

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL  
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA  
April 22, 2009  
6:00 p.m.**

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Mike Woldemar, Chair  
Don Woodrow  
Andrew Butt

Eileen Whitty, Vice Chair  
Diane Bloom

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Woldemar, Vice Chair Whitty, Board Members Bloom, Butt, and Woodrow

**Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Councilmember Tom Butt

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Jonelyn Whales, Lina Velasco and Carlos Privat

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

March 25, 2009:

**ACTION: It was M/S (Butt/Bloom) to approve the March 25, 2009 minutes; unanimously approved.**

April 8, 2009

Chair Woldemar asked to confirm that Hector Rojas and not Hector Lopez were present for the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. He referred to page 3 and said the Public Works Director's first name is "Yader" and his last name started with a "Z" rather than an "S".

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Bloom) to approve the April 8, 2009 minutes, as amended; unanimously approved.**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Woldemar gave an overview of the procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. He noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, May 4, 2009 by 5:00 p.m. He repeated the appeal period after each affected item.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Bloom/Woodrow) to approve the agenda; unanimously approved.**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Chair Woldemar noted Consent Calendar Items consisted of Item 2. Boardmember Bloom requested removal of Item 2.

**Items Heard:**

- 1. PLN 08-066 – Dakini Temple, Windows Replacement on Washington Street - DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT** to legalize the replacement of seven stained glass windows on the Dakini Temple, located at 235 Washington Street (APN: 558-101-025), a contributing structure to the Point Richmond National Register Historic District. MFR-1 (Multi-Family Residential) Zoning District. Owner: Dharmata Foundation; Applicant: Lerner & Associates. Staff Contact: Lina Velasco. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Chair Woldemar noted that the item was continued from the March 25, 2009 meeting. Staff and the applicant are in agreement with conditions, and he suggested moving the item forward if amenable to both staff and the applicant.

Arnie Lerner, Architect, was amenable to moving the matter forward.

Boardmember Butt recused himself from participating in the matter due to his residence location, and left the room.

The public hearing was closed.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Bloom/Whitty) to approve PLN 08-066 subject to staff's recommendation and conditions of approval; unanimously approved (Butt recused).**

Due to technical issues relating to Item 2's presentation, Chair Woldemar requested moving up Item 3.

**3. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff**

Ms. Whales reported that City staff moved their offices back downtown to the Richmond City Hall on Barrett Avenue.

Boardmember Woodrow suggested:

- Staff plan a recognition for former Chair Avellar's service for two years, and Chair Woldemar asked that an agendized presentation/recognition be scheduled for the May 13, 2009 meeting.

Boardmember Bloom requested:

- Agendizing a Retreat with Boardmembers and staff on procedural matters for an upcoming regular or special Board meeting.

Vice Chair Whitty reported that she would be absent at the May 13, 2009 meeting.

Chair Woldemar requested:

- Staff exploring and agendize a discussion on May 13, 2009 regarding initiation of a policy that outlines attendance of a Council liaison to DRB meetings, such that the liaison could provide an update of City Council actions that affect the DRB.

- He also reported speaking with Hector Rojas regarding the format of the Board's agenda, distributed a sample revised agenda format and asked staff to return on May 13<sup>th</sup> with an agendaized discussion regarding revising Board's agenda format.
- He questioned staff as to the workload in upcoming months for the DRB, and Ms. Whales noted staff was in the process of revising staff report formats and this will also be brought forward.

**2. PLN 09-034 – Contra Costa County, Maritime Child Development Center on Florida Ave.** - DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT to rehabilitate, in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic properties, the interior and exterior of the historic Maritime Child Development Center building located at 1014 Florida Avenue (APN: 550-340-005). The rehabilitation project will include site work. Public (Knox Freeway/Cutting Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan) Zoning District. Owner: Contra Costa County; Applicant: Hamilton + Aitken Architects. Staff Contact: Lina Velasco. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Velasco gave the staff report, stating the matter is a request for design review approval for an historic resource which is not officially listed but is eligible, and the project is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards. She noted that Condition 2 states that any recommendations that were to come out of the consultation would be incorporated into the project. Staff's recommendation is that the proposed project meets the findings for the Historic Structures Code and also design review, and she recommended project approval.

Chair Woldemar referred to Condition 2, reference to potential mitigation measures that might come out of a NEPA environmental assessment, and he questioned what these were. Ms. Velasco said NEPA is the federal equivalent to CEQA; the project is exempt from CEQA because it is a rehabilitation and compliance with the Secretary of Interior standards. Possible mitigation could be if any cultural resources are identified, they would contact an archaeologist or other measures which are typical, and this is why staff did not include them. Staff does not anticipate any cultural resources, but they wanted to incorporate the statement into the project. Chair Woldemar questioned why this was not included in conditions of approval, and Ms. Velasco said it is rather tied into the environmental assessment.

Chair Woldemar questioned if this was the only approval necessary for the project to move forward, and he confirmed with Ms. Velasco that the project would not go forward to Planning Commission or to the City Council.

Scott Hamilton, Hamilton + Aitken Architects, said they have a Building Department application that is pending and they hope and anticipate approval would occur this month.

Chair Woldemar questioned if there was a time constraint on the project. Ms. Velasco said there is in the sense that there is a grant in the amount of \$2 million for the project which requires a map by the City which needs to be extended through June of 2010. The City must go out to bid and start construction right away. Chair Woldemar confirmed with Ms. Velasco that there was no other urgency beyond that timeframe.

Boardmember Bloom questioned if there would be an opportunity to review the fixtures and concrete colors. She noted there is a materials board but it did not include those items, and said such items would include baseboards, pedestal for sun dial and furnishings. Ms. Velasco noted that there is no photograph provided except that there will be a textured concrete color, and she did not believe that level of detail was required to be brought forth.

Mr. Hamilton said they would be happy to bring those items back and they have not yet finalized the level of detail for the finish items.

Boardmember Butt asked the applicant to clarify whether the project will be a LEED project and if so, he questioned what the target goals were. Mr. Hamilton said the project is targeted to be a LEED Silver project; they have clearly identified 43 points which put them at the high end of LEED Silver and are also working toward achieving a higher number.

Mr. Hamilton then gave a presentation of the project, discussed its historical perspective, said the building is eligible for the historic register and noted the 1943 building was built without a structural foundation. They want to restore the building to be used as a child care center, provide a space for an interpretive center for visitors and the community, and to provide for community joint use access for some of the spaces. He discussed the building's historic restoration using sustainable design principles to achieve a LEED silver at a minimum, presented photographs from the early milestones and use of the building and said its use, and not the structure itself creates its historic value.

Mr. Hamilton presented a series of photographs of the lobby showing mothers dropping off children, original windows, original exit system for the upstairs day care area, historic play yard which unfortunately has been paved with asphalt, an original aluminum storefront entry vestibule, deteriorated west and south side walls of the building, the south classroom façade, an the asymmetric floor plan with the focus to preserve and restore the interior parts of the building which were used. He further presented a focus made for an NPS exhibit area and room which will be restored to what existed in 1943 and he said the National Parks Services proposes to operate it as an interpretive center. The lobby, which is very much intact, is also proposed to be restored as much as possible to its original condition. He pointed out a small point which is an existing exit slide that it still there but boxed in and they propose to restore it, but not for exiting.

There will be brand new components introduced to the building such as an elevator to be used for access which is located in the knuckle area between the two L's of the building. They need to provide new toilet rooms up to a modern standard but are using the original toilet rooms' locations. The original kitchen and administrative areas will be restored and configured for community, staff and child care use. He then presented the original sleeping area and to facilitate community use, they are dividing it up into three classroom sized spaces for community meetings, adult education and similar uses.

Mr. Hamilton then showed the south and west elevations of the building, described similar materials to replicate what the building looked like as it did as when it was brand new. He said the building would be clear stained redwood siding, and above a pale earth-toned cement plaster, and new windows will match the proportion and scale of the original classroom windows and will be restored and reglazed to match what had originally existed. He described the street façade of the project, said they will remove the exterior, provide structural paneling to resist structural load and replace finishes with like finishes.

He then presented the site plan, said there are several mature trees which he identified and described, said hardscape and turf will be incorporated for the play yard, a story book area will be implemented with amphitheatre seating under a tree, and the perimeter foundation of the building will be planted with foundation shrubs similar to the original construction, and they will implement low water use through drought-resistant ground cover.

Boardmember Butt referred to the original drawings and said originally there was a glazed canopy over the south and west portion. He questioned why a standard roof was being implemented. Mr. Hamilton said there is light coming in above the rafters and they propose

partial shade to prevent overheating and partial glaze with a fluted glass for shading, so the quality of light will continue to be present. He then explained how it was partially glazed, which Boardmember Butt confirmed would serve as the same effect, along with rain protection and more shade.

Boardmember Butt said he was surprised to find originally stained redwood, but he questioned if there was a desire to propose something else because of the maintenance issue due to the need to seal and/or possible graffiti issues. Mr. Hamilton asked Mr. Edwards to explain the protective covering of the wood.

Burton Edwards, Architect, said they looked at the various layers of the original wood which revealed a stained coat on top of the redwood, and he felt it was appropriate to use this. They spoke at length about the possibility of graffiti and said while they cannot do much about carvings into the wood, but they are planning on having a graffiti coating so it is a washable surface.

Mr. Hamilton said they are investigating the possibility also of using salvaged wood which would also add to their LEED credits. They had looked at using other materials like hardy plank or cement board, but are reluctant to use them.

Chair Woldemar said the application materials indicate that a lot of the existing siding has tried to be salvaged, and he confirmed with Mr. Hamilton that they are backing away from doing this due to toxics of lead paint and the wood's condition. Chair Woldemar questioned if drawings were at the plan check process, stating that if a natural finish were not to be proposed, he questioned what it would do to the various approvals thus far.

Mr. Edwards said the stain is pigmented and the original coat did have some color in it. He referred to the photo of the exterior building where they removed layers of paint, and the building never got to the grey aging phase. Therefore, it will be a nominal brown building and not light, clear wood.

Boardmember Butt voiced concern that potentially that the building will be re-clad anyway with hardy board and it would have the same appearance. Mr. Edwards then described what the color would look like.

Boardmember Butt referred to the windows, and said some of the wood windows will be restored and there will be new windows. He questioned the material of the new windows. Mr. Hamilton said most of the original windows are in reasonable condition, but most of the classroom windows will need to be replaced completely.

Boardmember Butt referred to the doors and to a nano wall, and questioned why this was not proposed. Mr. Hamilton said all of the doors slid and said they looked at a nano wall, but it is a 10 foot door and the panels would be too awkward to mechanically contract. He confirmed that the fixed wall was glazed and it will have a similar appearance.

Boardmember Butt said it looks as though there is an existing fence along Harbour Way which is chain link, and he asked if it could be replaced. Mr. Hamilton said this will be replaced and it may or may not be done right away but rather when the yard next door is done.

Vice Chair Whitty referred to the Richmond Children's Foundation's trailers in the back, and questioned whether or not they will stay there and/or have use of the facilities. Mr. Hamilton said this is not yet known. Vice Chair Whitty questioned if the National Parks Service (NPS) is going to stay in the building and be in charge of it, and Mr. Hamilton said they will not be in charge but will have use of one of the original child care rooms and use of the lobby.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned what would happen with all of the restored space, and Mr. Hamilton said the building is about 17,000 square feet and was originally conceived as a K-5 charter school. Much of the program is similar. There would be four primary pre-school classrooms on the ground floor, a space next to the NPS space that was originally proposed to be a research center, and the future operator is not yet secured. The upper level was proposed to be for 5<sup>th</sup> graders and partially adult education, and they believe the community function of the upstairs area will remain in the program.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned access to the building, and Mr. Hamilton said this is unknown and discussed the need to operate effectively, stating he hoped they will be able to work with the operator for supplemental use but he could not answer that question.

Vice Chair Whitty referred to the lobby and questioned the signage outside. Mr. Hamilton said they were not proposing any signage as of yet. She questioned the type of chain link fence, and Boardmember Butt noted that the new existing fence on the adjacent use will be black, ornamental wrought iron at about 6 or 8 feet.

Vice Chair Whitty questioned exterior lighting for the project, and Mr. Hamilton said there will be lights over the entry and they are not planning a large amount of new exterior light standards. She felt the building might be a nice place to hold receptions and events, and she believed lighting amenities would be needed.

Vice Chair Whitty referred to the comments regarding walls and she confirmed with Mr. Hamilton that they were proposing a wall of windows. Mr. Edwards presented a photo of the three-door windows frames and wood and glazed in the same proportion they were originally.

Vice Chair Whitty said because the building has some interesting features, she hoped there will be interesting signage. Mr. Edwards said there are many categories of LEED design that allows innovation and design and many points are available using the building as a learning resource. He said signage will be done that illustrates those sustainable features in the interior of the building but they are not yet finalized.

Vice Chair Whitty referred to the AC Transit bus stop and asked that there be a shelter provided. Mr. Edwards said this is in the public right-of-way and they do not have the legal authority to require a shelter. However, he would support such a structure.

Boardmember Bloom agreed with the bus stop, but said the trees that are grouped by the stop are Liquid Amber and are infamous with small bulbs that children throw at one another and get hurt. She asked that this be called to the City's attention. She questioned the number of children in the facility and whether or not they were only pre-school children. Mr. Hamilton said the pre-school would serve approximately 70-80 children; however, there is no operator as of yet. She confirmed that the operator would be the entity responsible for the landscaped area.

Boardmember Bloom questioned whether or not there was any mold in the facility. Mr. Edwards said there is dry rot in the structure which is a fungus, but in terms of mold in the interior on the surfaces of the project, there is no odor or sight of mold.

Boardmember Bloom questioned how deep or shallow the water table was. Mr. Edwards said they have a geological report but this was not flagged as a structural issue. The footings; however, will be deeper than they are now and the crawl space will also be deeper and it will facilitate dryness under the floor space.

Boardmember Bloom felt there should be consistency between adjacent projects, to include fencing, landscaping, color, etc. She questioned and confirmed that because of the historic nature of the building, there will be no orange or green stripes.

Boardmember Bloom said her major concern is that this is a child care center which is a wonderful project; she asked that the garden areas is kid-friendly and also provide opportunities for curriculum. She suggested having a meeting addressing this to include the types of plants, how kids are invited into the beds. Mr. Edwards said the street side has ground cover and children will not be allowed to play in that area. The courtyard side will have turf, planter beds and some hardscape.

Boardmember Bloom then described ground cover and plantings in certain areas and suggested that for historic and children purposes, a theme should be provided for the garden areas. She suggested a learning center into the garden and asked that plants be re-evaluated, as well as the amount of sod, meandering paths, butterfly gardens, and she asked that the plan be further developed. She questioned if Mr. Edwards was aware of what trees were located on site other than "mature trees." Mr. Edwards said they have not verified the species of existing mature trees.

Boardmember Butt asked staff if the Board decided to re-examine landscaping, would it set back the project given its funding cycle. Ms. Velasco said the major portion of the project is rehabilitation of the building and if this could get started, with a condition to require that the applicant work with Boardmember Bloom regarding landscaping, and it would not need to return to the Board.

Boardmember Butt questioned if landscaping was also under the State's purview, and Mr. Hamilton noted that landscaping was discussed and SHPPA approved the project with the proposed design. The historical photographs showed there was minimal landscaping on the south side and because of water usage concerns, they would replace the front and side yards. He did not believe it was an issue unless they were to propose something dramatically different, such as structures within the landscape. He would prefer working toward receiving approval for the building with the condition that final landscape design be held over to a subcommittee or to the entire Board. Mr. Edwards agreed and they would be amendable to meeting to review landscape details.

Boardmember Butt questioned if there was a bicycle parking rack, and Mr. Hamilton said it was not mandatory for LEED. They do not expect pre-schoolers to ride bikes and they have not included it in the design. He agreed that park visitors may visit on a bike, and he confirmed they would look at incorporating a bike rack for the project.

Chair Woldemar believed that the packet the Board received was not a complete application and he did not know what he was approving. Mr. Edwards said the plans are labeled Design Review submittal of March 25, 2009 and staff provided distribution copies to the Board from that submittal. Ms. Velasco noted that the copies were the same as submitted to the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee.

Chair Woldemar confirmed that there was an existing topography map, and he said on the north end of the playground, there is a retaining wall made of timber, which is not reflected and how grades would work.

Chair Woldemar referred to C3, which is a different document, and he did not see design response for storm water management. There is reference to the requirement of the Fire Department to require a fire sprinkler riser, which is not shown or described. He referred to parking and a parallel handicapped parking space across the street in a path of travel for the

building, which he did not believe was accessible. Mr. Hamilton said they were not providing any parking for the project and this was not their parking space.

Chair Woldemar referred to the elevated tower which he believes is plaster; however, the documents do not show this. He questioned details of the cap flashing and or fascia around the top. The western stair is new, which is a perforated metal. He presumed it is steel and he asked for details and what it looks like on the elevation, and also questioned whether it was too modern for the building.

Chair Woldemar questioned trash locations for the project which were not shown on the plans, and Mr. Edwards stated trash is located within the building at an exterior room. He referred to a sound wall on the west side of the play yard and he confirmed it was no longer proposed. He felt signage would be an important element to the project, both historically and contemporarily. He said there is roof top equipment that has been added in over the years and he questioned where the new equipment is located, and if visible, how it would be screened. Fencing for the project should be reviewed, and he questioned whether wrought iron was the right element. He said there are existing security grills on windows especially on the east face, which he confirmed would be removed. The landscape plan shows no planting in the planter strips adjacent to the street, and Mr. Edwards noted this was in the public right-of-way outside of their site boundary.

Chair Woldemar questioned who would maintain the planting strip, which he felt should fall onto the applicant and should be incorporated into the project. He said C3 needs to be incorporated into the site plan, questioned if there was a security system for the project, and he suggested the potential for a vegetable garden for children. Lastly, he said signage and its relationship to the National Park Service and how it ties into connectivity with all other elements with the park should represent itself graphically.

Boardmember Woodrow confirmed that the plans of the building were drawn up in 1942, which was in the midst of the war, and it is curious that the building has held up so long. He questioned if they changed studs, substitute 2x4's for 2x6's, or did the applicant run into any short cuts. Mr. Hamilton said the building most likely was built of very good materials and the foundation was built of redwood which has lasted for over 60 years. The exterior siding was redwood, but he cannot speak to the structure inside the walls. The metal of the flashing is rusting through and there is grass growing in the eaves, there are parts of the floor where the joists have rotted free of their bearing, etc.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned whether rehabilitation would be enabling the building to be brought up to structural integrity. Mr. Hamilton said there are innovative structural features which have not been tested; however, a fairly innovative double stud wall system with acoustic insulation was done between each of the classrooms. The paneling in all classrooms was primavera board which was a mahogany laminate and they believe it is still there under the paint over the years. Counter tops have a clear varnish on them. Therefore, the work was nicely done in a fairly restrained vocabulary which was appropriate for the 1940's. He said the work they are proposing will not make it fancy. It will restore features discussed already, and it will continue to be high quality workman-like finishes.

Boardmember Woodrow said he was pleased the project is moving forward and was supportive of Boardmember comments. Mr. Hamilton noted the building's twin was 8-10 blocks away and different pieces of that building still remain—the exterior stair is in place, it does not have the interior slide, it has some of the finishes on the wall paneling which were never painted, if he could he would take some of the light fixtures from that building for this project, and it provides a good model for them.

Public Comments:

Tom Butt, President of Rosie the Riveter Trust, said the trust is the recipient of a \$3 million grant from the California Cultural and Historical Endowment, and without this, the project would not exist. He said the building is owned by Contra Costa County and has been leased to Rosie the Riveter Trust currently for 30 years. At some point in the next several months it will be transferred from the County to the City of Richmond or the Richmond Housing Authority, and thereafter, it may be transferred to a developer. In terms of urgency, the CCAC grant if not fully extended will expire in the middle of June 2010. It will take a year to construct the project and he urged the Board to move forward, as it was already one month late in its schedule. He said the project also went to HPAC and recommended approval and it would not be at the Design Review Board at all except for the fact that there has been no design review since its transfer to the City, and it also must be a LEED Silver building.

Boardmember Bloom questioned who the child care operator would be, and Mr. Butt said as a part of the greater project, the Housing Authority is ready to recommend to the City Council a developer for the child care portion of the project. The project must have an element for community meeting use, activities, and for child care. Instead of building a new facility, they would incorporate a child care center. He said the latest plan is that Richmond Children's Foundation would lease part of the building and move their pre-school operations into it, and use 2-4 classrooms for pre-school. However, it may be another entity. One space will also be used for the National Park Service as an interpretive center and classroom. One space will a community space jointly used by the Park Service and remaining spaces will likely be pre-school classrooms, primary classrooms, reading rooms for the community or something else. He asked the Board to approve the building and move on.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned why the Board did not review the project in January, and Mr. Butt said that in writing the grant application, they had to name the match. They received a \$2 million grant and matched it. The only commitment they could get is \$500,000 from the City of Richmond, \$1.5 million from the West Contra Costa Unified School District, and the plan was to do the project as a school district project. To satisfy their SB 39 requirements to provide housing for charter schools, they would turn it over to the Richmond Children's Foundation to operate the entire building as a charter school.

