

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING

Richmond Room, 450 Civic Center Plaza

Richmond, CA 94804

September 8, 2025

5:30 P.M.

MINUTES

Roll Call

Chair Joann Pavlinec called the meeting to order at 5:35 P.M.

Present: Chair Joann Pavlinec, Vice Chair Caitlin Hibma; Commissioners Jerry Cole, Fatema Crane, Chad DeWitt, and Michael Hibma

Absent: None

Guests: None

Staff Lina Velasco, Community Development Director
Avery Stark, Planning Manager
Wendy Wellbrock, Senior Civil Engineer, Public Works Department
Michele Morris, Senior Planner/HPC Staff Liaison

Approval of Minutes: August 4, 2025

ACTION: It was M/S/C (C. Hibma/DeWitt) to approve the minutes of the August 4, 2025 meeting, as shown; approved by the following Roll Call vote: 5-0-1 (Ayes: Pavlinec, Cole, DeWitt, C. Hibma, M. Hibma; Noes: None; Abstain: Crane; Absent: None.
--

Approval of Agenda:

There were no changes to the agenda.

Meeting Procedures

The meeting procedures were as shown on the agenda.

Public Forum

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, congratulated Chair Pavlinec on her reappointment to the HPC. He also invited members of the HPC to the Contra Costa Mayors Conference in early December in the City of Pinole at the Senior Center, RSVP required, \$70/dinner; he had attended the Youth Council meeting to encourage the group to help fill the vacancies on the HPC and would do so again at the next meeting; he invited everyone to the Richmond weekly Rotary Club on September 12, 2025 at LaStrada, \$30/lunch; and he invited the HPC to the next Richmond weekly Rotary Club meeting on September 19, 2025.

Liaison Reports: None

Consent Calendar: None

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

Appeal Date: Any action taken at the meeting must be appealed prior to 5:00 P.M. on Thursday, September 18, 2025.

Public Hearings

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| 1. PLN25-0313 | MIRAFLORES HISTORIC STRUCTURES |
| Description | PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS RELATED TO THE REHABILITATION PLANS FOR THE OISHI RESIDENCE, POTENTIAL RESTORATION OR REHABILITATION PLANS FOR THE SAKAI RESIDENCE, AND REHABILITATION OF THE PUMP HOUSE AND WATER TANK AT THE MIRAFLORES SUSTAINABLE GREENBELT |
| Location | S 47 TH STREET, NEAR FLORIDA AVENUE |
| APN | 513-330-018 AND 513-321-012 |
| Zoning | PA, PLANNED AREA DISTRICT |
| Applicant | CITY OF RICHMOND |
| Staff Contact | LINA VELASCO |
| | Recommendation: CONDITIONAL APPROVAL |

Community Development Director Lina Velasco presented the staff report dated September 8, 2025 for the public hearing to consider a Certificate of Appropriateness related to the rehabilitation plans for the Oishi residence, potential restoration or rehabilitation plans for the Sakai residence, and rehabilitation of the pump house and water tank at the Miraflores Sustainable Greenbelt. She introduced City consultants Kimberly Butt from Treanor Architects and Marcia Vallier from CSW/ST2 and noted there had already been some prior approvals around Miraflores and some adjustments were being requested based on some of the existing conditions related to the for-sale component. She clarified that there was also potential reconstruction involved with the Sakai house given the effects of two fires when squatters had gotten into the building, and all of the structures would be relocated to the Greenbelt. Given what was happening with the for-sale subdivision, she recommended the advancement of the historic preservation to get all of the structures relocated to the Greenbelt.

Ms. Velasco reported that the former Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency had purchased the 14-acre site in June 2006. There were structures on the site associated with Japanese American flower growing nurseries and many of the families associated with those nurseries had been interned during World War II, so there were ties to national history as well as local history that made the site eligible for listing on the National Register.

Ms. Velasco explained that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) had been prepared, a Statement of Overriding Considerations had been adopted, and all of the structures had been removed. The ensemble of structures under consideration had been kept for preservation and incorporation into the project.

Ms. Velasco reported that there were three phases to the project and the first phase was a senior project that had been completed in 2018 with 80 units of affordable low-income; a for-sale project had been approved in 2018 and the property transferred to the for-sale developer that same year, although construction had not been initiated and the prior developer had since filed for bankruptcy. The property had since been acquired by the lender under foreclosure proceedings, and there was a new property owner that was working to re-entitle a for-sale residential development. Given the market, tariffs, construction costs and the like, it had been difficult and the timing of the development was unknown. Discussions were ongoing with City staff about having the new property owner donate additional land needed for the park in order to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

set the historic structures, and she reported that developer was open to the probability of that donation.

Ms. Velasco presented the site plan of the property and pointed out the projects already completed and those proposed. Phase 1 was the 80-unit low-income senior project that had been completed and occupied. Phase 2 was primarily grant funded, the daylighting of Baxter Creek and the creation of a greenbelt park where the Oishi house would be placed along with the reconstruction of a greenhouse. The greenhouses were still contained in containers and the plans for that reconstruction had yet to be developed and was anticipated in the future if the greenhouses could be reconstructed. Phase 3 was a for-sale development, 100 units of condominiums; the developer had gone bankrupt and no longer owned that site. She clarified that the City had negotiated a Development and Disposition Agreement (DDA) that was still on the property, which was the reason why the City continued to negotiate with the property owner.

Ms. Velasco explained that the Oishi house was proposed to be located within the greenbelt area and the Sakai house, pump house and water tank were to be relocated to a tot lot park area within the subdivision, to be owned by the future homeowner's association. She pointed out the interpretive signage proposed as part of the project, funded by a combination of Successor Agency funds as well as a National Park Service Japanese American Confinement Sites Grant Program. That project had been bid and was ready for construction.

Ms. Velasco presented images of the Sakai house and the Oishi house along with the water tank and the pump house. She recommended that the Historic Preservation Commission make the required Certificate of Appropriateness Findings and approve the request so that all of the structures could be relocated to the greenbelt.

Ms. Velasco responded to comments and clarified the location where the structures would be relocated and confirmed that reconstruction was likely the treatment required for the Sakai house that had been damaged by two fires. As a result, the drawings would have to be redone for the Sakai house given the damage where reconstruction as opposed to rehabilitation would likely be required, with the intent that the reconstruction would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Chair Pavlinec requested that the plans return to the HPC for review and approval if the Sakai house was to be reconstructed. She also asked about the funding for the reconstruction, and Ms. Velasco stated there might be some grant funding available and the developer was also open to contributing a component. She added that the item could return to the HPC for informational purposes.

Asked whether the reconstruction, if that were the case, would preclude plans to alter the interior configuration of that building for a community center, as proposed, it was noted that reconstruction was stricter and the building would have to be reconstructed as a residence; rehabilitation allowed a more flexible reuse.

Kimberly Butt, Treano Architects, City Consultant, confirmed that the Sakai structure was going to be a community center. She suggested the same layout could still be pursued with a reconstruction, although a change in door size or similar issues would have to be negotiated. A structural engineer had just evaluated the Sakai structure and had confirmed that a reconstruction would be required in that the building could not be saved.

Chair Pavlinec OPENED the PUBLIC HEARING

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

CORDELL HINDLER, Richmond, stated he lived adjacent to the site. He supported the proposal and he urged the HPC to accept the staff recommendation.

MARK ELLIS, Richmond, who lived across the street from the senior homes, verified with Ms. Butt that a reconstruction would involve rebuilding the building new as close to the original as possible based on historic documentation, and if anything could be saved, such as boards from the exterior, could be reused.

When asked by Mr. Ellis who owned the property, Ms. Velasco stated that the City did not own the property where the buildings were located, although there was an agreement that the property owner would pay for the relocation and all the utility connections, and the City would be responsible for the rehabilitation at its cost. As such, the City felt it had an obligation, which was why the City had hired the architect to develop the plans to do the rehab. She stated it was always intended that when transferring the property construction would happen soon after, although that had not occurred. She stated there were no separate agreements to indicate that the City owned the buildings and the situation was difficult. Both the City and the property owner were working to secure the vulnerable structures and make sure that squatters could not take over.

Mr. Ellis verified with Ms. Velasco that the properties were considered to be historically significant National Register eligible properties and part of the mitigation for demolition for the project was the preservation of the structures the City and the property owner had agreed to do.

Ms. Velasco acknowledged the concern with squatters and explained that was why the advancement of the relocation component was being pursued to rehab/rebuild the structures, and alternative fencing was being considered to better secure those structures.

Mr. Ellis asked, and was advised that the Parks Division maintained the greenbelt.

Ms. Velasco added that City staff was working with the Rotary Club for the interpretive signage, which was part of the Club's Centennial Project, and staff had met with them about adopting the park and signage, along with general caretaking. Staff would also look at partnering with others to do the same thing.

Commissioner Cole verified that the greenway was City land and the current plan was to move the structures to the greenway; completely rebuild one and move the other two to the greenway.

Ms. Velasco confirmed what was called the Richmond Greenway and pointed out its location on the map, which was separate from the Miraflores Greenbelt in relation to the structures to be moved. She reiterated that additional property would be needed from the property owner for the placement of the relocated structures. The City did not have to buy the structures.

TREVOR RICE, Richmond, asked about the previous site plan and the spatial relationships and orientations from the 1949 era that he had reviewed in comparison with the proposed new location. He asked how the new spatial relationship would be managed.

Ms. Butt explained how the relocated structures would be positioned on the greenbelt property, admittedly somewhat closer together on the City-owned sliver of property given the desire to save the buildings. She noted that the house would be oriented to how one would enter the park. While not the perfect solution, she stated it was the best solution right now.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

Chair Pavlinec wanted assurance that the reconstruction of the Sakai house would be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for reconstruction, and that the revised building drawings would be returned to the HPC for review and approval or as an informational item.

Commissioner Crane supported the Chair's recommendations and asked about the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings. He sought some HPC input on those findings.

Ms. Velasco verified that the City had used a Categorical Exemption under CEQA, and that the rehabilitation work would be in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Commissioner DeWitt supported a review and approval of the revised building drawings for the Sakai house.

A concern was expressed that the Categorical Exemption from CEQA review was for restoration and rehabilitation, although it was reconstruction that was expected to occur for the Sakai house.

Chair Pavlinec wanted to determine the character defining features of the building, and Ms. Butt explained that the character defining features of the building had been determined, although the documentation had not been included in the staff report.

Chair Pavlinec wanted to make sure that documentation was available and would be presented to the HPC as part of the review and approval of the plans, along with a complete Statement of Significance.

On the comment that some of the cost estimates for materials and other information that was in some cases years old, there was a question as to whether or not that information should be updated and submitted to the HPC. It was verified that once the project was completed, as proposed, the buildings would sit on City land and be owned by the City.

Chair Pavlinec noted that funding was difficult in historic preservation and she asked if there was a time limit on when grants could be sought or whether after a certain period of time the house could somehow be reinterpreted if the funding did not develop.

Ms. Butt commented that the City still had funding from the Redevelopment Agency for the project, although not for a reconstruction.

Ms. Velasco added the intention was that the sale proceeds from the purchase of the land would be used for the rehabilitation, and it was anticipated that would have occurred seven years ago, and the delays had incurred cost overruns, but she expected gap funding. If not able to identify grant funding, the City would be seeking capital improvement project funds. While the structures were now vacant, she stated there was some potential to generate revenue if the City leased the structure(s) to some non-profit or other option. The first step was to get the plans and permits and the Engineer's Estimate. The City wanted to advance what it could afford and right now that was the Oishi house, the pump house and the water tank while figuring out Sakai. She wanted to proceed so that costs did not continue to rise and the City would potentially lose another structure.

Ms. Butt suggested that the condition of the Sakai house could be re-analyzed with respect to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to see if there might be some option to consider other than total reconstruction. She asked if there was a way to get a line item on the location of the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

Sakai house to be able to keep the pump house and the water tank together. The concern was whether or not the Sakai house could be reconstructed.

Ms. Velasco suggested the soonest the relocation and rehab could start would be next spring, although the scope of work related to the Sakai house was unknown at this point. She stated that staff could return to the HPC before spring.

On the continued discussion of whether the fire damaged Sakai residence could be rehabilitated or whether it would require a reconstruction treatment approach instead, and how that would affect the Certificate of Appropriateness for a major alteration and conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, Chair Pavlinec referred to the proposed additional condition that the plans for the reconstruction of the Sakai house would have to return to the HPC to ensure that it met the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Ms. Butt added that the entire project had previously been approved and reviewed consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the only difference was the specific relocation of the buildings.

