

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024**

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

July 10, 2024  
6:00 P.M.

**BOARD MEMBERS**

Bahar Biazar  
Ben Kellman  
Vita Rey

Kimberly Butt  
Karlyn Neel  
Brian Carter, Chair

Chair Brian Carter called the regular meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Brian Carter, and Boardmembers Bahar Biazar, Kimberly Butt, Ben Kellman, Karlyn Neel and Vita Rey

**Absent:** None

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Hector Lopez introduced the three new members of the DRB: Bahar Biazar, Ben Kellman, and Karlyn Neel

**Staff Present:** Planners Hector Lopez, Rae Alberts, Pete Srivarom, Kristi Ellerbroek and Christopher Dykzeul from the City Attorney's Office.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** May 8, 2024

<b>ACTION:</b> It was M/S/C (Butt/Carter) to approve the minutes of the May 8, 2024 meeting, as submitted; approved by a voice vote: 3-3 (Ayes: Butt, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: Biazar, Kellman, and Neel; Absent: None.)
--

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** None

**MEETING PROCEDURES:** None

**PUBLIC FORUM**

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT:** None

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

<b>1.CC</b>	<b>PLN24-146</b>	<b>JOHNS ADDITION</b>
	Description	REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONVERT AN EXISTING SECOND-STORY DECK INTO LIVING SPACE.
	Location	2116 SAN MATEO STREET
	APN	507-160-002

**MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024**

Zoning RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT  
Owner SARA JOHNS  
Applicant AMBER EVANS  
Staff Contact PETE SRIVAROM Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Rey) to approve PLN24-146, Johns Addition, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended nine Conditions of Approval; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Biazar, Butt, Kellman, Neel, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

**2.CC PLN24-134 HERRERA ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**  
Description REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 512-SQUARE FOOT DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE IN THE REAR YARD OF AN EXISTING RESIDENTIAL LOT.  
Location 21 SNOWDRIFT COURT  
APN 433-362-013  
Zoning RH, SINGLE-FAMILY HILLSIDE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT  
Owner DANIEL HERRERA  
Applicant SCOTT GROSCHEL  
Staff Contact KRISTI ELLERBROEK Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Butt/Rey) to approve PLN24-134, Herrera Accessory Structure, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended 11 Conditions of Approval; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Biazar, Butt, Kellman, Neel, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

**APPEAL DATE**

The appeal date for actions taken by the Board at this meeting will be no later than 5:00 P.M. on Monday, July 22, 2024.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**3. PLN24-181 LI TWO-STORY DECK ADDITION**  
Description REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A TWO-STORY DECK IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING RESIDENCE.  
Location 5335 ZARA AVENUE  
APN 519-240-016  
Zoning RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL  
Owner JUNMING LI  
Applicant TRACIE CANNONE.  
Staff Contact PETE SRIVAROM Recommendation: **CONTINUE TO JULY 24, 2024**

Staff recommended that the item be continued to the meeting of July 24, 2024.

**4. PLN22-134 TORRES RESIDENTIAL ADDITION**  
Description STUDY SESSION TO PROVIDE AND RECEIVE COMMENTS ON THE DESIGN OF A ±1,544 SQUARE-FOOT SECOND-STORY ADDITION TO AN EXISTING DWELLING. THE PROJECT ALSO INCLUDES A ±500 SQUARE-FOOT ADDITION AT THE LOWER FLOOR, NEW BALCONY AND PORCH GREATER THAN 4 FEET IN HEIGHT.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024

Location	3317 BRENTWOOD AVENUE	
APN	431-213-005	
Zoning	RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT	
Owner	CARLOS TORRES AND CHRISTINA VELASQUEZ	
Applicant	CHRISTINA VELASQUEZ	
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ	Recommendation: <b>PROVIDE COMMENTS</b>

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated July 10, 2024, for a study session on the 9,000 square-foot cross-sloped parcel at 3317 Brentwood Drive located in the May Valley neighborhood. The parcel contained a single-family dwelling and a two-car garage that had been constructed in 1959, comprising three bedrooms and two bathrooms for a total floor area of 1,544 square feet. The project involved a second floor, a portion of which would be at a higher level with the garage down below; three stories along one side and two-stories along the right side of the structure in a neighborhood of single-family homes built around the same time. The project would also include an addition to the ground floor for a new bathroom and playroom and the main level would be reconfigured for a new living room, kitchen, and a new half bathroom. The proposed second-story would include three new bedrooms and three new bathrooms. A new porch and stairs had been proposed for the new front entryway to the home. A new covered patio would abut the east side of the dwelling.

