

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
March 9, 2011
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Andrew Butt, Chair
Otheree Christian
Michael Woldemar

Raymond Welter, Vice Chair
Eileen Whitty
Don Woodrow

Chair Butt called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Andrew Butt and Boardmembers Whitty, Woldemar and Woodrow

Absent: Boardmember Christian and Vice Chair Welter

Staff Present: Kieron Slaughter, Mary Renfro, Jonelyn Whales

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA - None

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

MEETING PROCEDURES – Chair Butt referred to the meeting procedures outlined on the back of the agenda and asked those present to familiarize themselves with the basic meeting procedures.

Public Forum – No speakers.

CONSENT CALENDAR: - Chair Butt reported there were no items on the Consent Calendar.

- 1. PLN10-193 AYALA NEW TWO-STORY RESIDENCE ON HELLINGS AVENUE**
- | | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| Description | (Held Over from 12/8/2010) REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT A NEW ±2,891 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE. | |
| Location | 1800 HELLINGS AVENUE | |
| APN | 530-230-025 | |
| Zoning | SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) | |
| Owner | MANUEL AYALA | |
| Applicant | ROBERTO PENA | |
| Staff Contact | KIERON SLAUGHTER | Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Kieron Slaughter gave the staff report regarding the application for approval of a 2,891 square foot, two-story single family residence consisting of 4 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms. He indicated the applicant accepted the majority of the Board recommendations but explained that the owner

wanted to keep the building orientation and overall design the same as originally proposed. Staff also made some additional recommendations and modifications shown in the latest version of the plans including new concrete pavers on the left side between the house and the fence line. He also liked the opportunity to provide community benefit via a bus stop bench, trash container, and additional trees on the side of the house where there is an existing bus stop. The applicant has supplied staff with a letter of support for the proposed project with eight surrounding home owner signatures. The neighborhood council had requested more outreach which was provided, and no further comments were received from the president of the neighborhood council.

Staff feels the current proposed project enhances the appearance of the property and is in compliance with the set back height regulations of the SFR3 residential district and recommends approval with the twelve conditions set forth.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the status of the December 8 notes submitted by staff.

Mr. Slaughter noted these were his personal notes from the December 8 meeting. He indicated he sent these notes to the applicant to address what he thought were the main concerns of the Board.

Boardmember Woodrow complimented the applicant for having gone out of his way to show the plans to gain support. With regards to the notes he was surprised that they did not say anything about the obvious fact that this is a 27 foot house in an area where almost every house is only one floor. There are only two, two-story houses, one off two blocks and one almost two blocks off, yet we are told by staff that it fits because this is an area of one and two story dwellings.

Mr. Slaughter replied there were split comments on that issue with some Boardmembers not having an issue with the height because the maximum allowable height in the district is 35 feet. Whether they want to see a 35 foot house is up to the Board's discretion but it is difficult to slowly creep up to that level when you can do only a one or two story house. He indicated that although a split-level is an option to sort of split the difference, it is not typical in this area and the applicant would like to accommodate his family with a certain number of bedrooms.

Boardmember Woodrow indicated that he asked this question because often times when a house of that size goes into an area where there are not homes of that size that people up and over the street say that others can look right into their rooms. He questioned whether any comments were received regarding this issue. Mr. Slaughter responded that the applicant did reach out to the adjacent neighbors who all signed the support letter.

Chair Butt questioned if it was safe to assume that one of the signatures on the support letter is an adjacent neighbor. Mr. Slaughter answered yes and that one can only assume that the neighbor would be comfortable with the second story aspect. He also indicated that since it is a corner house, it really only deals with one side. He also stated that he knows it can be a concern that comes up quite often when dealing with second story additions and that privacy can sometimes be an issue, but that it did not come up in this instance.

Boardmember Woodrow indicated his support and said these were the only points he wanted to address.

Boardmember Whitty asked about the green checklist and inquired as to what "to be determined (TBD)" meant, wondering if it meant that the item will probably change for the better, indicating that she hoped that was the case.

Kieron Slaughter answered that the checklist contained either yes, no, or TBD statuses and if there are any particular items that are still yet to be finalized it would be indicated with a TBD status.

Chair Butt confirmed that there were no items that indicated TBD status.

Boardmember Whitty stated there are real areas of opportunity such as foundation, and wondered why one of the choices that would be really good was not chosen. She also questioned landscaping and was curious as to why the outside finishes did not call for low toxic materials. Mr. Slaughter answered that at this time for new construction of single family houses the green building ordinance only requires 55 points on the checklist. Once the applicant has reached the 55 points staff can only make suggestions.

Boardmember Whitty said she found it was bizarre that there was no insulation in a two-story house. Mr. Slaughter indicated that he was sure there was insulation but as far as reaching some of the green standards to give special points for upgraded insulation he guessed it was unavailable. Chair Butt noted the upgrade was for insulating with 75% recycled content materials, reiterating that the code does require insulation.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the very bottom of page 5 of 6 showing that the project has not yet met the following minimum requirements. He surmised that perhaps the whole form is meaningless because of the CALGreen requirements that must be complied with by State law. Since the form states, "if applicable" he is confused as to what is being required of the applicant.

Mr. Slaughter answered that staff is still working on updating the ordinance to meet CALGreen standards and that at the time the green building ordinance was adopted, CALGreen was not in place.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned and confirmed with Mr. Slaughter that the project complied with the City's ordinance based upon the chart.

Boardmember Woldemar clarified that Mr. Slaughter did not know whether or not the project complied with CALGreen, and Chair Butt noted that by code, it must.

Boardmember Woldemar stated that presumably it would have to comply by code and that even though the chart is included in the staff report; it is somewhat meaningless since there are so many other different requirements. He requested that it be added to the list of what is coming, as it needs to be cleared up for the sake of the applicants.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned why the two story roofed porch entry at the front corner of the house does not count as part of the front yard setback. He indicated he thought that only uncovered porches could be in the setback, and this is a covered porch.

Mr. Slaughter said he would have to look this up but he believed it was allowed to project as long as it does not exceed a certain percentage of the width of the house.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that the second floor to the east of the two story roofed porch entry also has a projection of several feet plus a pop out window balcony. He also noted that there are two different elements on the front of the house that contribute towards the street front and corner mass. He remembered that the mass on the front corner of the building was the principle concern of the Board when they first heard the application and he asked to check on the legality of the front porch as it is illustrated. Mr. Slaughter stated that the front porch as illustrated was legal.

Boardmember Woldemar reiterated that he remembered that it was uncovered porches, stairs, and landings that could be in the yard space, not covered. Mr. Slaughter stated that he would look up the section of the code, as there were other exceptions to the setback, as well.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned Jonelyn Whales whether the proposed six foot high wooden fence in the rear along 18th Street to the south of the driveway is allowed along the street frontage. Mr. Whales stated the fence is allowable if it is the rear of the house. Boardmember Woldemar questioned if that was the case even though it is a corner lot, and Ms. Whales said yes, since it is a triangular lot.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that he knew it was 50% as it applied to an interior lot but questioned whether on a corner lot the requirement was to step the fence down to 42 inches. Mr. Slaughter indicated that since it was the rear of the lot, the 42 inch requirement did not apply.

Boardmember Woldemar voiced concern that it is still a front yard with a six foot fence and there is something lacking in the design quality. He also questioned staff about the location of the backyard gate. Mr. Slaughter noted the fence wraps around and hugs the driveway and the drawing, while not labeled, indicates a gate near the cable/PG&E box. He also had answers with respect to the projections. Citing Section 15.04.830.050 of the code, "projections are allowed into yards and common space, and unenclosed ground floor level porches and landings covered with a roof and which are no wider than 60% of the front wall width may project a maximum of 6 feet into the required front yard."

Boardmember Woldemar confirmed that Mr. Slaughter cited ground floor covered porches and reiterated that the proposed porch in question is two stories tall. He questioned whether it would be unreasonable to ask to reduce the height of the roof down to one story instead of a two story open stonework face as shown on page A04.

Chair Butt questioned whether there was even a door going out to the porch. Boardmember Woldemar said there are open columns with no door contributing to the mass scale instead of trying to reduce the profile. He mentioned that early on there was discussion about stepping back the living room ceiling to a one story condition to reduce the mass on the corner. He gathered from the staff report that the applicant was not willing to agree to that redesign.

Mr. Slaughter said the applicant was in attendance to present to the Board and indicated the applicant wanted to pursue his proposed design.

Roberto Pena, applicant, referred to the prior meeting to address comments and had voiced several reasons why the owner wants to stay with his original design. He indicated that he presented several layouts to the owner including rotating the layout and the owner felt it had a negative impact on the size of the rooms. Also, the other proposal to put the entry in the center created problems, as the owner does not want to close the side entrance, and this design change would make the house only 7.5 feet from the sidewalk. Another issue centered on roof eaves at the garage altering the pitch in the roof.

Chair Butt asked the applicant that, aside from the flipping recommendation, all other comments were picked up. Boardmember Whitty confirmed that little things like the medallions and wrap around brick were in the revision.

Mr. Pena referred to the revised drawings and discussed the square window in the rear and the elevation lay-in stone. He also discussed removal of the medallion over the garage resulting in a

garage elevation difference of 1.5 feet, from 9.5 feet down to 8.0 feet. He indicated he removed the Mexican Palm in the corner, replacing it with flowers. Regarding the front setback, he indicated there was a mistake in the first presentation showing the dimension of the cantilever and it has been corrected on the new drawings.

The applicant indicated that his name (for the record) was Roberto Pena.

The public hearing was opened.

Public Comments:

Gabriel Ortiz and Gustavo Sandoval were present to show support for the proposal, but declined to speak.

Boardmember Whitty indicated to the applicant that the proposed landscaping showed a lot of grass and there are alternatives for low to no water use landscaping that the applicant should consider such as a vegetable garden. She questioned whether the fence would be made up of boards with intermittent caps and Mr. Pena reiterated that it was not a special fence, just typical wood.

Chair Butt indicated that the fence was on the sides.

Boardmember Woldemar noted the elevations showed the fenced gate back set about 4 feet with the stone returning around the corner.

Boardmember Whitty expressed her concern that the fence not be "junky", providing good longevity. Mr. Pena, after translating her concerns to the owner, said he had previously planned an 8 foot fence with metallic decorations. There was some confusion as to what the owner meant, but he now indicated that he would like to put in an iron fence. Boardmember Whitty replied that the Board would consider the fence change.

Chair Butt questioned whether the owner desired iron fencing in the same location as the wood fence shown in the current drawings. Mr. Pena said it would be in the same location, only metallic and 4 feet high.

Boardmember Whitty had questions regarding the cement printed walkway pavement along the side on the house in the garbage area. She said it needed to be pervious type pavement to allow for water drainage. Mr. Pena said the left walkway is designed with paver block. Boardmember Whitty requested the stamped concrete be replaced with rocks to allow for water drainage. Chair Butt said the drawing indicated paver block, but there seemed to be inconsistencies with it also indicating stamped concrete.

Boardmember Whitty reiterated that the walkways needed to be composed of paver blocks and not stamped concrete and that she preferred that the driveway also be paver blocks and not cement. Mr. Pena said the problem with the driveway being composed entirely of paver blocks is that cars would cause the blocks to move. Boardmember Woldemar indicated there would be weed problems with a paver block driveway. Boardmember Whitty suggested that perhaps the applicant could do as much as possible to keep a large expanse of cement to a minimum. She also asked about solar considerations.

