawn, asked whether fencing was required, and asked what the deck would look like.

In response, Mr. Chung explained that the finished floor was elevated, the deck was used for transition to the back yard and it consisted of a step and landing only to get to the back yard. There was no carport in the rear and what currently existed was a canopy with a picnic table under the canopy.

Mr. Lopez explained that the canopy had been used as a carport in the past.

MANUEL SANCHEZ expressed the intent to keep the landscaping as easy and open as possible. He clarified that the fence line would not be modified.

Boardmember Fine commented that it was notable and challenging to match existing historical details. She liked the arches and the parapet and suggested the charm could be added and still work.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Carter) to approve PLN20-256, Sanchez Two-Story Addition; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 7 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 8) The exterior architecture to be modified with the arch at the back of the addition to be eliminated, with the addition of a

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

center mullion between the proposed windows painted to match the existing. (It was clarified that the east elevation was okay, the south elevation would have mullions, the west elevation would have mullions, and the two large windows on the north elevation would be split up with a mullion); and 9) Drop the sill on the ground floor to as low as possible; approved by voice vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Butt, Carter, Fine, Hook, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).

- 3. PLN19-375 SECOND-STORY ADDITION**
Description (CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 27, 2021) PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW TO CONSTRUCT A SECOND-STORY TO AN EXISTING STRUCTURE.
Location 223 25TH STREET
APN 515-291-007
Zoning CM-3, COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE DISTRICT
Applicant NANCY CONDOR (OWNER)
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: CONTINUE TO FUTURE MEETING

The item was recommended to be continued to a future meeting.

Boardmember Butt advised that she would recuse herself from the next item, St. John Missionary Baptist Church, due to the fact that her husband's architectural firm had prepared a report for the applicant. She left the meeting at this time.

- 4. PLN20-061 ST. JOHN MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH**
Description (CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 27, 2021) CONSIDER A RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±10,000 SQUARE FOOT RECREATIONAL FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS TO SERVE AN EXISTING BAPTIST CHURCH.
Location 29 8TH STREET
APN 538-410-027
Zoning RM-2, MEDIUM-HIGH MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner ST. JOHN MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH
Applicant ABDUL ESMAIL
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated February 10, 2021, for the request to construct a 9,800 square foot recreational facility on a site involving multiple parcels owned by St. John Missionary Baptist Church. He presented the site plan to show the 2,000 square foot main sanctuary located at the northern portion of the site, the surface parking consisting of 26 parking stalls located at the southern portion of the site, and two ancillary buildings owned by the church that were used for parking. The church also owned the parcel located across the street, one of which contained a brick building that had recently been demolished. Both sites were situated adjacent to a wide range of residential and nonconforming industrial uses, with the Richmond Greenway Trail to the south and a public school to the north on Chanslor Avenue.

Mr. Lopez explained that the application had initially been continued from the December 9, 2020 meeting due to a lack of quorum given that two members of the DRB had to recuse themselves. The application had also been continued from the January 27, 2021 Board meeting to allow the applicant to incorporate staff and Board recommendations. He described those

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

recommendations and the revisions proposed by the applicant and recommended the DRB's recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Carter clarified with Mr. Lopez that five bicycle parking spaces had been proposed, as required; there was no setback requirement for fences although there was a height requirement of no more than four feet at the front property line and up to six feet along the side and rear property lines.

Mr. Lopez identified the correspondence from Pogo Park objecting to the placement of a parking lot next to the park and requesting instead housing for people from the community, with the further request for windows in the proposed Family Life Center adjacent to the park and that the design of that structure be more connected to the park. He also advised that there had been several revisions to the design since it had first been seen by the DRB and windows had been added to the building as requested in connection to the trail.

Boardmember Hook asked if stormwater management was required, particularly related to the parking lot, and Mr. Lopez referred to the Stormwater Control Plan which had shown two bio-swales on the southern and eastern property lines. The parking lot also had a bio-retention area.

Chair Livingston noted inconsistencies between the civil engineering plans and the architectural/landscape plans with respect to the handicap parking. He commented that the civil engineering plans appeared to be correct. He also referred to a sketch he had prepared to allow some way for the applicant to terminate the roof given his opinion that the plans were insufficient.

ABDUL ESMAIL, the project architect, reported that St. John Missionary Baptist Church had been in the Richmond area for 77 years at 662 52nd Street and 29 8th Street, where the Family Life Center had been proposed. He described the community outreach ministries that supported the Richmond area and explained that St. John's Pastor had envisioned a Family Life Center as an amenity to the community that would include a basketball court and a two-story building with a gymnasium and a game room on the second floor. He explained that they had incorporated the recommendations from staff and the DRB, described those revisions, and affirmed that the civil engineering plans were correct with respect to ADA parking stalls.

Pastor KEVIN B. HALL, St. John Missionary Baptist Church, described the aim to enhance the two locations in the community and to make a positive difference in the community. He noted some of the benefits the church had provided the community, including serving 100-150 people every Tuesday with groceries, even during the pandemic. He requested approval of the application.

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

KIERON SLAUGHTER thanked St. John Missionary Baptist Church for the proposal and stated the proposal was needed next to the Richmond Greenway Trail. He had submitted a comment letter that the Chair acknowledged receiving, and offered recommendations to better connect to the Richmond Greenway Trail. He noted that his comment letter had referred to other projects that had successfully connected to the Greenway, and his letter had listed examples of glazing related to light shining into and out of the gym in relation to the Greenway, along with examples of how the proposal could get better. He stated there was no need for a fence adjacent to the sidewalk and no need for a fence at the side of the building.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

Boardmember Fine asked Mr. Slaughter if there was a way of physically connecting the actual pathway, and Mr. Slaughter stated there was precedent one block away which encouraged the residents of an apartment located adjacent to the Greenway to access the Greenway with direct connections.

Boardmember Hook suggested that the fencing segmented the two spaces. She supported something more welcoming, particularly to bicyclists, and suggested that trees or boulders in certain segments could offer a buffer as opposed to the use of fences.

Mr. Esmail stated that the fencing in the area proposed was for security to secure the church sanctuary. He clarified that the proposal was for a gymnasium, not a community center, and was not a place for senior citizens. The gymnasium would have solid walls. The south side facing the green zone would be enhanced with a lattice and vines to blend in and somehow soften the impact of solid concrete. The idea of having a fence was for security purposes. He stated that more greenery or a buffer zone could be created to plant along the fence, similar to what had been done to the parking area across the street.

Mr. Slaughter noted that society had moved away from fences, gated communities, and bars on windows which indicated an unsafe neighborhood. He stated that a block away the buildings were right up to the sidewalk. He was sensitive to protecting the sanctuary, which was why fencing would be added in appropriate locations, but fences were not needed right next to a wall and would send the opposite message of why the Iron Triangle Neighborhood had gotten together to make the "Yellow Brick Road," explicitly created to reduce the imposing and intimidating wrought iron fences kids had to walk next to when going to and from the Greenway. He recommended a compromise to provide adequate security, where needed.

Mr. Lopez referred to the graffiti issue, particularly in areas that were not illuminated.

As to blending landscaping into the Greenway proper, Mr. Slaughter did not represent the Richmond Greenway Trail but spoke for best practices, pedestrian, bicycle and park planning, and as the project manager of the Richmond Wellness Trail, he recommended some connection with seating, and suggested that connection could be closed up for the night.

Boardmember Leung commented that fences in some developments were intended to provide safety, not to keep people from the outside coming in but to keep children safe from the street, for instance, and the fences could be wood fences with vines or something to soften the visual impacts without reverting to the use of metal fences.

Boardmember Carter asked for a clarification of the proposed locations of the fence around the Family Life Center, to which Mr. Esmail clarified that there was a preexisting fence on the south and east sides of the sanctuary that covered the parking lot where the proposed Family Life Center would be situated and those fences would remain.

Mr. Esmail explained that the building that had been demolished where the parking lot would be located had been covered in graffiti on the south and west elevations, as shown in the exhibits provided, which had devalued any historic value of the building. There was a five-foot setback from the Greenway where the building would start, and opening that up to the Greenway made no sense to him. He could soften the fence by planting vines and covering it up. He stated that the south elevation had been revised to soften the concrete walls of the gymnasium when the lattice had been introduced and made into a living wall to blend in. He reiterated that the gymnasium could not have windows on the south elevation because it was a basketball court.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

Mr. Lopez stated that there had been changes to the south elevation as shown in the development plan to address some of the recommendations.

Boardmember Carter referred to the entrance to the sanctuary where there was no fence and asked if the applicant would be opposed to removing the existing fence on 8th Street to be more inviting to the public. He understood the concerns for security but questioned whether a four-foot fence would provide security and asked if the applicant would be amenable to the removal of the wrought iron portion.

Pastor Hall advised that when the property had been purchased graffiti was a problem as was the theft of some of the plants in the ground and break-ins to steal sound equipment. While he suggested that things were getting better, he emphasized there were far more problems at the 8th Street site than the site at 52nd Street, and there had been no choice but to secure the property. He stated that to remove the fencing around the sanctuary with all the sound equipment inside would be disastrous.

Boardmember Carter verified that the existing rolling gate would be retained and kept open during business hours but secured at night. He expressed support for the green wall, particularly at the south elevation to the Greenway, and verified that tube steel would be used for that component with the vines growing from the ground intertwining with the lattice.

Boardmember Hook recommended, when asked, the use of potato vines, clematis, or other hardy plants that would grow well. She noted the adjacent academy had planted water gum trees and suggested that language could flow to the subject site as well. She asked about the crepe myrtle and questioned what that would do to the habitat. She supported more native trees or larger canopies to provide more shade for the harsh urban environment.

Mr. Esmail stated that the trees for the parking lot had been proposed to blend in with what Pogo Park intended on the Greenway. He verified with Mr. Lopez that staff recommended Condition 4 (*Street trees shall be provided for every 50 feet of street frontage*) related only to the area along the new building and the parking lot within the development. He had no problem replacing the crepe myrtle and considering the species recommended by Boardmember Hook.

Boardmember Hook suggested as a compromise that a gateway to the back towards the Greenway with a garden or back yard to the church could be considered with a pathway leading out to the Greenway, although Mr. Lopez stated that was the area of the bio-swale and noted that the Bay Trail could easily be accessed from 8th Street and two accesses were unnecessary.

Boardmember Fine referred to the feedback the DRB had previously provided and thanked the applicant for the significant improvements that had been made in response to that feedback. She asked if a mural could be considered with something to represent the artistic culture of the community to address the pristine façade. With respect to the large glazed elements, she noted that some were significant and urged some proportion at the north elevation of the door system as well as the large swaths of glass on the south. She recommended that the nice mullion patterns on the south elevation be repeated on the north, and encouraged the applicant to look at the glazing for the gymnasium at Longfellow Middle School in Berkeley as an example.

Boardmember Leung supported the proposal for the Family Life Center and the fence as important given the street front and the need to protect the safety of children; the softening of the wall with vines or the planting of more trees; lighting to help address security at the entrance and along the perimeter of the building; color canvasses or something to add color to the gym;

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

and more storage; interchangeable spaces for girls as well as boys; and supported a mural to frame the entrance and use the Richmond community to produce the mural.

Pastor Hall stated there was plenty of storage space available in the church sanctuary and in an education building. As to a mural, he did not support a condition of approval for a mural. He urged being realistic given that the neighborhood was a high crime area and security was essential.

Mr. Esmail referred to an exhibit that had been submitted that identified the photometric for the building and the parking lot along with a fixture schedule.

Chair Livingston thanked the applicants for the proposal and for making the changes that the DRB had previously recommended. He again referred to his sketch of recommendations, and re-verified that the civil engineering plans were the correct plans.

Chair Livingston closed the public hearing.

Boardmember Carter understood the applicant's need for the fences due to the security issues and accepted the applicant's approach to the fencing. He commented that perhaps in the future there might be enough neighborhood improvement to allow the removal of the fences.

Boardmember Hook agreed that if and when the neighborhood improved and the fencing was no longer needed for security it could be removed. She would send a list of recommended vine species to the applicant to consider for the space along the Richmond Greenway Trail.

Boardmember Fine was encouraged to explore the most expeditious path forward for a project she recognized had been in process for many years. She recognized the need and desire to retain the fencing, asked the applicant to integrate more into the community, and urged the removal of the fence if there was a point in the future when that could be done.

Boardmember Leung liked the project, had no issue with the fence, and asked whether a mural would or would not be a component of the project.

On the question, there was no verification at this time whether the one percent public art requirement would apply to the project.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to recommend to the Planning Commission the approval of PLN20-061, St. John Missionary Baptist Church; subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with 12 Conditions of Approval and additional DRB conditions as follows: 13) The tube steel trellis be hot dipped galvanized $\frac{3}{4}$ by $\frac{3}{4}$ tubed steel; 14) Each living wall shall have four vines planted per trellis, with a recommendation to staff of the vines to use including potato vine, purple vine, and others to be identified; 15) There shall be a substitution with the water gum tree along 8th Street; 16) The civil plans shall govern in terms of site plan; 17) Suggested a public art component/mural at entry wall subject to staff's review of the one percent for public art requirement; 18) Lighting shown on E1.0 to be modified to be 3,000K max and not 4,000K; and 19) Inclusion of Exhibit A submitted by Chair Livingston this date, regarding the exterior way of handling the south side of existing church to return the roof in a more harmonious way; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Carter, Fine, Hook, Leung, and Livingston; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None; Recused: Butt).

Board Business

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2021

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston noted that the voting for Chair and Vice Chair had not been agendaized for this meeting but would be scheduled for the next meeting agenda.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, February 24, 2021.