

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING
CITY HALL RICHMOND ROOM, 1ST FLOOR
450 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA
October 14, 2009
6:00 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS

Michael Woldemar, Chair	Elieen Whitty, Vice Chair
Diane Bloom	Andrew Butt
Otheree Christian	Raymond Welter
Don Woodrow	

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Woldemar, Vice Chair Whitty, Boardmembers Bloom, Butt, Christian, Welter and Woodrow

Absent: None

INTRODUCTIONS

Staff Present: Jonelyn Whales, Michael Williams, Hector Rojas, Mary Renfro, Richard Mitchell

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Chair Woldemar noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, October 26, 2009 by 5:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. PLN09-035 – (Held Over from 9/24/2009) 23RD STREET STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT** – Planned streetscape improvements to promote pedestrian and bicycle safety along the 23rd Street corridor by reducing the number of vehicular travel lanes, widening the sidewalks, shortening crossing distances for pedestrians and improving overall pedestrian and bicycle visibility. This is an information-only item and no action will be taken by the Design Review Board. The project area is generally along the 23rd Street public right-of-way between Costa and Bissell Avenues. Owner: City of Richmond; Applicant: Richmond Redevelopment Agency. Staff Contact: Hector Rojas. Recommendation: Receive Staff Presentation.

Associate Planner Hector Rojas said the City is preparing a draft environmental impact report and anticipates it will be ready for public review in February, 2010. They plan to get the report to the Planning Commission by March or early April.

Chair Woldemar said there are some very specific design items in the report and asked if the project will come back to the DRB for input. Mr. Rojas answered that at this point in time

everything is conceptual and is subject to change depending on the budget available for the project. At the point in time when they begin construction, there will be a bidding process for the consultant and they will evaluate whether they will bring the project back to the DRB. He will find out the traditional process for MacDonald Avenue and other parts of the City so they can keep consistent with what has been done in the past.

Chair Woldemar said the Board did see MacDonald Avenue improvements and he fully expects that the design related elements of this project will come back to the DRB. Mr. Rojas said he expects it to, but he needs to determine what the tradition was for streetscape improvements in the past.

Chair Woldemar said there is a certain amount of conceptual precedent being set by the details within this document. The Board just reviewed the San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan, and some of the conceptual ideas within that plan. He asked if staff was giving any consideration to pull all of these street projects together, and questioned if they should be brought together or kept separate. He would like to discuss that issue because some of these streets are well interconnected.

Mr. Rojas agreed and said staff is working on a street light master plan for the entire City to standardize the light fixtures. He discussed this with the Planning Director and they are putting together a concerted plan to be sure these street improvements are interconnected. They started with 23rd Street improvements because funds were available rather than waiting for the long-term General Plan update.

Michael Williams, City of Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, said the community wants the City to have neighborhoods or districts that are unique. The 23rd Street Merchants Association wanted a different flavor because of the shopping and pedestrian access that takes place along their street. They have had several meetings with the City of San Pablo to coordinate so that designs are complementary.

Chair Woldemar asked if Richmond High School is included in this project, and Mr. Rojas said the project does reach to the City limit, but the jurisdictional boundary line runs at the midpoint of the street. Their intent was to cover the entire jurisdictional area. The City of San Pablo will meet up with the City of Richmond's improvements along the other side of the street.

Boardmember Christian asked if the area will be completed on only one side of the street. Mr. Rojas said the intent is not to leave it half done, but to do it in phases. The current project will be approached the same way. They will do segments of 23rd Street, but eventually it will be done completely. They will start at the lower end near MacDonald, and then work progressively in sections and phases.

Boardmember Woodrow said several years ago he was in the City of Stockton and he questioned where the downtown of Stockton was located, and staff could not answer the question. Boardmember Woodrow questioned what is meant by downtown in Richmond. Mr. Rojas referred to the historical downtown, from Harbor Way to Marina Way. Boardmember Woodrow asked if 23rd Street is downtown. Mr. Rojas said he does not think 23rd Street is downtown because it does not have the history.

Boardmember Woodrow said he comes from an area of town where no one can point to where downtown is located because they have not been there for 50 years. He asked staff to be clear about where downtown is located in this project.

Brian Fletcher of Callander Associates reviewed the outreach process for the project. He said the focus of the project was to gain some vitality and unique character to the 23rd Street

commercial district. The goal was to work with the community and improve pedestrian and bicycle safety and calm traffic, and design a plan that promotes shopping and vitality. The study area was from Bissell to Costa and now encompasses a portion of 22nd Street. They will open up a portion of 23rd Street and 22nd Street back to two-way traffic instead of one-way traffic because businesses were having a difficult time with people finding their stores. It was a five-step process: gathering information, developing the design, refining the design, final design report, construction and improvements.

Mr. Fletcher said several community workshops have been held; the first two were to discuss with the community openly what they would like to see on 23rd Street. They had several streetscapes and elicited responses from the community, quantified votes and surveys taken at the workshops and showed the results in graphs. The top findings were pedestrian safety, appearance, and traffic. The biggest concerns were pedestrian safety and traffic speed. These themes guided the rest of the design work. They brought six different plans to the community in the next workshop and elicited feedback and dialogue. The community preferred parallel parking because it allowed them to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment with wider sidewalks, safer bicycle access, and maximizes the amount of available parking. He reviewed the alternative that was designed from this discussion: two lanes of traffic, a center turn lane, and wide sidewalks on either side. He showed what the sidewalk configuration would look like with opportunities for café seating, ample 5 foot clear zone and 4 foot amenity zone with benches, bike racks, etc and said these are meant to be a framework for the final design and not exactly what the final design will look like. They are used to working with the community to find out preferences for the character of the Street. The community expressed a preference for a timeless character for 23rd Street.

At the next workshop, Mr. Fletcher said they showed the community various gateway features, examples of columns at MacDonald and a pedestrian plaza that could be used as a farmer's market or other community events. They chose lighting that fits in with MacDonald Avenue yet is also unique. They wanted to ensure ease of maintenance by choosing lighting with standard bulbs, and so they used the same manufacturers to choose lighting that uses the same bulbs as MacDonald Avenue. They designed plant material that would create a unique appearance and at the same time provide ease of maintenance and drought tolerance. They also chose bus shelters that are unique yet similar to the one on MacDonald Avenue.

Mr. Fletcher said their estimates show a total of \$16 million for this project, and they have broken it into phases. They will first improve vehicular circulation on 22nd and 23rd Street. In the second phase they will improve the sidewalks in that district. In subsequent phases they will move the work northward down 23rd Street.

Boardmember Woodrow said the plan is very good and he is glad to see it. He thinks more of these types of projects are needed and asked for a summary of what is gained by making 23rd Street into a two-way street. Mr. Fletcher said there are currently 3 lanes of traffic going northbound and cars speed. Traffic and pedestrian safety were big issues for the community, and one major way of achieving a safer streetscape environment and calming traffic is to reduce the number of lanes, add two-way traffic, include a center turn-lane, and reduce the crossing distance.

Boardmember Woodrow said it sounds like the street becomes safer with more cars on it, and Mr. Fletcher disagreed and said this is why they have changed 22nd Street to a two-way. There will still be a split option so that cars can come up 22nd Street and cross over onto 23rd Street. Cars going southbound can cross over at Brooks and take 22nd Street. It does not create more cars in that area. It creates cars within the district rather than commute traffic through the district.

Boardmember Woodrow asked if they have studied where cars are going on 23rd and 22nd. Mr. Fletcher said they have had two different traffic engineers on this problem and they have modeled it and found there are a significant number of cars that are commute traffic who are not inclined to stop and shop in the businesses. Mr. Williams said the community is aware of that and they want to change it because the area is laden with schools and there are a lot of local pedestrians. They have been working with Contra Costa County on a program to monitor children and youth safety, and 23rd Street has 4 of the 5 hot spots for vehicle and pedestrian injuries. He pointed out the communities should be planned for the people who live, walk, and shop there, rather than those that commute through.

Boardmember Butt was impressed with the project, and questioned if there is a Specific Plan component for 23rd Street. Mr. Rojas said following this initiative will be a plan for 23rd Street, focused on the building environment including setbacks, parking, and aesthetics. Boardmember Butt was surprised that landscaped medians were not included and asked why. Mr. Fletcher said the number of lanes in either direction is providing access for emergency vehicles. If too many vertical curbs and landscaped medians were included, that would make that difficult. They focused on having some medians for pedestrian refuges at some of the crosswalks. They need to be highly visible and they are small.

Boardmember Butt said the medians seem unsafe because they are totally bare, and having a shared turn lane could be hazardous and cause accidents. He liked the conceptual gateway elements, but wanted to make sure they are careful about the placement. He mentioned the City of El Cerrito being in trouble because gateway elements obstructed vision to a traffic signal.

Boardmember Bloom commented on the aging population and the need for different bench sizes in bulb-outs, as well as leaning bars. She thinks it is very important to consider the demographics of Richmond, which includes growing numbers of older people and suggested attractive resting places that include benches, landscaping, and tile work. She also suggested landscaping more creatively. Mr. Fletcher described some bench designs and agreed a cluster of benches could work.

Boardmember Bloom also suggested hiring people from the Art Center to design them. Mr. Fletcher acknowledged Boardmember Bloom's suggestions to provide enough seating and a variety of artistic seating along 23rd Street.

Boardmember Welter asked for clarification of the number of lanes on 23rd Street and for information on landscaped medians. Mr. Fletcher clarified the lanes and direction of traffic, and Mr. Rojas said there are no landscaped medians in this project but he may have seen them in an earlier community workshop. Mr. Williams said the reason there are not more landscaped medians is it is problematic for Public Works. They require utilities and they need to be maintained.

Boardmember Welter questioned the materials suggested for the pedestrian sidewalk zone, and Mr. Fletcher said they have not made that decision, but it is predominantly concrete, and he has a preference for sandblasting concrete versus multiple colors. Those details will come out in the final design, but it will be predominantly grey sidewalks with a combination of different textures. They may do something slightly different at the bulb-outs with different scoring patterns or colors rather than different materials. They also may use different materials or combinations of coloring for crosswalks. Boardmember Welter added that he liked the idea of the crossover and being able to shut it down temporarily for events.

Boardmember Christian said he likes the design of the streetscape and the wider sidewalks, as well as slowing the traffic down and making the area safer for pedestrians.

Vice-Chair Whitty agreed with all other Boardmembers and commended the project team for including the community. She suggested the plaza area include a ground design representing musical notes because this could be an informal music stage. She also suggested color-coding some of the crosswalk areas such as Brooks Plaza coded red and Barrett might be coded blue since it leads to BART.

Boardmember Butt referred to a project done at Santana Row where sidewalks were extended by 8 feet when the street was closed by moveable sections. He suggested looking at that project to see if that design might be incorporated into this area. Mr. Fletcher said that was the idea to incorporate flexible space in the plaza area where there are a lot of restaurants. There may be off-street parking areas that develop in the future, interchangeable areas with planters to buffer the moveable sections, and noted that the City of San Jose's downtown is incorporating something similar to this.

Chair Woldemar said streetscape projects tend to have a life of 20-30 years. He suggested making sure that materials would last that long. University Avenue is a classic example of the deterioration of an area that was redone and is now falling apart. He requested the project committee think about the lifespan of this project and know that it will deteriorate and need to be done again. He also observed that the whole street has become a Latino district, and yet he does not see anything in the design on the streetscape that reflects that cultural aspect. He said Vice-Chair Whitty's music ideas were interesting to him. Mr. Fletcher said they brought sketches and materials to the community meetings that spoke more to the Latino culture, tile mosaics and color. Consistently, the community came back and said they want a timeless character and not necessarily something that spoke to one group.

Chair Woldemar asked why there are separate strips of streets each with their own character, when the community does not want to accentuate a particular character. Mr. Fletcher said it is the balance the community was trying to get. The stores and markets in that area are dominated by Latino culture, but when meeting with the residents it becomes clear that the neighborhood is a lot more diverse than it appears.

Chair Woldemar said this street has a strong opportunity to become a pedestrian street and he asked why not make the intersections curbless, raise the sidewalks so the transition across the street are at the same level, with cars having to go over the hump, or make it all level. He pointed to San Mateo where the water goes underneath the grate on the corners. He wondered about doing something like that to make this area even more pedestrian friendly. There are some crosswalks across 23rd Street in the plan that are not at intersections, and he wondered how people crossing in those areas will be protected. He suggested in-pavement blinking lights or more pocket medians on either side of the crosswalk. He brought up the issue of trash management in the storm drain systems and said it is their responsibility as a City to make sure this occurs.

Boardmember Bloom suggested more curvy lines in the cement. Mr. Fletcher said because of utility improvements over the years where pavement must be cut, he does not recommend a lot of use of color and designs in the cement.

Boardmember Bloom said she would like to make the area more interesting and kid-friendly and gave the example of Addison Street in Berkeley where there is poetry and inlaid metal in the sidewalks. Mr. Fletcher said they have worked with artists in the past to do inlays into the concrete and he said there is a real opportunity to add art to the streetscape. The plan sets a framework and then additional detail can be added.

Boardmember Woodrow said concrete sidewalks are wonderful because they do not pose tripping hazards. Many of the other materials mentioned do cause tripping hazards. Anything

ridged is a tripping hazard, and he recommends concrete only. Mr. Fletcher agreed there are some great things that can be done with textures on concrete.

Chair Woldemar thanked Mr. Fletcher for his presentation and said the Board looks forward to seeing specific designs on this project in the future.

- 2. PLN 09-065 – (Held Over from 9/24/2009) TWO STORY ADDITION TO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ON MODOC AVE – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL** for a ± 784 SF second story addition to an existing dwelling located at 5507 Modoc Avenue (APN: 507-120-014. SFR-3 (Single Family: Low Density Residential) Zoning District. Owner: Paris Patron; Applicant: Carl Sherrod; Staff Contact: Jonelyn Whales. Recommendation: Conditional Approval.

Senior Planner Jonelyn Whales said staff has been working with the applicant over the last six months. When staff first received the application it was incomplete and since then, they have been working to bring the drawings up to scale. They have also been attempting to contact the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council. She noted that a letter was received from the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council with questions that can be addressed as conditions of approval if the Board approves the project tonight and she spoke of difficulties in communications between the contractor and President of the Neighborhood Council. Ms. Whales said while this is unfortunate, staff has been communicating with the applicant so that the project could be brought to the Board this evening, and noted that the owner added about 950 square feet to the project for a second-level bedroom.

The public hearing was opened.

Paris Patro, applicant, said they presented and subsequently revised three sets of plans. The first plan was to make a 3,200 square foot house with a 5 foot barrier on each side. The third set was a tri-level house. At the time the setback was only 7 feet, but the setback changed during the time to 20 feet and he had to re-draw the drawings. He accommodated by having a large family room with a bay window at that 20-foot setback. The garage is unchanged. The old family room will be the new formal dining room. One of the two bedrooms will be an office and the other will remain a bedroom. They added a second suite on the upper floor as the master suite, added a composition roof 1-inch thick, a three-dimensional roof usually used in the East for snow conditions, added two skylights and more light to the kitchen, added a back section for an indoor laundry room, and in the backyard they used French doors instead of sliding doors to have easy access.

Boardmember Welter questioned whether the Board was discussing a project that had already been constructed. Ms. Whales said this is the second story addition that was already approved and constructed, which will provide a good picture of the existing house, as it is easy to see where the applicant is proposing to put the other bedroom.

Mr. Patron said they are building on the existing house, on top of the original 1939 design because it has the bolts to support it. The original house was designed by a contractor so that a second story could be added on top. The addition squares off the house in the back section and the tri-level design is now below the original height.

Ms. Whales noted that she received a copy of the letter from the Neighborhood Council today. The first question on the letter states they do not have the correct information regarding the lot. Her response to this is that staff, as well as the draftsman, has used the information provided by the County Assessor's office. It is a 5,000 square foot lot size. The proposed height is to scale and has been checked by the applicant.

Chair Woldemar asked if the height is 27'2", not 22' as shown in the table on page 2. Ms. Whales confirmed it is 27'2"; they have a plot plan on the front of the drawings. That was not included which was an oversight by the applicant when the drawings were sent in.

Vice-Chair Whitty asked if there is landscaping, as she has not seen any. Ms. Whales answered yes, and distributed copies of the landscape plan. Ms. Whales continued addressing questions in the Neighborhood Council letter, and said the roofing plan will be addressed by the applicant tonight. Chair Woldemar noted that the interior bathroom is not something the Board will review because it is on the inside of the house.

Ms. Whales recommended conditional approval of the 748 square foot addition with revised plans when they are submitted.

Boardmember Welter asked for photos of the neighborhood and surrounding houses, as there is really no way for the Board to put this project in context with them. Ms. Whales suggested bringing up some Google pictures of the neighborhood to show there are many bungalows and said there is a two-story home directly behind the applicant's.

Vice-Chair Whitty asked if the applicant met with the Neighborhood Council, and the applicant answered yes, they met in August. They were told to wait and they would conference them in a few days, and they never heard again from the Neighborhood Council. Vice-Chair Whitty asked Mr. Patron if he talked to neighbors. Mr. Patron said all of his neighbors are new and have moved in over the last two months and many houses are vacant. The new neighbors like the project because it brings up the value of their homes.

Boardmember Bloom asked if the applicant could speak to the issue of why he needs such a large home. Mr. Patron said he has a family of seven; having had two more children in the last few years, and they need the space for them. He tried to look for a new home last year, but the sale did not go through. They decided to try again and design a larger home.

Chair Woldemar said the location of the pool and the Google photo are unrelated. He questioned and confirmed with Ms. Whales that the dimensions are listed accurately for the rear yard. He questioned and clarified that the legal required rear yard setback is 16%, and that the applicant was not doing any work in the rear of the yard.

Chair Woldemar asked where the concrete front yard came from, and Ms. Whales said it was on the previous plans and had been approved in 2001.

Chair Woldemar noted that the site is not accurately drawn and questioned why this did not get brought up in the submittal. He said if you view the front elevation house and the front elevation photograph, the windows are different sized and the doorway is recessed. He further pointed out that there is a horizontal band between the first and second floor, but no indication of the function of that material. He questioned what the material is and why it sticks out on the left and right. Ms. Whales said she thinks those are drafting mistakes on the drawings; however, the plans that are submitted to the Building Department for the addition will be correct.

Chair Woldemar questioned whether or not staff ever suggested the potential of adding a two-story addition to the rear yard of the house, and Ms. Whales said yes, but the applicant decided to build on top of the structures and relocate the staircase to allow more room in the dining area.

Mr. Patron said the staircase will be against the back wall because if it were not moved, it would interfere with the overall building construction because it is in the location of a wall needed to support the second floor. Chair Woldemar asked how he is providing legal light and air to the

den, and Mr. Patron said the den has a 40 x 40 window. Chair Woldemar said it will be blocked by the stairway, but Mr. Patron disagreed.

Chair Woldemar questioned if the applicant considered doing a two-story addition in the rear yard. Mr. Patron said they thought about adding to the back of the house, but there was not enough room for the setback. It would require either a slab or a foundation to support the addition. Chair Woldemar said they could have at least a 16 foot addition to the back of the house. Mr. Patron said it is 16 feet to his back doors, which would leave only 12 feet to the fence line.

Chair Woldemar believed that something was in conflict and said the dimensions are incorrect. All of the issues that have come up could have been avoided by relocating the pool and putting an addition in the rear yard on the east side of the house. Mr. Patron said the pool is 15 feet in diameter. There is very little yard overall, and they would have to remove all of the structures in the yard to do the addition in the back yard. The addition is not just 16 feet but is over 20 feet in depth to give them the room capacity they need. He said the house is a tri-level home and not a two-story house. Also, putting the addition in the back of the house would require new sewer lines to accommodate the new bathroom. In the current configuration they can connect to an existing pipeline directly below. In 2001, their plan to build behind the house met with a lot of criticism because it took light from the neighbor's house. They decided to put the addition on the existing structure.

Vice-Chair Whitty asked how high the ceilings are in the new addition and Mr. Patron answered the entire second floor has 8 foot ceilings.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned what is parked in the garage, and Mr. Patron answered his street rod car. Boardmember Woodrow said he has one car in a two car garage, and yet the plan says he has two covered parking spaces. Mr. Patron said originally he had a boat parked in a cement slab area, and he had a cover over the top. The original garage has a 7 foot ceiling. It is a short height ceiling, and a standard van or truck will not fit into it.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned where he plans to put all of the family's cars, and Mr. Patron answered his children will not have cars.

Boardmember Welter questioned the trim on the proposed north elevation and the west elevation. He thinks it is a CAD error, but it looks like it is overhanging and they know by the plans that it is not. Mr. Patron said that is a fiberglass foam moulding to separate the two areas, just in case they cannot match the stucco. Chair Woldemar asked why it extends past the wall, and Boardmember Welter believed this was a drafting error. Chair Woldemar questioned why it does not extend all the way around. Mr. Patron said he intends to extend it all the way around, and Chair Woldemar said it does not show that. He asked about the vertical line three-quarters of the way across. Boardmember Welter said this is a drafting error. He said he is frustrated because the drawings do not accurately represent the project.

Boardmember Welter asked if the existing roofing will be matched by the new roofing. Mr. Patron said the new addition will use the same compost topping for the second floor. It will be identical to what exists.

Boardmember Bloom questioned the materials used for the fence in the landscaping plan. Mr. Patron said the new plans will include cedar or redwood boxes wrapped around the property, with a drip system.

Boardmember Bloom questioned the height of the lattice, and Mr. Patron said it is 2 feet, to match the backyard fence which has lattice on the top. Boardmember Bloom said this is a large

house, and they try to encourage massing of green material to balance the massing of the house. She suggested more than what the regulations require. For residential, the regulations require 16% and she questioned whether that is being met currently. Vice-Chair Whitty suggested a street tree out front and gave instructions to Mr. Patron for requesting a street tree from Parks and Recreation.

Boardmember Bloom said plants do better in the ground than they do in pots and suggested plants that are big enough to attract butterflies and provide a nice environment for children. Mr. Patron said they chose the plants because of safety for the children and ease of maintenance. Boardmember Bloom said it is good for kids to have a variety of plants so they can learn about plants. She suggested trying some shrubs in the front so it will look nicer, and offered to supply some names of plants that are low maintenance. Putting plants into the ground is better for them and is not higher maintenance at all than putting plants in pots. She said it is easier and more cost-effective to not put in the planter boxes. Mr. Patron said he is building them and there is no cost factor other than materials.

Chair Woldemar questioned the location and access of refuse bins, and Mr. Patron noted they are on the garage side of the house and are accessed via the original three-foot walkway. Chair Woldemar questioned what trim is around the windows, and Mr. Patron said there is no trim; it is all stucco downstairs, and upstairs there will be foam window mouldings around the front windows.

Chair Woldemar asked staff if the final product is determinable using the drawings as they stand and confirmed with Ms. Whales that it is not known what is around the windows. Chair Woldemar said he not know how to evaluate the drawings because they are not accurate. He said there is a curbside planter strip in front of the house that does not show up on the drawings and he questioned what was in it. Mr. Patron said lawn is currently in the planter strip. Chair Woldemar suggested planting street trees in that strip, and noted it is Mr. Patron's obligation to take care of the strip.

The public hearing was closed.

Boardmember Butt commented the whole plan is a drafting error, and despite how far it may have come, there is no way he could approve it tonight, even with a number of conditions as it is completely inaccurate.

Boardmember Welter agreed. Vice-Chair Whitty suggested giving the applicant a list of things to change. Mr. Patron said if he had this information in February it would not have been a problem. Boardmember Butt acknowledged that he understands the applicant's frustration, but suggested a continuance so the applicant could create plans that accurately represent what is being proposed. Mr. Patron said the Board should read the plans rather than looking only at the drawings. Boardmember Butt said for the Board to do the job they need to see accurate drawings. Mr. Patron complained that the project has been postponed for six months.

Chair Woldemar said the Board has three choices: 1) Continue the item for at least 30 days to give the applicant a chance to respond to comments about accuracy of drawings, 2) Vote to approve the project with a series of conditions, or 3) Vote to deny the project and give the applicant an opportunity for the applicant to appeal the Board's decision to the City Council.

Vice-Chair Whitty asked if the applicant would have to pay new fees, and Chair Woldemar answered yes, if he had to reapply. Boardmember Butt noted if the project is continued, then he will not have to pay any fees, and his preference was to continue it.

ACTION: It was M/S (Butt/Welter) to continue the application for PLN 09-065 to the November 18, 2009 meeting, including a staff facilitated meeting between the applicant and the Richmond Annex Neighborhood Council and staff review of the accuracy of the plans; unanimously approved.

BOARD BUSINESS

Boardmember Butt said the Board has been requesting for this application checklist to include the standard requirements, but only a few were checked. He requested more complete submissions from staff so that applications do not need to be continued.

Boardmember Woodrow questioned if there is a law stating that drawings must be drawn by an architect, and Ms. Whales said not for minor residential additions; only for commercial projects. She said staff needs to modify their checklist for various projects, and they are working on changes for the future. Boardmember Butt suggested spending time in a DRB session to work with staff on these checklists. Boardmember Welter said if there is going to be one checklist to cover everything, perhaps it could be revised to say "if applicable" for each item.

Boardmember Butt asked that a color and materials board be required for every project.

Ms. Whales suggested discussing December meetings. Chair Woldemar agreed and said there will probably only be one meeting during December. There is currently one scheduled on the 9th and on the 23rd. He suggested only one meeting in November and one in December. The next DRB meeting will be on October 28th, and the Board will discuss the Plunge sign, second floor deck on Solitude Lane, proposed exterior paint at 2 Richmond Avenue, and an office addition at 84 Broadway.

Ms. Rojas said it is important to discuss the Plunge at the October 28th meeting to meet scheduling deadlines. The project will go before the Historical Preservation Advisory Committee on October 21st.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.