



City of Ukiah, CA
Design Review Board

MINUTES

Regular Meeting **March 25, 2010**
Conference Room 3 **3:00 p.m.**
Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL Present:** Tom Liden, Alan Nicholson, Jody Cole, Nick Thayer, Richard Moser, Chair
Absent: Estok Menton, Tom Hise
Others Present:
Staff Present: Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner
Kim Jordan, Senior Planner
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
-

Chair Moser recused himself.

3. **CORRESPONDENCE** – None

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 25, 2010**
M/S Member Liden/Member Cole to approve February 25, 2010 minutes, as submitted with Vice Chair Menton abstaining.

5. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS** – None

6. **RIGHT TO APPEAL – Vice Chair Menton** read the appeal process. For matter heard at this meeting, the appeal date is April 5, 2010.

7. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

8. **NEW BUSINESS:**

8A. **Site Development Permit 08-23**, proposed exterior upgrade and awning replacement to the building located at 262-274 Smith Street, Ukiah APN 002-191-23. Recommendation to Zoning Administrator for Minor Site Development Permit.

Staff Comments:

- Requested the Board further review the design aspects for the proposed project and make comments regarding the proposed exterior stucco treatment and the installation of columns between each storefront and make a recommendation to the Zoning Administrator about the project.
- The staff report addresses the comments/project recommendations from previous Board discussions for this project.
- Attachment 4 represents the current design for the storefronts.
- The project is not currently within the boundaries of the FIP. If the proposed FIP changes that include possible modification to the program boundaries are adopted by the Ukiah Redevelopment Agency, this parcel may be included within the program boundaries wherein the property owner could apply for FIP funds.

- 1 • The applicant is not in attendance and favors the proposed project, as designed.
2

3 **Board Discussion:**

- 4 • There was general discussion regarding the layout of the existing building.
5 • In previous discussions:
6 The Board questioned the structural compatibility of the building with the
7 proposed application of the art stone material to the exterior of the building as
8 shown in the current revised design (attachment 4) and supports the building be
9 assessed to determine that if structural reinforcement is needed to support the
10 proposed stucco.

11
12 There was also some question about reevaluation of the structural integrity of the
13 front of the building with the infrastructure/utility improvements the City planned
14 to make on Smith Street.

15
16 The design characteristics/features should demonstrate that it is essentially one
17 project.

18
19 It was noted a settlement has been made in a lawsuit for damages to the façade
20 of the buildings as a result of the sidewalk improvements.

21
22 **Staff:** The Board had indicated in previous discussions that if structural
23 reinforcement/foundation repair is necessary this would be a good opportunity to raise
24 the roof height of some of the storefronts to allow for some articulation variation that
25 would architecturally improve the appearance of the individual tenant spaces.

- 26
27 • While the Board supports requiring a sign program for the project, the applicant
28 desires to leave the matter of signage to the individual tenants.
29 • In order to make informed recommendations, the Board needs to see site plans
30 with scales and dimensions.

31
32 **Richard Moser, project representative,** explained the exterior building treatment,
33 noting the process involves foam and stucco.

- 34
35 • The Board was concerned the treated columns would extend into the public right-
36 of-way.

37
38 **Board Comments:**

- 39 • The proposed project design gives the appearance of ‘fakeness.’ It is not the
40 right look for the neighborhood.
41 • Project is not compatible with the neighborhood, such as in keeping with the
42 architectural theme of the Railroad Center and other building characteristics of
43 the neighborhood. Additionally, the proposed building treatment is very out of
44 contrast/context with other buildings in the vicinity, some of which are tin.
45 • Even if the project was eligible for FIP funding, the design does not meet the
46 criteria/merits of the program.
47 • The proposed improvement is decorative in nature and not ‘real construction.’
48 • With the proposed improvements, the front of the building would not match the
49 rear of the building.
50

1 **Staff Comment:**

- 2 • The applicant is not obligated to make improvements other than what the City is
3 required to pay for in the way of repairs for damages made to the building from
4 the sidewalk improvements and no approval is required for improvements such
5 as paint/awnings if the applicant is not making structural changes, since the
6 property is not located within the current FIP boundaries wherein funding is being
7 requested.
8 • The intent of today's meeting is to make comments regarding the proposed
9 changes to the project.

10
11 **Board:**

- 12 • Concerned that the proposed radical exterior changes to the building does not
13 maintain the true value/style of the building as originally designed.
14 • Questioned whether the Board's liking or not liking the design is relevant?
15 • The color of the stone is not shown on Attachment 4.

16
17 **Staff:** The project has been fairly undefined from the beginning in terms of the previous
18 DRB discussions concerning the project.

19
20 **Board:**

- 21 • The mass and style of the building can be effectively changed using design
22 techniques without having to change the value of the building as opposed to
23 radically changing the context/flavor of the building as it presently exists.
24 • Other enhancement amenities such as providing for landscaping planters and
25 street trees where feasible can be effective.

26
27 **Staff:** What about from an applicant's perspective that his project has been presented to
28 the Board for review three times.

29
30 **Board:** Reiterated the Board did make comments/recommendations regarding the
31 design each time the project was reviewed and each time the Board indicated detailed
32 plans designed to scale and material/color boards are necessary in order to make
33 informed recommendations and that a design professional could assist in this regard. No
34 formal design packet was made available to the Board.

35
36 **Board Consensus:**

- 37 • Not supportive of the proposed design of the project and cannot make a
38 recommendation to the Zoning Administrator for approval of the minor site
39 development permit.
40 • Recommends the applicant hire a design professional.
41 • Provide future site plans drawn to scale.
42 • Preserve the 'value' of the building as it presently exists.
43 • Supports making building improvements that are more simplified add to the
44 quality and aesthetic appeal of the building that are less intense/drastring and likely
45 less costly.
46 • In terms of architectural detail some recommendations include:
47 ➤ Use of a paint scheme that enhances the building.
48 ➤ Possibly raise the roofline to better articulate the façade, provide for
49 character and differentiate the individual tenant spaces.

- Use awnings for the front of the storefronts to accent the paint scheme and add style to the building storefronts.
- Replace the doors with a different design.
- Provide for a sign program.
- The existing window frames can be retained, but provide for high performance glass that is energy efficient.

Richard Moser: Will discuss the Board's comments with the applicant whereby the applicant can make a decision about which style would be appropriate.

Member Hise recommended denial of the project as proposed with the recommendation to resubmit with a new design.

M/S Member Nicholson/Member Hise the DRB recommends the applicant hire a design professional, the proposed design and application is inappropriate for the City block of buildings, for the applicant to re-think the scope of the project and provide the City and DRB with professional drawings and documents to support his proposal and to complete the required application packet for a Site Development Permit.

Discussion:

Member Thayer: Requested it be made known the DRB has addressed issues at previous Board discussions concerning the project.

Vice Chair Menton: Given the documents the applicant has submitted to support approval of the project may not have been sufficient, but flatly stating the proposed design is inappropriate for the area is not providing the applicant with good feedback/direction. Many of the concepts discussed by the Board could be worked into the project allowing it to be a good fit for the site, as well as architecturally pleasing to the community.

Staff: It may be beneficial to ask if the reason the Board does not support the project is because the design would not be appropriate for an entire block.

Board: The design is essentially too much of the same thing.

Member Hise: The design would not be appropriate for any site.

Member Nicholson: Cannot support the project and noted the design to be less than 'amateur' wherein the project would have a large impact on the fabric of the City.

Member Cole: Is supportive of the motion. There is another way to look at the matter and that is if the applicant is 'set' with the design, then the design should be placed into the category of an eccentric design. If someone has to have a project this eccentric, she would require more justification for approval. It may be the applicant presumes the DRB is accepting of the project, as designed.

AYES: Members Liden, Thayer, Hise, Cole, Nicholson

NOES: Member Menton

Member Menton was opposed to the motion because in his opinion the project has merit in some form and that the Board needs to provide more direction.

1 **Board:** The intent of the Board is to be encouraging with regard to projects.

2
3 **Board:** Talked about formulating another motion.

4
5 **M/S Hise/Cole** to reject the aforementioned motion. Motion carried by an all AYE voice
6 vote.

7
8 **M/S Member Liden/Hise** to recommend denial of the application, as submitted and it is
9 recommended a new project be submitted with the assistance of a design professional.

10
11 **Member Thayer** desired to add clarification to the motion why the project was denied.
12 The motion carried with the following roll call vote:

13
14 **AYES: Members Liden, Menton, Thayer, Cole, Nicholson and Hise**

15 Motion carried.

16
17 The Board recommended the Downtown Design Guidelines for Commercial buildings be
18 available to the applicant for references purposes.

19
20 **9. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

21 The Board asked about past discussions and direction to staff about posting signs for
22 projects that have been completed with the assistance of FIP. Schats was one of the
23 projects where a sign was to be displayed.

24
25 Staff will review the project conditions.

26
27 **10. MATTERS FROM STAFF:** None

28
29 **11. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

30 There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

31
32
33 _____
34 Estok Menton, Chair

35
36 _____
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary