

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
Civic Center Multipurpose Room, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
October 28, 2009
6:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS

Michael Woldemar, Chair	Eileen Whitty, Vice Chair
Diane Bloom	Andrew Butt
Otheree Christian	Raymond Welter
Don Woodrow	

The meeting was called to order at 6:09 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Woldemar, Boardmembers Bloom, Butt, Welter and Woodrow

Absent: Vice-Chair Whitty and Boardmember Christian

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Hector Rojas, and Carlos Privat

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 14, 2009:

Boardmember Woodrow noted the heading for PLN 09-046 should be revised because all of the comments are regarding the Port. Chair Woldemar said the third paragraph from the bottom on page 6 should be revised to state Mary Renfro made the comment rather than Ms. Harbin.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Butt) to accept minutes for the September 14, 2009 meeting of the Design Review Board, as amended; unanimously approved.

September 24, 2009:

Boardmember Bloom requested the following changes:

Page 4: "Future planning" should be "future planting."

Page 10, paragraph 3: "Downtown has free busses" should read "downtown Portland has free busses."

Page 11, paragraph 3: Quotation for Bloom should read "a path for kids. See Addison Street in Berkeley for creative treatment."

Chair Woldemar referred to page 5; second paragraph from the bottom, "SPEC" should read "SPAC."

On page 6, second to last paragraph; he noted that Chris Beynon is misspelled, and "from MIG consultants" should be added following Mr. Beynon's name.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Butt) to accept minutes for the September 24, 2009 meeting of the Design Review Board, as amended; unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Woldemar noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, November 9, 2009 by 5:00 p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Woldemar said the Consent Calendar consisted of Items 1 through 4. Boardmember Woodrow requested removal of items 3 and 4.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woodrow/Butt) to approve Consent Calendar Items 1 and 2; unanimously approved.

Items Approved:

- 1. PLN 09-077 – (Held Over from 9/24/2009) WEST CONTRA COSTA YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU ADDITION ON BROADWAY – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL** for a ± 1,418 SF addition to a commercial building located at 84 Broadway (APN: 515-331-021. C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial), SFR-3 (Single Family: Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Owner: West Contra Costa Youth Service Bureau; Applicant: Danilo Serrano; Staff Contact: Kieron Slaughter. Recommendation: Withdrawn.
- 2. PLN 09-105 – MATUNDAN SECOND STORY DECK ON SOLITUDE LANE – CONSTRUCTION** of a ± 210 SF second story deck in the rear yard of 1521 Solitude Lane (APN: 433-401-005. SFR-3 (Single Family: Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Owner: Matundan Romeo G & Lydia P; Applicant: Matundan Romeo G & Lydia P; Staff Contact: Hector Rojas. Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3. PLN 09-125 – RICHMOND PLUNGE ROOF SIGN AND SITE LANDSCAPING ON E RICHMOND AVENUE – PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a Design Review permit to restore the historic roof sign and provide site landscaping for the Richmond Municipal Natatorium, a contributing structure to the Point Richmond National Register Historic District, located at 1 E Richmond Ave. (APN: 556-170-002. PC (Public and Civic Uses) Zoning District. Owner: City of Richmond; Applicant: Todd Jersey Architecture; Staff Contact: Hector Rojas. Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Recusal:

Boardmember Bloom recused herself from participating on the item due to conflict of interest, as she is performing the landscaping for the project.

Associate Planner Rojas introduced Michael Donahue from Todd Jersey Architects and reviewed the plans for the sign and landscaping. The roof sign will closely match the original 1920s Plunge as obtained from photographs. He said a description and discussion of the design can be found in Exhibit C.

Mr. Rojas said the sign is subject to the revised sign ordinance for the City of Richmond. As proposed, the sign does not meet the sign requirements as revised by the Council, and therefore, requires a sign variance. The premise behind making the sign variance findings are

due to the need to restore a character defining feature that is an integral part of the building for the Richmond Plunge. There is also a requirement that the project be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Design Review Subcommittee, which occurred on October 21, 2009. The Subcommittee determined the signage and landscaping meet the required Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation of a historic property.

Mr. Rojas noted the landscaping is subject to requirements of the City of Richmond's zoning ordinance, which requires 10% landscaping for commercial property. He said that although this particular part of the landscaping is limited, the total amount of landscaping to be implemented around the Plunge area will be more than 10%.

Mr. Rojas said there were no public comments received for the application, although staff and representatives from Todd Jersey Architects attended the Point Richmond Neighborhood Council's Land Use Subcommittee meeting to inform the Council about the project. Staff did receive questions from Chair Woldemar regarding the paint colors. In 2006, the Design Review Board looked at the project plans which specified the procedure for selecting the colors of the building as matching the colors used historically on the Plunge. They removed plaster chips from the building to determine the original colors used. No action is needed by the Board on the colors because they were approved by the DRB in 2006.

Chair Woldemar requested discussion of colors because the agenda did not specifically address colors. City Attorney Privat answered colors should not be discussed because they were previously approved by the Design Review Board in 2006.

Chair Woldemar said the Design Review Board grants the variance for the sign and he questioned and confirmed the DRB's decision on that variance is appealable to the City Council.

Chair Woldemar asked for clarification of the landscape approval process. Mr. Rojas said staff is requesting specific landscaping elements including bike racks, benches, fountain, and the hardscape outlining the landscape area. The specific arrangement and selection of plantings will be determined at a future meeting.

Michael Donahue, Architect, said that to determine the size and characteristics of the sign they used perspective drawing techniques. They approximated where each photo was taken, and by drawing technical lines, they were able to determine the size of the sign. Using the measurements of the letters they could build a good idea of how the sign was historically constructed. None of the old plans had any measurements, but the sign they are proposing is fairly accurate.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned why the sign is oriented the way it is. Mr. Donahue said he read on-line that it was pointed toward a major thoroughfare. At the time it was built there was a road that ran close to where Cutting Boulevard is now. The intent was to draw attention from out of Richmond towards the natatorium.

Boardmember Woodrow noted two things working against the sign being viewed from the freeway: 1) the sound wall along the freeway which blocks it; and 2) the sign went up before the trees grew, which now block the sign from Cutting Boulevard. He said this can be solved if the sign were front and center instead of canted.

Mr. Donahue answered that it is possible to move the sign front and center, but that would go against the historical placement of the sign. Boardmember Woodrow suggested the original purpose of the sign was to be seen from Cutting Boulevard, but that is not true now.

Boardmember Woodrow said the forecourt shows the Plunge fountain, and he questioned whether that sits right over the well site which originally was the reason for the location of the Plunge. That site has been saved since 1921 and he felt it would be ashamed to bury it. He asked whether the fountain could tap into the well by sitting over it and using a pump to bring in the water.

Mr. Donahue said he did not know the engineering involved but they probably do not have the money to do the work on such a project. Boardmember Woodrow suggested an engineer could solve this problem quickly. He felt it is ashamed to bury the well since it was the original premise for the Plunge. Mr. Donahue said he likes the idea of tapping into the well for the fountain but he does not want to hold up the project. He agreed to investigate the possibility of using natural well water for the fountain. Boardmember Woodrow agreed and asked if a sign could be placed saying the fountain sits over the well site.

Boardmember Butt said the sign should definitely be constructed in size and location as close as possible to the way it was historically. He asked about the color of the steel used in the sign. Mr. Donahue replied it is galvanized sheet metal, which was the original design. The backs of the letters may be painted an off-white color.

Boardmember Butt questioned the choice of plywood as a material and recommended using hardy board or paper stone which will last a longer period of time. He asked about the use of LED lights and whether it will look similar to incandescent low-voltage lighting. Mr. Donahue said the LED lights are actually inside of frosted bulbs and will be warm white light.

Boardmember Welter agreed with Boardmember Butt's comments about replacing the plywood with a better material.

Chair Woldemar noted the old photographs show flagpoles on the building on either side of the entryway and he asked if they will be added to the design. Mr. Donahue replied the poles were considered but were removed. Chair Woldemar questioned who was making the choices about what to include in the restoration, and Mr. Donahue said the architect has guided the process and is very aware of the budget. The Plunge Trust is regularly consulted and there are interactions with the City to make these decisions.

Chair Woldemar said in the original report about the historic nature of the building it very explicitly mentions the flagpoles as being part of the character of the old building. The flagpoles may make the sign make more sense because there will be something on the roof besides the sign.

Chair Woldemar agreed with the other boardmembers regarding the plywood and suggested a powder-coated metal material. Boardmembers Welter and Butt agreed this would make sense. Chair Woldemar suggested the sign should be constructed to last so the City does not have to repair it in 10 years

Mr. Donahue reviewed the details of the hardscape. Much of the existing hardscape will be reused due to costs. They are adding some impervious paving around the fountain to absorb runoff or splashing. There will be benches. They are only discussing the front area of the building; the area to the west and south of the building will be instituted in another phase. The Historic Design Review Board recommended a date in the tile mosaic for the fountain to date the fountain and renovation period. They have located two trash cans outside in the front of the building, as well as bicycle parking.

Boardmember Woodrow noted three benches that are 18 inches high and asked whether the area in Group 4 will be raised to accommodate the bench. Mr. Donahue said the grade is the

same as the paved area. They had considered building retaining walls and infilling, but the cost was prohibitive.

Boardmember Woodrow asked about interior trash generated by pool staff. Mr. Donahue said there will be a trash enclosure built on the west side of the building. Boardmember Woodrow expressed concern that area is shown as developed in another phase, and also there is no pathway to get to that trash area. Mr. Donahue confirmed that the trash enclosure would be built as part of the current proposal.

Mr. Rojas said what is seen in shaded color on the landscaping plan will come back to the Design Review Board with specific plantings and hardscapes. Right now the Board should focus on the front area. He said the comments about the trash enclosure are well-noted and they will make sure to incorporate those comments, but the Board will see that again at a future meeting.

Boardmember Woodrow said he is concerned about some of the elements of the project that are currently being done, such as the paint colors. This has been a vexed project from the start, and funds have always been short. One of the things that could really damage this project is if a pile of trash were left outside. He said he thinks it is important to bring up all of the issues tonight.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned lighting in the forecourt. Mr. Donahue explained there are four lights, two to the west of the fountain and two to the side of the access entering into the portico on the north.

Chair Woldemar questioned if those lights are only 6 ½ feet high, and Mr. Donahue confirmed this is the case. The fountain is in front of the building and they are using the height of the original cast bases. Chair Woldemar questioned the use of 6 ½ foot site lights and suggested raising the same lights higher. He asked if the applicant has done any lighting studies to determine how much light is present at night. Mr. Donahue replied that no technical studies have been done with a light reader, but it is right off the main street and they are trying to highlight only the entrance from the street into the pool area.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if the front area will be fenced. Mr. Donahue said it will be open. There is some railing around the light wells and around the stairs to the basement. There is a fence between the site and the train tracks.

Boardmember Woodrow said things have changed since the 1920s and this site has been used by homeless people for the last 7-8 years. Mr. Donahue pointed out the balance in public projects between making things inviting, and avoiding these types of problems.

Boardmember Woodrow noted staff has received emails from TRAC and they would like the Bay Trail to be finished. He said the City Engineer told him the Bay Trail will share the walk at the side of the Plunge. His concern is that TRAC is always trying to get 10-12 foot wide trail, and that would take parking away from the Plunge. He was encouraged to know the City Engineer is thinking the walkway's size and location are fine. Mr. Donahue said they are not proposing any changes to the sidewalks at that location.

Boardmember Woodrow noted he lives about 100 yards away from the Plunge and there are many people waiting for the project to be completed so they can use the pool. He expressed concern about enough parking and the spillover of parking onto E. Richmond where large campers have been parking. Chair Woldemar asked how far Boardmember Woodrow lives from the site, and Boardmember Woodrow answered 2-3 blocks. Chair Woldemar noted they may need to continue this discussion because Boardmember Woodrow may need to be recused from this discussion and the Board would no longer have a quorum.

BREAK

Mr. Rojas asked to verify the distance from Boardmember Woodrow's residence to the site location, and the Board agreed and took a 5-minute recess.

Boardmember Woldemar reconvened the meeting and noted Boardmember Woodrow recused himself because he lives within 500 feet of the site. The Board no longer had a quorum and the item was recommended to be continued.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/) to continue the application for PLN 09-125 to the November 18, 2009 meeting; unanimously approved.

- 4. PLN 09-120 – UP AND UNDER PUB BUILDING EXTERIOR PAINT COLORS & IMPROVEMENTS ON W. RICHMOND AVENUE** – REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION of proposed exterior colors and signage for the Up and Under Pub based on recommended conditions of approval for the establishment located at 2 W. Richmond Ave. (APN: 558-122-020. C-1 Zoning District. Owner: Lompa Richard; Applicant: Nathan Trivers; Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales. Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Recusal:

It was noted that Boardmember Butt lives within 500 feet from the property and he recused himself from participating on the item.

Senior Planner Whales reviewed the color palate for the exterior of the Up and Under Pub and Grill, and the windows, door, and signage. The applicant is proposing a painted stencil sign design in the signage at the top of the building. Another sign will be placed on the northeast side of the building.

Chair Woldemar asked for clarification of the sign locations. Ms. Whales said there is a total of three signs. The design went to the Historical Preservation Advisory Committee Design Review Subcommittee on October 21, 2009. Staff overlooked the historical findings in the actual staff report. In order for the DRB to act this evening, the Board must review those findings as part of any approval.

Ms. Whales said the main building colors will be chanticleer, which is a red brick color, and black, shamrock green, and saucy gold for the top accents.

Chair Woldemar said the letter from the Historical Preservation Advisory Committee Design Review Subcommittee indicates the color scheme involves removing the black paint for the coining and archway at the front of the building. He asked if that is reflected in the conditions of approval before the DRB tonight. Ms. Whales answered that it can be added at the end and will be part of the final conditions of approval.

Chair Woldemar asked for clarification of the location of the signs because different locations are shown in Exhibit B in their packets. Ms. Whales said there are three signs. Boardmember Bloom asked for clarification of the colors. Ms. Whales answered the swatch colors are the actual colors that will be used for the building.

The public hearing was opened.

Nathan Trivers, applicant, said when he first saw the building it was run-down and uninviting. He wanted to bring it back to life as a neighborhood pub and grill and bring it as closely as possible to its historical likeness. He clarified the placement of the sign will be in the same location as the

original historical sign. In the first Historical Preservation meeting, the Committee requested a design in line with the historical look. The building was originally brick, and stucco was added onto the building later. Throughout that time, red has been on the building, and the red will be bringing it back to the color it was in the past. He engaged Bob Buckner's services as a colorist to assist in choosing the saucy gold, chanticleer with black trim, and shamrock green. He then asked for public input on the colors, and most chose the same palette as Mr. Buckner's recommendation.

Mr. Trivers said they wanted a double-hung style for the windows. They are laminate and energy-efficient and still give the historical look of what was originally there. He wants to replace exactly the signage that was there previously. The signage on top is a painted stencil sign with nothing anchored onto it. The front door is a large modern door with an archway. It is 8 feet x 4 feet, and they added a 2 foot window to allow visibility. He does not know what the original door was in 1910 and he does not want to assume what it was like. He would like to put in a nice, simple, clean door that is warm and inviting. He read quotations about the use of the Secretary of Interior Standards stating they are open to interpretation and meant to encourage thinking deeply about the historical preservation project. The Standards are "an avenue to thoughtful dialogue." He believes the project has gotten close to the historical look of the building and he has tried to present a nice, upstanding building for Point Richmond.

Boardmember Bloom asked if the inside of the arch will be a contrasting color, and Mr. Trivers said he would like it to be saucy gold.

Boardmember Welter reviewed the Historic Preservation list. Only the first floor windows will be replaced. He asked what the second floor windows are currently. Mr. Trivers replied they are double-hung operating windows. Boardmember Welter said he thinks the front door is fine and he likes it. He said the sign at the top will be stenciled and asked about the materials used for the lower sign. Mr. Trivers said the lower sign will be on the side of the building and will be a metal-based sign designed by the same company that designed the Mechanics Bank sign across the street.

Boardmember Welter asked for clarification of the colors. Mr. Trivers said the archway will not be painted black, but rather the trim only. The trim includes only the areas that stick out. The trim on the archway will be black and the inside will be saucy gold. Chair Woldemar pointed out the HPAC recommended removing black on the arch, and Mr. Trivers said they did not like black on the vertical areas.

Boardmember Welter said he agreed with the comment to remove the eagle at the top. Mr. Trivers said the eagle was on the building before he ever came to Point Richmond, and he has no opinion on it. He is more concerned with colors, windows, doors, and signage and deferred that topic to Richard Lompa, the building owner.

Boardmember Bloom asked for clarification of the words "Pub & Grill" in two different fonts. Mr. Trivers clarified the lettering will be a "Harrington font" of the same size on all of the signs and apologized for the Photoshop errors.

Boardmember Bloom suggested dark green with gold for the colors of the building because it would look like an English pub. Mr. Trivers pointed out that would be an Irish pub. Boardmember Bloom said she thinks the suggested colors are crass and asked Mr. Trivers to arrive at something more subtle. Mr. Trivers said he used the services of Mr. Buckner so he could satisfy the HPAC. He wanted to come back to the brick red and said red is a difficult color to work with. He has photos of all of the brick buildings in Point Richmond and they are all different shades of red. Boardmember Bloom said she thinks for optimum business it should look as classy as possible, and Mr. Trivers assured her it will be classy.

Boardmember Woodrow noted he has never seen a brick color the same as the chanticleer red. Mr. Trivers said he wants the red to be shiny and bright. The building was a disaster and an embarrassment to the area. He would like to bring it to life and would like it to stand out.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if he will take down the blue ball and bird. Mr. Trivers said he does not know whether the owner of the building will do that. Boardmember Woodrow said he is asking that because the blue clashes with the new colors. Mr. Trivers said he could paint it if that would help, but Boardmember Woodrow said he would like to see it removed.

Chair Woldemar confirmed the location of handicap access to the building and Mr. Travers said he replaced 800 square feet of the sidewalk because there were two steps on each side. Chair Woldemar questioned if it was wide enough, and Mr. Trivers said the minimum for a historical building is 30 inches and he has 31.5 inches.

Chair Woldemar asked if the color on the Railroad Avenue side is the finished color. Mr. Trivers replied that is white-based primer and is not the finished color. The final color will be a solid color; they still have two top-coats to add.

Public Comments:

Jerry Feagley spoke in support of the project. He did a historical building in San Pablo in 1979 and had it placed on the National Registry of Historical Buildings. When you get into details about front doors, etc., there have to be compromises made because certain materials are no longer available. He knows the building was brick underneath the stucco, and he likes the fact that the color will stand out. It is a major corner coming into Point Richmond. He has been a resident of Point Richmond for 35 years.

Margaret Morkowski, President of Point Richmond Business Association, said Mr. Trivers presented the project to their membership at the last meeting. The vast majority of the membership approved of the colors, the process, and the business. She thinks the business community is behind the project. The President of the 23rd Street Business Association also supports the project. She has lived in Point Richmond since 1994 and is the President of the Women's West Side Improvement Club. Many of the women in the club liked the colors and said it reminded them of when they were growing up in point Richmond when there were colorful buildings. Mr. Trivers has been receiving a lot of input from people in the community. She thinks the opinion on the eagle is split in the community. When she first joined the Business Association she was asked to pass out pamphlets to businesses and when she entered the previous bar she decided she would never go in again. Since Mr. Trivers has been remodeling the feel of the bar is changing and she already feels more comfortable inside. It is definitely an improvement. She had never realized there were so many details in the building, and the black trim is bringing out the historic character of the building. She also thinks the colors will complement the bank building, which is bright yellow. Across the street there is also a mural done in bright colors. She thinks the building will complement that mural as well.

Connie Lompa, wife of the building owner, commented on the color scheme. She said she has always loved English pubs, and the color scheme is synonymous with a traditional English pub. Since there will be a rugby theme to the décor inside, she thinks the colors really suit the building and creates a sense of continuity between the outside and inside. She thinks the mustard yellow of the bank and the deep red of the pub looks beautiful with the trees in the area. It is a very welcoming color scheme.

Richard Lompa, building owner, said he saw the derelict condition the building was in when it was for sale. He bought it partly because it is a "cool" building and wanted to feel good about it.

They hired Mr. Buckner to help choose the colors because he is an extremely renowned color consultant. He has done hundreds of historic buildings for over 30 years. When they engage someone of that professional ability and integrity he thinks they should take his suggestions. They think the pub will be world class and will do a huge amount for the improvement of Point Richmond.

Boardmember Woodrow asked whether the eagle will stay on the building. Mr. Lompa said he has always been an eagle fan and would like it to stay. It was designated as the American bird in 1782 and it has always been the country's symbol. He would like to understand the specific objections anyone has against the eagle.

Boardmember Woodrow said he does not object to the eagle, but he does not think it fits in that location. Mr. Lompa said the reason he obtained the eagle is a friend of his saved it from a demolished Veteran's building in Alexandria, VA. Boardmember Woodrow repeated that the eagle does not fit the pub style of the building; it is a wonderful symbol but it does not fit with the design.

Boardmember Bloom questioned if the statue of Venus will stay in the window, and Mr. Trivers answered yes. Boardmember Bloom pointed out the strangeness of the eagle, blue ball, and statue on the building. She said that combination makes her think it is a kitschy art place. Mr. Trivers said that makes people want to go inside. Ms. Lompa said the ball is a model of the earth and is a symbol of imperialism. Boardmember Bloom asked if he would be amenable to painting the ball, and Mr. Trivers said he would like to repaint it to look more like earth. Boardmember Bloom pointed out others have said the blue clashes with the red.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Woldemar asked about Condition #6 stating the applicant shall return to the HPAC subcommittee for any changes. He is confused about who has jurisdiction on this project.

Ms. Whales clarified that HPAC is the advisory board to the DRB and the applicant would have to come back to the DRB if changes are made to the project. Chair Woldemar said HPAC is the expert on historic preservation and the DRB is not, and he does not understand why the DRB even considers making changes to their recommendations without having an understanding of the historic background on which their recommendations are based. Ms. Whales explained that all historical projects go to the HPAC Subcommittee first for a recommendation because they are more familiar with historical buildings. Which is why they went to that committee first, and the DRB usually accepts their recommendations.

Chair Woldemar questioned some of the black details that are on the building but not in the photo. Mr. Trivers apologized for leaving them off of his Photoshop drawing and said all four of them will be black.

Chair Woldemar said he likes the black windows with black frames and sills. He dislikes the black bellyband and quoining. He thinks that is the wrong color on this building and the bellyband and quoining should be the same green as on other areas of the building. It would be a much nicer contrast to carry those color lines down and break up the vertical aspect of the building. He acknowledged, however, that colors are the most subjective part of the project. He said he liked the signage, both the small sign and the upper sign. He was glad to hear they will be the same typeface. The small sign should be centered between the three windows. He was surprised there is not another sign around the corner. Mr. Trivers said they can add a sign there, but did not because a tree has grown there and would block it.

Chair Woldemar agreed with the Subcommittee that the door should be a more contemporary door. It should be a wooden door with a wooden frame. Mr. Trivers said it is wooden. Chair Woldemar said he would remove the eagle and perhaps put it in the window. He recommended moving the statue to the bar area. He likes the idea of bringing the gold color into the entry.

Boardmember Welter said he agrees with Chair Woldemar's color suggestions for the bellyband and quoining. He thinks if the arch were a different color it would be less heavy in the front entry.

Boardmember Bloom suggested planting a tree on the other side of the building. Mr. Trivers said when they replaced the sidewalk for handicapped access they installed a 3 ½ foot by 10 foot planter box. He is not sure a tree would work because of blocking the signs, but shrubbery and landscaping will definitely be done.

Boardmember Bloom asked if there is room for entrance shrubs, and Mr. Trivers said he would like to add hanging flower baskets at the entry to add color as well as flower baskets in the windows. He would like to beautify the corner. Boardmember Bloom agreed that is a good idea.

Boardmember Woodrow noted the project keeps growing with plantings, hanging baskets, centered signage. He questioned whether they have plans they can sign off on.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Woodrow) to conditionally approve the application for PLN 09-120 with the Historic Building findings items 1 and 2, the Design Review Board findings in Staff report items 1 through 4, and the Staff conditions for approval, with the following additions and revisions: Condition #6 stating that any changes would go to the HPAC Subcommittee for their recommendation before returning to the Design Review Board for review and approval, and Condition #9 indicating the front door shall be replaced with a new wood door that is contemporary in character, size, and material with a wooden frame; the eagle statue at the top of the building will be removed; the DRB supports its relocation in the window above the entry; the entry inset will be painted in saucy gold; the small sign on the northeast face of the building will be centered within the three windows closest to the corner; groundcover shrubs and/or trees will be added to existing the curbside planting area subject to review and approval by the Planning Director; and the bellyband, quoining, and entry arch will be revised from black to emerald green; unanimously approved.

BOARD BUSINESS

Chair Woldemar noted there is only one meeting in November due to the Veteran's Day holiday. It will take place on Wednesday, November 18, 2009. Following that there will be only one meeting in December on December 9, 2009. The next meeting after that will be on January 13, 2009.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:31 p.m.