Mr. Lopez stated the neighborhood included a variety of roof forms with similar pitches, with small porches and dominant garages facing the front. The prevalent pattern of building design was also fairly uniform.

Mr. Lopez sought comments from the DRB given that the project would deviate from the prevalent context of the neighborhood. He noted that comments with the property owner had indicated the proposal was consistent with a compatible structure at 5009 Sweetwood Drive.

CHRISTINA VELASQUEZ, the applicant/owner, stated the home was essentially two-story and most of the portion of the basement was a crawl space and was unused and she wanted to convert it to a more usable space. She expressed the desire to expand the home given that it was too small with little room for parents and guests. She explained that her father was wheelchair-bound and an easy access lower floor would be needed for him. The desire was to move up to create more space given that all rooms in the home were small.

Mr. Lopez noted a concern with a lack of comments from the neighbors and stated that no comments had been submitted to date.

Ms. Velasquez commented that when the application had been submitted there had been a different neighbor.

In response to Boardmember Kellman, Mr. Lopez confirmed that the proposal for the structure in the rear would have to be decreased in size to meet the floor area requirements. As to the height, the addition was 29 feet 11 inches while the maximum height allowed was 30 feet. The building also represented the total square footage allowed on the property. The reduction of square footage would have to be on the ground floor to address lot coverage requirements.

Boardmember Kellman commented that the proposal, at least in the photos provided, seemed to be out of character with the other homes in the neighborhood, and he wanted to know if there was a way to differentiate the upper floor from the existing home, and while he suggested the proposal represented a cost-effective design, he suggested it would be nice to soften the look by setting back one or two elevations from the existing perimeter, which might also address the

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024**

overage in square footage.

Chair Carter noted that stepping back floors two and three a couple of feet could add some relief to the space between the existing homes.

Boardmember Neel referenced the exhibit of four homes shown in the staff report where stylistically the first floor with the garage always had a separate color than the top floor, so instead of making floor one and floor two the same, she suggested making floors two and three the same to be more harmonious with the neighborhood. She advised bringing the color down versus up.

Chair Carter agreed with respect to bringing the colors down.

Ms. Velasquez commented that they were open to keeping the front the same as the rest of the neighborhood to be more compatible with the neighborhood.

Chair Carter noted the rooflines also fit within the context as did the ways the windows had been trimmed. He agreed with the need to stick within the context of the neighborhood but commented that the style was already there and making the proportions true to the subject home would be more honest.

Boardmember Butt asked why the applicant was going through the exercise of moving the window to the center over the garage given that might be structurally expensive and difficult to do.

Ms. Velasquez stated the architect could explain that better than she could but it had to do with breaking up the mass.

Boardmember Butt recommended looking at the neighborhood examples since those windows had been pushed off center over to the edge and she would retain that theme. She would keep that window where it was and allow the architect to play around with modifications. She also referred to the center stair coming out and questioned that element. She noted the columns had a little capital on them which was also in conflict with the Mid-Century style. She recommended keeping it simple with all simple posts. She also agreed that stepping back the floors could break up the mass of what would be a three-story volume.

As to the covered patio and the fact that the roof had been proposed to extend from the existing home over the patio, Ms. Velasquez described the details of that proposal.

Chair Carter commented that the proposed covered patio abutting the east side of the dwelling offered the impression of a very long home and he suggested a different style roof to cover the porch could be considered.

Boardmember Kellman referred to the example photo of another three-story home in the neighborhood that had been submitted by the applicant and commented that example did not fit at all with the representative photos of homes in the neighborhood provided by staff while the applicant's rendering did a much better job of fitting in since it was stepped in and was not one big square box. He suggested a small reduction of square footage would look nicer and be more in keeping with the neighborhood.

Boardmember Biazar suggested that connecting the covered patio to the home would make the

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024**

home seem like more of a huge mass and she recommended a way to break that ultra big semblance of a mega mansion to be able to better fit in with the harmony of the neighborhood. She verified with the applicant the type of rooms that would be located in the area and the purpose of the two sheds shown in the site plan.

The DRB discussed the roof over the patio and the issues involved and recommended a different covering that would be more of a landscape element or an accessory structure or pergola to the home itself as opposed to an expansion of the existing roof.

Ms. Velasquez expressed a willingness to remove the roof over the patio but wanted to retain the bathroom proposed in that area, particularly given the convenience to the proximity of the pool. She clarified, when asked, that the two sheds in the rear of the yard would remain.

The installation of a bathroom completely detached from the façade in the rear of the yard was suggested as a better option.

Boardmember Butt suggested that the detached roof could be brought back a bit from the front and pulling the second floor back would reduce the mass and create a better situation with an outdoor structure. She also recommended that the curved stairs in the front be straightened and come from the driveway. A meandering path up to the building was also recommended to be more readily accessible, particularly with respect to required wheelchair access along with the narrowing of the sidewalk path.

Chair Carter urged the applicant to consider the comments and return to the DRB with changes.

Prior to the staff report for the next item on the agenda, several neighbors to the prior application PLN22-134, Torres Residential Addition, explained they had been the first to arrive at the meeting and had been unaware of the process. There had also not been any information or speaker cards available to them on their arrival. They requested the ability to make their comments at this time, and members of the DRB clarified that this had been a study session and the actual hearing for the item would include another opportunity for neighbors to speak.

Chair Carter opened public comments at this time.

Daniel Guzman, 3321 Brentwood Avenue, Richmond, situated up the hill from the proposed addition, expressed concern that the proposal would completely block the west-facing window views from his home, which included views of Mt. Tamalpais.

Mr. Lopez commented that the subject structure was already a two-story structure and he suggested the view channel would remain the same.

Jill Shaughnessy, 3333 Brentwood Avenue, stated the proposal would totally change the continuity of the neighborhood and suggested the home could also block her views. She suggested that an addition out would not disturb anyone.

Daniel Clock, 3329 Brentwood Avenue, stated the mass and the extension would be an obstruction to them. He noted that he and his wife lived with a disabled relative and understood the need to create more space. They supported the applicant either going back or moving into the crawl space. He objected to the obstruction of views, the disruption to the aesthetic of the street and the environmental impact with more structures in the subject area.

James and Patty Fisher, 3328 Clearfield Avenue, who lived directly behind the subject structure, stated the neighborhood was comprised of essentially one-story homes, and the ways the

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024

homes had been staggered going up the hill allowed every home its own view. He objected to the size of the proposal and the impacts to existing views.

Chair Carter described the process where the application would return at some future date at which time public comment would again be allowed prior to any action taken by the DRB.

Chair Carter cautioned that while the DRB was sensitive to views and the value of views to homeowners and did everything possible to work with applicants to respect neighboring views, the Richmond Municipal Code (RMC) did not include any provision to specifically protect views other than height limitations and the like.

When asked, Mr. Lopez reported that he had recommended that the applicants submit the application to the May Valley Neighborhood Council for review.

Boardmember Kellman commented that he was sympathetic to the applicant's need for space and if the proposal remained in the limits allowed, he suggested that the objecting neighbors consider some sort of compromise to submit at the next meeting for consideration.

Boardmember Rey stated the best compromises and resolutions were often reached in meetings between the applicant and the neighbors.

<b>5. PLN21-390</b>	<b>RIVAS RESIDENTIAL ADDITION</b>
Description	REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO LEGALIZE AN UNDOCUMENTED TWO-STORY ADDITION THAT WOULD INCLUDE A RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNIT AND A DECK GREATER THAN 4 FEET IN HEIGHT.
Location	600 WILLIAMS DRIVE
APN	408-053-021
Zoning	RL2, SINGLE-FAMILY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
Owner	OBDULIO RIVAS
Applicant	DARREL DEBOER (ARCHITECT)
Staff Contact	HECTOR LOPEZ
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Hector Lopez presented the staff report dated July 10, 2024, for property located at 600 Williams Drive in the Parchester Village neighborhood for a design review permit to legalize an undocumented two-story addition. A new accessory dwelling unit (ADU) had been proposed on the second floor with a deck in the rear. The ADU would include three bedrooms and two bathrooms for a total floor area of 1,198 square feet. The project would reconfigure the first floor to include three bedrooms and two bathrooms for a total floor area or 1,232 square feet. The first floor would also include a Junior ADU of approximately 386 square feet. The 5,000 square foot parcel contained an existing single-family dwelling and a converted garage.

Mr. Lopez reported that in 2020, a stop work order had been issued on this property for construction without a permit. The work included a garage conversion, roof modification, and a newly created attic.

Mr. Lopez explained that the surrounding neighborhood contained single-family residential dwellings, predominately one-story in height. There had been a lot of variation in roof form over the years and a common issue was that most homes had a very shallow roof and there had been many proposals to increase the pitch of the roof for better drainage. The architect had modified the original roof in the work that had been constructed without permit. The proposed design was characterized by an opposite gable roof on the second floor with a horizontal projection in the front façade that separated the two floor levels. A redwood trellis had been

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024**

proposed in front of the porch to enhance the front entry. Proposed exterior materials included vertical siding for the second floor and horizontal siding for the first floor. Composite shingles had been proposed for the roof, with white vinyl windows.

Mr. Lopez stated there were two-story buildings and a wide range of additions that had changed the original design of the homes in the neighborhood.

The proposal was consistent with other two-story residences and would not create significant visual impacts to the adjacent and surrounding properties.

Mr. Lopez understood that the property owner had spoken with most surrounding neighbors and a petition letter had been submitted by the applicant to identify the support from neighbors. He stated the findings for approval of design review could be met since the project would be further modified and consistent with the scale and massing of the two-story structures on other parcels.

DARREL DEBOER, the project architect, commended Mr. Lopez for the completeness of the staff report for the changes that had been adjusted to the design along with the rearrangement of the roof.

Boardmember Butt clarified that the original roof was a flat roof, which was the original style of Parchester Village, which she emphasized needed to be a designated historic site.

Mr. DeBoer commented on the historical context in that Parchester Village was the one place in the Bay Area after World War II where an African American could buy a new home. He stated he had gone around a five-block area around the subject site and had counted 32 homes that were two-story, and the proposed design had attempted to mimic the pattern in the neighborhood. As to the proposed colors, he stated the property owner had selected the colors to be consistent with those in the neighborhood. It was clarified that the proposed stain was a natural stained redwood. The body of the home had been proposed to be blue in color. The current roof shingles installed without a permit had used a combination of a couple different composition shingles.

Boardmember Butt commented that the colors were a little bright. She supported one roof color and recommended keeping the design simple.

Boardmember Rey expressed a desire to consult on the colors.

Boardmember Neel liked the door but sought some architectural interest in the front of the home.

It was clarified that the proposal would completely change the current design of the home and correct some structural issues.

Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

No written comments were submitted, or oral comments made, by any member of the public.

Mr. Lopez clarified, when asked by Boardmember Kellman, that this item had not been on the consent calendar as the first two items had been since those items were more straight-forward. He felt it prudent that the subject item be considered in a public hearing given that it was not so straight-forward.

The DRB emphasized the point of making sure that the proposed colors were appropriate.

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024

Chair Carter proposed that the colors be modified, if needed, through staff. On the discussion, Boardmember Rey wanted to retain the blue color but not too saturated, Boardmember Butt supported one shingle color; and Boardmember Kellman had no comment on the colors but noted he had been impressed with the interior and how much could be fit into the interior.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Neel) to approve PLN21-390, Rivas Residential Addition, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended 10 Conditions of Approval, along with the additional DRB conditions, as follows: 11) The blue main paint body color be reduced in saturation, with the color chip to be submitted to staff along with the redwood stain; 12) The roof shingles be a single color; and 13) Shield the trash cans with a cool trellis redwood element; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Biazar, Butt, Kellman, Neel, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

<b>6. PLN23-353</b>	<b>LUO COMMERCIAL ADDITION</b>
Description	REQUEST FOR A DESIGN REVIEW PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A ±1,079 SQUARE-FOOT ADDITION IN THE REAR OF AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING.
Location	12641 SAN PABLO AVENUE
APN	542-220-003
Zoning	T5MS-O, TRANSECT 5 MAIN STREET OPEN (FORM-BASED CODE)
Owner	SUSAN LUO
Applicant	SHANE PASCO
Staff Contact	RAE ALBERTS
	Recommendation: <b>CONDITIONAL APPROVAL</b>

Rae Alberts presented the staff report dated July 10, 2024, for a design review permit to construct a nearly 1,080 square-foot addition in the rear of an existing commercial building at 12641 San Pablo Avenue that would involve the legalization and modification of an existing 414 square foot addition for storage already constructed as well as an additional expansion of 665 square feet for storage for the retail store. She presented the site plan and identified the residential areas abutting the property at the rear, the commercial uses on the other side and primarily commercial uses along the corridor. She also identified the portion of the site that existed, the portion that needed to be legalized, and the portion representing the new addition.

Ms. Alberts stated the proposal was consistent with the Form-Based Code and the applicant intended to keep the addition relatively in line with the massing and size of the existing building. She explained that the subject building was fairly old and the Form-Based Code was significantly different from the previous requirements and was also very specific. The applicant had been flexible to work with staff to meet the requirements while minimizing the necessary changes given cost concerns. She identified the standards imposed by the Form-Based Code, particularly the architectural standards related to roof forms, windows, trim and materials as well as to exterior materials. She reported that the applicant had attempted to meet all those architectural requirements and standards.

Ms. Alberts added that staff had been concerned with some buffering with respect to the residential uses to the rear. Currently, the subject site was completely paved, although the applicant had agreed to create a landscaped area with trees to provide privacy to the rear.

Ms. Alberts stated that the proposed addition was consistent in terms of form and function with

## **MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024**

the existing commercial building, the massing was aligned with the existing building and fit well with the size and massing of surrounding properties, it met the standards in the Form-Based Code and was consistent with the character intended. The proposed landscaping in the rear provided appropriate screening for the abutting residential use and a condition of approval proposed that lighting be designed to avoid glare. She recommended approval of the application subject to the findings and conditions, as shown in the staff report.

Boardmember Kellman commented that he thought he had seen some structural sheets associated with the application. When told that was not the case, he referred to Sheet A.21 and a detail with respect to an interior gutter which he advised against. He noted that interior gutters always leaked and created problems and he proposed a leader or downspout to take the drainage to grade and then to the storm drain.

Boardmember Rey asked if the applicant was required to have trash dispensers and Ms. Alberts stated that the Form-Based Code superseded every requirement in the main zoning code and trash was not specifically included, although that could be a condition of approval.

Chair Carter verified that the proposal did not meet the criteria for a percent for art requirement.

Chair Carter opened the public hearing.

SHANE PASCO, the applicant, explained that she was trying to help the owner who had purchased the property when the illegal storage unit had already existed on the property. She stated the intent was to legalize that unit. She also explained that the building would be painted front and back using a monochrome color, similar to the current color but likely darker. With respect to exterior lighting, there would be fixtures on the side and lighting would be provided given that the area was dark. She explained that an industrial design light fixture would be used.

Chair Carter referred to the scuppers and verified that a downspout would be provided. He agreed that interior gutters could be problematic.

Boardmember Butt asked about the doors to the building and in the discussion the doors were pointed out. She verified that trees would be added to the rear of the site and the trees in the front would remain the same. She was told by the applicant that the metal wall panel would remain natural.

Chair Carter suggested that to increase the curb appeal, a slight treatment other than the green in front could be a way to modernize that area and make it more contemporary.

Boardmember Butt verified with the applicant that the storage structures in the rear would be matte finish and would not shine or glare. She also verified with the applicant that the windows would be wood trimmed, although a discussion developed on a preference for aluminum or steel-framed windows. The doors would be wood and fiberglass.

Boardmember Biazar stated that a color scheme example of colors and finishes would be helpful, and she requested renderings of facades. She noted that the subject project was very straight-forward and she had no problem with it.

Boardmember Butt asked about the gate and whether it would remain or be replaced. She was told there was no intention to replace the gate. Her concern was to ensure that the storage

## MINUTES APPROVED AT THE DRB MEETING ON AUGUST 14, 2024

units would not be shiny, that the drainage would be appropriate and what the lights would look like.

Boardmember Neel wanted more details on the lights, windows, and colors and she thanked the applicant for screening the fence in the rear to accommodate the abutting residents.

Boardmember Kellman asked where conditions of approval were applied, whether the condition would stipulate details with respect to the required landscaping, and Mr. Lopez explained that there were generally specifications for the size and sometimes the type of landscaping.

Boardmember Kellman had nothing to add to the comments already expressed.

Chair Carter closed the public hearing.

**ACTION: It was M/S/C (Carter/Butt) to approve PLN23-353, Luo Commercial Addition, subject to the four Findings and Statements of Fact with the staff recommended nine Conditions of Approval, along with the additional DRB conditions, as follows: 10) The scupper have a downspout; 11) The galvanized metal be a solid gray color that is non-reflective; 12) Wall-mounted sconces be downward facing and conform to all City regulations; and 13) Install aluminum windows; approved by a Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Biazar, Butt, Kellman, Neel, Rey and Carter; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None.)**

<b>7. PLN24-208</b>	<b>ADU GUIDEBOOK &amp; PRE-APPROVED PLANS</b>
Description	STUDY SESSION TO OBTAIN THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD'S FEEDBACK ON DRAFT DESIGNS FOR THE CITY'S UPCOMING PRE-APPROVED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) PLANS
Location	CITYWIDE
APN	NOT APPLICABLE
Zoning	NOT APPLICABLE
Owner	NOT APPLICABLE
Applicant	CITY OF RICHMOND
Staff Contact	HECTOR ROJAS
	Recommendation: <b>CONTINUE TO JULY 24, 2024</b>

Staff recommended that the item be continued to the meeting of July 24, 2024.

### Board Business

#### A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements

Chair Carter welcomed the new members and each member of the DRB introduced himself/herself and offered their background to the DRB.

#### B. Boardmember reports, requests, or announcements: None

### Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 P.M. to the regular Design Review Board meeting on Wednesday, July 24, 2024.