Chair Butt felt it was not the purview of the Board to mandate solar use but indicated that the City had a program to subsidize solar costs.

Boardmember Whitty encouraged the applicant to use recycled and green materials for interior insulation and flooring applications. She recognized the applicant's proposed use of low power and low water usage appliances. She also encouraged the applicant and owner to shelve the plan for the two-story porch in favor of just putting a roof over the front door.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that he still had concerns regarding the need to flip the house layout and carve off the corner, but moreover felt the placement of house on the corner is wrong. He also had other concerns including feeling the two story front door porch element should be a one story and, although he does not typically comment on interior considerations, he felt that the absence of an interior entry was bad and that traditional houses have a foyer. He said resolving these two issues would reduce the scale of the bulk of the house on the corner. He also questioned whether the house was a slab or floor joist foundation, and Mr. Pena answered that it was a slab foundation.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that the window to left of the porch entry tower opens up onto a circular stair and it may provide an unappealing exterior elevation. He referred to the west elevation and the two pop-out bay window elements; one off the living room and one off the dining room, and indicated they are backset off the corners of the house. This is a nice trick to soften the scale of house, but he wished there was more window area to them.

Referring back to the front elevation and the upper floor projection, he said it is a flush projection with the left hand edge to the wall and it would be much better if this could be reduced backset off the corner so that it was more like a bay window, stating that it would help reduce the scale or overall mass of the house. He also suggested that the landscaping is rather minimal with a few shrubs and grass and felt that foundation planting and shrubs to grow up side of house were two landscaping items that would reduce scale of house. He said the applicant and owner would benefit from the help of a landscape architect.

Boardmember Woldemar also indicated that he had no problems with the 18th Street side providing there was a good looking 5-foot back set wood fence with 2 x 6's on top and planting in front, suggesting that it be painted in a color compatible with the house. He did not even want to entertain the idea of an iron fence, citing the need for privacy.

Lastly, he wondered where the color board and grading/drainage information was and whether the Board had the entire story regarding this proposal. Mr. Slaughter stated that the color boards were in the original packets from three months prior.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned the 2x12 foam belly band with the drawings indicating it is a contrasting color, stating that proper color selection can be used to help reduce the scale and the bulk of the house. He said he really feels this is the wrong house design for that corner, and said it is really important to flip it around to get a one story element out at the corner, more in line with all the other one story houses in the neighborhood.

Mr. Pena said the owner did try to take into consideration the surrounding structures when designing this project, pointing to a house on the next corner.

Boardmember Woldemar referred to the aerial photo and could not ascertain as to what Mr. Pena was referencing. Mr. Pena indicated color selection was done to break the vertical line. Boardmember Woldemar replied there were classic methods to address bringing the visual pieces together, stating that the current selection looked too tall. He also discussed the stone and caps as a way of giving the house a foot going up to the window sill. Boardmember Woldemar referred to the front elevation showing the kitchen and stairway windows and indicated that it looked more like a side elevation with the smaller windows.

Boardmember Woodrow indicated he had no further comments and supported comments made by Boardmember Woldemar.

Chair Butt indicated he had no comments in addition to what was already said by Boardmember Woldemar, and agrees with his comments on every account, particularly with respect to lowering the porch entry to a single story that would bring it into compliance with the municipal code and which would work towards decreasing the mass at the entry and corner. Although he appreciated the applicant's effort to effect minor comments, the broader comments regarding the mass of the house being focused at the corner is really not in concert with the surrounding neighborhood even though he understands it is within the allowable height limit and conceivably down the road, more of these two story houses could be added on as people need more family space. He also agreed with Boardmember Whitty's comments.

Mr. Pena stated he was fine with changing the design of the front porch to one story and questioned if the height of the porch could be approximately one and a half to two feet greater than the base of the second story height. Chair Butt voiced support of this, and would probably be supportive of bringing the height and mass of the porch down. He reminded Mr. Pena that as Boardmember Woldemar previously mentioned the porch roof, as currently designed, is so high up it would not be functionally effective in keeping weather out of the entry.

Mr. Pena referred to the bay windows previously mentioned by Boardmember Woldemar and indicated he could make the bay window smaller and set back.

Boardmember Woodrow referred Mr. Pena back the color boards and clarified which board contained the color schemes the applicant was planning to use. He then questioned how that scheme compared to other homes in the area. Mr. Pena answered that the other colors were almost like what they were proposing. Boardmember Woodrow pointed to the second beige color on the board and said this would stand out like a "sore thumb".

Chair Butt pointed out a color that appeared more "earthy". Mr. Pena noted that the red color was for the accent color.

Mr. Slaughter pointed out to Boardmember Whitty that although the applicant did not do exterior solar they propose to use Solatube spotlights that do generate energy in the hallways and bathroom.

Boardmember Woodrow commended the owner on the condition of the lot, as it is in super shape with no trash.

Boardmember Whitty motioned to close the public hearing. Boardmember Woldemar indicated he would not vote to close the public hearing, as he would like more conversation before it was closed. He stated that if he were required to vote now he would vote no and he did not want to do that because he felt the house deserves to be built. He agreed that he was probably "stepping on toes" but showed a quick floor plan drawing that replaced the circular stairway with an ordinary switchback stair using less space with a large window at the landing providing light in the stairway. This design would provide a bearing line up above that allows the roof to tip over the living room and create a sloping vaulted ceiling that could slope down to a single story edge out on the front corner, sloping in two directions. He pointed to a window upstairs in the bathroom and said this type of design would allow the entire corner in both directions to be a single story. He believes it would take the current roof pitch and continue it on down with no eave in that portion. A design such as this would give that corner a significant difference.

He also illustrated that instead of having the two pop outs in the living room and dining room, just the living room pop out would remain and the other pop out over the dining room would not be a bay on the downstairs, as it would just cantilever on the upstairs just like the one on the other side of the building that had previously been discussed. He felt this was a way to address the majority of concerns without doing the flip flop and that it simply changes the stairway and the roof and ceiling plan of the living room while still providing character and volume and a nice overlook at the top landing of the stairs.

Boardmember Woldemar said this is why he wanted the conversation to continue, as he feels there are other designs that would get part of the way to where this really ought to be. He still maintained that a house could be done with one story character that has pop up areas that provided a two story house. And, while it was not his intention to provide a design, it was the job of the Board to make the best out of it that they can, and the current proposed plan is not quite there.

Boardmember Woodrow added that he does not believe that the current coat area on the first floor under the stairs works because the ceiling of the closet is low but with the stairway change proposed by Boardmember Woldemar, the ceiling of the closet would be raised providing for greater access.

Mr. Pena indicated that the idea for the two-story foyer is something that the owner's wife really wanted.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that although he understands her wish for a two-story foyer, there are other goals or criteria that must be accomplished. and it is not unreasonable to try and do both. He stated the principle concern of the Board is the exterior, but that interior design affects the exterior. He went on to state that if the house was shrunk a couple of feet in length an entry vestibule could be done that would then step into a large sloping ceiling area. He suggested reducing the house length from 60 feet to 54 or 56 feet in length, providing greater design flexibility. He also referred to an upstairs bedroom that is 14 by 12 feet, stating that is very large for a bedroom.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that he understands the criteria for large spaces given the cost of the house, but there are still other considerations with respect to the community and the neighborhood, hence his suggestions for changes that would meet both the Board's and the client's criteria. He asked Mr. Pena if he was willing to take the suggestions of the Board, and if so, the hearing would be continued. If Mr. Pena and the client were not willing to take the Board's suggestions, then the Board would vote and he would vote no, noting that he could not say what the outcome would be, but that any decision could be appealed.

Mr. Pena conferred with the owner and the Boardmembers conferred design considerations amongst themselves. Mr. Pena then indicated that the owner had an idea pertaining to certain elements. Boardmember Woldemar answered that he was just doing it upstairs, not downstairs, as the dining room is so large anyway, reasoning that it is more like a bay window and referring to another back set bay window on the drawings. He said the current drawing did not show the new location, and in referring to the drawing, he indicated where it would be. He also said there was only one, as the other would not be there because of the new roof slope. This would give greater flexibility to change the windows to look like more typical living room windows.

Boardmember Whitty agreed that new windows would not be small, lower windows as in the current plan.

Mr. Pena clarified portions of the porch area in Boardmember Woldemar's drawing. Boardmember Woldemar indicated that the applicant may need to push some things around to make that work, but that ideally when entering the front door, one can look up the slope and up at the top is the landing/railing for the stairs with the upper landing overlooking the rooms downstairs.

Mr. Pena referred to the living room and questioned the ceiling. Boardmember Woldemar answered that it would be a sloped ceiling with dropped lights with the roof framed with 2 by 12's to provide space for insulation and that it may require a hip ridge beam to carry the joists. He confirmed with Mr. Pena that his client would be supportive of this.

Boardmember Woldemar motioned to continue this public hearing until a certain date, guessing a month from now.

Ms. Whales indicated that staff was hoping to actually receive a decision tonight contingent on the building permit rather than continue the hearing. She said the applicant had filed the application back in October of last year and it had been continued twice already. She noted that the Director has advised staff that it would be best to render a decision by the Board this evening, stating that the applicant is willing to change his design.

Boardmember Woldemar inquired whether the Board was facing any deadlines with respect to this application. Ms. Whales indicated that the Board was within any deadlines of the Permit Streamlining Act, stating that legally the Board was fine and there were no other fees involved for the applicant, but that there would be additional staff resources spent on the project.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated that he thought the Board would be doing the wrong thing to depend on approval based on the quick sketches that had been made during the meeting.

Mr. Slaughter said the Board could condition their decision so that the final approval goes to the Director using the sketches as exhibits. He voiced concern with the amount of staff time devoted to this project and requested that since the applicant was amenable to the Board's changes, there might be a way to render a decision one way or the other. Mr. Slaughter also mentioned that the Director could pass on the application for final approval to the Board once it comes in, but that scheduling another public hearing is costly from a financial and manpower standpoint.

Boardmember Woldemar said when the applicant has the design ready he would be glad as a subcommittee of one or two members to meet with the applicant and staff to help staff indicate approval so staff does not spend more time writing staff reports on the project. Mr. Slaughter said there are ways to reduce staff costs surrounding approval of the proposed project.

Boardmember Woldemar indicated he is willing to assist in cost reduction, and though sympathetic, this is an important corner that the City needs to get right. Staff agreed. Chair Butt expressed his concern that the rough sketch changes significantly the massing for the better, but the details need to be correct.

Boardmember Whitty indicated that it sounds like the Board subcommittee and the applicant could come into the staff office and discuss the final drawings.

Ms. Whales questioned whether the proposal could come back on the Consent Calendar, to which Boardmember Woldemar agreed.

Assistant City Attorney Renfro stated that a continued item can come back on Consent stating that the Board could approve the project, conditioned upon final approval of the subcommittee

rather than final approval of the Director. Boardmember Whitty agreed with this process for final approval of the subcommittee.

Ms. Renfro suggested conditional language to read: "Following the conditions and substantial compliance with the sketch by Boardmember Woldemar dated March 9, 2011." Boardmember Woldemar and Mr. Pena concurred.

Boardmember Woldemar suggested to Mr. Pena that the Board subcommittee meet with him quickly to insure that the design will work for both the client and the Board, thereby conserving resources, and also wanted to insure that a staff member be present. The staff agreed to that and Mr. Slaughter will try to schedule a meeting for next week.

Boardmember Woldemar restated his motion to continue the item for one month until the April meeting, giving the subcommittee, staff, and applicant time to review and talk. At that time the item would come back on the Consent Calendar or even as a public hearing where the Board agrees that they are going to move it to a Consent Calendar, either way. He also stated there would be a meeting held whether there were other items, or not.

Boardmember Whitty questioned and confirmed that the project could either be approved tonight subject to the subcommittee process or agendized for the Consent Calendar.

be worked out if it was not going to be subject to approval by the subcommittee, if it is going to be worked out by the subcommittee and come back on consent. Discussion follows by the Board, staff and applicant, and all agreed that precedence was established with the Civic Center approval procedure. Boardmember Woldemar requested the item return as an informational item.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to approve PLN10-193 subject to the staff's recommended four findings, the staff's recommended twelve conditions, plus the additional conditions as follows: 1) That the applicant amend the drawings based on the meeting's conversations, notes, and sketches labeled Exhibit A and Exhibit B; and 2) that this approval be subject to final approval by a subcommittee of the Design Review Board; unanimously approved.

Chair Butt officially appointed the subcommittee for the above action as himself, Boardmember Woldemar, and Vice Chair Welter as either an alternate or member. Chair Butt stated that the application has been approved contingent on the items listed and the changes drawn in the Exhibits, requesting staff to arrange a meeting next week in a City Hall conference room.

Boardmember Woldemar stated that rather than the applicant doing change drawings ahead of time, they should all sit down with a yellow overlay that can then be put on CAD. Chair Butt relayed to the applicant that he would not have to prepare anything further for the first subcommittee meeting.

Chair Butt noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, March 21, 2011 by 5:00 p.m.

BOARD BUSINESS:

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

1. Continue discussion on landscape bond procedures.

Ms. Whales noted that that staff was still working on the landscape bond procedures and was able to secure a template from Boardmember Woldemar.

2. Review and discuss possible amendments to RMC 15.04.810.030 (Fencing and Landscaping Standards, Residential Properties) and RMC 15.04.820.010 (Fencing and Landscaping Standards, Commercial Properties).

Ms. Whales indicated that she required more input from the Board to move those two items forward. She indicated that staff was never officially notified as to what amendments the Board wanted to make to the Richmond Municipal Code.

Boardmember Whitty stated that she thought that the subject amendments were noted at the last meeting.

Boardmember Woldemar said it was several meetings ago and he would have to go back and reread the minutes again. He thought it had to do with inconsistencies in the ordinance about landscaping and fencing requirements for both commercial and residential, focusing on the differences between area specific plan and zoning ordinances, and that within the zoning ordinances there were different requirements.

Boardmember Whitty questioned whether this related to the Toyota item and Boardmember Woldemar answered that this was prior to the Toyota item.

Ms. Whales indicated she thought it was November 10, 2010, as she was absent at that meeting. Boardmember Woldemar stated that he thought tonight exemplified the problem, stating that tonight's item included a terrible landscape plan and that the Board should have better criteria in the zoning ordinance that requires residents put in street trees at more than 50 foot on center and cited green considerations. He noted that some of this may not happen until the ordinance is rewritten.

3. Review and discuss possible amendments to RMC 15.04.930 (Design Review) to include DRB jurisdiction over City projects.

Boardmember Woldemar noted that this item came from the Carlson fence matter. Of particular interest was the portion from Cutting south which has bark, an irrigation system, and vines every 16 feet on center. He said contrary to what was told where the portion north of Cutting was going to have that because they could not determine where to get the water from on the other side.

Boardmember Woldemar also questioned the status of the previous discussed joint Planning Commission and DRB Retreat, and Ms. Whales answered that staff was working on this.

B. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Mr. Slaughter announced that the study session for the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan will go before the Council on March 22, 2011. There will not be an official action requested but simply to receive comments on the final drafts of the two plans. Staff has selected LSA to perform an environmental review of the Bicycle Master Plan.

Adjournment:

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.