



City of Ukiah, CA
Design Review Board

MINUTES

Regular Meeting **April 5, 2011**
Conference Room 4 **3:00 p.m.**
Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

1
2
3
4
5
6 **1. CALL TO ORDER: Acting Chair Hise** called the Design Review Board meeting
7 at 3:00 p.m.

8
9 **2. ROLL CALL Present:** Tom Liden, Alan Nicholson, Tom Hise,
10 Nick Thayer,
11 **Absent:** Estok Menton, Chair Richard Moser
12 **Others Present:** None.
13 **Staff Present:** Kim Jordan, Senior Planner
14 Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner
15 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

16
17 **3. CORRESPONDENCE:** None

18
19 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes from the March 25, 2010, July 8, 2010,
20 and October 14, 2010 meeting.

21
22 **M/S Liden/Nicholson** approved the March 25, 2010, July 8, 2010 and October 14, 2010
23 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0).

24
25 **5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

26
27 **6. RIGHT TO APPEAL:** There are no appealable items on this agenda.

28
29 **7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

30 **7A. Façade Improvement Program – Verbal Update (10 Minutes)**

31 **Staff:**

- 32 • Introduced and provided an overview of the updated and revised Façade
33 Improvement Program approved by the Ukiah Redevelopment Agency.
- 34 • Provided each board member with a copy of the FIP Guidelines and Project
35 Evaluation Form.
- 36 • Potential participants (property owners and tenants) within the boundaries of the
37 program were advised by mail of the FIP as well as for the Business
38 Improvement Program (BIP).
- 39 • The FIP guidelines provide information about corresponding eligibility criteria,
40 program requirements, associated program benefits, information about how the
41 program functions, and other considerations/information.
- 42 • The programs were launched/became effective Monday, April 4, 2011.
- 43 • FIP includes a provision for smaller projects that would provide the entire project
44 funding up to \$15,000 with part as a forgivable loan and the remainder as a zero
45 interest loan.

- 1 • Provided the Committee with a URA Façade & Business Improvement Program
2 map that shows the boundaries of the Commercial Property Improvement District
3 boundaries and noted the boundaries have changed somewhat compared to the
4 boundaries for the former FIP.
- 5 • FIP now includes up to \$2500 in free Design Assistance in order to address
6 many of the issues of the previous FIP that were identified by the Board and
7 staff.

8
9 **Board comments:**

- 10 • Potential applicants should take advantage of the free design assistance benefit
11 to help shape and get ideas for a project.
- 12 • The FIP is a worthwhile program particularly with the free design assistance
13 benefit whereby even a \$15,000 forgivable loan can bring about significant
14 improvements to a building.
- 15 • The intent of the process is to encourage quality projects as opposed to
16 owner/tenant doing the work on his/her own. While applicants may have to put
17 more money into a project to get a quality project, the benefit of getting 50%
18 funding is a reason to consider the FIP.

19
20 **Staff:**

- 21 • The most significant change to the FIP is the free design assistance up to \$2,500
22 to assist the applicant design his/her project whereby a potential applicant is
23 encouraged to select a design professional from the RDA recommended list of
24 design professionals as part of the benefit program package. While using a
25 design professional is encouraged, it is not mandatory. The submittal of plans
26 and/or drawing matrix for the professional design assistance is modeled with the
27 City's planning department application, which specifically addresses
28 drawings/illustrations.
- 29 • The FIP contains three categories of projects, Minor, Major and Special, which
30 are further explained on pages 3 and 4 of the FIP guidelines with regard to
31 funding amounts since project objectives vary as to need/context and associated
32 cost.
- 33 • The maximum FIP funding amount is 50% of the total project cost (eligible
34 expenses) or \$15,000 whichever is less for a minor project and \$30,000
35 whichever is less for a major project. Special projects are projects that include
36 any combination of eligible expenses and requesting more than \$30,000 of FIP
37 funds. The terms for special projects relative to amount of funding, timing of
38 funding and forgiveness schedule will be determined by the RDA as part of the
39 FIP application wherein unlike minor and major projects, special projects require
40 review and approval of the URA.
- 41 • A eligible applicant could receive as much as 75% of the 50% funding upfront
42 provided, he/she can demonstrate ability to complete the project. Unfinished
43 projects are undesired.
- 44 • The other program benefit also offers a forgivable loan unlike the former program
45 that provided funding in the form of a grant and where no maintenance schedule
46 was a requirement. A percentage of the loan will be forgiven annually when the
47 project has been maintained in accordance with the maintenance standards
48 based on the amount of the loan and the type of improvements included in the
49 project.

- 1 • The maximum lifetime funding amount per parcel and building is currently
2 \$50,000. Page 4 of the guidelines provides additional information about the
3 lifetime maximum amount.
- 4 • The program objective is to encourage better projects and a list of the eligible
5 improvements is provided on pages 3 and 4 of the FIP guidelines.

6
7 **Board questions:**

8 **Q1.** Inquired about the lifetime of materials and need for projects to comply with
9 industry standards for paint, awning material, and other types of materials.

10 **Q2.** What is the timeframe to complete a project.

11 **Q3.** Inquired about general program requirements and prevailing wage. It is important
12 potential applicants and contractors are made aware of the prevailing wage
13 requirement.

14
15 **Staff:**

16 **Q1.** Staff will consult with the DRB relative to sustainability of materials and resources
17 for projects. The Board may request the applicant provide information about
18 materials for projects in order to adequately complete the evaluation form to
19 avoid misuse of funds. The intent is to attain the highest lifespan for materials.
20 The DRB has the professional expertise to make decisions about the
21 quality/lifespan of materials.

22 **Q2.** Applicant has two years from FRC approval to complete a project.

23 **Q3.** Improvements funded by the FIP are subject to the payment of prevailing wages
24 as required by State law. Because the FIP uses public funds, there is no choice
25 other than to comply with the prevailing wage requirement. Staff has looked at
26 this repeatedly and it has been vetted by the City Attorney. There is no way not
27 to comply with prevailing wage, except in the case where the owner does the
28 work himself. It may be that applicants are reluctant to take advantage of the FIP
29 because of the prevailing wage requirement.

30
31 **Member Thayer:** Has information about prevailing wage that he will forward to staff.
32 This information should be provided to applicants at the beginning/before an application
33 so that they understand the implications for participating in the program and having to
34 pay prevailing wage.

35
36 **Staff:** It is important to have information about prevailing wage and the requirements.

37
38 There was discussion about prevailing wage relative to owner/builder and contractor/
39 sub-contractor types of situations, noting prevailing wage does not apply if the work is
40 being done by the owner. Owner/builders solely doing the work improvements are
41 exempt from prevailing wage. Accordingly, if an owner is seeking funding for painting of
42 his/her building, the FIP will pay for paint at 50%. If the work improvements require a
43 licensed professional, it must be done at prevailing wage so if any portion of the
44 improvements has to be completed by a contractor such as for electrical work, the entire
45 project must be done at prevailing wage. Qualified contractors are paid at prevailing
46 wage because they are licensed, bonded and insured.

47
48 **Board question:**

49 **Q1.** If prevailing wage is enforced for projects, is it necessary to see documentation
50 of contractor qualifications in terms of appropriate licensing and insurance?

51 **Q2.** Will there be a list of qualified contractors?

1
2 **Staff:**

3 **Q1.** Appropriate documentation relative to using qualified licensed and insured
4 contractors will be confirmed as part of the FIP process.

5 **Q2.** An approved contractors list cannot be provided and advised the design
6 professionals that will be assisting applicants with their designs did do through an
7 'RFQ' process to be on the approved list.
8

9 **Member Nicholson:** Noted it is costly to be on the list of qualified contractors.

10
11 **B. Building Improvement Program – Verbal Update (10 Minutes)**

12 **Staff:**

- 13 • The Business Improvement Program (BIP) was also launch/introduced 4/4/2011
14 at the same time and in the same way as the FIP.
- 15 • Referred to the BIP Application Process document that provides a step-by-step
16 process of the program, BIP application, submittal requirements and footnoted
17 information
- 18 • Improvements can include interior remodels, particularly if there is a new tenant
19 and can include such improvements as grease interceptor, seismic upgrades.
- 20 • The DRB will not be involved in the BIP because the program pertains to
21 improvements that are not related to design. Applications will go directly to FRC
22 for approval.
- 23 • Elaborated on the intent of the BIP submittal requirements document that an
24 applicant must submit as part of the application process.
- 25 • Funding has been approved by the URA for 2010/2011. Do not know how long/if
26 funding will remain available due to the Governor's proposed changes to
27 redevelopment.
- 28 • In order to be eligible for funding, the improvement must be required by Building
29 Code.
- 30 • Staff asked the Board to take some of the program brochures and pass them out
31 in the business community if they would like.
32

33 **Board Questions:**

34 **Q1.** Are ADA improvements upgrades allowed?

35 **Q2.** The question "Does the project include any of the following? Check all that apply"
36 is confusing and suggests that other improvements may be eligible. This should
37 be restated.

38 **Q3.** Are there other types of improvements that should be on the eligibility list?
39

40 **Staff:**

41 **Q1.** Confirmed ADA improvements are allowed. Staff will add this improvement to the
42 eligibility list included on the application form.

43 **Q2.** Form will be revised to read "Check all improvements for which funding is
44 requested."

45 **Q3.** No other improvements were approved by the RDA to be covered as part of the
46 BIP so once ADA is added, the list will be complete.
47

48 **8. NEW BUSINESS:**

49 **8A. Discussion regarding appointment terms for Board Members (15 Minutes)**
50

1 **Staff:** Referred to the staff report and noted:

- 2 • The DRB consists of seven members with three year terms.
- 3 • There is one vacancy due to Jody Cole's recent resignation.
- 4 • Three members have terms that expire in June of this year.
- 5 • There are no term limits for the DRB so if a member would like to continue they
- 6 can request to be reappointed by the RDA.
- 7 • Having some kind of design experience is generally a plus when considering
- 8 serving on the DRB.
- 9 • Asked the Board to start thinking about a replacement for Jody Cole, community
- 10 at large.

11
12 **8B. Development of Downtown Zoning Code Design District Guidelines (60**
13 **Minutes)**

14 **Staff:**

- 15 • Provided a staff report explaining the intent of having a design appendix for the
- 16 DZC.
- 17 • The Planning Commission reviewed how best to proceed with creating a design
- 18 appendix and in their discussions approved of the idea of Design Guidelines
- 19 using the Central Petaluma Specific Plan (CPSP) as a possible model for the for
- 20 the Downtown Zoning Code.
- 21 • As part of their discussion, the Planning Commission identified three design
- 22 districts: Historic, Main Street and Perkins Street Corridor. The DZC map shows
- 23 the boundaries for the three design districts.
- 24 • The Planning Commission also selected existing buildings with architectural
- 25 styles and design elements that exemplify each district and are appropriate for
- 26 each district. The Commission did not consider its selection to be all-inclusive.
- 27 • Planning Commission is requesting that the DRB and staff formulate a design
- 28 appendix for the DZC and to provide direction to staff taking into consideration
- 29 design patterns, style, composition, and design/architectural character for the
- 30 three districts.
- 31 • The design appendix would replace the existing Downtown Design District
- 32 Guidelines for properties located within the boundaries of the DZC.
- 33 • Attachment 3 is intended as a working table for the creation of the Design
- 34 Appendix. Anything can be added, changed, etc in the table based on the
- 35 direction of the DRB.
- 36 • Emphasized when considering design concepts for the design appendix, do not
- 37 have to think about the form, but rather pattern and style as to the design
- 38 elements the Boards thinks would work in the different districts.
- 39 • DRB does not need to limit itself to buildings within the boundaries of the DZC or
- 40 City. If there are other styles or buildings that can be described as part of the
- 41 Guidelines these can be considered.
- 42 • Recommend that ideas for the guidelines are not "filtered" and that everyone is
- 43 open to considering/identifying what works best for Ukiah and within each district.
- 44

45 **Board:**

- 46 • Likes the CPSP approach as a potential model for Ukiah.
- 47 • Discussed Attachment 2 of the staff report, particularly the Petaluma's guiding
- 48 principles for development within the Central Petaluma Specific Plan Area and
- 49 noted while the purpose statement is nicely articulated, it may be too general.

- 1 • Discussed some of the design elements and variations in the three design
2 districts.
3 • Likes the format of attachment 3, DZC working design guidelines table for the
4 three design districts.
5 • Commented on the three design districts and identified different design
6 characteristics that are existing and that make sense for each district.
7 • Will think and provide suggestions about the best approach to creating a design
8 appendix and corresponding expansion of the working design guidelines table.
9 • May not be able to find many good examples within the DZC or the City. May
10 need to look elsewhere.
11

12 **Board consensus:**

- 13 • Supports having a design appendix and Planning Commission's approach that
14 the design characteristics identified in the three districts do not necessarily have
15 to be all-inclusive.
16 • Meeting April 20 to further discuss the Design appendix for the DZC.
17

18 **M/S Nicholson/Thayer** to continue discussion of the Design Guideline Appendix for the
19 DZC to April 20 at 3:00 p.m.
20

21 Staff gave the DRB a copy of the completed draft DZC.
22

23 **9. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:** None.
24

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

27 **11. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT:** April 20 at 3 pm
28

29 The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.
30

31 _____
32 Tom Hise, Acting Chair
33

34 _____
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary