



City of Ukiah, CA
Design Review Board

MINUTES

1
2
3 **Regular Meeting** **March 12, 2009**
4 **Conference Room 3** **3:00 p.m.**
5 **Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue**

6 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

7 **2. ROLL CALL Present:** Alan Nicholson, Tom Hise,
8 Estok Menton, Vice Chair
9 Jody Cole, Richard Moser, Chair
10 **Absent:** Nick Thayer, Tom Liden
11 **Others Present:** Robert Palafox
12 **Staff Present:** Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner
13 Kim Jordan, Senior Planner
14 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

15
16 **3. CORRESPONDENCE – None**

17
18 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 12, 2009**

19 **M/S Menton/Hise** to approve February 12, 2009 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried
20 by an all AYE voice vote of the members present.

21
22 **5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS – None**

23
24 **6. RIGHT TO APPEAL**

25 **Chair Moser** read the appeal process. For matters heard at this meeting, the final date
26 to appeal is March 23, 2009.

27
28 **10. MATTERS FROM STAFF (Continued)**

29
30 **10B.** Update on Downtown Streetscape Improvement Plan

31 **Associate Planner Faso** stated this agenda item will go to City Council on April 1, 2009.

32
33 **Deputy Director of Public Works Rick Seanor** is the contact person for this matter.

34
35 **Associate Planner Faso** reported Economic Development Coordinator Cathleen Moller
36 has provided fliers concerning a '2009 North Coast Green Opportunities workshop'
37 hosted by The Solar Living Institute and City of Ukiah on May 5, 2009.

38
39 **10C.** Continuation of Façade Improvement Grant Program discussion of potential
40 revisions to the Façade Improvement Program and discussion of Façade
41 Improvement Funds Site Sign.

42
43 **Planning Director Stump** referred to City Resolution No. 2007-04 and commented:

- 44 • The URA established the DRB as an advisory body to the Planning Commission
45 on Major Use and Site Development Permits; Zoning Administrator on Minor Use
46 and Site Development Permits; to the FRC on FIP applications, and to the City

1 Council or other city policy boards as set forth in the UMC or as directed by City
2 Council or the URA.

- 3 • Changes have been made to the DRB whereby the membership has increased
4 from 5 to 7 members and the DRB roles/responsibilities have expanded to
5 include the authority to review the design elements for new
6 construction/renovations/alterations/reconstruction within the Redevelopment
7 Project Area in connection with the Design Guidelines for Commercial
8 Developments in the City. The DRB has been making recommendations about
9 the design aspects for projects within and outside the Commercial Downtown
10 Design District with a recommendation to the Planning Commission in addition to
11 the traditional role of reviewing FIP grant projects and making recommendations
12 to the FRB.
- 13 • A question was recently raised by an applicant whether the DRB has jurisdiction
14 for review of design elements for a project outside of the Downtown Design
15 Review District.
- 16 • The DRB has been using a checklist for commercial projects within and outside
17 the Downtown Design District.
- 18 • Staff reviewed the Resolution with regard to jurisdictional authority and the
19 Resolution states, 'The DRB of the Ukiah Redevelopment Agency evaluates new
20 public and private construction, renovations, alterations and reconstructions
21 *within* the Downtown Design District and evaluates façade improvements for
22 projects requesting URA funding within the Façade Improvement Grant Program
23 areas for consistency with the Downtown Design Review Guidelines and
24 standards adopted to ensure that projects enhance the physical elements of the
25 City and that Ukiah remains an attractive community with a unique sense of
26 place.'
- 27 • The Downtown Design Review District has expanded over time. However, since
28 the current adopted Resolution relevant to jurisdictional authority pertains to
29 projects *within* the Downtown Design Review District, which include Gobbi Street
30 to Low Gap Road, the Downtown, and City corridors, the DRB should make
31 design decisions for projects within the purview of the Downtown Design Review
32 District.

33
34 Staff is in the process of researching the history of the FIP to include program and DRB
35 role changes made over the years and inform the DRB.

36
37 **Planning Director Stump** briefly commented on the importance of maintaining a
38 quorum at all times so that applicants seeking FIP grant funding recommendations and
39 design element review for projects do not have to wait a month for review when there is
40 a quorum. He asked the Board to advise staff in advance of a planned absence.

41
42 **Member Hise** commented on the issue that funding determinations are based on
43 compliance with the current adopted URA FIP guidelines wherein projects must meet the
44 program criteria: to revitalize Ukiah's Downtown Design District through a public/private
45 partnership to stimulate investment; to reduce blight; and, to improve the physical
46 appearance of commercial buildings and related site elements. He questions the issue of
47 blight as one of the program's criteria and stated, in his opinion, essentially none of the
48 projects seeking FIP funding have been 'in blighted' condition and further questions how
49 projects have successfully met all three of the requirements in order to be eligible for
50 funding.

1 Staff will review redevelopment law concerning the element of 'blight' as a condition that
2 must be met when seeking FIP grant funding. According to redevelopment law, vacant
3 land is considered 'blight.'

4
5 **7. MATTERS FROM STAFF**

6 **7A. Meeting Dates and Agenda** – The next regular meeting will be April 9, 2009 at
7 3:00 p.m.

8
9 **8. NEW BUSINESS**

10 **8A. SDP 09-10 Major Site Development Permit:** CALSTAR, Shock Trauma Air
11 Rescue, 1357 S. State Street, APN 003-280-05, placement of two modular
12 buildings at the new location of CALSTAR operations at the Ukiah Airport. The
13 building will be used for administrative offices and crew quarters.
14 Recommendation to the Planning Commission.

15 **Associate Planner Faso** referred to the site plans and project objectives for relocation
16 of the Calstar operation at the Ukiah Municipal Airport. The project is technically outside
17 of the Downtown Design Review District. Calstar proposes to relocate to the former DHL
18 building, move an existing modular building and add a new modular structure to the site
19 as shown on the plans for a total of three buildings for the helicopter and fixed-winged
20 emergency rescue operation.

21
22 The DRB generally discussed the project and supports that the modular buildings match
23 the color scheme of the former DHL building. They further support the applicant provides
24 for some landscaping to enhance the visual presentation and provide for a softer
25 appearance.

26
27 **Member Nicholson** recommended the applicants consult with volunteer/service
28 organizations such as Mendocino ReLeaf, Ukiah Garden Club, Lions Club and other
29 similar organizations regarding landscaping suggestions for the project.

30
31 **It was the consensus** of the DRB to strongly recommend to the Ukiah Planning
32 Commission relative to discretionary review of the Major Site Development Permit SDP
33 09-10 selection of a color palate for the modular buildings complementary to the existing
34 DHL building and provide for a landscaping scheme for the site.

35
36 **8B. Façade Improvement Grant FIP 09-03:** 130 W. Standley Street,
37 APN 002-224-02, Virginia Willaims/Craig Strattman, applicants. Façade
38 Improvement Grant application for new awning fabric. Recommendation to the
39 Finance Review Committee.

40 **Associate Planner Faso** commented the applicant is seeking FIP grant funding to
41 replace the front awning on the building. The existing frame will be retained and is not
42 part of the proposed project. The applicant has selected 'True Brown' as the color for the
43 new awning. The estimated cost of the awning is \$3,369.44 @ 50% grant = \$1,684.72.

44
45 There was a general discussion concerning the proposed color for the new awning.

46
47 Staff noted this building has received prior FIP funding for new awnings, paint, and
48 windows under different ownership.

1 It was further noted the FIP requirement of \$50,000 lifetime sum is relevant to the
2 property and not to change in ownership. The building received funding in the sum of
3 \$3,063 in 1994 and \$4,432 in 2002 for a grand total of \$7,495.

4
5 **M/S Menton/Cole** to recommend the FRC approve FIP 09-03, as proposed, with
6 Conditions of Approval 1-8. Motion carried.

7
8 **Vice Chair Menton** was acting chair for the balance of the meeting.

9
10 **8C. Façade Improvement Grant FIP 09-02**, 720 N. State Street, APN 002-114-18
11 Ruff & Associates, applicant. Façade Improvement Grant application for new
12 exterior paint, new side awning, new landscaping. Recommendation to the
13 Finance Review Committee.

14 **Associate Planner Faso** commented the project involves exterior painting, a new
15 awning over the side entrance, replacement of existing sign face, new landscaping, and
16 new front doors.

17
18 The applicant submitted cost estimates for the project and staff determined which costs
19 would be eligible under the FIP requirements as follows:

- 20 • Design/color renderings = \$2,500 - **yes**
- 21 • Permits/fees = \$500 - **no**
- 22 • Building/street signage including permitting = \$4,320 (**no**, signage has already
23 been completed)
- 24 • Replace front doors - \$3,100 - **yes**
- 25 • Main building paint north/east facades including existing awning = \$13,425 - **yes**
- 26 • New awning to north entrance = \$4,400 - **yes**
- 27 • New pots/plants at north entrance = \$1,650 - **yes**
- 28 • Landscape on street side = \$1,500 - **yes**
- 29 • Redo ADA access including striping = \$1,200 - **no**

30 **Subtotal is \$32,595.**

31 Other expenses include:

- 32 • Project management & supervision = \$1,500 - **no**
- 33 • Insurance = \$650 - **no**
- 34 • Profit & overhead = \$4,890 - **no**

35 **Project Grand total = \$39,635**

36
37 No color/materials boards were provided. The applicant provided computer renderings
38 as examples of color for the awning, door samples, and pottery samples relevant to the
39 landscaping.

40
41 The DRB cited other approved projects and how decisions were made concerning
42 funding in conjunction with what the applicant was initially requesting.

43
44 DRB comments:

- 45 • Front doors – Sample selected likely not durable for the type of use.
46 Recommendation: Look at samples of door that may be more durable. Replace front
47 doors, as proposed (Style 7037 I.G./37 (S.G.)).
- 48 • New awning to north entrance – A sample of the fabric should have been
49 submitted.

50 Recommendation: Approved of the color and replace awning, as proposed

1 • Painting/preparation of main building – The proposed cost is high/unreasonable.
2 Paint preparation has begun on the building wherein a significant number of
3 gallons of painted have already been purchased and applied that is too dark.
4 Recommendation: The DRB supports the three color scheme. The DRB requests the
5 applicant provide 3 bids by licensed/bonded contractors to get a ballpark figure of what a
6 reasonable cost should be at 50% grant funding for the east and north elevations only.
7 The prerequisite for approval is the work must be completed by a licensed contractor.

- 8 • Design/color renderings – The DRB initially questioned the cost. It was noted the
9 costs are likely for architect consultation fees.

10 Recommendation: The proposed cost is reasonable.

- 11 • Landscape on street side.

12 Recommendation: Acceptable, as proposed.

- 13 • New pots/Plants at north entrance – The DRB was not supportive. Pots could
14 easily be vandalized and are not particularly durable.

15 Recommendation: Utilize the costs allotted for landscaping of parking lot.

16
17 The DRB are in agreement the building needs improvements.

18
19 **M/S Menton/Hise** to support FIP 09-02 with the following recommendations:

- 20 • The owner considers more durable front doors.
21 • With regard to the exterior painting, there be 3 bids from licensed contractors for
22 east and north elevations and that the work be completed by a licensed
23 contractor allowing for up to 50% grant matching funds;
24 • Supports of the proposed awning for the north entrance;
25 • Provide for permanent landscaping on the north side of the building in lieu of the
26 proposed landscaping pots.
27 • Supports landscaping for the front portion of the building.
28 • Supports the proposed color scheme.

29 And, Conditions of Approval 1-8. Motion carried.

30
31 **Senior Planner Jordan** requested clarification what should occur in the event the owner
32 is not willing to do the recommended landscaping on the north elevation and does this
33 mean the DRB would recommend no money for the landscaping pots.

34
35 The DRB were in agreement in this regard.

36 **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

37 **Associate Planner Faso** stated the DRB has been discussing FIP revisions relative to
38 boundaries, use of the scorecard and applications wherein further discussion needed
39 relative to the applications and whether projects should be categorized as major/minor.
40 For example, requests for funding for awnings and minor painting could be considered a
41 'minor' project and projects with substantial improvement requests/costs could be
42 considered 'major' projects.
43

44
45 The DRB is supportive of placing temporary signs acknowledging/advertising to the
46 public that project improvements/remodels/renovations made to buildings are completed
47 with 50% matching FIP funds from the RDA wherein approval for use of the signs and
48 cost of the signs is necessary from the URA.
49

1 The DRB discussed the feasibility of possibly assigning dollar values and/or percentages
2 of work based on the scope of the project, as to improvement elements are visible
3 depending upon whether the façade improvement is considered to be a minor or major
4 project. Incentives should be towards creating new upgrades rather than maintaining old
5 ones for the purpose of 'spreading the money around.' What criteria should constitute a
6 minor or major project would depend upon the scope of the project and must be defined.
7 For instance in terms of costs, a minor project could be improvements costing under
8 \$7,000 wherein a major project may be improvements costing between \$7,000 and
9 \$10,000 or more.

10
11 Should projects be evaluated according to cost, scope and what is that threshold?
12 Should projects be evaluated on 'the point of diminishing return' so that applicants are
13 discouraged from returning for replacement for the same improvement? How does the
14 requirement of 'blight' apply?

15
16 The Scorecard concept is a mechanism for determining/evaluating projects based on
17 merit and with establishing priorities from a group of projects.

18
19 Staff stated it may be that flexibility should be included in the working documents. Also,
20 projects can be reviewed as frequently as is needed, but the intent is to appropriate
21 funding quarterly.

22
23 The DRB stated the question becomes how to select a project when funding is nearly
24 expended. There is always the question of whether to do as many minor projects as
25 possible at the potential expense that a really large/great project comes along.

26
27 It was noted a minor project would not require the cost of hiring an architect.

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

30 There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

31
32 _____
33 Richard Moser, Chair

34
35 _____
36 Estok Menton, Vice Chair

37 _____
38 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary