

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, RICHMOND CITY HALL
1401 Marina Way South, Richmond, CA
August 8, 2007
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Vacant, Chair
Ted J. Smith
Diane Bloom

Jonathan Livingston
Don Woodrow
Robert Avellar, Vice Chair

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Vice Chair Avellar, Boardmembers Livingston and Smith

Absent: Bloom and Woodrow

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Lamont Thompson and Mary Renfro

Vice Chair Avellar gave an overview of the procedures for speaker registration and public hearing functions and procedures. He noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, August 20, 2007 by 5:00 p.m.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

June 13, 2007

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Smith) to approve the minutes of June 13, 2007; unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR

Vice Chair Avellar noted the Consent Calendar currently consisted of Items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Items requested for removal were Items 3 and 6 (Livingston) and Items 5 (public).

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Smith) to approve the Consent Calendar Item 4 and 7; unanimously approved.

Consent Items Approved:

4. **DR 1104111 – Addition to Single-Family Residence on Dimm Street** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±500 square foot addition at the rear of the existing ±1,500 square foot residence located at 415 Dimm Street (APN: 519-271-012). The addition consists of a second dwelling unit, provision of an additional parking space in the front yard, and a second-story roof deck that will serve the main residence. SFR-3 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Giuseppe Salvato, owner/applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval

7. **DR 1102306 – Canyon Oaks II Development on San Pablo Dam Road** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval of the proposed residential designs for 32 homes, located on the south side of San Pablo Dam Road at its intersection with Castro Ranch Road within the El Sobrante Valley area (APN: 573-020-009). The project applicant received entitlements for a tentative subdivision map to construct 36 detached single-family dwellings, including 4 custom home sites; associated utilities infrastructure and roadways for the subdivision. The City Council approved a General Plan Amendment and a rezoning for the project. New zoning districts are SFR-1, SFR-3, and CRR (Single-Family Residential and Community and Regional Recreation) Zoning Districts. FRB Inc., owner; Tom Simonson of Eden Bridge Homes, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 8/22/2007.

Items Discussed:

1. **DR 1103503 – Construct Mixed-Use Complex on Humphrey Avenue** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a mixed-use complex, consisting of five apartments on the second and third floors of the proposed ±5,592 square foot building above ±4,072 square feet of commercial space on a ±9,512 square foot corner lot located at 2300 Humphrey Avenue (APNs: 528-010-005, -006, -007, & -008). MFR-1 (Multi-Family Residential) and C-2 (General Commercial) Zoning Districts. David Townsend, owner; Darryl Debor (Architect), applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 9/12/2007.

Vice Chair Avellar noted Items 1 and 2 should have been moved to the Consent Calendar and Mr. Thompson suggested the Board motion to hold over both items to their recommended dates.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Smith) to hold over DR 1103503 to September 12, 2007; unanimously approved.

2. **DR 1104032 – Construct Mixed-Use Senior Housing Development on Cutting Blvd.** - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a mixed-use development consisting of twenty-three (23) low-income senior restricted units and ±4,235 square feet of ground floor commercial at the properties located at 3601 and 3627 Cutting Boulevard (APNs: 513-152-001 and 513-152-002). The project would require approval of a density bonus and exception to the off-street parking requirements. Neighborhood Commercial (Knox Cutting Specific Plan) Zoning District. Eastbay Community Development Corp., owner; Durrelle S. Ali, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Hold Over To 8/22/2007.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Smith) to hold over DR 1104032 to August 22, 2007; unanimously approved.

3. **DR 1104109 – Second-Story Addition to Detached Garage on Rheem Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±640 square foot second-story addition to the existing detached garage located at 3107 Rheem Avenue (APN: 526-220-012). The proposed second dwelling unit consists of two bedrooms, 1 full bathroom, kitchen, and great room. SFR-3 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Norman Garver, owner; Stan Ginn (Design Consultant), applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Boardmember Livingston said the application appeared to be incomplete, as there were no existing elevation drawings. Mr. Thompson said staff determined that the application was complete and did not require the applicant to submit an existing elevation on the garage since it was going to be a very significant modification to the front façade. However, if the Board felt it would significantly affect the project, the item could be held over.

