

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING
Multi-Purpose Room, Community Services Building, Basement Level
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond CA 94804**

September 25, 2019

6:00 P.M.

BOARD MEMBERS

Kimberly Butt
Michael Hannah
Jonathan Livingston

Jessica Fine
Macy Leung
Karlyn Neel

Chair Livingston called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jonathan Livingston, Vice Chair Michael Hannah, and Boardmembers Kimberly Butt*, Jessica Fine, and Karlyn Neel*
*Arrived after Roll Call

Absent: Boardmember Macy Leung

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Planners Jonelyn Whales and Hector Lopez; and City Attorney James Atencio

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 14, 2019 and August 28, 2019

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Hannah/Fine) to approve the minutes of the August 14, 2019 and August 28, 2019 meetings, as submitted; approved by voice vote: 3-0 (Ayes: Fine, Hannah, and Livingston; Noes: None; Absent: Butt, Leung, and Neel).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Public Forum

[The recording of the meeting started with public forum in process, and there was no quorum at this time.]

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, expressed concern with the Valmar Laundromat and the need for applicants to make a presentation to the applicable Neighborhood Council prior to any action taken by the DRB.

With no quorum to continue the meeting, the DRB took a recess at this time.

City Council Liaison Report

CONSENT CALENDAR:

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

Chair Livingston announced that any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, October 7, 2019 by 5:00 P.M. and he announced it after each affected item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chair Livingston identified the request to consider Item 5 first.

5. PLN17-512	NEW TWO-STORY RESIDENCE
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN OF A NEW \pm 2,000 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING.
Location	5201 VAN FLEET AVENUE
APN	510-081-022
Zoning	RM-1, MEDIUM DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	SHAIK SUBHANI
Applicant	ADNAN QADEER (DESIGNER)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: PROVIDE & RECEIVE COMMENTS

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated September 25, 2019 for a single-family dwelling to be constructed in the rear of a residential property in the South Annex neighborhood on an improved site with an existing 700 square foot structure in the front, which would become an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) while the proposed new 2,000 square foot unit would become the primary dwelling. The proposed two-story dwelling would have an attached one-car garage and an uncovered parking space along the eastern side of the property. The home would contain three bedrooms and two bathrooms on the second floor with a living area and kitchen on the ground level. Comments from the DRB were requested to allow a final design.

Mr. Lopez responded to comments and explained that two parking spaces were required and would be provided with one space in the garage and one alongside the home.

Chair Livingston expressed concern that there was insufficient space to back out of the drive aisle. He expressed concern with the harsh concrete and stucco environment.

On the question of whether the home could be moved back further on the lot to allow more space for parking, ADNAN QADEER, the applicant, confirmed the required parking and clarified that the proposed third parking space between the two homes was 18 inches greater in width than required. He added that to move the home back would jeopardize the rear yard space.

Boardmember Hannah agreed with the concern for the paved area, agreed that it would be nice to have the home pushed back five to ten feet and landscape the area, and understood the desire not to allow the parking space, although since that space was not required it would be the applicant's discretion whether or not to provide that third parking space.

Boardmember Hannah confirmed with the applicant that the current home had been completed and the new home would match the existing stucco and comp shingle roof with some new features such as the windows and entry. He referred to the six-inch cedar panel, asked why it was so limited in space, expressed concern that it would stain the stucco, and requested more information on that feature. He also referred to the stucco reveal joints and recommended a bump out belly band to break up the mass.

Boardmember Fine noted the underlying design challenge of dealing with an existing home that

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

was in the front of the property with the new home in the rear.

Boardmember Fine requested that the applicant show the outline of the new home in the background, sought consistency in the treatment of the two homes, recommended consideration of the common room/family TV room in the context of the overall layout, and recommended landscaping between the ADU and the primary residence. She also noted that the laundry room appeared to be duplicated in the main home.

Boardmember Butt requested that the finished front building (the ADU) be illustrated in relation to the new building behind. She also questioned the cedar panels on the east elevation, questioned the composition of the entry tower, and stated the proposal needed to be finessed.

Chair Livingston suggested either the elevations or the roof plan was incorrect which would affect the massing. As a result, he requested that the two be made consistent. He suggested that the front needed more work and recommended that the features be organized and simplified. He and Boardmember Hannah offered to help the applicant with some sketches.

Boardmember Hannah recommended that the applicant work up an axon view, to be submitted by email so that he and the Chair could consult to finesse the design.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 1. PLN18-358 | ISLAMIC SOCIETY MOSQUE RENOVATION AND ADDITION |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT FOR RENOVATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF A 2,500 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN EXISTING MOSQUE. |
| Location | 1110 36 TH STREET |
| APN | 526-030-012 |
| Zoning | RL-2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT |
| Applicant | DR. MOHAMMAD ANWANWZZAMAN, ISWCC (PRESIDENT) |
| Staff Contact | JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONTINUE TO OCTOBER 9, 2019 |

The application was continued to the October 9, 2019 meeting.

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| 2. PLN19-149 | NEW SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND ADU |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A \pm 1,784 SQUARE FOOT TWO-STORY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE WITH A DETACHED \pm 483 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ON A VACANT PARCEL. |
| Location | 9 TH STREET (APPROXIMATELY 50 FEET NORTHEAST FROM THE CORNER OF RIPLEY AVENUE AND 9 TH STREET) |
| APN | 534-181-025 AND -026 |
| Zoning | RM-1, MEDIUM DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT |
| Applicant | TIMOTHY CARTER (OWNER) |
| Staff Contact | JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated September 25, 2019, for a new 1,584 square foot two-story single-family home in the Iron Triangle neighborhood on a 5,000 square foot lot consisting of two 2,500 square foot lots currently being merged, with a proposed 560 square foot ADU in the rear. A one-car garage had been proposed with a parking space in the front of the garage to meet the two-parking space requirement for the single-family dwelling. There was no parking for the ADU. The applicant proposed landscaping in the front yard. All standards of the RM zoning district had been met and approval was recommended.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

Chair Livingston opened the public hearing.

TIMOTHY CARTER, the Owner, explained that he had outsourced the design of the proposal to Kodiak Steel Homes, which would do everything but the foundation, interior, roof, and landscaping, some of which he would do on his own. The building would be vinyl sided with stone in the front.

Chair Livingston questioned why there was two feet in between floors and Ms. Whales explained that she had been told by Kodiak Steel Homes that the space was needed because of the steel construction.

Ms. Whales clarified at this point that an incorrect iteration of the plans had been provided to the Board. The latest iteration was presented.

Chair Livingston clarified that the building would have to be moved back so that the front porch would not be within the 20-foot front setback.

On the review of the latest iteration, Boardmember Fine recommended more screening between the two homes for privacy purposes. She characterized the design as uninspired, liked the play of the two materials, questioned the height as awkward, and noted there was no precedent for the proposal in the neighborhood. She urged some play with different materials, potentially with the first floor in one material and the second floor in another. She also expressed concern with the proposed colors.

Boardmember Butt commented that the locale of the material change was odd, she recommended wood siding and suggested the stone was not appropriate, supported a belly band, and agreed with the need to add detail and avoid a cookie cutter appearance.

Boardmember Hannah noted that buildings were needed in the neighborhood and with one next door very similar but turned on its side, he suggested it was fine. He recommended the elimination of the stone, something better than the basic vinyl, a belly band, the centering of some of the windows, and reconsideration of the front.

Boardmember Neel suggested that pieces of wood or cable over the garage would add some architectural interest. She offered to sketch her suggestion.

Chair Livingston summarized the Board's recommendations to:

- Drop the height;
- Show a porch behind the front setback;
- Reconsider colors that were too white and "beigey;"
- Integrate porch details with four columns, two on the outside and two half columns against the pilasters;
- Delete the stone;
- Add a belly band to reduce mass and bulk;
- Center windows where appropriate;
- Consider trellis detail over the garage;
- Consider alternate siding to vinyl (Niche is a better quality, Hardy is also appropriate); and
- Consider a composition roof more speckled than straight black.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

ACTION: It was M/S/C (Livingston/Fine) to continue PLN19-149, New Single-Family Residence and ADU, to the October 9, 2019 meeting subject to the recommendations shown; approved by voice vote: 5-0 (Ayes: Butt, Fine, Hannah, Livingston, and Neel; Noes: None; Absent: Leung).

3. PLN18-219	JERUM TWO-STORY DWELLING
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN OF A NEW $\pm 2,666$ SQUARE FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING LOCATED WITHIN THE TISCORNIA ESTATE SPECIFIC PLAN AREA.
Location	523 SANTA FE AVENUE
APN	558-184-005
Zoning	TISCORNIA ESTATE SPECIFIC PLAN
Owner	FIRST GROUP INVESTMENTS LLC
Applicant	BRAD GUNKEL
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: PROVIDE & RECEIVE COMMENTS

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated September 25, 2019 for a study session. She clarified that given the downslope lot, there would be no cutting into the hillside.

GREG and JENNIFER JERUM, the applicants, explained that they had worked closely with the architect and had worked with the neighbors.

BRAD GUNKEL, the Architect, stated that the design of the home had evolved over time and was in character with the applicants' desires. He reiterated that he had worked closely on the design with the applicant, staff, the neighbors, and the Engineering and Fire Departments regarding access off of Bishop Avenue. The design complied with elements of the Tiscornia Estate Specific Plan for a downslope lot, which was dictated by the height of the adjacent road and followed the slope down with no portion of the home over 30 feet above the natural grade. The home had been terraced and had been broken up to sit within the landscaping. The garage was a separate building from the primary structure with a bridge. Flat roofs were being used to create as small a profile as possible using natural woods and stucco. The design was different from the adjacent home design although it was in harmony with the adjacent home. When asked, he clarified the differences between the two homes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

DEL OLSEN, 301 Pacific, Richmond, commended the presentation but questioned whether the proposed massing of the home conformed to the suggested profile as shown on the diagrams in the Specific Plan where homes were to be stepped down the hill parallel to the slope. He stated the home was lovely, took advantage of the views, and otherwise appeared to meet the requirements of the Tiscornia Specific Plan.

RODRICK IVERSON SATRE, 530 Santa Fe Avenue, Richmond, the owner of a property across the street, noted that the elevations had not been shown where the building intersected grade, which he wanted to see in the drawings. He expressed concern with fire access given his understanding that the width of the road in front of the proposed home did not meet fire access requirements. He also noted that non-combustible siding had been proposed in the area given the high fire hazard.

Boardmember Hannah referred to the building height and the definition of height in the Tiscornia Specific Plan and explained that the Plan called for rooflines following the natural slope. He suggested the sheer wall factor could be mitigated by surrounding the whole thing with planters,

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

terracing, and diffusing the entire building where much of the bottom was exposed. He asked if there was a problem with the roof height and suggested the problem could be mitigated from below.

BONNIE SATRE DALEY, 530 Santa Fe Avenue, Richmond, asked about the discussions with the Fire Department and noted that the neighbors had never been notified of any meetings.

Mr. Jerum explained that the fire turnaround discussion related to Bishop Avenue and was not related to an earlier discussion of a fire turnaround for another project. He noted there had been an informal meeting at the planning desk with the Fire Chief who had reviewed the plans.

Boardmember Hannah verified that final approval would be required and any concerns would have to be addressed.

Mr. Gunkel commented that he liked the idea of terraced planters.

Chair Livingston emphasized the importance of and conformance to the Tiscornia Specific Plan that, among other things, required that all structures will be designed to be harmonious with the local setting and the neighborhood development; all buildings will be adapted to the site's hilly terrain; the structures will be designed to conform to the natural topography rather than altering the topography to accommodate the structure; all grading will be kept to a minimum, among other objectives, particularly since the proposal was in the most visible area of Tiscornia. Color was also an important objective that had to be considered.

Boardmember Neel stated overall the architectural style fit in very well to the area although her biggest concern was the large decks and ship shapes that came out away from the hill. She liked the color palette and suggested that the wood would be a maintenance nightmare.

Boardmember Butt wanted to know what the home would look like from the street below and suggested not much would be seen from above. She requested a rendering to identify that perspective.

Boardmember Fine appreciated the comprehensive package, commented that there appeared to be a lot of dead trees on the site, and asked about the strategy in that case.

Mr. Gunkel stated that a majority of the trees on the site were either dead or very sick and many neighbors had lobbied the owners to remove all the trees on the site given fire concerns and the views. He stated that landscaping needed to remain below the 30-foot line and no trees that might exceed that height had been proposed.

Boardmember Hannah explained in response to Boardmember Fine's recommendation for non-combustible materials that Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) was a way to create non-combustible materials for buildings such as what had been proposed. He did not recommend using strictly most natural wood given the maintenance required in the area, although he suggested that clear heart cedar from certain lumberyards was fire rated and classed as non-combustible. He recommended looking at non-combustible resin panels, and suggested the proposal was more in line with non-combustible materials than the other homes around it. He requested realistic grade sections and how the building would meet the ground. He disagreed that the building, as proposed, would be terraced and suggested the issue was the exposure of the three stories and the form that appeared to be contrary to the spirit of the Tiscornia Specific Plan. He commented that there was a solution to those concerns and suggested the whole

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

one-story of the home would have to be landscape treated.

Chair Livingston suggested a simple solution would be to take off the top room which was the workout room, and place it below, which would eliminate the mass and step it down the hill.

Mr. Jerum explained that had been considered but the space had specifically been designed given the unobstructed view of the Bay, was a very important room to he and his wife, and would be where he would spend most of his time. He would consider some of the terracing suggestions

Chair Livingston suggested the architect could solve the issue and address the large vertical inverted mass which he suggested the Specific Plan opposed. He offered some methods to mitigate that element. He also explained that the Specific Plan wanted more muted colors and requested that the color palette be revised to mute the proposed white. He referred to the south elevation off the kitchen and suggested the façade could be improved at that location, and requested a complete landscape plan for the whole site, particularly since the trees would be removed.

Mr. Gunkel stated that a materials board would be returned with revised plans. He also noted the intention to keep the site wild although he acknowledged the issue of fire concern and fire resistant planting.

Chair Livingston added that certain things would have to be irrigated. He liked the home and requested that the massing on the one elevation be reduced.

Boardmember Hannah sketched an Exhibit A to address that elevation.

Chair Livingston questioned how a car could back out of the driveway, suggested there was room for a hammerhead, and commented that the boundary of the influence of the Tiscornia Specific Plan was not the road but an easement where the driveway would be placed. As a result, he suggested the Specific Plan would not be relevant to the driveway and recommended where more space could be created with a battered retaining wall to allow an easier exit from the driveway.

The Board's comments and suggestions were presented to staff.

4. PLN19-198	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE (UPS) EXPANSION
Description	STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED DESIGN OF A NEW 350,000 SQUARE FOOT LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING AND ASSOCIATED PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS.
Location	1601 ATLAS ROAD
APN	405-270-011
Zoning	IL, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
GP	INDUSTRIAL
Applicant	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE (UPS) (OWNER)
Staff Contact	JONELYN WHALES Recommendation: PROVIDE & RECEIVE COMMENTS

Jonelyn Whales presented the staff report dated September 25, 2019 for a project that included a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) that would be submitted at a later date.

The unidentified Architect from Ware Malcomb identified the existing industrial building on the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

63-acre site with 168,000 square feet that used both feeders, package cars, and rail operations to move and sort packages. The project consisted of a new 349,000 square foot expansion of the building and a reconfiguration of the existing site functions to maximize the efficiency for UPS by minimizing the number of locations for sorting. The new building would add more sorting capacity and add jobs to the City while securing current jobs. She identified the existing site, noted that the majority of the site was already paved and used for feeder cars, and all functions would be reorganized as part of the project.

The Architect explained that the site also included an existing auto shop for repair of package vehicles, car wash, fuel station, employee parking, and customer counter. She identified the uses surrounding the site, stated that the landscape buffers would remain, and the site was recessed 12 to 15 feet from the Atlas Road height which helped to screen the site. Some of the landscaped areas would be enhanced to further maximize the efficiency of the buffer. She identified the proposed improvements to the site, the preservation of the rail operation on the north, and stated there would be little change in volume and the primary shifts of deliveries would be during off-peak hours. The employee parking would be brought up to current standards given the expansion and trees for shading would be provided to meet zoning requirements; 308 stalls would be required and 390 stalls would be provided. The new building design would be consistent in the beige and brown two-tone color scheme with consistent materials. The new building would be tilt-up metal panels with stained concrete to match the existing colors. A photometric study had been prepared for the site and the lighting would be improved to current zoning standards. New light fixtures would be upgraded to LED. She clarified, when asked, that there had been no contact with the neighbors across the street or with the adjacent elementary school which had a current 100-foot buffer, which would be maintained. She noted that the areas on the east of the site would not be expanded. The expansion would be to the west.

Ms. Whales clarified that any traffic impacts to the adjacent neighborhood would be addressed through a traffic study that had yet to be submitted. It was also clarified that the neighborhood area to the east was located in unincorporated Contra Costa County.

SANDY JACKSON, 5725 Oakmont Drive, Richmond, commented that he had just learned about the application two days ago. He pointed out the location of his home and explained that one of the biggest problems was the location of one of the entryways close to the residential area where employees parked 24 hours a day, changed clothes, played loud music, ate, and tossed debris in the area. He requested that the entrance be moved to the industrial parkway where there were no homes so that employees would tend not to park near and in his community. He noted that the community had a Homeowners Association (HOA) which had complained to the UPS Administrator, although nothing had changed. He added that Richmond Police did not patrol the site.

In response to Mr. Jackson, the Architect confirmed that the new building would be higher than the existing building since it would have to accommodate a conveyor system and would be in the 40-foot height range.

Mr. Jackson explained that the height of the new structure would block views of the Bay. He expressed concern with the addition of 84 new bays as part of the expansion and stated the number of trucks would impact the residential neighborhood, particularly since trucks lined up along Atlas Road, and many family members of the truckers met those trucks when they finished their run. Many trucks parked along Atlas Road and some drivers slept in their trucks. He reiterated the need to move the entryway to lessen the impacts on the residential community, and noted that if the entryway was retained at its current location, UPS security would have to patrol Atlas Road and patrol the parking lot. He pointed out the location of the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

guard station in that area. He also referred to the significant wildlife in the area.

Boardmember Hannah suggested that UPS would need to do some outreach to address the reported concerns.

Chair Livingston advised that there would be public hearings as part of the MND, stated the issues would be addressed in that document, and urged Mr. Jackson and his community to identify their concerns at the public hearings.

Mr. Jackson also referred to soot from the site and asked what would be done to address that issue as part of the expansion. He commented that while he did not mind the additional lights that had been proposed, he urged that the lighting be redirected from the residential neighborhood.

The Architect commented that the soot from the site would be investigated from the environmental report, the 100-foot buffer on the easternmost portion of the site adjacent to the residential neighborhoods was intended to mitigate impacts to that neighborhood, and there was no current proposal to expand or increase the operations on that portion of the site. With respect to the employee path, she pointed out one of the guard stations that would be moved to the new employee parking lot when employees would enter the building through the building expansion, which would help to reduce noise. She also commented on what was expected to be done to the buffer area.

The Architect stated that UPS had provided vehicle counts that would be part of the environmental report for actual impacts, and reiterated that while the building size would triple, the number of trucks would not given that the expansion related to sorting only. In response to comments, she explained that landscaping immediately adjacent to the dock doors was routinely damaged and destroyed by trucks and as a result the landscaping had been pulled back from the loading doors and had been shifted around the perimeter to benefit the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Boardmember Fine sought something along the façade to soften it and suggested the opportunity to create some visual interest to the building should be considered.

Chair Livingston requested a larger scale elevation, a blow-up of the lighting plan.

Boardmember Hannah wanted to see a site elevation that identified the whole site. He commented that the facility was causing a lot of pain to the community and wanted UPS to genuinely show that it cared for the adjacent neighborhoods and wanted to see the issues that impacted the community be addressed. He stated the buildings were ubiquitous, which was why they were located where they were, but emphasized that the company would need to address the issues that severely impacted the adjacent neighborhoods since there had been no effort to engage the HOA.

Boardmember Fine referred to the wetlands to the south, asked about a bio study and was advised that the MND would address that area. She also requested exhibits on the buffer façade and sought landscaping around the perimeter of the building.

Boardmember Neel wanted to see UPS get more involved in giving back to the community. She suggested the building was too bright in addition to the lighting, suggested the design could be improved, did not hear anything about green building elements, and suggested people were parking outside given the closeness to the guard station but suggested that the problem would persist even with the relocation of that station. She recommended the use of shuttles to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON OCTOBER 23, 2019

address some of those concerns given the expected increase in employees. She also urged that loud activities be moved away from the school and toward the rail area. She supported an additional entrance and verified that the expansion would include public art given its size.

Boardmember Butt suggested the site was an opportunity for UPS to determine how it could function better and function better with the adjacent neighborhood. She recommended that the entrance near the neighborhood be eliminated to make the site work better and allow UPS to be a better neighbor. She also acknowledged that the color was very bright and that lighting would be an issue. She also requested that the buffer zones be better addressed.

Chair Livingston encouraged the architect to make an effort to drop the light standards from 36 feet to 15 feet, with the light color at 3,000 or below and with shrouds on all the LED lights to direct the light downward and keep them as low as possible. He also suggested that the massing could be changed by paint value. With respect to parking, he suggested the proposal did not comply with the City's requirements for tree shading and urged compliance with the ordinance. As to truck parking, he recommended a cluster of trees every 10 trucks or so to avoid a mass of asphalt. He also requested that the roof top equipment and screening be identified.

Boardmember Hannah urged the applicant, as he had urged other applicants, to find no-cost ways to make tilt-up buildings more community friendly.

The Architect referred to the color and asked if the beige tone on the building was considered to be too white or if it would be acceptable to play with the beige tone.

The Board suggested that the beige was too light and suggested the building should be taken towards the earth tones. The Board also wanted the issue of the buffer zone to be addressed in the MND with respect to the landscape.

Mr. Jackson was asked to provide pictures from the upper stories of some of the homes to document the views.

Board Business

A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements:

Ms. Whales noted that the 70,000 square foot building at the end of Atlas Road and Giant now had a buyer for the whole building.

B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements:

Chair Livingston updated the status of ongoing DRB activities.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 P.M. to the next regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, October 9, 2019.