Ms. Velasco clarified that there were two treatments being proposed in the overall project; rehabilitation and reconstruction, with the City's goal to preserve what it could under the limitations involved.

Commissioner M. Hibma recommended a motion to approve the relocation of the buildings onto City-owned property, require that the City and the City's architect provide the Secretary of the Interior's Standards analysis for the rehabilitation of the Oishi house, pump house and water tank, and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards analysis for reconstruction of the Sakai house, to be returned to the HPC for review and approval.

Commissioner C. Hibma stated since the proposal had previously been reviewed and approved, and the exact same thing would be done for the rehabilitation structures, the HPC could accept that and approve the proposed location, but the HPC wanted to see the Secretary of the Interior's analysis for reconstruction of the Sakai house.

ACTION: It was M/S/C (M. Hibma/C. Hibma) to: 1) Approve the relocation of the buildings for the Miraflores Historic Structures at S 47th Street, near Florida Avenue, onto City-owned land; 2) Approve the rehabilitation analysis for the building structures per the earlier review, except for the Sakai residence; 3) Require the Secretary of the Interior's reconstruction analysis of the Sakai residence for review and approval by the HPC; and 4) Include a list of the character defining features of the Sakai residence; approved by the following Roll Call vote: 6-0 (Ayes: Pavlinec, Cole, Crane, DeWitt; C. Hibma, M. Hibma; Noes: None; Abstain: None; Absent: None).

Commission Business

A. Update on Historic Inventory Report

Planning Manager Avery Stark presented a report by City Councilmembers Bana and Robinson dated June 17, 2025, particularly around historic preservation, with a number of different tasks the Planning Department had been asked to address within the next 180 days, along with a few directives.

Those directives included the formalization and publicly sharing of a verified list of City-owned historic buildings and historic significant locations throughout the City; creation of a process to

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

accept nominations to review and install commemorative signage and the establishment of a formalized procedure for City staff and the public to go through the process of requesting plaques and the like; development of a task list of prioritizations of which City-owned assets were under the City's control where they may need to be prioritized to establish funding sources to rehabilitate; the establishment of a priority list of what the City had as usable spaces into the next decade; and exploration and return to the City Council where to engage in grants, and internal funding sources in the CIP budget with respect to asset management.

Mr. Stark stated additional directives related to creating and asserting a context statement around Richmond historic preservation and collaborating closely with the City Library, the HPC and the Richmond Museum of History & Culture to bring back and explore the story and history of Richmond. He explained that the last inventory had been compiled in 2023 and it needed to be updated. Two planning consulting firms had been engaged to help with that directive. ESA would help with the actual development of inventory and provide an up-to-date map to identify properties and existing structures owned by the City to create and update a holistic repository and develop a program around the commemorative signage program that would be brought to the HPC and have stakeholder engagement in terms of what that would look like. All those things would be brought back to the HPC and eventually to the City Council to create a historic program. EMC would primarily help with the Housing Element and other code updates and would be looking specifically at the Mills Contract component.

A. Update on Mills Act Contracts

Planning Manager Stark reported that all the agreements had been signed. The biggest task was to establish the actual program for those contracts and actually look at all the work previously done, going through and reviewing the template provided, focusing on community engagement as to how to share and illustrate the importance of the program and what it could do to help people understand the value and to understand the constraints. He noted, for instance, that many residents were concerned with the historical significance of their homes given that homes over 50 years old had potential historical significance, which might limit a homeowner's ability to maintain or make changes to homes, such as re-roofing. The HPC would have to determine whether or not there could be future exemptions to remove some of those homes from the requirements. He added that staff was attempting to put together FAQs and a guide to make homeowners understand what regulations applied.

Mr. Stark advised that staff would return at the next HPC meeting of the full Commission or a subcommittee to identify the status of the two consulting committees, the work product to date, and provide information to create a robust data base for the City.

Mr. Stark provided a description of a Mills Act Contract, an agreement to be signed between the city and property owner to maintain and/or rehabilitate an existing home where the incentives could include things to reduce the taxable amount on property value and other ways to help maintain and preserve an existing home. He added that as a legally binding contract there were several other things attached to the agreement.

Mr. Stark responded to questions about creating a historic inventory, verified staff would look at the national, state and local registries to identify places of historical significance, and whether individuals could submit lists based on potential historically significant places stated those properties could be added to the Richmond registry through the HPC by a Request for Nomination but not on line.

Commissioner DeWitt identified a number of modernist properties in Point Richmond and noted that one of his passion projects was to document the significant architecture in Point Richmond.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

He noted that the Planning Department had approved a permit that he stated was identified as CEQA exempt for one of Richmond's most important architectural structures, which concerned him. He had a list of hundreds of homes and he could identify the 25 significant modernist homes to put on a list to flag for a watch list so that would not happen again. He acknowledged that not all the homes were at the 50-year mark.

Mr. Stark stated the list could be shared with him but under current practice, a home not on the register identified as a home with historical significance by an architect and style would obligate a staff response to analyze that home. He did not minimize the importance of a flag list. He acknowledged the desire in the community for individuals to be able to submit their own recommendations for places potentially historically significant without actually going through the process of nomination. He suggested that could be done but how that would turn out he would have to analyze in terms of operation. He explained that what came up on a day-to-day basis was the identification of the homes that were potentially historically significant, which he suggested could be 80 percent of the City of Richmond. Staff was trying to right size and stated so far the national and state registries would be analyzed to make sure everything had been listed, and called out, and since a lot of historical and preservation work was done through CEQA, all existing documents would be analyzed to be able to assess what needed to be evaluated. He sought input from the HRC and stated that ESA would ground truth the City's inventory lists.

Mr. Stark added that the referenced list could be forwarded to him and he would forward it to ESA, which would cross-reference it in the other documents. It would also show up in ESA's initial report.

Chair Pavlinec asked about neighborhoods that had yet to be analyzed, and Mr. Stark stated that was part of the recommendation ESA would be making to the City Council, which would require City Council participation to figure out where the historically significant properties were located. It would also require an investment in staff time to support the roles responsible for upkeep and the management of the lists to keep everything going. There was a desire to get everything in front of the historians.

It was recommended that the consultants share their methodology, as stated in their contracts, to be forwarded to the HPC.

Mr. Stark clarified that he was taking the mandate from the City Council and expanding it on more than just City-owned property to those properties owned by the City, on City land to public and private land it was the City's responsibility to manage.

Mr. Stark referred to a consistency in the cadence in which the report was prepared, stated there was a need to discuss what was needed to support it, noted that every year more homes would be added to the age eligibility list, and stressed the need to identify the priority sites that would need to be added to the list from what was up and coming.

Chair Pavlinec explained that some lists started with historically significant properties of 45 years and older since starting at 50 years could miss many eligible properties.

B. Informational Update on Richmond Main Library Modernization (PLN24-105)

Wendy Wellbrock, Senior Civil Engineer, Public Works Department presented an update to the Richmond Main Library Modernization project, and introduced several people involved in the

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

Library project from the architect (Alyson Yarus, Noll & Tam Architects), the Library Director (Kate Eppler, Deputy Director of Community Services – Library), and the Public Works Director (Daniel Chavarria).

Ms. Wellbrock clarified that the update was a condition of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed Rehabilitation of the Historic Richmond Main Library approved by the HPC in October 2024. The presentation at this time was the same as the previous presentation to the HPC in October 2024, with some refinements. The project had now been put out to bid.

Alyson Yarus, an Associate Principal Architect with Noll and Tam Architects reported that the first overall goal was to bring the function and appearance of the Richmond Library into the modern age while still retaining its character. There was a lot of interest in increasing public safety which had been discussed with the Richmond Police Department (RPD) and the Richmond Fire Department (RFD), and also to create opportunities for public art. She explained that the windows were failing, the building was seismically challenged and complete new building systems such as the power service for replacing mechanical systems and plumbing were required. Some of the roof drains could be retained but additional roof drains were required. She identified the status of the project, identified a number of meetings that were held with the community and spoke to the vibrant feedback and responses from a survey and the space arrangement that had resulted, which she then summarized. She commented that the current door between the Children's Library and the Adult Library would be opened up and since the windows would have to be replaced anyway, the windows in the children's room would be extended to allow more space in that room. She added that the existing features would be retained and other requested features would be added, rejuvenating the courtyard as a public space, and making room for public art. Staff would be upstairs in the back, a new stair from the second floor down would be constructed, and the community room would stay in the same place but get refreshed.