Mr. Butt said the District then spent more money than anticipated on their bond program, things went over budget, charter schools are not popular with employee unions, and they backed off. They then had to find another agency to take over, and the City of Richmond Housing Authority suggested it be part of the Nystrom Building Replacement Project. Funding for it has taken a long time and the entire project could collapse if one thing does not fall into place, and the building is important, as it is named in the Congressional legislation that established the National Parks, and is equivalent to a national historical landmark.

Chair Woldemar noted that any number of City public projects over the last 5-8 years have always come into the Board rather late. Inevitably, the Board is required to make decisions on less than required information and he questioned how to get around this problem.

Mr. Butt said in principle he agreed with the need to have a complete application; it looks like staff tried to pull pertinent drawings rather than the complete set of working drawings. However, in this case, a value judgment should be made to save the funding and the building.

Ms. Velasco noted this is rehabilitation of an existing building, the submittal requirements the City has address new construction, and in terms of C3 requirements and landscaping, the applicant is increasing the impervious surface and it is not a requirement of LEED and the applicant is not required to do landscaping. Therefore, in terms of submittal requirements, they

cannot always be looked at as exact because sometimes they will not apply to every single project. She felt that in the future, some of these details could be called out.

Chair Woldemar asked staff to identify what is and what is not required in the submittal in the future.

Boardmember Bloom questioned the Board's options, and she questioned what sort of timeframe the applicant would be required to be held to if moving forward on the project.

Boardmembers Woodrow and Whitty believed there was no stated timeframe and the meeting can be called at the appropriate time to review outstanding items. Boardmember Woodrow felt that the Board has provided some specific feedback and felt the applicant would address them. He suggested voting to have the project approved based upon what has been heard, the developer can move forward with the project as stated, and once an operator is identified, they can then return to the Design Review Board.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Butt said the only item he would be concerned with are conditions for mechanical issues, felt the project would be a good one, and wants to ensure that if the Board approves the building that the landscaping be brought back and that landscaping is required and included into the project.

Vice Chair Whitty said there is landscaping provided already in the plan, and staff has indicated the applicant is not required to propose landscaping.

Chair Woldemar said in order for the building to be worked on, they must tear out major and significant portions of landscaping surrounding the building. Therefore, they must replace landscaping.

Ms. Velasco noted that what is triggered for new construction is not necessarily triggered with rehabilitation of a building. If it is less than 50%, new landscaping is not required, but as part of this project, deferring the landscape plan to return can be a detail element as part of Phase II of the overall project.

Chair Woldemar said it is clear that the majority of the Board would like to move this item forward, there are a number of site planning issues, and he felt it would be appropriate to move to approve the building with additional requirements beyond what staff is recommending for the building, and that perhaps the Board lists a series of landscape/site planning issues to be addressed and returned to the Board at some point in the future. He was not interested in who is operating it, but rather what will get built, what will be approved, and how it will be maintained.

Ms. Velasco recommended amending the recommendation that the landscape plan return to the DRB for final approval and details be provided for fencing, signage, lighting, mechanical equipment, furnishings, issues regarding concrete, grading regarding the play yard retaining wall, fire sprinkler riser location and screening, elevator tower details, bike parking and access for the public, and that final occupancy be tied to the landscape plan.

Chair Woldemar suggested that at least one handicapped access parking be provided regardless of the plan and it being a rehabilitation project.

Ms. Velasco noted that the space does not actually have to be within the public right-of-way because staff can work with the City Engineer to have a designated space and it does not need to be on the site.

Boardmember Butt felt that when the site plan returns, the area on South 11<sup>th</sup> Street that dead ends into the school may be an area where this could be reviewed and provided.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Whitty) to approve PLN 09-034 with the staff's two code findings and four design review findings, two recommendations with the additional conditions that the landscape plan return to the DRB for final approval and details be provided for fencing, signage, lighting, mechanical equipment, furnishings, issues regarding concrete, grading regarding the play yard retaining wall, fire sprinkler riser location and screening, elevator tower details, bike parking and access for the public, and that final occupancy be tied to the landscape plan; unanimously approved.**

**BROWN ACT – Public Forum – No speakers.**

---

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.