On March 16, 2020, the Marin County Public Health Officer issued a legal shelter in place order. On March 31, 2020 the Marin County Public Health Officer issued an updated legal order directing all residents to shelter at their place of residence through May 3, 2020, except to perform Essential Activities. Again on April 29, 2020 the Marin County Public Health Officer again updated the Order directing all residents to shelter in place until May 31. The April 29, 2020 Order prohibits the gathering of any number of people occurring outside a household unit, except for the limited purpose of participating in an Essential Activity. Additional information is available at https://coronavirus.marinhhs.org/.

This meeting is necessary so that the City of Belvedere can continue its business and is considered an Essential Activity. Consistent with Executive Orders No. 25-20 and No. 29-20 from the Executive Department of the State of California, the meeting will not be physically open to the public. Members of the City Council and staff will participate in this meeting remotely as permitted under said Executive Orders.

As always, the public may submit comments in advance of the meeting by emailing the Building Official or the Director of Planning and Building at: bvanson@cityofbelvedere.org or iborba@cityofbelvedere.org. Please write “Floodplain Analysis Committee Public Comment” in the subject line. Comments submitted one hour prior to the commencement of the meeting will be presented to the City Council and included in the public record for the meeting. Those received after this time will be added to the record and shared with City Councilmembers after the meeting.

The meeting will be available to the public through Zoom video conference. Those who do not have access to Zoom may access the meeting by calling the number below.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82391644127?pwd=aWxvR2J4TEF3cGRweEQzc2d3dkU3QT09

Meeting ID: 823 9164 4127, Password: 923739

Call into Zoom Meeting
888 788 0099 US Toll-free
877 853 5247 US Toll-free
Meeting ID: 823 9164 4127, Password 923739

The City encourages that comments be submitted in advance of the meeting. However, for members of the public using the Zoom video conference function, those who wish to comment on an agenda item should write “I wish to make a public comment” in the chat section of the remote meeting platform. At the appropriate time, the Director of Planning and Building will allow oral public comment through the remote meeting platform. Any member of the public who needs special accommodations to access the public meeting should email the Building Official at bvanson@cityofbelvedere.org, who will use his best efforts to provide assistance.

COMMENTS ON AGENDA ITEMS BY MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE

The audience will be given an opportunity to speak on each agenda item when it is called. Upon being recognized by the meeting chair, please state your name and address, and limit your oral statement to no more than three minutes. The Committee welcomes comments and questions raised by interested citizens but typically does not respond during the comment period.
AGENDA

OPEN FORUM

This is an opportunity for any citizen to briefly address the Floodplain Analysis Committee on any matter that does not appear on this agenda. Upon being recognized by the Chair, please state your name, address, and limit your oral statement to no more than three minutes. Matters that appear to warrant a more lengthy presentation or Committee consideration may be agenized for further discussion at a later meeting.

SCHEDULED ITEMS

1. Approval of Floodplain Analysis Committee May 14, 2020 Meeting minutes.

2. Briefings/Discussion
   a. Review of the goals and objectives established in previous Sub-committee Meetings.
   b. Review and discuss contents of newly revised draft Floodplain Analysis policy and procedures dated May 6, 2020:
      i. Correlation between projects defined as a demolition, as per the Planning Dept. definition, and a substantial improvement
      ii. Confirm a construction price per square foot valuation for projects.
      iii. Standardizing analysis process of appraisals providing valuations of Floodplain properties and/or conducting an independent third party appraisals. Additionally, approving the list of appraisers that will be utilized for this work.
      iv. Confirm the timeframe for which a cumulative valuation for all projects conducted on a structure located in the Floodplain will be added together and evaluated.
      v. Confirm new Design Review finding allowing the Planning Commission to deny a project based on inconsistencies with Floodplain documentation.

3. Conclude meeting and discuss further action to be taken by City Staff

ADJOURN
NOTICE: WHERE TO VIEW AGENDA MATERIALS
Staff reports and other writings distributed to the Committee, including those distributed after the posting date of this agenda, are available for public inspection at Belvedere City Hall, 450 San Rafael Avenue, Belvedere. To request automatic mailing of agenda materials, please contact the City Clerk at 415-435-3838.

NOTICE: AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT
The following accommodations will be provided, upon request, to persons with a disability: agendas and/or agenda packet materials in alternate formats and special assistance needed to attend or participate in this meeting. Please make your request at City Hall or by calling 415/435-3838. Whenever possible, please make your request four working days in advance.

Posted 6/1/2020 Amended 6/3/2020
Background and Discussion.

In early May 2020, the Floodplain Analysis Subcommittee virtually met to continue its discussion to provide clarity and consistency in determining what projects constitute a “substantial improvement” and are therefore required to be raised pursuant to floodplain regulations. The previous staff reports contains a history of the Subcommittee’s discussion.

As noted in previous staff reports, a project that qualifies as a “substantial improvement” must comply with floodplain regulations, including raising the home. A substantial improvement occurs where the cost of a project equals or exceeds 50% of the market value of the structure prior to construction.

At the May meeting, the Subcommittee considered various proposed Administrative Policy Amendments and a Code Amendment. The proposed Administrative Policy Amendments aid in administering the substantial improvement requirement. Additionally, a proposed Code Amendment allows the Planning Commission to consider whether a project constitutes a substantial improvement based on the facts and circumstances of a particular case.

A. Changes to Proposed Administrative Policies as Directed by Subcommittee.

Staff has made the suggested changes to the Administrative Policy per the Subcommittee’s direction at the May meeting, noted below.

First, a project that is considered a demolition is presumed to qualify as a substantial improvement, but the Floodplain Administrator may determine otherwise based on the unique circumstances of the project. The Subcommittee wanted to clarify that there may be unusual
circumstances where a demolition did not qualify as a substantial improvement, and that the Floodplain Administrator should have the discretion to consider all facts of the case.

Second, the City may require a third-party appraisal to provide an appraisal evaluation and/or a full appraisal of the structure. The Subcommittee clarified that the third-party appraisal methodology should be the Actual Cash Value methodology as approved by FEMA Guidelines, unless otherwise determined by the Floodplain Administrator based on the particular property.

Third, a standard cost per square foot valuation pursuant to the Craftsman National Building Manual will be used to evaluate an applicant’s estimated project costs. However, the Floodplain Administrator retains discretion to use the applicant’s cost per square foot, or value the project pursuant to another method, if appropriate based on the particular project.

B. Request for Direction Regarding Substantial Improvement Analysis for Multiple Projects Over Time.

Staff is returning to the Subcommittee seeking direction regarding how to evaluate multiple projects on the same property occurring over time.

Pursuant to current City practice in determining substantial improvement, staff evaluates total project costs by measuring the time of construction inactivity between projects. Under current City practice, in order for a project to avoid being considered together with previous projects towards the 50% substantial improvement threshold, there must be a one-year period of construction inactivity between projects.

The previous suggested Administrative Policy language from the May Subcommittee meeting outlined this current City practice. However, some members of the Subcommittee raised concerns that this policy may encourage the phasing of a single larger project into smaller projects in order to avoid complying with floodplain regulations. It is in response to this concern that staff seeks direction.

FEMA publications define a “phased improvement” as a single larger improvement broken into sections. (FEMA “Administering Substantial Improvement and Substantial Damage Requirements; Desk Reference” Section 5.6.2, p. 5-6.) FEMA guidance further provides, “[l]ocal officials should take care to ensure that phased improvements to not circumvent the substantial improvement requirements.” (Id.) FEMA guidance notes that consecutive applications should be evaluated together to determine if the whole project constitutes a substantial improvement. (Id.)

FEMA guidance contains tools to ensure that substantial improvement thresholds are not circumvented by constructing multiple phases of a single project, where taken individually the project does not meet the 50% threshold, but together exceeds 50%. For example, a local jurisdiction may adopt a lower substantial improvement threshold, i.e., when total project costs equal or exceed 40% (or 30%, etc.) of the value of the structure prior to construction, the project constitutes a substantial improvement. (Id., at 5-18.)
Also, FEMA suggests that jurisdictions may adopt a cumulative substantial improvement definition to ensure that multiple phases of one project are considered together, as quoted below: (Id.)

“Substantial improvement” means any combination of repairs, reconstruction, rehabilitation, addition, or other improvement of a structure taking place during [insert period of time selected by the community] the cost of which equals or exceeds fifty percent of the market value of the structure before the work is started.”

Staff suggests that the reduced substantial improvement threshold and/or the cumulative substantial improvement definition would be most clear by adopting a code amendment changing the definition of “substantial improvement” under BMC 16.20.040.

Moreover, the National Flood Insurance Program’s Community Rating System may provide insurance premium rate reductions for communities that adopt more stringent floodplain measures, such as a reduced substantial improvement threshold or a defined cumulative substantial improvement requirement. (FEMA, CRS Credit for Higher Regulatory Standards, p. 2.)

Pursuant to the information above, the Subcommittee may wish to consider recommending a reduced substantial improvement threshold or a cumulative substantial improvement definition to assist in implementing the substantial improvement requirement and ensure that floodplain standards are met.

Alternatively, the Subcommittee may wish to maintain the current City policy of analyzing the time of construction inactivity between projects. Staff has included revised Administrative Policy language providing that a period of 3 years of construction inactivity prior to the application of a subsequent building permit is required, or else prior construction costs will be considered when evaluating substantial improvement.

Finally, the Subcommittee may determine that the City’s current practice of requiring 1 year of construction inactivity between projects is appropriate.

Staff seeks direction regarding the analysis of multiple projects at the same property over time.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

No environmental review is required for the proposed policy as it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility of an adverse environmental exception, pursuant to the Common Sense exemption, CEQA Guideline 15061.

1 By way of reference, Belvedere Municipal Code section 16.20.040 currently states, in applicable part, “Substantial improvement” means any reconstruction, rehabilitation, addition, or other proposed new development of a structure, the cost of which equals or exceeds 50% of the market value of the structure before the start of construction of the improvement.
CORRESPONDENCE

At the time of writing this staff report, staff has not received any written communications.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests that the Subcommittee provide direction regarding the analysis of substantial improvement in the context of multiple projects over time.

ATTACHMENTS.

1. Proposed Revised Administrative Policy.
POLICY 14.7
ADMINISTRATION OF SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECTS WITHIN DESIGNATED FLOODPLAINS

Adoption Date: ??????  Adopted by: City Council Motion
Creation Date:  Revised by: None
Authority:  City Council

14.7.1  BACKGROUND

The Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") has designated two floodplain areas in Belvedere, which are the AE and VE Zones. Projects in these Zones are subject to the Floodplain Management Code sections in the Belvedere Municipal Code, Chapter 16.20, and applicable FEMA regulations. Pursuant to Chapter 16.20, any construction project that constitutes a "substantial improvement" is required to be elevated a minimum of 1 foot above Base Flood Elevation ("BFE"), with minor differences between the separate zones.

BMC section 16.20.040 defines substantial improvement as:

BA. "Substantial improvement" means any reconstruction, rehabilitation, addition, or other proposed new development of a structure, the cost of which equals or exceeds 50% of the market value of the structure before the "start of construction" of the improvement. This term includes structures which have incurred "substantial damage," regardless of the actual repair work performed. The term does not, however, include either:

1. any project for improvement of a structure to correct existing violations or state or local health, sanitary, or safety code specifications which have been identified by the local code enforcement official and which are the minimum necessary to assure safe living conditions, or
2. any alteration of a "historic structure", provided that the alteration will not preclude the structure's continued designation as a "historic structure."

Additionally, the BMC defines “market value” as;

AK. “Market value” means the appraised valuation for the property minus the land value as determined by an independent appraisal by a certified appraiser.

To assist in establishing whether a project constitutes a substantial improvement subject to Floodplain regulations, an applicant submits an estimate of construction costs and an appraisal of the structure along with a building permit application. If the Floodplain Administrator calculates that the cost of the project equals or exceeds 50% of the structure’s appraised value, then the project
is a substantial improvement and be elevated pursuant to Floodplain rules.

However, there have been questions raised regarding the accuracy of some structure appraisals and project cost estimates. If an applicant wishes to avoid raising the structure pursuant to Floodplain requirements, there is an incentive to overvalue the structure and undervalue the estimated cost of construction. For example, if the appraised value of the structure appears high, and the cost of construction appears low, the cost of construction will be less likely to meet the 50% threshold required for a substantial improvement, thereby avoiding Floodplain regulations.

The purpose of this policy is to provide tools for the Floodplain Administrator in making the substantial improvement determination by confirming the accuracy of both the appraised value of a structure and the estimated costs of construction. These tools will help in providing consistent and predictable determinations for whether a project constitutes a substantial improvement and must be raised per Floodplain regulations.

14.7.2 COMMENTS

1. Demolition In Flood Zone Presumptively Substantial Improvement Subject to Floodplain Regulations

This Administrative Policy provides that any project located in a designated flood zone that meets the definition of a demolition in BMC section 19.08.136 is presumptively a substantial improvement subject to Floodplain regulations, unless the individual facts and circumstances of the project indicate otherwise. BMC section 19.08.136, defines demolition as:

19.08.136 Demolition. “Demolition,” for the purposes of this Title and Title 20, means the razing of a building, removal of a dwelling unit, or the removal of more than fifty percent of the total exterior wall and roof area from the grade up, including all exterior openings. Removing a residential second unit or converting a duplex into a single unit is considered a demolition. The following activities shall not be considered to be demolitions within the meaning of this definition: a retrofit (see Section 19.08.458); maintenance, repair and/or replacement of exterior surfaces, so long as the materials are consistent with the requirements of Section 20.04.140 “Materials and colors used;” and other maintenance efforts deemed by the Building and Planning Departments to be minor in nature and scope. It is the intent of this definition to ensure that all alterations to existing structures that are part of a major project for the remodel, alteration, construction, or repair of a home or accessory structure are reviewed by the City through a Design Review process, pursuant to Title 20 of the Belvedere Municipal Code.

Noted above, a substantial improvement is where the cost of a project equals or exceeds 50% of the value of the structure prior to construction. In most cases, the cost of construction to replace a demolition – which is defined as including the removal of more than 50% of exterior wall and roof areas – will logically exceed 50% of the structure’s value, thereby qualifying as a substantial improvement. However, the Administrative Policy provides that the Floodplain Administrator maintains the discretion to determine that a demolition does not constitute a substantial improvement based on the unique facts of the particular case.
2. Substantial Improvement Calculation for Successive Projects

FEMA regulations provide that multiple projects constructed over a certain period of time that cumulatively equal or exceed 50% of the value of the structure will qualify as a substantial improvement subject to Floodplain regulations. FEMA guidance states that local jurisdictions should work to ensure that larger projects are not separated into different phases to circumvent the substantial improvement requirements, and that each project should not be dependent on subsequent work.

Consistent with FEMA regulations, the Administrative Policy provides that a period of 3 years of construction inactivity prior to the application of a subsequent building permit is required, or else prior construction costs will be considered when evaluating substantial improvement. For example, if a project is approved with a total construction cost of 40% of the appraised value of the structure, and a second building permit application is submitted with an estimated construction cost of 15% of the structure’s value 24 months after the completion of the first project, then the total construction value would equal 55%, constituting a substantial improvement, and the property would require elevation pursuant to Floodplain regulations.

3. Independent Third Party Appraisals and Evaluations

Noted above, if an applicant does not wish to raise a structure as required by Floodplain regulations, the applicant has an incentive to establish a high appraised value of the structure compared with low project construction costs, so that the cost of construction will not meet the 50% substantial improvement threshold.

The Administrative Policy allows the City to hire an independent licensed appraiser to evaluate the appraisal submitted by an applicant, and/or perform an independent appraisal of a structure. All appraisal and analysis costs shall be paid by the applicant.

The third-party appraiser shall use the Actual Cash Value appraisal methodology, as approved by FEMA guidance, unless otherwise determined by the Floodplain Administrator based on the particular property.

4. Standardized Per Square-Foot Cost Estimate

Establishing an accurate project cost estimate is an important component in determining whether a project constitutes a substantial improvement.

An applicant submits an estimated project cost with a building permit application. In most cases an applicant’s project cost estimate is a rough estimate by the architect, designer, or property owner. These estimates may be inaccurate because a contractor has not been selected. Once a contractor is retained, construction estimates may increase. If project costs are increased after issuance of a building permit, the project may then meet the 50% threshold for substantial improvement, compelling the City to rescind project approvals, require modification of the project, or require the home to be raised pursuant to Floodplain regulations.
An applicant who seeks to avoid Floodplain regulations has an incentive to establish a low estimated project cost, such that when compared to a structure’s fair market value, the project does not meet the 50% threshold for substantial improvement.

To avoid this uncertainty, and provide a predictable and accurate project cost estimate, the Administrative Policy provides that the Floodplain Administrator may compare the applicant’s estimated project costs with an estimated project cost using a standardized cost per square foot set forth in the latest version of the Craftsman National Building Cost Manual (the “NBCM”). The NBCM provides a national and statewide average per square foot valuation for construction within specific regions of all 50 states, including the Bay Area, and considers the size and configuration of the home, as well as the type of construction.

For example, the most common type of home built in Belvedere’s Floodplain qualifies as luxury construction. The NBCM provides a cost per square foot of construction as $388.89 for luxury construction in the Bay Area with a local area multiplier of 27%. For a 2600 square foot home, staff would initially multiply the square footage of the project by the cost per square foot, $388.89. This totals $1,011,114.00. That total would then be adjusted with the local area modifier of 27%. This totals $1,284,114.78. Therefore, the total cost of construction for this project would be $1,284,114.78.

If the NBCM project cost estimate is greater than the project cost estimate submitted by the applicant, the NBCM cost estimate shall be used in the substantial improvement analysis. The Floodplain Administrator has the discretion to use the applicant’s project cost estimate if appropriate based on facts and circumstances of a particular project.

14.7.3 POLICY/PROCEDURE

1. A Demolition In Flood Zone Presumed Substantial Improvement for Floodplain Regulation Purposes.

If a project located in a designated floodplain constitutes a “demolition” as defined in Belvedere Municipal Code chapter 19.08, then the project will presumptively be considered a substantial improvement pursuant to Belvedere Municipal Code chapter 16.20 and as such, must comply with all applicable Floodplain regulations. In his or her discretion, based on unusual facts or circumstances, the Floodplain Administrator may determine a demolition is not a substantial improvement and is not required to satisfy Floodplain regulations.

2. Successive Projects

The cost of successive projects on the same property will be considered together for purposes of the substantial improvement analysis unless there is a 3 year period of construction inactivity between projects. If the cumulative costs of successive projects on the same property equal or exceed 50% of the structure’s value prior to the beginning construction, the project that equals or exceeds the 50% threshold shall trigger a substantial improvement determination requiring compliance with Floodplain regulations, including raising the home, unless there is a 3 year period of construction inactivity between projects.
3. Use of Independent Licensed Appraisers and Preferred Appraisal Method

In its discretion, the City may hire an independent licensed appraiser to evaluate any appraisals submitted by an applicant, and/or perform an independent appraisal of a structure’s fair market value. The costs of such evaluations and/or appraisals shall be paid in full by the applicant. Appraisals shall use the Actual Cash Value method, which evaluates the cost to replace a structure on the same parcel with a new structure of like-kind and quality, minus depreciation due to age, use, and neglect. The Actual Cash Value appraisal method is accepted by FEMA. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this section, the Floodplain Administrator in his or her discretion may require that a different appraisal methodology be used based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case.

4. Standardized Per Square-Foot Cost Estimate

In his or her discretion, the Floodplain Administrator may analyze the accuracy of an applicant’s estimated project cost by comparison with the standardized project cost per square foot construction established in the latest version of the Craftsman National Building Cost Manual (the “NBCM”). If the NBCM project cost estimate is greater than the project cost estimate submitted by the applicant, the NBCM cost estimate shall be used in the substantial improvement analysis. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this section, the Floodplain Administrator may use the applicant’s project cost estimate if appropriate based on the facts and circumstances of the particular case.
CALL TO ORDER OF SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 2:12pm.

Instructions for remote meeting conduct were explained.

Roll call was conducted; all present.

OPEN FORUM

There were no public comments.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 28, 2020

Minutes of the January 28, 2020 Floodplain Analysis Committee were approved with a revision to Committee member Stoehr’s comment of “Committee member Stoehr discussed utilizing the gross appraised number”, to "Committee member Stoehr suggested utilizing the Gross appraisal value on a $/sq ft basis to assess the proposed project construction cost."

DISCUSSION

DEMOLITION CORRELATION

Commission member Mark was concerned that the demolition correlation with a substantial improvement is not absolute. Gave examples of when the Planning Dept., may define a project as a demolition and it still not meeting the substantial improvement definition.
Commission member Mark also wanted City Council to have more discretion for judgement of the timeline between projects in an attempt to discourage working around FEMA suggested guidelines for projects within a given timeframe.

City Attorney, Emily Longfellow, provided background information as to how the 1 year timeframe standard was originally established.

Committee member Mark suggested timeline/timeframe of projects be addressed at the Planning Commission Meeting for Design Review.

Committee member Carapiet stated that many members of the public did not fully understand the project timeline standard when it was first established. Also stated that the community should be able to voice any concerns regarding projects.

Committee member Mark suggested that the demolition language in the policy should be more suggestive and provide more discretion to the Building Official to evaluate projects that possibly meet the substantial improvement definition.

Commission member Lynch agreed and suggested that the burden of proof be placed on the applicant if there is a question of the demolition correlation.

Commission member Stoehr questioned the validity of the demolition and substantial improvement correlation.

Commission member Lynch stated that more often than not a project defined by the Planning Dept. as a demolition, usually constitutes a substantial improvement.

Committee member Mark stated that the designation of a demolition is usually an indicator of a substantial improvement and should be used as such.

Committee member Carapiet stated that it is difficult to replace 50% of a structure for less than 50% of the value. It would be an unusual circumstance to have a project defined as a demolition and not a substantial improvement.

**PROJECT TIMEFRAME**

Committee member Carapiet stated that the current timeframe procedure appeared to encourage large improvements without triggering a substantial improvement designation and requiring the elevation of the structure.

Committee member Lynch agreed, however, stated that this policy met FEMA guidelines per previous discussions. Also requested that it be noted that some Committee members are in favor of a longer timeframe between construction projects.
Committee member Stoehr felt that the process should not be more difficult than necessary for applicants to remodel or upgrade their residences.

Committee member Mark described language from FEMA guidelines referencing improvement projects within a given timeframe.

Committee member Stoehr did not believe the timeframe should be more restrictive.

Committee member Mark requested a change in the policy language that conforms more with the prescribed language in the FEMA guidelines.

Committee member Lynch requested that staff avoid using the term “phased project” and wanted a broader discussion for a larger timeframe.

Committee member Stoehr referenced past efforts to remove lagoon properties from FEMA designated Floodzones. Stated that different Floodzones have different considerations.

Committee member Mark stated that the policy language should better reflect suggested FEMA guidelines. Possibly leave the timeframe as is and modify the policy language.

Committee member Lynch suggested a discussion around an increased timeframe, as opposed to the current one year limit.

Committee member Mark stated that the current one year timeframe may be acceptable based on community desires and the ability of property owners to self-insure. Additionally stated that staff needs to be careful for projects that increase the scope of work working under a valid building permit. Committee member Mark described this as “project creep”.

Committee member Lynch stated that FEMA disfavors “phased projects” and this language should be removed from the policy.

Committee member Mark agreed that this language needed to be removed and revised.

Committee member Carapiet stated that the Committee recognizes and understands the issues that need to be addressed with the current policy.

Committee member Stoehr was concerned that the Planning Commission and staff may not see the entire scope of work at the time of Design Review and may only see the first “phase” of a larger planned project.

Committee member Mark reiterated that the “phasing” language needed to be revised and the Committee members agreed.
LIST OF APPRAISERS FOR EVALUATION

Committee member Stoehr was unclear about the need of the approved list of licensed appraisers. Committee member Lynch clarified that this provides City staff the discretion to utilize the list to evaluate appraisals submitted by the applicant in the event that any issues or discrepancies appear with the submitted appraisal.

Committee member Mark stated that per the submitted appraisal, a structure’s market value should be established by taking the difference between the actual cash value of the structure and its depreciation. This method would be more in line with suggested FEMA guidelines.

Committee member Stoehr agreed with this method and requested that staff better define this approach in the policy.

Committee member Mark also stated that the evaluation should also be subject to the determination of the Building Official.

Committee member Lynch agreed.

Committee member Stoehr requested that staff provide the proposed list of appraisers.

PROJECT SQUARE FOOT MULTIPLIER

Committee member Carapiet requested that guidelines be provided for projects with questionable project valuations at the time of Design Review.

Committee member Mark agreed and stated that the Building Official should provide a recently created square foot multiplier worksheet as documentation as to how the City values the proposed construction.

Committee member Mark also felt this would be a very valuable metric.

Committee member Stoehr inquired about using gross value as provided in the appraisal in the project square foot multiplier.

Committee member Mark stated that this is not comparable in all applications. The proposed square foot multiplier will remain consistent with all applications.

Committee member Stoehr verified that an explanation of the square foot multiplier number, as well as, percentages of remodel work was provided on the proposed worksheet.

Committee member Mark agreed with the proposed square foot multiplier number, as well as, the proposed worksheet.
Committee member Lynch expressed concerns with the wide range of possible finish building materials and their cost.

Staff stated that these costs were taken into account in the proposed construction price per square foot.

**DESIGN REVIEW PROVISION**

City Attorney, Emily Longfellow, read and explained the proposed Design Review finding for the Planning Commission.

Committee member Mark questioned how the Planning Commission could make the finding if staff deemed the project compliant.

Staff explained that the new policy would eliminate this.

Committee member Lynch questioned the need for the proposed finding.

Committee member Mark stated that this would be better as a policy, rather than an ordinance.

The City Attorney stated that this may cause more confusion.

Committee member Stoehr questioned how this would be communicated to the project applicants.

Committee member Mark indicated that the intent is to provide staff the ability to deny a proposed project that has questionable Floodplain documentation. Additionally, the Design Review finding is needed in the event that the applicant decides to take a project to the Planning Commission, although staff has recommended denial.

Committed member Carapiet questioned the language staff may use at the Planning Commission. Instead of saying “staff approves the project” staff may state that the project meets the requirements and leave the decision to the Planning Commission.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00pm.