Ms. Yarus displayed some of the proposed changes from the courtyard to a fence that allowed the space to be defined as a Library space able to be locked. The courtyard floor level was currently two steps down and the new courtyard would be raised to the floor level of the new Library and new ramps would be brought out to the sidewalk so that everything would be accessible. The same thing would be done at the front door. She highlighted the design of the new fence and pointed out the handful of locations where the public art process was underway for murals and hanging sculptures inside the building.

Ms. Yarus noted in response to a Commission comment that the uneven top of the fence was not consistent with modernism, that the uneven top for the fence was intended by the RPD to discourage someone from climbing over. The RPD wanted a fence its officers could see through, and from a historic standpoint, a new thing such as a fence that was different, distinct and standing off from the existing as opposed to pretending to be a part of it was good.

Commissioner DeWitt suggested that aspect of the design was a near miss, which was something he tried to avoid.

Kate Eppler, Library Director, added that the desire was that the Library would appear to those driving by to be an exciting and inviting place to want to go in, and during the community feedback process anything that looked remotely like jail bars was not supported by the community. The fence incorporated movement, playfulness and colors from the inside.

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

Chair Pavlinec added that from the HPC's prior discussion of the Library proposal the HPC had directed that since the fence defined the children's court it should be artistic and be a more playful addition.

Commissioner C. Hibma commented that the modern design was so horizontal and focused on the vertical pickets that it did not relate to the building. While the colors related to the interior they did not relate to the used brick. She did not see the relationship.

Ms. Yarus confirmed that the landscaping was part of the project and presented a plan to show the landscaping that had been proposed. She stated the RPD had requested the removal of some existing landscaping, which she pointed out, and highlighted the planting on the rest of the site.

Ms. Yarus also highlighted the new emergency exit that would require an opening in the brick wall; a new tree in the new courtyard; sloping out the sidewalk; the bushes next to the building that would be removed; there would be a new exterior book drop, a new accessible entrance for staff; the generator enclosure would be replaced with a new generator and generator enclosure at the same location; and new trees would be added. She stated nothing had been changed. She identified new flowering trees outside the courtyard and various plants in front that would not grow together and become a hedge. A trash enclosure would be added in the back along with benches. She also pointed out the patterned sidewalk and identified the Roman brick that would be used. On the discussion of the Roman brick, she was to verify whether Roman brick or standard brick could be used.

Ms. Yarus presented some exterior signage, identified an existing sign that was actually not visible and would be replaced with a new sign in the font to match the other signs in the Civic Center. As part of the seismic work, concrete sheer walls would be added that would go up against the brick under the ground in many locations, although it would all look the same when completed. She noted that the windows were not original, had been replaced previously, and pointed out all the new windows that had not changed since the approval of the project. She added that according to Richmond rules and best practices, buildings facing parks would require that the new glass would be bird safe. She added that the drawings had been modified to show what the building would look like.

The discussion continued on the fence, although Chair Pavlinec noted that the item on the agenda was an informational item for the Library modernization, including the fence, but was not a review and approval of the fence. On the discussion, Commissioners offered comments that the fence was more a backdrop for art, and concerns related to the verticality of the fence for a horizontal building with an uneven top represented a disservice to the building and there was a suggestion to make the top straight and horizontal, which would at least mimic the outline of the rest of the buildings. Alternatively, there was a suggestion that the fence needed to be even more different. In its favor, the fence did not connect to the wall and it met the required standards, it was also lower and see through, the fence would be powder coated, and the fence rendering was presented. It was noted that to make something disappear it would need to be darker in color. If in the natural environment, it should be the appropriate shade of green.

Chair Pavlinec stated the fence was playful, in a children's space, and given the use she did not think the fence detracted that much, and there was a compromise between the use and the historic building. She could accept the fence as presented.

Other Commissioners noted that even with all the enhancements and improvements, the buildings had a brick and glass look and the fence, while it did not match, added something. There was support for the fence as playful for children. The opposing view suggested as an

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE HPC MEETING ON OCTOBER 6, 2025

alternative there might be a need to make the fence even more different, looking at something that was intentionally more playful with more colors. Supergraphics were recommended to distract from the waviness of the fence, a pattern that did not call attention to the wavy top. Another Commissioner referred to the Richmond hills, another geographic area of Richmond, and still another suggestion was made that the fence be orange in color with whimsical cutouts.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:43 P.M.