City Attorney Mary Renfro said there were provisions in the zoning ordinance that permit the Director of Planning and Building as Zoning Administrator to waive submittal requirements; however, if not enough information is given, it would be inappropriate. She said the item could be held over with the request that the applicant provide additional materials to further evaluate the application. **Boardmember Livingston** asked for the applicant to present the project.

Stan Ginn, applicant/designer, distributed photographs which had been e-mailed to the Board, said he and the Engineer were looking to complete the drawings per requirements, they used vertical siding similar to the garage, as requested by the neighborhood council, and the stucco and its color matches the house. The wrought iron gates currently existed and would be cut back on the side. The stairway was originally in wrought iron which he felt looked much better with the stucco; however, the neighborhood council requested it be changed to wood. He said the garage was 20 x 25 feet and they are adding a 640 square foot unit, per the City's Code. The original drawing had been changed and he distributed revised copies to the Board.

Boardmember Livingston said a second story unit was being proposed to be built on top of an old garage and questioned whether the existing footings on the garage had been evaluated.

Frank Giuliani, Civil Engineer, said he had not yet looked at the existing footings on the garage.

Boardmember Livingston said it was his opinion that, given the buildings in the 1950's, the scantlings on the foundations for a one-story building were not sufficient for two-story loads. He questioned whether the Board was approving a plan that could not be built. He also questioned how the new footings would be done where the old footings were.

Mr. Giuliani said they will underpin the existing footings completely around the perimeter of the building, with the exception of the tie where the garage door is, to meet the requirements of the design and the Uniform Building Code.

Boardmember Livingston questioned what a 2 inch cornice wall frame was.

Mr. Ginn said if you look at the upper floor, he had a bay window sticking out and in the Code, he could not encroach into the setback. The two ends were 2 x 4's and the center was 2 x 6's in order to move it out to give it a little definition.

The public hearing was closed.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Avellar) to approve DR 1104109 subject to staff's 4 findings, 8 conditions , and with the additional condition that the plan that is submitted dated 8/8/07 on a 12x18 inch sheet be the plan incorporated for approval; unanimously approved.

- 5. DR 1103979 – Construct Three Dwellings on Espee Avenue - PUBLIC HEARING** to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct three proposed dwellings with reduced front setbacks because of an irregularly shaped lot located at 247 Espee Avenue (APN: 540-182-008). The project applicant has also applied for a variance to reduce the front setback to allow development of the dwellings within the City Center Specific Plan Area; Urban High Density Zoning District. Napoleon Diaz, owner; Bill Brobisky, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Recommend Conditional Approval to the Planning Commission.

Bill Brobisky, applicant, said they feel the design is a very good one to include three small units on a very small and irregularly shaped site and merits approval. They are requesting a variance for a 10 foot front yard setback and noted the neighboring house has a 5 foot setback on both front corners, and the large lot to the other side of their lot was a church and he believed its setback was 10 feet.

NOTED PRESENT

Boardmember Woodrow was noted present at 6:25 p.m.

Mr. Brobisky said the units were being referred to as townhouse units which he would assume would each have separate entrances, but he would think of them more as apartments. He said they were required to have 1.5 parking spaces per unit, they have 5 spaces and the staff report indicates they have 6 spaces, which they did not have. He noted that each garage was one-car and not two-car garages.

Boardmember Livingston said he liked the plan, said he noticed all entries were off the one porch which all work. At 18th Street there is no sense of entry, but there is off of the other entrance and he questioned if the applicant considered putting entries to the living units off 18th Street. Mr. Brobisky said no, but he assumed an entry would not be allowed across, as it would defeat the purpose of the common area.

Boardmember Livingston said there was an easy way which would not change the floor plan to put two entries off 18th Street; one would reverse the stairway for an entry and a porch, it would serve the upstairs unit. And, off the living room, another porch could be created for Unit 1, thereby rendering three separate and individual entries for each unit. Also, there was no roof plan with the submittal, the elevations were partially complete, and there were no dimensions other than setbacks. Mr. Brobisky said they were not told the plans were incomplete and confirmed that a roof plan was included in the submittal requirements. He felt it would be less attractive to have entries off of the parking space as opposed to the porch which is surrounded by landscaping; however, it could be accomplished.

Boardmember Smith questioned the trash container area, and Mr. Brobisky said it was 5 x 12 feet and there was a concrete slab as stated in the landscape plan.

Boardmember Woodrow felt the request was a good plan as drawn.

Boardmember Livingston questioned the stucco texture and type of windows. Mr. Brobisky said they had not yet chosen a stucco texture and the windows were vinyl per Title 24 standards and he said they could indicate this on the drawings.

Boardmember Livingston referred to roof's rake, drafters, and trim, deck, railings, garage doors, and said these items were also not identified on the plan. He confirmed the 2x6's would be used, which were not identified on the drawings and that a color board had been submitted to staff.

Public Comments:

Diane L. Harper said she received the public hearing notice but no other information on the project, said she was directly affected, voiced concerns about knowing whether the project was apartments or townhomes, whether it was rental property, and she had not yet seen the project. She has lived in her home for 30 years and was surrounded by apartments, questioned parking, said her home trembles when the train goes by and questioned what would happen with a project this close to the railroad tracks. She said residents around the Kingdom Hall church also were not aware of the project.

Mr. Thompson said the project was properly noticed, they were invited to visit City Hall to learn more information about the project, and he suggested Ms. Harper review the file now or continue the hearing. Ms. Harper said the notice did not provide much information, felt the neighbors were not aware of the project and confirmed the area was in the Iron Triangle neighborhood. Mr. Thompson said generally an owner and not tenants of properties would receive notice of the matter and confirmed the item was properly noticed.

Boardmember Smith felt the matter should go to the neighborhood council and recommended the item be held over in order to provide an opportunity to review the plans.

Rebuttal – Applicant

Mr. Brobisky suggested Ms. Harper review the plans, confirmed there was no neighborhood council meeting held and said he was not aware it was his responsibility to seek out interested parties. **Vice Chair Avellar** noted the checklist item was not marked. **Boardmember Woodrow** also felt it was a good idea to discuss the plans with immediate neighbors, which had not yet been done.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Thompson noted the item would need to be recommended to the Planning Commission and therefore, if continued, permission from the applicant would need to be obtained in order for the meeting to be held over. Ms. Renfro said the ordinance states that all applicants for administrative design review are strongly encouraged to work with their neighborhood council prior to submitting a formal application. If applicants do not, they run the risk for opponents attending the meeting and indicating they have not reviewed plans, which delays the decision making process.

Vice Chair Avellar confirmed the matter would be heard by the Planning Commission on September 6, 2007 and the Board had another meeting on August 22, 2007. Mr. Thompson noted also dependent upon this was the meeting schedule of the neighborhood council. He felt there was no specific requirement that the item must be heard by the Planning Commission on September 6, 2007.

Boardmember Woodrow felt the applicant might simply approach neighbors in the area and felt the matter did not necessarily need to be heard by the neighborhood council.

Mr. Brobisky said he preferred the item not be continued, but was amenable to holding it over.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Woodrow) to hold over DR 1103979 to September 12, 2007 and strongly encouraged the applicant and staff to review and update drawings, to submit a roof plan, provide dimensions of overall building outline, have all exterior materials and colors called out such as roof fascia, barge material, guard railings, hand railings, garage doors, colors and materials, stucco texture, roof materials, provide re-design for three separate entries, enlarge the garage enclosure area to fit 9 cans or approximately 20 feet and for staff to revise the parking count; unanimously approved.

6. DR 1103947 – Construct Self Storage Facility on West Ohio Street - PUBLIC HEARING to consider a request for Design Review approval to construct a ±85,864 square foot Self Storage facility with ±2,110 square feet of office and living space for an on-site manager, plus ±83,764 square feet of storage area divided into 618 units on a 1.43 acre triangular-shaped parcel. The applicant is also proposing to add a second floor to the front building (Bldg. B) in the future, during the second phase of the project. The site is located at 300 West Ohio Street (APN: 550-050-021). M-2 (Light Industrial) Zoning and General Plan Designations. West Ohio Ave Land Co., Inc., owner; Chris Patchin of Cubix Construction Company, applicant. Tentative Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Boardmember Livingston questioned if the project had been properly noticed, stating the adjacent property owner at 1570 West Ohio indicated they were not noticed. Ms. Whales said the proposal had been noticed to all property owners within 300 feet of the site, but staff could check the mailing addressing from the record.

Boardmember Livingston said in reading the sign ordinance, he questioned which part of the sign ordinance applied to the M2 Zone, and Ms. Whales said staff used the sign ordinance on page 591, Section 15.06.070(d) regarding the actual zoning district where the property lies within. He said he could not determine what the allowable square footage permitted for signs was. He said there were three signs; one on the ground and two on the building which were at 90 degrees

Ms. Whales said for the total display area ratio there is 30 square feet for every 10,000 square feet of lot area. Therefore, the maximum display area is 60 square feet per sign. She said the applicant proposes a monument sign and a civic sign and they must be separated and referred to Detail 2, Sheet 3. **Boardmember Livingston** questioned if the sign was only the part with the lettering or did it also include the part it is mounted on and felt the sign dominated the building. Ms. Whales said the measurements pertained to the entire sign and the applicant had it dimensioned correctly.

Matt Borslack, Cubix Construction Company, said they have worked with staff since June to ensure their application was both complete and fully conforming with all zoning codes of the Knox Cutting Specific Plan. They have looked at Richmond for some time and feels there is a strong demand for their product, conducted a professional marketing study that proves this case for demand, the existing facilities have a high occupancy in the area and they like what is happening in Richmond. Their site has a highly irregular shape, is bisected by easements, encumbered by wetlands mitigations and surrounded by industrial buildings and railroad tracks, and they feel the use at the location was ideal and the only suitable use for such an irregular parcel of land. They feel the facility will be very secure with state-of-the-art amenities, the level of design will exceed or be consistent with the neighborhood and likely to improve views from the street, and their use is fully conforming without any variances, and said he was available to answer questions.

Boardmember Woodrow referred to Sheet C1, said he was having trouble fitting the land onto the second map which shows the tract map. Mr. Borslack said the two plans were drawn with slightly different orientations and this could be the reason, but he assured all buildings were within the property line and described the location of the property line and building, stating it was 50+ feet from the tracks. **Boardmember Woodrow** said since the area was in a wetlands and constantly tremored by trains, would this pose design concerns. Mr. Borslack said the evidence of wetlands revealed some plant species that indicate a wetlands plant community but did not mean they have standing water or marsh. **Boardmember Woodrow** said if the applicant were to look at the pre-war photographs, the area was a broad tidal plat with wetlands soils underneath, and Mr. Borslack said they have a soils report, there is some evidence of some Bay mud, there is extensive fill on the site which has been there for 50 years, and they have planned for these facts.

Ms. Renfro said Mr. Thompson found the property owners identified as not being noticed were not identified on the mailing list and he was currently determining whether their property was within 300 feet or not.

Boardmember Livingston confirmed that the applicant was amenable to suggestions on changing the front exterior fencing design and the office live/work units.

Public Comments:

Mark Guelfi, said he and his brother, Matt Guelfi own the properties at 50, 70 and 100 West Ohio. They also own Hartman Studios which occupies a good part of the three properties. He confirmed they did not receive any notices, said they were strongly opposed to the proposal, did not feel the neighborhood needs any more self-storage units or anything that looked like self-storage from a design standpoint. He felt it was not consistent with the existing buildings in the neighborhood that are not self-storage, there has been new self-storage built within the year and felt it was all the neighborhood could take. The buildings are nothing more than cement block and corrugated metal and did not feel it was the highest and best use of the property in the community. Hartman Studio employs more than 200 people at those three properties, 45% of the people who work at their company live in Richmond, the use would not generate more than a handful of jobs and would not provide any economic or design benefit to Richmond. He also felt the landscaping in the proposal was minimal and concentrated at the entrance only and the style looks more appropriate in Bakersfield and Stockton rather than in Richmond. The City spent a lot of money to upgrade the intersection of West Ohio and Canal Streets as a gateway and the proposed development does not conform with this upgrade and urged the Board to have the project re-designed in order to have it look more like the live/work spaces being built down on Ohio Avenue, the recently approved office building at the 500 West Ohio building office building, or the new buildings at the Crossings at Marina and I-580. They also do not feel the storage units was consistent with the Richmond Greenway Master Plan recently completed, feel a contemporary style was needed to convey the message that the Ohio corridor is dynamic and not a dumping ground. He said the business does not also generate sales tax revenue from rental units and does not take advantage of the Enterprise Zone which gives companies incentives to locate in the neighborhood.

Boardmember Livingston questioned how many other neighbors may not have been noticed, and Mr. Guelfi said his brother, Matt, called around and could not find anyone in the neighborhood who was noticed. He called the Atchison and Sante Fe Neighborhood Councils who also had not been noticed. Mr. Thompson said he checked the assessor parcel map and conducted a zoning look-up and it appears that the East Shore property owners about the subject property and they did not receive notice and it looks like the APN numbers have changed over time somehow and the database did not capture them. He agreed it was clearly a defective

notice and for all practical purposes, the Board should treat the matter like a study session, staff will re-notice the item and the Board should take no action.

Matt Borslack said he did know the previous speaker has known about the project since May, said his comments were focused on land use and jobs which were not criteria for the development, they feel they have a conforming use and urged the Board to not delay them further.

Ms. Renfro noted if there was defective notice, any action taken would become null and void, and Mr. Borslack said he understood the technicality but simply did not want to be penalized for it.

Vice Chair Avellar said he knows the neighborhood well, felt the design should be more of a residential or condominium/townhouse look as far as the office was concerned and suggested gabled vents on the edges of gables.

Boardmember Smith felt the storage business must be good, as there were other large storage businesses in the nearby area. Mr. Borslack said it was not uncommon to have self-storages clustered in various cities and much of it had to do with zoning, and he felt it could be a good business.

Boardmember Livingston felt the Ohio corridor was a commercial/industrial corridor, noted over a month ago the Board approved a very contemporary glass and steel office building across the railroad tracks, felt it was a great addition to the street, said he noticed a lot of fake items in the plans such as fake windows, fake steel, arbors, fake walls and cornices, and he did not feel it was what should be in existence and asked the applicant to provide a more simplified wall design, increase the landscaping in the front and find a style of architecture that is consistent with the area. He did not agree with a residential look, but more of a live/work look. He referred to the Crossings at Marin Bay Parkway and said this would better lend itself to the corridor. He also said the two-story building will stick up behind the building, the building will be stucco on top, nothing but roll-up doors on the bottom, and he said the buildings would not look alike and would look fake. He asked the applicant to make the two-story building look like the other buildings next door and with a greater level of detail required of other applicants.

Mr. Borslack said the bottom floor actually has a series of concrete columns around it to provide weight on the bottom, the stucco is consistent with what is proposed on the front in the manager's building, and the view angles are such that the public's view of the two-story building will be very limited. **Boardmember Livingston** disagreed, said he could see the façade, windows that go no where and he could see down the corridor right through the gate. He felt the living office design sign was very large, noted there were three huge signs in the proposal and felt they were out of proportion. He encouraged Mr. Borslack to find another way to more subtly advertising the business. In summary, he felt the signs were out of proportion, the design needed to be redone, and he asked the applicant to remove all fake detailing.

Vice Chair Avellar agreed with Boardmember Livingston's comments, withdrew his comment about residential design, and also asked the applicant to include office window trim.

Mr. Borslack said staff had indicated they were well within the signage limits according to the zoning ordinance. **Boardmember Livingston** agreed, but it was within the Board's purview in the Knox Cutting Specific Plan to look at the sign and determine whether or not it was in proportion with the building. They may fall correctly within the ordinance, but they must review it as being proportionally correct with the building. Mr. Borslack agreed they could work to scale back the signage.

Boardmember Woodrow said this is the third large construction of storage that could be built in the area over two years; one on the corner of Canal and I-580 ramp, the new company behind the old Ford office, and this one. The others built have a funny way of putting up signage. He said they put up flags and signs that are up for a week or two, remove them when someone calls in, and he asked if these were the only signs the applicant was proposing. Mr. Borslack said these were the only intended signs and agreed that some of their competitors have put up massive, non-conforming signs.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned and confirmed that Phase B would be built after one to two years, there would be no rooftop equipment, that the roofs were a standing theme galvalene roofing which was common in the industry of a light gray color and their views would be well beyond the freeway but drivers could look down briefly and see their light gray roofs. He confirmed their primary storage items would include household goods, some business storage, and some commercial storage. Mr. Borslack said Interstate Self-Storage was primarily boat and RV storage that has about 153 similar storage units mostly on the second story of their building.

Boardmember Woodrow provided a sketch to the applicant and encouraged him to look at re-designing the two-story building to be more consistent with the other two-story buildings in the area in terms of form and function, change the architecture in the front to be more in keeping with the industrial district, use glass, steel, concrete and a contemporary infusion of tech, simplify fences to follow the property line, encouraged plant growth for the walls, recommended the sign be reduced to be less imposing and significantly landscape the front and sides of the building.

Vice Chair Avellar said he liked reveals in the fencing and asked for different materials on the wall.

Mr. Borslack said they have incorporated a lot of landscaping, said their neighbor to their left has gravel and down the street there is essentially gravel and palm trees, but agreed to review the additional landscaping request.

Ms. Renfro confirmed the matter was heard as a Study Session, the matter will be re-noticed and there will be a public hearing held in the future. Mr. Thompson requested the applicants approach their neighborhood council and anticipated the item could return on September 12, 2007. Mr. Borslack said it was his understanding from staff that they were not a part of any neighborhood council and showed the map to Mr. Thompson, and Mr. Thompson said he would research this and follow-up with the applicant.

BOARD BUSINESS

8. Reports of Officers, Board Members, and Staff

Ms. Renfro said the new draft ordinance merging the functions of the Design Review Board and the Planning Commission was ready for circulation for comment. She felt it was ready for first reading on September 11th and what it does is establish new thresholds for exemptions, for administrative design review it creates one body—the Planning and Design Commission--of which there will be a technical sub-committee; the DRC. It also streamlines the process for applicants by saying they get all of their land use approvals, other than design review, first and then design review is considered. She said the ordinance will be sent out for comment prior to its introduction next week. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation as well as the City Council, so members will not be able to discuss it amongst each other. She said staff can provide copies of the draft ordinance to the Design Review Board and they will have a right to comment on it.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned the status of the DRB guidelines, said it was his understanding that they take years to formulate and said he was also told that the worst thing to do was set up the plan before the guidelines were written. Mr. Thompson said the Planning Director was working on it with the consultant and progress was still underway. Ms. Renfro said the way it is being written, the standards to be applied by the DRC would be from adopted design review guidelines. **Boardmember Woodrow** voiced concern about the length of time the City would be without approved design review guidelines.

Boardmember Livingston referred to process, said he read an area of design review in the Knox Cutting Specific Plan, the applicants read it, there is a conceptual review process, a preliminary review process and a final review process. He felt each review would get more and more detailed and he questioned how staff holds applicants accountable and questioned whether the process would be applicable. Ms. Renfro said the Knox Cutting Specific Plan was enacted in 1991 prior to the 1994 approved General Plan and in 1997 there was a comprehensive zoning update. To the extent that specific development standards or land use designations in the Knox Cutting Specific Plan have been changed by the General Plan, subsequent legislation, the General Plan would rule. So, to the extent that the subsequent legislation dictates, it would govern. She also said when Knox Cutting Specific Plan was enacted there was no Design Review Board, and how design review has been done over the years has shifted.

Boardmember Livingston read the opening paragraph of the Knox Cutting Specific Plan, and Ms. Renfro said there were certain aspects of the Knox Cutting Specific Plan that were great and right, and it does not sound as if it is superseded by compatibility issues or the General Plan.

Boardmember Livingston said he received the green building requirements ordinance recently approved and he questioned if the Board should be reviewing this. Ms. Renfro said staff are supposed to review the green building requirements as they process applications and green building is encouraged.

a. Nominate and Vote to Elect New Chair and Vice Chair

Mr. Thompson said the Nominating Committee of one was absent and Ms. Bloom indicated she would provide her nomination at the next meeting. **Boardmember Livingston** noted he was the Alternate and made a motion for nomination.

Boardmember Livingston made a motion to nominate Boardmember Woodrow as Chair and Vice Chair Avellar as Vice Chair. Ms. Renfro briefly discussed the action taken by ordinance to allow for members to maintain their membership on the Planning Commission.

Boardmember Livingston amended his motion to continue the Election of Chair and Vice Chair. **Vice Mayor Chair Avellar** seconded the motion.

ACTION: It was M/S (Livingston/Avellar) to continue nominations for Chair and Vice Chair; unanimously approved.

Public Forum – Brown Act - None

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.