

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
CIVIC CENTER MULTIPURPOSE ROOM, BASEMENT LEVEL  
440 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond, CA  
April 28, 2010  
6:00 p.m.**

**BOARD MEMBERS**

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Woldemar, Vice-Chair Whitty, Boardmembers Bloom, Butt, and Welter

**Absent:** Boardmembers Christian and Woodrow

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**Staff Present:** Jonelyn Whales, Hector Lopez, Carlos Privat

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Minutes of March 10, 2010**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Bloom/Whitty) to approve the minutes of March 10, 2010 as written; unanimously approved (Woldemar abstained).**

**Minutes of March 24, 2010**

Boardmember Welter noted his absence at the March 24, 2010 meeting and requested his name be correctly spelled on page 1 of the minutes.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Bloom) to approve the minutes of March 24, 2010 as written; unanimously approved (Welter abstained).**

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Woldemar reviewed the procedure for speakers and noted any decision approved may be appealed in writing to the City Clerk within ten (10) days, or by Monday, May 10, 2010 by 5:00 p.m.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

Chair Woldemar said the Consent Calendar consisted of Item 2 and Item 1 is recommended for Hold Over to May 12, 2010. Chair Woldemar suggested moving Item 1 to the Consent Calendar and requested removing Item 2 for discussion.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Whitty) to move Item 1 to the Consent Calendar; unanimously approved.**

**ACTION: It was M/S (Whitty/Bloom) to approve the Consent Calendar Item 1; unanimously approved.**

**Items Approved:**

- 1. PLN09-125 RICHMOND PLUNGE EXTERIOR ARTWORK ON E. RICHMOND AVENUE**
- Description **(Held Over from 3/24/2010)** REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL TO INSTALL NEW EXTERIOR BUILDING ARTWORK ON THE RICHMOND MUNICIPAL NATATORIUM, A CONTRIBUTING STRUCTURE TO THE POINT RICHMOND NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT.
- Location 1 E RICHMOND AVE  
APN 556-170-002  
Zoning PC (Public and Civic Uses)  
Owner CITY RICHMOND  
Applicant TODD JERSEY ARCHITECTURE  
Staff Contact HECTOR ROJAS Recommendation: **HOLD OVER TO 5/12/2010**

**Item(s) Removed:**

- 2. PLN09-144 BIO-RAD INDUSTRIAL BUILDING ON REGATTA BLVD**
- Description REQUEST FOR DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION TO REPLACE EXISTING BUILDINGS CURRENTLY USED FOR OFFICE AND LABORATORY SPACE WITH A NEW ±17,000 SQUARE FOOT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES ON THE BIO-RAD CAMPUS.
- Location 3110 REGATTA BLVD  
APN 560-111-001  
Zoning M-1 (Office Flex District)  
Specific Plan KCSP (Knox Freeway/Cutting Boulevard Specific Plan): Mixed Use  
Owner BIO-RAD LABORATORIES INC  
Applicant CARLA EVANS  
Staff Contact HECTOR LOPEZ Recommendation: **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL**

Mr. Lopez gave a brief staff report, described the property, current office and laboratory use, and staff recommends approval.

Carla Evans, Applicant, Bio-Rad, reported that the buildings on site are very old. Bio-Rad has tried to maintain them but they have come to the end of their useful life and need replacement. She said there will be one building instead of several buildings on site and asked for the Board's approval.

There were no questions of Board Members. Chair Woldemar referred to a sidewalk he contacted staff about it being on private property, and questioned whether there was resolution on the matter. Ms. Evans noted the sidewalk is in front of their warehouse parking and referred to Sheet A.101. They are only proposing to extend the sidewalk in front of the building.

Chair Woldemar said the sidewalk looks like a public sidewalk but is on private property, and he questioned who would bear the liability if an accident occurred. Mr. Privat stated the sidewalk is private and the owner would be liable. Chair Woldemar suggested proper signage indicate that the sidewalk is the property of the owner. He questioned why the public frontage does not have public sidewalks. Mr. Lopez noted there are several parking spaces in the front of the building which was a specific condition from prior design approval.

Chair Woldemar referred to the new west end of the building where there is a significant landscape area that appears to have curb and gutter that sticks into the right-of-way by approximately 8 feet. At the intersection of the street, the curve appears not to stick out into the right-of-way and he questioned if there was a reason why the two did not align. Mr. Lopez could not answer.

Chair Woldemar said the project is deficient in landscaping by 1,000 square feet. It mentions this would either be in the parking lot or on the western frontage, and he asked Mr. Lopez to point out the area near the western frontage where landscaping would be proposed.

The public hearing was opened.

Bob Evans, HDR Architects, thanked staff for their recommendations of the design, reviewed the process undertaken to survey the architecture of buildings in the vicinity and said those nearby were normal, uninteresting and unfriendly industrial buildings. To distinguish what they are doing from what exists now is providing public access to the building. The building's functional organization and design allows the public to see people working inside. He discussed Bio-Rad's corporate headquarter buildings and image, branding, noted he spoke with Board Member Bloom regarding landscaping whose suggestion was that it be native plantings. They engaged a landscape consultant to provide an indigenous native plant species from which to pick from. All plantings are drought tolerant, appropriate for a bio swale environment, and species suggested were used to determine plant types for the project. Mr. Evans said they prepared a 3-D model of the building, and presented a color and materials board.

Mr. Evans gave a presentation of the design of the building, stating the building is a structural steel frame, and falls to a height 10 feet above the finished slab. It is single-story, square building with a depressed roof level in the center. On the north side there is a dormer type structure and the position of the dormer screens is all mechanical. The image of the building would have no reference to a laboratory or manufacturing facility.

The materials of the building above 10 feet are flat metal paneling painted beige. Below 10 feet is cement plaster, and continuous storefront, slightly tinted window glass. From the ground to 18 inches above the floor slab is a stone veneer base which flows all around the building. He said there is a phase II for the project which upgrades the existing warehouses. Eventually, the color and materials would be compatible, and said Phase II elements would include landscaping, parking facilities in the rear of the building, and striping. He noted that the primary public frontages are north and east exposures which means they can have openness. Solar is controlled by sunscreens on the east sides of the building; the main entry is under a fairly deep

overhang for weather protection, and all way finding leads to the front door. He said there are several mature trees being removed. Evergreens are at risk due to the proximity of large buildings to them, as well as risks to the buildings from trees. He said most common problem tree is a Myoporum, which is typically a toxic and invasive species, and given its proximity to the bio swale, it will not have a good survivability. They are minimizing tree loss with three California Live Oaks on the Regatta frontage, relocating three juvenile Magnolia trees to the front of the entrance, and the long east exposure is being screened by indigenous species such as dogwood.

Board Member Butt noted the proposed building height is 26 feet, and he questioned the heights of existing trailers. Mr. Evans said they were between 15-20 feet.

Board Member Whitty asked Mr. Evans to describe fencing around the property and around the building. Mr. Evans said phase I does not modify fencing outside the work area. He said the demolition plan would show existing fencing, and he briefly described the proposed fencing.

Board Member Bloom stated she liked the building a lot and would return with landscaping questions.

Board Member Butt said he thinks Bio-Rad has done a very nice design for an industrial building, agreed the buildings were deteriorating, questioned the applicant's understanding of the City's requirements for off-street parking and questioned if the parking spaces on the frontage were included in the City's off street requirements. Board Member Butt said he thinks the municipal code requires dedicated off-street parking not be off the street and have its own separate drive lane. He voiced concerns with this and said it does not set a good precedent for future development along Regatta or other streets. It presents aesthetic challenges, safety issues, and sets a poor precedent. Regarding solar shades, he confirmed they were deductive alternate, and he asked to have them stay in and remove the alternate reference.

Chair Woldemar questioned signage, stating there is no condition in the staff report about signage. He said he read there are specific sorts of lights, but he has not seen any cut sheets and asked what they look like. Mr. Evans said this aspect is design build; the performance and design intent for light fixtures are such that off sight spillage of light is controlled. He said there is a lighting plan in the packet and the photometrics of the drawing provide for a licensed lighting engineer. There are 2, 15 foot standards on concrete piers that illuminate parking along frontage in front of the building. Those are the only intended stand-alone standards of the project. The lighting along 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is from illumination from the building out to the sidewalk, which addresses security and safety, and this is where there is more than normally seen.

Board Member Whitty questioned the design of the lighting, and Mr. Evans said the design preference is halide fixture, green ice fixtures, the housing around the lamp will be natural aluminum with a sunscreen vocabulary; or basically a disc with a lens underneath it. In some cases, they are not low pressure

Chair Woldemar said the fencing shown is iron picket material between the two corners of the new building. He was surprised that it was basically black "off the shelf" material, when there are so many good selections of color. He asked to see something of higher character. He disliked the views particularly down the western corridor against the warehouse, and he suggested something with more screening.

Mr. Evans said the applicant may need to discuss security issues there; they actually need to see all the way down the side of the building. Chair Woldemar clarified that it was the design image, which he believed has little to do with the character of the building. Mr. Evans said the color palette for the fencing is taken directly from Bio-Rad's corporate branding. He felt the corporate standards have been very well met.

Board Member Butt clarified Chair Woldemar's comments with Mr. Evans, stating that he is an architect and the applicant did a great job with the quality of the building but should propose higher quality fencing to match the high quality design of the building. Board Member Welter agreed and said he can appreciate the design build approach, as well, but the Board has no way of knowing whether the plan is compatible and built the way it was designed. Mr. Evans presented an image of the corporate campus to assist in providing visual elements.

Chair Woldemar questioned how much building will be demolished and how much is added. Mr. Evans said they are demolishing over 19,000 and replacing over 70,000 square feet. Chair Woldemar noted the Richmond ordinance requiring percentage of area devoted to landscaping and numbers of trees to cars in parking lots, said there is none proposed now. He asked the applicants to be aware of the requirement in returning in the future. Ms. Evans said they are planning on redoing their rear parking lot and when this is done, there will be added landscaping in the future.

Chair Woldemar referred to parking 90 degrees off of a public street, the alignment of curbs and gutters and similar issues. He said further in front of the street in front of the meat packing plant, there are a public sidewalk, curb and gutter. Just because it has been there does not make it right in his mind. The parking spaces going immediately in front of the building, if they stay where they are, would be outboard of where they were, and there would be more landscaping in front of the building. He believes apartment buildings were proposed with four spaces straight off the street, and the City wrote an ordinance preventing this, which is his same point here. He questioned why this is being proposed.

Vince Cunea, Cunea Engineering, said a good portion of the parking is a historical aspect of the site and is a compatible use with the street. The street is wide, with good visibility, and the nose in parking works successfully. The street comes down to a 90 degree intersection of either right or left and terminates at the canal. The current design perpetuates what parking has been over the years. It allows them to maximize visitor parking in front of the building, which is a big concern of the community and to the tenant. Regarding Chair Woldemar's concern about why the two nose curves line up, he said the nose curve at the larger bio swale area in-between the warehouse and the new facility lines up with the current travel way. Also, it is proposed in order to maximize that area for a bio swale and landscaping which has become an issue with C3 measures driving the design. The second nose island on the east of the building does not stick out as far. It is in as far as they can get it so large truck turning radiuses around the area can be achieved and maximize visitor parking. If pushed out or back with parallel parking would add more landscaping in the front and minimize visitor parking. The reason for the offsets for the islands is because of the civil design of the parking area.

Mr. Evans said he wanted to get a full depth of the required parking on the site as opposed to crossing the parking lot. He noted there is parallel parking. Mr. Cunea said Bio-Rad is also responsible for any associated liability and for placards at the property line regarding permission to pass or walk. He also said they could post parking for visitors or by invitation only if private parking is a concern from a legal aspect or if staff feels there is a liability.

Chair Woldemar said the overall right-of-way appears to be 70 feet. On the other side of the street, there is a property line to curb and gutter of about 16 feet. In the western landscaped area, it kicks out 8 feet. Aside from the issue of half in and half out of property lines, it struck him that all parking proposed along there virtually exists now, with it hanging out north of the property line. He was curious as to why that changed. He felt there is a lot of room for trucks to make turns even if the corner was out 8 more feet. His point is that if this aligned outbound, there would be approximately 8 more feet of landscaping in front of the building, which could be used for a bio swale, images, and other things Bio-Rad has done in Hercules; entrances and arrivals all much better. If the City is willing to let Bio-Rad do this, he said the applicant should take advantage of it. If not done, he felt the City was not doing it right.

Mr. Evans said the client is not opposed to moving parking out and developing landscaping on either one side or meandering the walk. If staff feels comfortable with it being slid to the north, they can modify the plans to do this.

Board Member Butt referred to parking and questioned if a variance is needed. Mr. Lopez said if the parking spaces are not modified, the zoning code would not apply, and noted the 85 parking spaces can be counted as street parking. Board Member Butt said he thinks leaving them where they are is probably a visual improvement, and since there is no net add to the building square footage, he would support the parking. However, this is not something he would like to happen a lot. Chair Woldemar said it seemed to him that doing perpendicular parking makes a lot of sense and the question is how it can be done to the advantage of everybody. Board Member Butt said he would rather see it go out and there be a buffer with landscaping and then parking, but he noted there is not enough room to do this. He confirmed they were 4 visitor parking spaces.

Board Member Butt confirmed that he was sure that the municipal code states that off-street parking must have dedicated drive lanes on the private property and he questioned whether a variance should be done.

Chair Woldemar said another answer to the parking is that the 8 spaces, 4 of which are for disabled and 4 for visitor parking, which is needed to comply with the total parking count, if the parking lot today were re-worked and if the applicant used some compact spaces and some of the drive isles were tweaked, the applicant could find 8 spaces. He said then, the applicant could do a conventional curb, gutter, sidewalk, 8 foot wide parking strip down the front of the project, and have more landscaping. Because the City has said in other instances that parallel, curve handicapped parking can be done, a couple of spaces could be provided out there as long as some are located on the inside. Mr. Evans said this would provide for no visitor parking and not convenient access to the property's entrance. Board Member Butt questioned if there was enough room to get angled parking along 32<sup>nd</sup> Street, and Ms. Evans said there was not.

Chair Woldemar said the downside to what he said is that when the parking lot is improved, the applicant will need to adhere to the rest of the zoning ordinance that relates to landscaping in the parking lot. Board Member Whitty said she thinks the applicant realized this and is putting parking out front. Mr. Evans said they can do what the Board is proposing, but thinks it could be addressed in the future, given the uncertainties with Regatta. Ms. Evans said they do need visitor parking in the front specifically for people like their auditors. Chair Woldemar said he did not feel all handicapped parking needed to be in front and suggested half could be proposed as parallel in front.

Mr. Privat said he would presume that a variance would be needed from the parking standard if something were proposed contrary to what the standards indicate.

Board Member Butt asked staff to read the standard, and Ms. Whales did so; "Every standard parking space shall have a size not less than 9 feet by 18.5 feet exclusive of maneuvering space and driveway, which shall be provided to make each parking space independently accessible from the street at all times." She said another standard refers to the actual backing up, and she asked for a break so she could locate the standard in the code.

**BREAK**

Chair Woldemar called for a break and thereafter, reconvened the regular meeting.

Chair Woldemar noted there is a consensus amongst some members and staff that we may be able to leave the parking spaces on Regatta in the same location they are now, which is half in and half out of the public right-of-way, and that the curb and gutter will move to the north approximately 8 feet, so this could increase the landscaping area and/or the bio retention area to the front of the north side of the building. He said unless the Board can arrive at a specific plan for landscaping with the new idea for parking, the landscape would have to return to the Board in the future. He said the Board has a strong prejudice about trying to do approvals in words, and suggested drawings.

Board Member Bloom noted she discussed landscaping with the applicant, identified a few concerns, stating that the Native Sycamore in the skinny bed against the building would need to be changed due to its size and spread. She questioned the colors of the foliage and suggested a dark green, asked to think about deciduous versus evergreen. She suggested the ribes be used less regularly and be replaced with something else.

Mr. Evans noted that they wanted deciduous on the east side of the building because there is sun in the winter. Board Member Bloom suggested the ground cover be increased and using different species of the same grouping of ground cover throughout. The Board would like a maintenance plan along with a planting plan, citing the spreading of roots of dogwoods, which would take aggressive maintenance and may overcome the Juncus. Ms. Evans noted they have a landscape maintenance plan for all of their properties.

Chair Woldemar referred to the three principle trees on Regatta which are Coast Live Oak and are moderate in growth. He asked if they can get bigger and questioned if they are an appropriate tree for that location solely for image. Board Member Bloom said oaks are a good selection, their growth is slow to moderate, but plants do better the smaller they are put in. The Board discussed drainage and size of the species. Board Member Bloom said another type of oak may grow faster, and suggested getting 24 or 36 inch sizes and alternative species for plantings, thinking about what the tree heights should be, and she agreed to meet with the applicants on specific species.

Public Comments:

Elina Dubikovskaya, Richmond, said she lives on the other side of the stream, has irregular working hours and voiced concerns with construction noise and her lack of sleep.

Board Member Butt said much of the work will be pre-constructed; the construction work will be done in about six months. Ms. Evans confirmed, and said a lot of things are being fabricated off site and then erected, and much of the noise should be shielded based upon where the speaker lives.

Board Member Welter confirmed that the construction hours are listed in Condition 29 as 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Chair Woldemar questioned if conditions could be imposed to shorten the period of time or to say truck traffic would be limited to certain hours. Mr. Privat said if the Board made findings that there is a rational basis to do this, it can. The noise ordinance is designed to address the community as a whole and not individuals and their particular circumstances. Chair Woldemar noted that any decision the Board makes is an appealable decision, which would move the Board's decision up to the City Council. He said unfortunately, the DRB cannot change such things. He suggested meeting with the applicant separately to determine whether other arrangements can be made.

The public hearing was closed.

Board Member Welter said he appreciates the parking issue, does not have a problem with what is presented or the solution proposes. He would like to approve the project tonight with conditions. Board Member Whitty and Bloom agreed.

Board Member Butt suggested highlighting the parking solution, and he thinks approval should be sought by the Public Works Director, as well. He said the Board did not talk about the building at all, which is a compliment. He also asked to add that external sun shades be included as part of the project and not a deductive alternate. He said he likes their functionality, they break up the façade nicely, and he believed the cost is reasonable.

Chair Woldemar said he very much likes the project.

**ACTION: It was M/S (Woldemar/Bloom) to approve staff recommendation to approve the design of the project, adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the associated Mitigating and Monitoring Program, as defined in staff's conditions, to adopt the four design review findings recommended by staff and to approve the project, subject to the 29 conditions, with the additional conditions: 1) that the light fixtures specifically be brought back to the DRB with a future date with specifics, including the requirement for them to be metal halid lighting or white light as opposed to yellow high pressure sodium lighting; 2) that the fencing return to the DRB with a higher quality design; 3) that the sign program for the building be returned to the DRB for review and approval; 4) that the natural aluminum light fixture be incorporated into the colors of the fixtures; 5) that subject to Public Works Department review, plaques be placed at the beginning and ends of each of the private sidewalks that are adjoining the public right-of-way that define the ownership is private and not public; 6) that the solar shades indicated in the documents be included as part of the project and not as a deductive alternate, with a detail to be returned to the DRB; 7) that the landscaping plans incorporating comments that Board Member Bloom be returned to the Board reflecting site planning changes; 8) that as a continuation of Condition 10 read, "In addition, the existing parking spaces currently located on Regatta Boulevard in front of the proposed building shall be kept in the existing locations. The sidewalk shall be relocated and additional landscaping shall be provided in front of the building. Landscaping and parking plans shall be submitted to the Planning and Building Services and Engineering Department for approval." 9) that the curb returns at the intersection of Regatta and 32<sup>nd</sup> Street align with the curbs on the western end landscaping; and 10) that parking spaces be defined as 16.5' deep with a 2' overhang with the intent of maximizing the landscaping; which carried unanimously.**

## **PRESENTATION**

**3. PRESENTATION OF THE GREEN BUILDING ORDINANCE**

Description    ORDINANCE TO ADD SECTION 6.46 TO THE RICHMOND MUNICIPAL CODE IMPOSING 'GREEN BUILDING REQUIREMENTS' ON CERTAIN COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.  
Location        CITYWIDE  
Staff Contact    JOE LIGHT      Recommendation: **RECEIVE AND PROVIDE COMMENTS**

Mr. Light said the Council adopted the Green Building Ordinance on April 6, 2010 and it will go into effect on May 17, 2010. He said staff wants to familiarize the Board with the parameters of the ordinance. He said two systems are fairly highly developed, have developed performance criteria and protocols for construction. Both have internal certification and inspection procedures. The City is adopting their checklist, more or less their verification procedures, we are not requiring in any instance registration or verification from those agencies for private developers seeking this on their own, and with the exception of commercial buildings over 20,000 square feet, the City is not requiring outside rating. The City is taking the verification process in-house. This said, the City is not certifying or guaranteeing that any building built under the ordinance is a Richmond green building, but simply requiring that as part of an application process, following of procedures. The City will to the best of its abilities, do inspections, similar to the building department conducting inspections and not being responsible for them.

Mr. Light discussed the process for implementation, stating that at the design review stage, the applicant will have to have the green building checklist filled out. Measures must be identified. Board Member Whitty noted the Board has received some of the checklists already. Mr. Light said for the most part, the design will not show details other than where the green building points have some specific relationship to a design level presentation. They will not specify low VOC paints, low flow water requirements, insulation choices, etc. Where there are implications for the design, the measure(s) will be reflected.

Board Member Butt said in some cases, the Board requested from the Planning Department the checklist in the packet. He assumes this will be added, and Mr. Light said this will have to be done.

Mr. Light noted that in some instances, Title 24 regulations may have implications for design changes, and other nuances will be worked out. When the project comes to the building permit stage, the checklist will have to be on the permit with an index identifying where each measure can be found, i.e., plans, specs, cut sheets, or details. The index will be signed by the project architect indicating that all measures are included in the plans and that the requisite point total required will be met.

Chair Woldemar said he cannot guarantee, from an architect's point of view, that all things will be built, which his license would not allow him to do. Mr. Light said the applicant will be required to appoint a green building agent, who can be the architect, contractor or engineer, who will at the end of the project; sign off that measures have been included. City staff is reserving its right to verify each measure and will do this to the best of its ability during plan check and inspection.

Mr. Light noted the ordinance will cover all new single family residence dwellings and duplex, additions over 1,000 square feet, which would involve Title 24 requirements. The City will need to build in new homeowner guidelines for these into the existing inspection protocols, and all multiple family dwelling units. Single family dwellings will have to meet the minimum 50 point achievement level, and jumping up to 55 points at the 1750 square feet gross floor area with a 2 point additional requirement for every hundred square feet thereafter. A flat 60 point

requirement is for multiple family dwellings and any residential dwelling unit below that threshold will be required to submit a checklist but not follow through with any performance.

There are 2 threshold levels for commercial buildings for below 20,000 square feet and over 20,000 square feet. Up to 20,000 square feet will be LEED certified, and over 20,000 square feet will be at the silver level, will be required to obtain a LEED accredited professional independent rater to do the verification but not register with the Green Building Council. There are protocols should an applicant choose to have a registered Build It Green and Green Building Council where the City would allow verification substitute for City inspection.

Renovations are also covered in commercial buildings with the same thresholds pro-rated to the Silver and certified rating based on the potential scope of the project. Projects having a limited scope will have a limited percentage of measures that must pass performance.

Staff anticipates a fairly limited impact in the way the DRB does business. He referred to page 6 of the ordinance and said one provision is that the Director of Planning and Building Services may accept green building systems that are found in equal or greater in rigorousness than in Build It Green or LEED systems. Staff is awaiting a conformance finding with the understanding that green building is evolving toward a 2020 mandate for zero energy home. Staff will be returning to the ordinance periodically in order to update as codes and other regulations develop. One of the provisions made which directly affects historic buildings is provision B on page 6; "In all instances where there is a conflict between commercial or residential green building standard and Richmond's architectural guidelines, the City's architectural design guidelines will take precedence and the commercial and residential green building standards shall be adapted to conform to those standards." For the most part, the DRB will continue to operate in its standard approaches, but will review how design relates to structural elements, how stylistic response to a program and its development relates to the building elements.

Boardmember Whitty said she sees the ordinance important when doing renovations in redevelopment housing. Mr. Light said there are some pilot programs being developed that would require energy retrofits. Chair Woldemar said we anticipate seeing Mira Flores in the future and he believed green building will be applicable, and Mr. Light agreed. Chair Woldemar confirmed that all public projects that meet the scope are subject to green building, as well as City projects over 5,000 square feet or have \$300,000 of invested City support. He noted private development requirements will become effective May 17, 2010 and municipal development requirements will take effect in 3 years.

Boardmember Whitty questioned if Mr. Light sees any problems occurring with the ordinance. Mr. Light cited Richmond's demographics because many projects do not have an architect and work is done by contractor services or designers. He said there will be a higher level of success when the architect stays in the entire development process and projects will not be issued a Certificate of Occupancy if it falls short.

Chair Woldemar and boardmembers discussed developments and the work associated with green building features, and Mr. Light said staff is very aware of the administrative overload happening all over in society and recognizes how difficult meeting requirements and follow-up will be. City staff believes it can be folded into inspections and review. Chair Woldemar noted it recently took two months to get a plan check and he questioned how much time green building requirements would add to the process. Mr. Light said the City is sending a number of inspectors and planners to be lead AP's, Green Building raters, and they are getting expertise on staff. He said starting May 10<sup>th</sup>, there will be a green building training at Richmond Works, there are some free slots, and boardmembers may attend if interested.

Boardmember Butt questioned what would occur when the State Green Building Code gets adopted, and Mr. Light said Build It Green will incorporate all mandatory measures and Build It Green are going to readjust their system to cover all mandatory Cal Green systems. The City may, at that point, bisect the system so that the basic system becomes the Tier I or Tier II Cal Green Code. However, in 2012, it will all need to be revisited.

**BOARD BUSINESS**

- A. Staff reports, requests, or announcements.**
- B. Board member reports, requests, or announcements.**

Chair Woldemar announced future agenda items, asked staff to have the Plunge project return in complete form, and noted that two Boardmembers would be termed out in June.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m. to May 12, 2010.