

**MINUTES  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
May 8, 2008**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jody Cole  
Tom Liden  
Estok Menton, Vice Chair  
Tom Hise  
Alan Nicholson  
Nick Thayer

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Dave Hull

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Richard Moser

**STAFF PRESENT**

Senior Planner Townsend  
Cathy Elawadly, Recording  
Secretary

The meeting of the Design Review Board was called to order by Vice Chair Menton at 2:00 p.m., at Ukiah Civic Center, Conference Room No. 3, 300 Seminary Avenue, Ukiah, California.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Roll was taken with the results listed above.

**3. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

No one came forward.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 10, 2008 minutes**

**M/S Liden/Hise** to approve April 10, 2008 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried.

**5. FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM**

**5A. Façade Improvement Grant Program 07-05**, Dave Hull, 376 E. Gobbi Street.  
Limited to Phase 2: Landscaping and related parking lot improvements, lighting and fencing (Continuation of Review): Recommendation to Finance Review Committee

**Senior Planner Townsend** commented as follows:

- The applicant has applied for a FIP grant to update his building on East Gobbi Street.
- The Committee recommended approval to the Finance Review Committee for Phase 1 of the project relative to building exterior, windows, doors, and roof/gutter improvements at the April 10, 2008 DRB meeting leaving Phase 2 for the landscaping/paving and other issues to be continued for discussion.
- The Finance Review Committee awarded FIP grant funding to the applicant in the sum of \$13,000 for Phase I.
- The final elements and costs for Phase 2 will be discussed at today's Committee meeting to include:
  - ❖ Fencing  
Proposed Cost: \$3,471  
DRB: discuss eligibility of west and south frontage, including revised fence caps  
Estimated Cost: \$3,471

- ❖ Landscaping, irrigation, lighting, front pavers  
Proposed Cost: \$24,065  
DRB: discuss landscaping and irrigation on East, South, West elevations; all pavers and exclude lighting (proposed along North border)  
Revised Estimated Cost: \$23,065
- ❖ Drainage, irrigation, utility relocation, remove existing vegetation, compaction, paving 8,685 square feet (west portion of site)  
Proposed Cost: \$35,445  
DRB: discuss eligibility of west portion of site and preparation for landscaping along north boundary of site  
And,  
Preparation for installation of irrigation and landscape along north boundary  
Proposed Cost: \$4,773  
8 lighting fixtures  
Proposed Cost: \$1,080  
DRB: discussion that lighting is International Dark Sky compatible; south and west elevations  
Estimated Cost: \$1,080
- ❖ Recycle/trash enclosure  
Proposed Cost: \$4,612  
DRB: discuss aggregate block to replace chain link enclosure at northeast corner  
Estimated Cost: \$4,612

**Grand Total Cost for Phase 2: \$72,446 @ 50% = \$36,223**

- Staff recommends discussion concerning the matter of paving since this has been an issue.
- The DRB appears to support funding for paving to the degree it is tied to the landscaping, which is also a component of the project.
- Staff considered cost comparisons between saw cutting, paving and the remediation versus all new paving. New paving is similar to the remediation process.
- Staff recommends the DRB review the staff report attachments concerning the fencing cap, paving/landscaping bids, lighting fixtures and recycle/trash enclosure block material.
- The total of both Phase 1 and Phase 2 is under the \$50,000 FIP cap.
- The applicant must submit all costs for work before the Finance Review Committee can approve the funding for the project.
- Staff has increased the proposed total from \$36,223 to \$36,500 to cover permit fees, if any.

Staff/Committee/Applicant discussed Phase 2 as follows:

- The Committee is pleased with the Phase 1 exterior improvements.
- There was discussion concerning the square footage and type/material for the fence. The proposed fence is for the front portion of the site. The Committee is agreeable the cap for the top portion of the fence being a ball and spire as shown in the attachment ball opposed to a pointed cap.

- There was discussion concerning the outdoor lighting fixtures whereby 8 lights are proposed @ approximately \$100 each. The Committee supported 'Madrid' for the outdoor lighting model as shown in the attachment.
- There was discussion concerning the measures taken by the applicant to discourage/address potential vandalism, trespass and other nuisance issues regarding his property.
- There was discussion concerning the matter of landscaping/paving and how to effectively apportion the work in conjunction with the cost estimate of \$40,218 to fairly and reasonably reach the optimum benefit from the FIP at 50% funding. The DRB is not supportive of paving, except to remediate for installation of landscaping, irrigation and proper drainage. Past FIP policy has not typically provided funding for the paving of parking lots. However, in this case, the façade improvements also include the element of landscaping to beautify the site, which is located in the City's gateway and provide for an aesthetically pleasing presentation to the community. In order to effectively complete the landscaping, site preparation involving saw cutting of the existing parking lot, removal of asphalt and soil and reshaping/recompacting of the existing base material are project components to accommodate the landscaping. The elements of drainage, irrigation, utility relocation, removal of existing vegetation and compaction of paving are also part of the landscaping process.
- The DRB expressed concern regarding policy pertinent to paving/parking lot improvements.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated the 'Excerpts from the Façade Improvement Grant Program Guidelines' provide information as to policy relative to program emphasis, eligibility improvements, and program exclusions. Projects involving landscaping and related site elements in highly visible locations such as city gateways and the Downtown core are emphasized under the program.
- **Dave Hull** explained how the improvements to the parking lot would be able to accommodate the proposed landscaping, utility lines, and drainage.
- The Committee discussed the landscaping features and reviewed the bid proposals for the parking lot improvements and landscaping.
- **Dave Hull** addressed the landscaping and potential use of the existing irrigation system for the eastern façade.
- **Member Liden** inquired regarding the current plans for the north elevation.
- **Dave Hull** supports staff's recommendation in the staff report and the Committee's suggestions regarding landscaping in the area as provided for in the DRB minutes of April 10, 2008. He has reviewed the plans and bid proposals and decided to proceed with paving the entire parking lot even though there was an issue concerning FIP participation for the improvements that would have to be made to the northern parking lot to accommodate the landscaping.
- The DRB continued discussion about the degree of FIP participation concerning fair compensation for parking lot improvements. The Committee agreed if the applicant must tear up his parking lot to accommodate the landscaping and corresponding systems, participation regarding paving is fair.
- The DRB addressed the staff report and possibly modifying the language relative to paving and landscaping.
- **Member Hise** is of the opinion that funding should not be allocated for paving purposes, but it is relevant in this case in order to provide for a pleasing site design since the applicant will have to modify the parking lot to accommodate the landscaping.

- The DRB noted the public does not typically look at parking lots when passing by a site whereby the overall appearance of a building's exterior and site design are what people notice.
- The DRB is concerned with setting precedence that it is acceptable practice for applicants to apply for FIP grant funding for parking lots improvements.
- The DRB supports that further discussion may be necessary to further define policy regarding improvement to parking lots using FIP grant funding.
- The Committee agreed paving/parking lot improvement is definitely a project component and supports that future projects involving paving/parking improvements be considered case-by-case as it relates to the total project.
- The DRB discussed the value/relevance of identifying/prioritizing which site elevations are the most feasible/reasonable in terms of eligibility from the FIP.
- There was a brief discussion about whether the URA can allocate additional funding because the \$100,000 budget may not be sufficient to participate in other projects.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** commented the issue concerning paving is whether the applicant is 'paving just to pave,' which creates another expense. In this case, paving is necessary to accommodate the landscaping, irrigation and related drainage.
- The DRB discussed eliminating the square footage cited in the staff report for paving of 8,685 square feet of the western portion of the site so the project would not put emphasis on the paving portion of the project because paving is not the primary focus of the project. The staff report, as written, appears the applicant is requesting funding for significant improvements to the parking lot and this is not the case. The applicant is requesting funding assistance for the western portion of the site for landscaping etc., and then parking lot remediation. Since the applicant is concerned with a quality project, he is willing to pay the cost for additional paving. However, the question is to determine how much paving should be compensated under the FIP.
- The DRB agreed since the Committee is asking the applicant to tear up his parking lot to accommodate landscaping/utilities he should be entitled to compensation.
- **Dave Hull** commented another element of the project that has not been addressed is staff's request in the preliminary project discussions there be a handicapped parking space situated immediately adjacent to the construction for the northern portion of the site, which would necessitate grading and paving to allow for the handicap access.
- **Senior Planner Townsend/Member Hise** clarified that this is not a requirement of the DRB, but could be undertaken along with the other changes.
- **Member Hise** stated the owner is obligated by law to address handicapped spaces.
- **Senior Planner Townsend/Member Hise** recommended alternative language in the project findings as it relates to that portion of estimated costs in the sum of \$40,218 should read, "drainage, irrigation, utility relocation, remove existing vegetation, and associated remediation of paving repairs and upgrades" and eliminate the language that reads, 'paving 8,685 square feet' as part of the approval process. In this way, it is clear that paving is only included as an incidental component of the project.
- All cost information would be submitted to the Finance Review Board for approval.

- The DRB agreed no further discussion regarding any of the other funding items was necessary.
- **Vice Chair Menton** supports the motion to recommend approval reflects staff's findings.
- **Dave Hull** requested his project be modified so that the recycling enclosure is Phase 3 because the contractor would not be able to complete the work until a later date. He could then seek reimbursement for the other work that has been completed since the Finance Review Board requires all costs be submitted for approval and the cost for this work could be deferred to a later date.
- The DRB agreed the specifications in terms of providing the number of species and square footage for work regarding drainage, paving, and other relevant improvements does not have to be expressly documented in the findings.
- The DRB agreed the location of the paving improvements should be specified. The DRB supports the language for compensation regarding landscaping and paving be modified to read: "Drainage, irrigation, utility relocation, remove existing vegetation, compaction, and associated incidental paving, repairs and upgrades to accomplish this on the western portion of the site." The findings supporting this language include: 1) the project is located in the City's gateway; 2) There would be substantial impact to paved areas as a result of the landscaping for the entire project; and, 3) the elimination of the language that reads, '**paving 8,685 square feet**' pertinent to the FIP participation regarding landscaping/paving estimated at a total cost of \$40,218.

**M/S Liden/Hise** to recommend the Finance Review Committee approve funding in the sum of \$36,500 for Grant Program 07-05 contingent on compliance with the project Conditions of Approval with Phase 2 as proposed by staff regarding the landscaping and related parking lot improvements, lighting and fencing, and Phase 3 to include trash/ recycling enclosure, including the findings and language modifications, as discussed above. Motion carried by an all AYE roll call vote.

## **6. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**6A. Continuation of Review: Façade Improvement Grant Program:** Program emphasis and eligibility requirements and project area, for possible recommendation to Ukiah Redevelopment Agency.

Staff/Committee continued the discussion of the FIP eligibility requirements and project area as follows:

- **Senior Planner Townsend** provided an update on the previous discussion regarding this agenda item as reflected in the April 10, 2008 minutes.
- There was discussion regarding whether boundaries for project areas should be expanded and/or whether the project areas should primarily focus on the Downtown and Downtown Core and key gateways such as Perkins Street as opposed to areas within the City limits on North and South State Streets and Talmage Road. The Committee supports setting Board goals and objectives for projects relative to eligibility rather than striving to balance the criteria provided in the FIP guideline for projects.
- The DRB further supports applicants apply for FIP grant funding wherein the Board would have the responsibility of providing comments, input, design information and make recommendations concerning the project.
- It may be that a funding cap should be placed on various project components, such as paving.

- **Member Cole** inquired whether the FIP guidelines specify how to address landscaping and whether there is a requirement concerning landscaping coverage.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated the guidelines address site elements and not the amount of coverage. However, the Commercial Design Guidelines address coverage for new projects.
- **Member Cole** commented while the landscaping for the Hull project will be very pleasing, she expressed concern that in the future more and more landscaping and paving project will come forward as opposed to exterior building improvements.
- The DRB noted the Downtown could really benefit from the FIP relative to awnings and newly painted buildings and emphasized the Board should not lose sight that this aspect has long been the primary Program objective.
- The DRB does not support allocating FIP funding for paving of parking lots.
- The DRB supports that applicants hire consultants for engineering, building and site designs and color schemes to present to the DRB for comments, questions, and input.
- **Vice Chair Menton** supports establishing goals and objectives and/or specific criteria for what they desire to see for projects so the funding is appropriately and fairly allocated.
- The DRB supports the URA look at possibly increasing the FIP budget.
- **Member Thayer** commented it is likely the matter of adopting the 'SMARTCODE' will have an impact on FIP projects and/or possibly change the scope of a project because of the zoning differential in conjunction with FIP policy. Since the Form Based Code supports mixed use residential and commercial/retail, how will the program deal with residential uses. The FIP policy indicates funding consideration can only be allocated for business purposes.
- **Member Thayer** inquired regarding churches, apartment buildings, schools and/or other agencies that may not fit the typical definition of what constitutes a business, noting such agencies could benefit from FIP. The question is whether FIP policy is tied to a building or a purpose, such as beautification.
- The DRB emphasized the importance of establishing FIP criteria to correspond with project uses and zoning designations.
- There was discussion about the definition of commercial property versus the definition of a business. FIP funding is available for commercial property whether privately owned or rented.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated changes in language and/or changes in the scope of the FIP must be approved by the URA.
- **Member Nicholson** commented decisions concerning the FIP should be considered based on the zoning requirements and whether the proposed project meets the zoning criteria wherein the project complies with the Program objective of beautifying the community. He inquired whether funding programs exist for residential improvements.
- Staff confirmed housing renovation and rehabilitation programs are available under affordable housing.
- **Member Nicholson** inquired whether the DRB should be using the checklist for pre-approval considerations for projects on page 23 of the Design Guidelines for Commercial Developments.

- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated the checklist does not pertain to the FIP and is used to assist with the design aspects for commercial projects that are subject to discretionary review.

**7. MATTER FROM STAFF**

**7A. Continuation of Review: Downtown Ukiah-Perkins Street Corridor Form-Based Zoning Code Amendment**, City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department.

None.

**7B. Discuss topics for joint Design Review Board/Planning Commission meeting; Review adopted Commercial Development Design Guidelines** and other adopted documents.

None.

**8. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

---

Estok Menton, Vice Chair

---

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary