

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL
440 Civic Center Plazas, Richmond, CA
August 10, 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 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Butt, Vice Chair Welter, Boardmembers Whitty, Woldemar, and Woodrow (arrived late)

Absent: Boardmember Christian

Staff Present: Carlos Privat, Kieron Slaughter, Lamont Thompson

APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to approve the Agenda; unanimously approved.

AGENDA

Item 1, a discussion item only, was moved to the end of the agenda.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Butt stated that the remaining Consent Calendar items were 2 through 5 and he asked if the Board or public wished to remove any item.

Boardmember Woodrow requested removal of Item 2 to discuss landscape exemptions, and Item 5 for clarification.

Chair Butt confirmed no members of the public wished to remove any items.

Items Approved:

CC 3. PLN11-252	MODIFICATIONS TO SCENIC AVENUE RESIDENCE REHABILITATION
Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO MODIFY AN APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE OF THE POINT RICHMOND NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT TO ALLOW THE ADDITION OF ONE NEW

SKYLIGHT AND REMOVAL OF AN EXISTING WINDOW ON REAR ELEVATION AND REPLACING IT WITH NEW FRENCH DOORS.

Location 221 E. SCENIC AVENUE
 APN 556-134-031
 Zoning SFR-2 (SINGLE-FAMILY VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL)
 Owner THOMAS & SHIRLEY BUTT
 Applicant DANIEL BUTT
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

CC 4. PLN11-078 MERCED STREET RESIDENCE NEW REAR DECK

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT AN 800 SQUARE FOOT DECK, 9-FEET IN HEIGHT, ATTACHED TO THE REAR OF THE RESIDENCE.

Location 1527 MERCED STREET
 APN 508-231-001
 Zoning SFR-3 (SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT)
 Owner KOSKI BRADLEY
 Applicant KOSKI BRADLEY
 Staff Contact LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Welter) to approve the Consent Calendar consisting of Items 3 and 4; unanimously approved.

Chair Butt noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, August 22, 2011 by 5:00 p.m. and announced the appeal procedure after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. PLN11-036 BAY MARINE BOATWORKS INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS

Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL TO CONSTRUCT TWO DETACHED INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS TO STORE BOATS FOR REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE.

Location 310 WEST CUTTING BLVD.
 APN 560-300-004
 Zoning M-4 (MARINE INDUSTRIAL)
 Specific Plan KNOX FREEWAY/CUTTING BLVD CORRIDOR
 Owner CHANNEL LUMBER CO INC.
 Applicant R. LENNON HAMILTON, AIA
 Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Boardmember Woldemar stated he asked for removal of Item 2 because he had some specific questions and thought it best to address those questions rather than have a full staff report, to which the Board agreed.

He said he was particularly pleased with the landscaping that was going along the street frontage of the project, the fence treatment, and the area between the curb and the sidewalk. He indicated that he had an issue with the staff report requesting the Board to grant an exemption to the 15% Knox-Cutting site requirement versus the ordinance that states 10%, and wanted clarification. He also wondered about the signs on the fence, stating they were not represented in the documents. He indicated that he felt the Board had never been given the prerogative to approve such variances or exceptions.

Hector Lopez answered that, according to the zoning code, the DRB has the discretion to grant variances for open space, referring to the same issue that arose on another project on Hilltop. Boardmember Woldemar stated that the section that was quoted to them before had something to do with the old Development Review Organization (DRO) and that supposedly the DRB was taking over the old DRO capability of granting these types of exceptions and asked if the staff was still using that determination to request the exception by the DRB. Mr. Lopez answered it was his understanding from counsel, specifically Mary Renfro, that this determination still stood. Boardmember Woldemar stated that he wanted to talk, perhaps at the end of the meeting, about getting that specific section of the ordinance changed because he felt that the DRB should not have this type of responsibility.

Boardmember Whitty stated that the specific landscape ordinance was Zoning Ordinance 1504-A20-013A. Assistant City Attorney Privat stated that the sign ordinance specifically calls out that the DRB has purview over variances and exceptions and this has been applied to this case. He was not sure whether that was because it was in writing or whether it was a general City practice. As it stands now, the DRB is responsible for making the determination for an exception unless there is an appeal.

Boardmember Woldemar asked, if the Board elected not to take that exception, could they specifically require this project to provide 15% of the site area in landscaping. Mr. Privat answered that if the majority of the Board could not make findings for the exception, 10% of the site area would be required for landscaping because the 10% requirement of the Zoning Ordinance supersedes the 15% requirement of the Knox-Cutting plan.

Boardmember Woldemar asked, if the Board made that decision, would it would be appealable to the City Council. Mr. Privat answered yes; and not to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Whitty confirmed that 10% of 128,000 square feet equated to 12,800 square feet of landscaping. Boardmember Woldemar restated that he wished the entire exception issue was clearer, indicating that there are a lot of projects where either the exemption or the requirement is clearly warranted, other less so, using Toyota as an example of where he was not so comfortable taking the exception.

Chair Butt indicated that he was not completely comfortable with the Toyota exception and said he thinks it should not be up to the DRB to grant variances in the Zoning Ordinance. Boardmember Woldemar stated that, historically, it had always been up to the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Woldemar requested Mr. Lopez tell the Board more about the signs. Mr. Lopez stated that he did not have information about the signage and requested that the applicant provide information. It was stated that there were no longer any signs. Boardmember Woldemar asked if there would be any opposition to adding a condition to the recommendations that the signage be removed. It was answered that since it was already against regulations that the signs were gone.

Boardmember Whitty questioned if Cutting Boulevard has a specific plan for that stretch of Cutting and if so, whether the landscaping plan as submitted fit in with that plan. Mr. Lopez answered that the Knox-Cutting Plan has specific landscaping requirements for any lots in that area. Boardmember Whitty asked whether there was a street plan similar to that of MacDonald Avenue and Mr. Lopez answered that there was not.

Boardmember Woldemar asked Ms. Vallier in the audience if she prepared a master landscape plan for all of Cutting along the subject area and she answered that Jackie Johnson prepared this years ago. Boardmember Woldemar questioned whether any of the plan was implemented and Marsha answered that some of the plan did get implemented from the Point Richmond area to a little past the old north face. Chair Butt asked if it was the median improvement and she answered yes. Boardmember Woldemar asked who at that time was responsible for taking care of the landscaping, and she answered that it was the City.

Chair Butt, referring to the tour, stated that the fence looked nice with the barbed wire removed and he questioned the applicant about how they were addressing security concerns. Mr. Hamilton answered that his clients were not happy about the removal of the barbed wire. He stated that the 7' high trellises strung with thin wire would break if climbed and the cross pieces would not provide room to squeeze in so they actually act as a barrier with respect to climbing over. Boardmember Woldemar questioned whether they were actually removing the chain link fence and/or slats, and Mr. Hamilton answered that they were removing the barbed wire only and essentially putting a green screen with stainless steel wire in between the posts in front of the existing chain link fence with a 7.5 foot height. Chair Butt indicated that he thought it was a good alternative to barbed wire and Mr. Hamilton stated this is a high crime area at night so security is a serious concern. Chair Butt reiterated that the Board did not want to see barbed wire used and Mr. Hamilton indicated that barbed wire is all allowed on the sides and if it were used it would be hidden. He added that typical business owners do not like the look of it either.

Boardmember Woodrow, apologizing for being late, indicated that he thought that nothing should be done to their plans, and asked the Board whether design or public safety comes first. Chair Butt reiterated that he liked their design, as it moved away from the typical razor wire design.

Mr. Privat said he wanted to thoroughly answer the question regarding appeals. Design review-only applications, i.e.; ones that do not require a CUP through the Planning Commission, are appealable to the City Council. If a CUP is required, the appeal is to the Planning Commission as part of that process because it is more of a recommendation.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Butt) to approve PLN11-036 with the four staff findings for exceptions to the landscaping requirements, the four staff recommended design review findings, the 13 staff recommended conditions for approval, and a 14th condition of approval that all street facing signage shall be removed and any new signage shall return to staff for review and approval; unanimously approved.

5. PLN10-179 CHEVRON STORAGE TANKS REPLACEMENT

Description	REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW APPROVAL OF A REVISED LANDSCAPING PLAN FOR PREVIOUSLY APPROVED STORAGE TANKS REPLACEMENT PROJECT.
Location	841 CHEVRON WAY
APNs	561-040-016; 561-100-003, -001, -003, -008, -009, -010, -011, -012, -013, -017, -020, -025, -026, -029, -034, -035, -036, -036, -037, -038, -040; 561-400-008; 561-410-002; 561-410-003
Zoning	M-2 (LIGHT INDUSTRY); M-3 (HEAVY INDUSTRY); AND CRR (COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL RECREATION) DISTRICTS

Owner CHEVRON PRODUCTS COMPANY
Applicant MARK PIERSANTE
Staff Contact LAMONT THOMPSON Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Lamont Thompson provided the staff report stating that the item was recommended to the Planning Commission for approval of the proposed tank design and the DRB recommended that the landscaping and visual concerns return back to the DRB for consideration. At the Planning Commission hearing the Planning Commission determined that they did not want the visual matters returning to the DRB, adopted a mitigating negative declaration, and approved a conditional use permit, leaving open only the landscaping. The Planning Commission was very specific as to the location of the landscaping, along Castro Street at the foot of the I-580 on/off ramp. He said the only item under the purview of the DBR is the palette of plants.

Boardmember Woldemar questioned, regarding condition B2 within the Planning Commission actions on page 4 of attachment 2, where the material was that the DRB was to approve relating to tanks #9 and #10. Mr. Thompson answered that SK-Tank-9 is the page referring to the landscaping and SK-Tank-10 is the actual palette of plant material. Boardmember Woldemar then questioned at the time the Board considered this plan, the whole Castro Street landscaping was withdrawn from their packets and now it is being put back in. Mr. Thompson answered that the staff report specifically spoke to this design and the concern from the Fire Marshall about plant landscaping and other locations, and they recommended no plantings in other areas. Boardmember Woldemar recalled that a series of landscaping was presented to the DRB around the fire water tank on the hillside. Mr. Thompson concurred and stated that the Fire Marshall did not want that design. Boardmember Woldemar said that effectively the Fire Marshall pre-empted the landscaping requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Thompson clarified that the Fire Marshall made the recommendation to staff and the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission agreed and approved the conditions as shown here. He said that basically the DRB actions are all recommendations to the Planning Commission and everything that happened was done at the Planning Commission level except for the approval of the landscape section and planting palette before them now. Boardmember Woldemar remarked that it would have been better had this been clear before reviewing the entire packet.

Boardmember Woldemar asked if the considered area was about 6,000 square feet and Mr. Thompson answered it was about 8,000 square feet. Boardmember Woldemar indicated that he had no problem with the landscape plan but felt that the path taken to get to this point was highly confusing. Mr. Thompson reiterated that in discussion he had tried to point out only the points salient to the Board. Boardmember Woldemar stated that there had been much discussion about points such as the size of plant materials around the tank, only to now find out that the Fire Marshall will not allow plants around the tank. Mr. Thompson said he should have included an email in the report and would endeavor to include everything next time.

Vice Chair Welter questioned if the "final landscaping details to be approved by the DRB" as stated in condition B2 was what was in the packet before them. It was generally concurred by all that this was the case. He pointed to a specific area and asked whether that was already landscaped and Ms. Vallier answered it was a 17,300 square foot area that was being renovated with new and replacement plants and trees. Boardmember Woldemar questioned whether the plant palette was consistent with the previous palettes that had been used and she answered yes.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Welter) to approve PLN010-179 with the four staff recommended findings and the conditions of approval; unanimously approved.

- 1. PLN11-410 BOOKER T. ANDERSON PARK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT**
- Description PRESENTATION TO RECEIVE COMMENTS FROM THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF THE EXISTING PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE BRIDGE OVER BAXTER CREEK WITH A PREFABRICATED 40 FOOT STEEL BRIDGE.
- Location 960 SOUTH 47TH STREET
- APN 509-241-003
- Zoning PARK / PLAYGROUND
- Owner CITY OF RICHMOND
- Applicant PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT-PARKS AND LANDSCAPING DIVISION
- Staff Contact KIERON SLAUGHTER Recommendation: **RECEIVE PRESENTATION AND COMMENT – NO FORMAL ACTION**

Kieron Slaughter provided the staff report stating that the Public Works Department proposes to remove an existing bridge and replace it with a prefabricated unit approximately 50 feet long and 8 feet wide. After completing a review of several bridge options and consultations with the Parks Department and the Parkview Neighborhood Council, the proposed replacement is a prefabricated unit composed of Corten steel in a pony truss format. He referred to photos from the site and indicated that the neighborhood council was involved in the design process. He concluded, stating that staff recommends the DRB accept the presentation and provide comments on the proposed project.

Chris Chamberlain, Parks and Landscaping Superintendent, said also present was Robert Stevens of BKF, a consultant which Public Works contracted with to assist with the design development for the replacement bridge. Mr. Chamberlain estimates that the bridge was initially installed in the 1960's and was slated and planned for replacement in the late 1980's, but the plans were shelved.

Mr. Stevens reiterated that the bridge is a pedestrian bridge crossing Baxter Creek at the Booker T. Anderson Park and is adjacent to the Civic Center building. The bridge is a timber bridge with wood piles of standard construction with a severely distressed railing with rotted under-supports. He indicated that working with the neighborhood councils and Parks Department, they came to the conclusion that a prefabricated steel bridge installed with a poured-in-place concrete foundation similar to other prefabricated bridges found in the community was appropriate. He referred to photos of an El Cerrito bridge and a Pleasanton Iron Horse trail bridge stating they were very similar to what they would propose. He indicated it would be a pony style truss bridge composed of Corten steel that is low maintenance and does not require painting. The community has indicated that they prefer vertical slats and a concrete deck and he presented a visual simulation of what the bridge would look like in place.

Mr. Stevens said they met with the Department of Fish and Game and the Regional Water Quality Control Board about how the bridge would be sat and configured, as well as how the existing riprap installed under the current bridge would be removed and set in a way so work does not occur in the creek zone. As the riprap is removed from the creek they would rebuild the slope in place, place a biodegradable fabric on the slope and plant the slope with native grasses to shore the slope so there would be no erosion.

Vice Chair Welter asked if the concrete would be colored. Mr. Stevens replied that it would be the standard Richmond mixed grey similar to what one would see on MacDonald Avenue. Mr. Stevens indicated that there was discussion with Fish and Game regarding their interest in having steel graded decking to allow light to penetrate, but that there were also issues with that configuration with respect to walking across the bridge and additional maintenance. Vice Chair Welter inquired about the rationale for going with vertical picket orientation, and Mr. Stevens answered that the concern with a horizontal orientation is that kids might climb it. Vice Chair Welter asked if the construction is all steel except for the deck, and Mr. Stevens confirmed that it was, with all steel being Corten except for the handrails which are standard painted steel as people do not like the feel of Corten because it oxidizes. He indicated the handrails would be painted a rust color to match the Corten. Vice Chair Welter suggested the handrails be powder coated, to last longer.

Boardmember Whitty asked to be shown exactly where the bridge was on a map and Mr. Stevens pointed it out stating that it was near the Community Center.

Boardmember Woldemar stated that it was a nice park and asked if the restrooms had been fixed. Mr. Chamberlain answered no, but they were slated for replacement but the funds were shifted when the Martin Luther King project came along, but that they would continue to work towards replacement. He feels that the restrooms at the park are critical because of the use of the athletic fields. He said the bridge was very active with after school community programs and is a thoroughfare from the Community Center parking lot to the softball field and playground.

Boardmember Whitty asked about signage requesting it be summarized, small and attractive. Mr. Chamberlain agreed and thought it would be good to do some sort of general sign master plan for the parks. He stated that a lot of the "Keep Out" signs resulted from some work done within the banks of the creek that ruffled feathers at the Water Quality Control Board. They have been working closely with them on mitigation resulting in temporary orange snow fencing up along the banks. He also stated that the Regional Water Quality Control Board did not want any access into the creek and wanted permanent fencing placed; however, he would like to not have permanent fencing as the creek has educational value as well. Boardmember Whitty stated that there are creek-keeper groups that continually restore creeks.

Boardmember Woldemar commented that El Cerrito has done an excellent job restoring Baxter Creek and expressed concern regarding the protection of the creek and the landscaping on both ends, stating that he would be interested in precisely what was going to be done and to what extent. He also noted that while he liked Corten steel, it does rust and the concrete that it is being set into will get streaked. He recommended the use of colored concrete to help make it more compatible. Boardmember Woldemar also noted that there was significant park lighting and felt that on either end of the bridge there should be pedestrian scale lighting and a light under the bridge that shined down onto the creek to add visual interest. He stated that he concurred with Boardmember Whitty regarding the signage configuration and overall park signage streamlining. He mentioned that Ms. Vallier had done work several years ago with City gateways, trying to coordinate a signage program.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the Planning Department they had just interviewed consultants as they were moving forward with an urban greening master program, hoping to standardize plants palettes and tree inventory. Boardmember Woldemar responded that this ties into the DRB requesting changes in the ordinance to tie things together better in terms of specific requirements for different kinds of projects.

Boardmember Whitty asked if they were going to come back with plans. Mr. Chamberlain responded that as part of this project they have to make a submittal to Fish and Game stating how the work is going to actually be performed. The areas on the approaches will have very limited disturbances and will specifically delineate how the work will be performed by the contractor. The work will be within the footprint of the existing asphalt so the surrounding landscape will not be affected. He said they need to take into account that on the down slopes, the removal of the existing riprap, although minor construction, the seed mix will be dictated by Fish and Game and will be something compatible with the creek environment. He said no actual plants will be planted, but they will use a hydro seed mix.

Chair Butt referring to existing photos, asked where it looks like there is existing concrete mixed in with the riprap, and whether this would all come out as part of this project. He also liked the idea of integrating lighting into the project as it would provide visual interest and safety. Chair Butt referring to the simulation and elevation and questioned which was accurate with respect to the thickness of the steel, the 1.5-2 inches on the elevation or closer to 4-6 inches thick on the simulation. Mr. Stevens answered the main suspension trusses will be about 4-5 inches in size and the individual slats will be closer to one inch. Chair Butt reminded him of the toe kick requirement and also questioned the perspective of the simulation, that it seemed like it was perched oddly. Mr. Stevens then referred to a different simulation that had a better perspective.

Chair Butt questioned what the clean up procedure was for Corten if graffiti was sprayed on it and Mr. Stevens answered that the surface is buffed with a wheel, providing for reoxidation or self-healing. Mr. Stevens also noted that a properly designed Corten bridge should not leak rust onto the cement. Chair Butt questioned what the cost of Corten was over regular steel and Mr. Stevens indicated that although there was an initial premium cost, the amortized cost over time was lower. Chair Butt stated that he also liked the idea of a colored concrete, perhaps a reddish color and asked Mr. Chamberlain if that was doable. Mr. Chamberlain answered that yes it was, although visually a color variation might be better. Boardmember Woldemar said he was thinking about the foundations and footings with respect to the colored concrete. Chair Butt asked if the rest of the path was AC and Mr. Stevens answered that the approach paths were asphalt, the deck concrete, and in theory the concrete abutments that this sits on should be mostly covered by earth and vegetation. Boardmember Woldemar stated that there was a headwall with piers and questioned how it looks from the side. There was general consensus that a color such as a light tan and not a grey would complement the Corten.

Boardmember Woodrow stated that he has seen a Corten building, specifically the steel company that holds patents on the Corten. They built their home offices forty years ago, sixty stories high out of Corten with large patios and no rust shows on the stone and concrete portions. Mr. Stevens indicated that he has experience with these bridges and projects and they have had great luck with Corten. He stated that one of his concerns was the graffiti but a buffing wheel works great to remove it.

Boardmember Woodrow asked about the stream, stating that he had a sense it was more of a dry gully. Mr. Chamberlain answered that it is a beautiful viable creek with flowing water, day lighted, with fish and a one hundred year flood level and felt it is a beautiful resource.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned how the prefabbed bridge was going to come in, whether it would be in sections and welded on site or whether it would come in one piece. Mr. Stevens answered that it would probably come in sections with the trusses all prefabricated and assembled on site. He stated that it is manufactured on the east coast or the mid west depending on the vendor. Boardmember Woodrow asked whether it came with the deck in place or whether it was to be poured here and Mr. Stevens answered that it is a metal pan and

would be poured here. Boardmember Woodrow also wondered why the drawings did not show something akin to fans on the sides so the bridge is extended about thirty degrees to draw people into the bridge. Mr. Stevens equated that to an approach wing wall and stated that the picture with the signs shows that the AC approach to the bridge has that same shape and felt that it served the same purpose without having problems with Fish and Game. He also stated that changing the cross section of the bridge would greatly impact the cost and put it out of budget.

The Board indicated it was a really nice bridge and Mr. Chamberlain thanked them and stated he looked forward to working with them in the upcoming years.

BOARD BUSINESS:

Board member reports, requests, or announcements

Boardmember Woldemar stated that last night he was invited to attend a Historic Preservation Advisory Commission meeting. He said there is a current discussion regarding changing the ordinance that relates to them, specifically changing the requirement that they recommend to the DRB, and the DRB makes the approvals of buildings and revisions. The discussion ranges from minor exceptions to full blown buildings. Boardmember Woldemar was asked to convey to the Board that they would like two DRB members to volunteer on a subcommittee with three of their members and staff to work through the discussion of that ordinance change. He felt that one of the most important things that came out of the discussion was that there are a lot of Richmond structures that are over 50 years old. He said they are looking at creating a shopping list of potentially historic buildings.

Chair Butt questioned whether there was a comprehensive survey. Vice Chair Welter answered that it was Project PRISM revolving around Nystrom Village and the Iron Triangle. Boardmember Woldemar cited an example of a church up the street, and questioned how a major addition or a building that burned down would be addressed. Issues such as these would be dealt with by this committee.

Boardmember Woldemar and Vice Chair Welter volunteered their interest in representing the DRB on this committee.

Boardmember Woldemar again questioned whether the retreat with members of the DRB and the Planning Commission would be scheduled and suggested that members from the Historic Preservation and the Art committees join in as well because they all share a lot of common things.

Boardmember Woldemar requested that staff change ordinances on what they have been talking about ahead of the rewriting of the Zoning Ordinance. He does not like the idea of the DRB being able to grant variances and feels it directly falls under the purview of elected officials and Planning Commissions and City Councils.

Vice Chair Welter indicated that his wife was interviewed for the vacant position. She was the only one that applied and that the next City Council meeting is not until next month. He also mentioned that her civil engineering company has attended all of the Lawrence Berkley meetings around the various cities and by far, Richmond's was the best, not only in the presentation but in the community backing and involvement.

Boardmember Woodrow reported that at the end of June, Dean O'Hare asked him to come over to Chevron's offices to hear some of the engineers tell why they needed the fire tank to be placed where it was. He went to the meeting and there were six engineers and firemen. He made the same arguments he made in the DRB meeting, to no avail. He said it was apparent that none of them had looked at the tank site from the bridge where the tank site stands out like a sore thumb. They all claimed it could not be seen from the road. Boardmember Woodrow said it cannot be seen from their pier base but it can be seen from the pier end. Once on the bridge you can see it the entire way. He asked them if they wanted the public to think that they were starting to encroach on land that they had given up. He indicated that nothing came from the meeting and he thought that it might have been a waste of time, but he urged them to get in their cars and drive over the bridge and look back.

Chair Butt confirmed that the DRB input to that project is done and wondered why the DRB did not have any official review. Mr. Thompson answered that the Planning Commission approved a project that was based on a certified EIR premised on that project so the project could not be changed without revisiting the environmental document. Chair Butt questioned that if it was another building such as a casino, that aside from the Indian aspect, wouldn't the DRB have design review even with an EIR? Mr. Thompson answered that he thought that the outcome was sensitive to this particular type of project. Some of the environmental concerns were premised on the actual tanks and where they were located. Chair Butt stated he knows the Fire Marshall nixed the landscape, but wondered what happened to the issue with the color of the top of the tanks. Mr. Privat answered that the DRB is only making a recommendation to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission can either accept or reject the recommendation. In this case, the applicant argued that any color other than white would affect the temperature inside the tank and cause more VOC emissions. White would produce less VOC emissions, the best for the environmental document, and as such created the mitigation. If the color was changed, the mitigation was changed. They also noted that as the tanks age and get dirty, the temperature rises and the mitigation becomes more important.

Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Mr. Slaughter announced that the Planning and Building Department has been working to accumulate an inventory of potential soft-story buildings, a project he has been working on for the past year. They have acquired a book with a photo of every potential building, the age of the building, the building description and number of units, and the owner. The next step is an August 31 Earthquake, Hazard, and Soft Story Workshop in City Council Chambers from 3:00pm-4:30pm and the DRB is invited to attend. The building owners are invited to hear resources from structural engineers regarding retrofitting for seismic safety. He said that about 12% to 15% of the multi-unit structures are potentially soft-story. There is not a current soft-story ordinance and this is all voluntary to inform homeowners and property owners of the resources available for seismic retrofitting.

Boardmember Woldemar stated that in the basement of the old building there were racks and racks of old plans that the City was mandated to maintain and he wondered if they had done so. Mr. Slaughter answered that they had microfiched what they could but did not think there was a specific requirement to do so. Boardmember Woldemar stated that if those records were there, it would help answer some of the soft-story questions on specific structures. Mr. Slaughter noted the permit cards had been scanned but was not sure of the status of plan sets.

Mr. Slaughter stated that there was a presentation by UC Berkeley Department of Planning and that a professor, a Ph.D student and a Master's student did a half mile radius survey of properties around El Cerrito Plaza and Del Norte BART station looking for the potential of

property owners to add second dwelling units. He stated that the presentation centered on ways in which the City could be more flexible to allow addition of second dwelling units, increase density around transit, and said they would be willing to present in front of the Board. He felt that their study needed a little more refinement but wondered whether the Board would be interested. He indicated that he would start by forwarding the documents to the Board and they could go from there.

A questioned was raised asking if there was an estimate as to how many multi story dwellings in the City are actually soft-story dwellings. Mr. Slaughter answered that they estimated about 260 dwellings but did not know how many tenants that equated to.

Boardmember Woldemar passed around photos of art on a parking structure in Pasadena.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 7:18 p.m.