

**MINUTES
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
June 12, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

OTHERS PRESENT

MEMBERS ABSENT

Richard Moser

STAFF PRESENT

Senior Planner Townsend
Cathleen Moller, Economic
Development Coordinator
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. RIGHT TO APPEAL

Vice Chair Menton read the appeal process. For matters heard at this meeting, the final date for appeal is June 23, 2008.

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No one came forward.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 8, 2008 minutes

M/S Liden/Cole to approve May 8, 2008 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried.

6. MATTERS FROM STAFF

6A. Continuation of Review: Downtown Ukiah-Perkins Street Corridor Form-Based Zoning Code amendment, City of Ukiah Planning and Community Development Department: Review and comment on proposal.

Senior Planner Townsend and the Committee members commented as follows:

- It was noted the Memorandum from Senior Planner Townsend dated March 27, 2008 is very informative and provides a summary of comments and staff responses pertinent to amplifying/clarifying and providing the next steps/possible solutions to various comments/questions presented at the Downtown Ukiah Perkins Street Corridor Form-Based Smart Code (SC) District charrette relative to the Purpose and Intent, Procedures and Process, Zoning Map and Regulating Plan, Building and Site Plan, Table 6 also Table 9 Summary of Standards (Block Perimeter, Lot Size, Façade Width, Lot Coverage, and Building Height), Parking, Architectural Standards, Landscape Standards, Signage, Lighting, Other Standards and Requirements (noise, toxic substances and odors, drainage and

water quality, and fire protection), Other issues (Law enforcement, Solid waster, Airport regulations, and Floodplain), Definitions (Lot coverage, Incentive Bonuses and Benefits, Secondary frontage, and Special design) sections, including comments from Member Nicholson relative to Architectural standards, Materials and elements, Openings, Roofs and Rooflines, Screening and fences, and Corner treatments.

- **Senior Planner Townsend** commented the above-referenced information has been incorporated into a chart format and is currently being reviewed by the Planning Director.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** recommended the DRB focus on architectural related components of the SmartCode and provide direction/comments as opposed to focusing on the planning and zoning aspects of the Code.
- The DRB reviewed an overlay map with regard to roads in relation to property lines, noting the roads are not drawn to scale. There was discussion regarding property lines and streetscapes as shown on the overlay map relative to new development in conjunction with the Regulating Map.
- The language regarding alleys as it relates to access and parking lots should likely be more flexible where the intent is not to be able to view parking lots from streets.
- **Member Liden** stated there are also issues concerning the Grace Hudson Museum area about new designated streets and alleys in relation to existing property lines. The question is to find a solution that does not involve the tedious/costly task of making property line adjustments.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated one solution would be to write text so the intent is conveyed wherein a new development must meet the key elements rather than be concerned whether property lines and designated roads and proposed alleys measure exactly. Also, some properties may be developed or redeveloped as one piece, which would affect properties, roads, and alleys differently.
- The public right of ways on Perkins Street are wider and may include areas that are not actually paved in which roads would not encumber.
- **Member Thayer** inquired how the intent is to be identified when considering a development in terms of parking lot configuration, setbacks, and lot lines.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** noted Article 6.5 of the SMARTCODE addresses the purpose and intent of the Downtown Ukiah and Perkins Street Corridor SmartCode District that would apply to the architectural section. The objective is to allow flexibility for architectural creativity so that the key elements of the purpose and intent for a particular transect zone are met without imposing too many restrictions and discouraging developments.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated the DRB has expressed concern that the architectural standards in the Code are very specific wherein the members questioned whether these set of standards are useful for a particular part of town, such as for the more historic district (Courthouse, buildings on School Street). This area likely requires more specific architectural standards than other areas in the Formed Based Zone district.
- There are approximately five or six districts in the City that maintain/protect the integrity of the properties in that particular area in the event the properties start to change dramatically and the corresponding integrity of the district lost. The intent is to really look at the big picture and how the architectural standards can be

applied to the different districts and be able to adequately preserve their respective architectural integrity.

- It is important to retain the historic integrity of the Downtown.
- The members expressed concern the architectural standards in the SMARTCODE would be the same for every city that adopts the code, taking note that all the communities would essentially look alike.
- **Member Nicholson** commented the premise of the charrettes may have been misleading to the public and inquired whether thought was given to the quality of life and with preserving the Downtown district. Developments in terms of architecture must be a good fit for the community and in scale/proportion with other buildings, which SMARTCODE, in his opinion, does not adequately address. The text with regard to architectural standards may be over specific relative to what is appropriate versus inappropriate and what the community desires to see. The intent should be what the public is interested in seeing in their community in the way of design and materials, as well as allow for a preference towards a particular design to preserve/maintain the existing integrity/historic character as much as possible. The style/materials for the various districts are not clearly defined as it pertains to Ukiah since most cities typically have a certain key style of architecture and as mentioned above may be 'over specific' in the general sense. The materials proposed in SMARTCODE may not be what the community desires for developments.
- **Member Hise** noted much of the original sense of style/design reflecting the character of the late 1800s and early 1900s has been destroyed by fire and replaced with masonry.
- **Member Thayer** stated SMARTCODE represents a concept that the creators are promoting for communities. He agreed there was too much 'over specific' language in the document from what the public stated they desired to see at the charrettes.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated the SMARTCODE consultants did take examples of building designs in the Downtown and incorporated architectural aspects in the document.
- **Member Thayer** generally supports the concept of the transect zones, but questioned how this type of zoning can be effectively applied to the Downtown, which has more than a 130-year history, emphasizing the important of preserving the historical style and character.
- **Member Nicholson** commented the style in the Downtown has not been defined and it is considered a historic zone.
- **Member Hise** stated the intent is to establish a standard where one of the review criteria would be to determine how the proposed design fits within the context of the block or neighborhood. It may be the proposed design may not meet the necessary criteria for a particular area whether it is intentional or not, but the document should raise the question whether the development respects/complements the existing design/architecture and this aspect of the SMARTCODE document is not presently addressed.
- There was a discussion concerning the Grace Hudson Museum development and how it was likely received within the context of the community when it was originated.
- **Member Liden** referred to the Regulating Map and noted the SMARTCODE as presented fits well with the 'virgin' areas. It may be there should be two sections, the virgin sections and the older established sections.

- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated one idea would be to choose particular buildings as good examples of architecture and fabricate from these. SMARTCODE is intended to encourage less discretionary review and this is the reason the document is more precise.
- **Member Hise** stated there are essentially two processes happening to include the non-view and the review scenarios wherein the non-view projects need to be specific with regard to design concepts and materials.
- **Member Liden** commented the document needs to have more qualification relative to the virgin versus the older established districts. He noted, however, SMARTCODE is already coded by zones relative to General Urban, Urban Center, Downtown Core, Special Districts, natural and rural.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated it may be difficult to specifically indicate what may be the best type of architecture for a district.
- **Member Hise** agreed with Senior Planner Townsend and stated a project that is an extension of the Downtown design may be a very nice fit on Perkins Street.
- Design aspect regarding the Code should be specific to Ukiah.
- Copying other city standards is no solution.
- Some of the best historical buildings are now gone or have been covered over and there is the question as to whether these existing buildings are examples of good architecture.
- Staff is reviewing the major policy issues in connection with SMARTCODE.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** recommends continued discussion concerning the document language for possible revision.
- **Member Hise** commented the text must fit/complement existing architecture and still allow flexibility for projects that may be exceptional in the way of design and style, but not exactly fit within the code standards as a prototype design.
- There was discussion about the review process, noting those development that confirm to the standards are not reviewed and vice versa. While one of the Code objectives to simplify the review process, but the question is whether the standards really are a good fit with the community desires.
- **Member Nicholson** commented SMARTCODE mollifies that what is existing architecture is essentially what the community has to work with and is considered 'the cream of the crop.' Historical creditability is difficult to distinguish.
- **Member Hise** commented replicating historical buildings is not an effective approach. Working in terms of design with the buildings that are existing is essentially all there is left.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated there are existing buildings in the community that are exemplary and well-built.
- There was discussion about the DRB's jurisdiction as a review body relevant to SMARTCODE. The City planning boundaries/districts include the City limits, Downtown Revitalization District, Façade Improvement District, Downtown Ukiah Design District, Form Based Zone District, and Redevelopment areas. The DRB has in past meetings discussed FIP boundaries and possible expansion. It may be that the DRB review district should include all areas on the Regulating Map, including the areas within the FIP district. There are basically three districts that concern the DRB and they include the boundaries established by the DRB other than the FIP Grant District, and SC District. The DRB reviewed the boundaries for the FIP, noting the boundaries extend from Brush Street to Talmage Road according to the FIP map.

- **Member Nicholson** stated it may be that the DRB should focus on the Downtown Core and/or historical district.
- **Member Hise** inquired which body would review the design/material aspects for developments outside of the DRB jurisdiction.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated it is her understanding the DRB will review all projects as provided for in the Code.
- The DRB discussed one approach in terms of DRB review would be to combine the Form Based Zone with the existing Downtown Design Review Board District, FIP District, and Redevelopment Agency areas.
- **Member Nicholson** questioned whether FIP monies should be extended to the areas discussed above.
- **Member Hise** stated the Form Based Zone may at some point in the future extend to Talmage.
- The FIP boundaries currently extend to Talmage.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** stated it may be that the boundaries should be more clearly defined at the staff level relative to the DRB's jurisdiction for review of developments, noting there are many possibilities for development relative to design and materials in addition to the SMARTCODE standards.
- **Senior Planner Townsend** commented the FIP applies only to commercial projects.
- **Member Liden** supports combining the districts so that commercial and/or commercial projects having a residential component are included in the FIP, which is also a part of the SC District and the other districts referenced above.
- **Member Thayer** supports extending the FIP to include Perkins Street.
- **Member Liden** stated visual coverage is very important for the Downtown area in which Perkins Street is a part. It makes sense to include Perkins Street in the FIP District for purposes of providing effective visual coverage and because the Downtown area is in the SC District. This will make review all inclusive with the Design Review District, the Façade Improvement District, and the SC District because the Perkins Street corridor represents a highly visible area as one of the City's gateways.
- **Member Hise** supports addressing the gaps in the DRB jurisdiction that impede effectiveness. He commented signage for commercial building should be part of the DRB review process like façade improvements.
- **Member Nicholson** noted part of the uncertainty may be attributed to role of the Planning Department, which takes on the role of architectural review without having an actual design review department.
- **Member Cole** expressed concern the FIP area is too large.
- The DRB expressed concern regarding signage for the Hall project, which the DRB approved façade improvements, but did not address the element of signage, which should have been part of the review process.
- It may be the FIP budget should be increased.
- It may be the DRB should focus on façade improvements for smaller projects for storefronts that involve new awnings and paint scheme rather than large projects having a variety of façade improvement elements, citing the Dave Hull project on E. Gobbi Street as an example.
- **Vice Chair Menton** commented if one of the DRB functions is to do pre-application review, the project must be within the DRB jurisdiction, which needs to be addressed. He desires to be able to review projects in such areas as the

Airport Industrial Park or the project that is occurring at the former Green Barn restaurant.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

- Conform boundaries of the Downtown Ukiah Design District with the SC District.
- DRB desires to review all new signs throughout the City Sign program to include new freestanding sign, lighted signs, and all other signs requiring a building permit.
- Since the commercial development guidelines apply to the entire City, the DRB is of the opinion it should review all commercial development within the City, as well as also review other development excluding single-family dwellings unless part of a larger commercial development.
- Look at increasing the FIP budget or decrease the size of the program area.

7. 3:30 p.m. FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM

7A. Façade Improvement Program No. 07-04, John Chan: Consideration of repainting building and repaving parking at 510 South School Street (002-271-03).

The applicant has applied for a Façade Improvement Grant to upgrade an office building on School Street. Staff determined the project complies with the General Plan and applicable zoning district, the Commercial Downtown Development Design Guidelines and the Façade Improvement Program Grant guidelines as addressed on pages 1 and 2 of the staff report. The grant request is for paint, gutters, and improvements to the parking lot.

Staff concluded the applicant is eligible for grant funding and the recommended eligible costs based on the cost estimates and staff's analysis include:

Paint	\$6,750
Gutters	\$3,765
Parking	0

Total: \$10,515 @ 50% eligibility with a lifetime maximum reimbursement of \$50,000 per storefront = \$5,257.50 for the FIP Grant.

Staff/DRB/Applicant addressed the project and provided direction to the Applicant as follows:

- Applicant is requested to retain a color consultant to assist with color palettes.
- Trim should be harmonious with the building.
- Consider typing the colors to those of City Hall.
- Color and profile of gutter is important.
- Consider alternative treatment of front door.
- Photographs of each façade and elevation would be helpful so that the view from the street can be clearly seen, with labels included as to direction.
- Consider alternative landscape treatments especially on the east side
- Consider eliminating or reducing the chain link fencing in order to better connect the building to the street.

The DRB considers that maintaining the same colors is considered maintenance and not an improvement, and therefore would not be eligible for FIP grant funding. The asphalt repair is also not considered eligible.

The DRB continued Façade Improvement Grant No. 07-04 to the July 10, 2008 meeting.

7B. Façade Improvement Program No. 08-02, Judith Waterman: Consideration of upgrading and preserving Victorian and garage, including landscaping, painting, roof and windows at 125 E. Mill Street (002-302-56).

The applicant has applied for a Façade Improvement Grant to upgrade and preserve an existing Victorian and garage in the C-1 Zoning District. The improvements include landscaping and fence, exterior paint, re-roof, raise the turret, and install energy efficient double paned glass windows and the applicant provided cost estimates for the above repairs/improvement as provided for on page 1 of the staff report and an estimate from Keough's Landscaping, Inc. for the trellis.

Staff's analysis of the project is provided for on pages 2 and 3 of the staff report in terms of project consistency with General Plan, and City Zoning Code, Commercial Downtown Development Design Guidelines, as well as the FIP Grant Guidelines and Project Eligibility.

Staff's recommendation concerning eligibility cost includes:

Landscaping/Fence	\$4,360
Exterior Paint	\$19,025
Windows	\$0
Re-roof	\$0
Raised Roof behind	
Turret	\$0
Trellis	to be discussed
Total Eligibility Cost:	\$23,385 plus the trellis @ 50% FIP grant = \$11,692.50

Staff/DRB/Applicant discussed the project and the DRB asked the applicant to submit the following information for further consideration.

- Landscape plan with dimensions or drawn to scale showing type and location of species.
- Consider reducing lawn area and framing the walkway and species such as crepe myrtle to create a vegetative trellis.
- Consider deleting fence. If the fence and the trellis are proposed, they should be of materials of weight consistent with the building pillars.
- Show the color, type, dimensions and shaped of the proposed materials.
- The trellis must be located at least 10 feet from front property line or applicant must apply for a Minor Use Permit to exceed the height standard in the front yard setback. Applicant may apply for the use permit prior to the decision by the DRB regarding whether they would recommend funding by the Façade Improvement Grant Program. If the use permit for the trellis is denied, it would not be allowed, notwithstanding any decision by the DRB.
- Provide paint samples on the building for review by the DRB. The yellow color proposed with the application is acceptable; however, it should be shown on the building so that the trim colors can be seen in comparison.
- DRB favors a light blue trim with other colors proposed as is. If the applicant desires to consider several shades, they should be displayed on the building.

The program guidelines stated no work proposed for funding may be undertaken until the Finance Review Committee approves the application.

On a Motion by Member Liden, seconded by Nicholson to recommend to the Finance Review Committee that funding be apportioned at 80% of the 50% FIP grant.

The DRB continued Façade Improvement Grant No. 08-02 to the regular July 10, 2008 meeting.

7C. Façade Improvement Program No. 08-03, Michael Shapiro: Consideration of awning replacement at 367 North State Street (002-186-12).

The applicant has applied for a Façade Improvement Grant to replace the existing faded awning in the C-1 Zoning District. The existing frames will be reused and covered with the same Blue Sunbrella fabric.

Pages 1 and 2 of the staff report outlines staff's analysis of the project with regard to consistency with the General Plan, City Zoning Code, Commercial Downtown Development Design Guidelines, and project eligibility under the Façade Improvement Program Grant Guidelines.

The recommended eligibility costs include:

Awning \$4,243.12 @ FIP Grant 50% = \$2,121.56

The DRB expressed interest in exploring an awning color other than the existing blue. The members suggested a color that would highlight the tones of the brick or possible red, but no agreement was reached. The applicant was not present and the matter was continued to July 26, 2008.

8. 4:15 p.m. OR SOON THEREAFTER: NEW AND MODIFIED CONSTRUCTION

8A. Pre-application Review: Ruff & Associates: Comment on conceptual plan and building massing for Hamlet Village (90 senior condominiums) located at 700 block of N. State Street (APN: 002-114-14-18, 19, 21, 69).

No discussion.

9. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

9A. Possible dates and topics for joint Design Review Board/Planning Commission meeting.

The DRB discussed a joint meeting with the Planning Commission at the regular July 9 Planning Commission meeting.

10. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:11p.m.

Estok Menton, Vice Chair

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary