

**MINUTES
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
July 31, 2008**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jody Cole
Tom Hise
Tom Liden
Nick Thayer
Richard Moser, Chair

OTHERS PRESENT

Robert Axt
Steve Siderakis & brother
Jan Chan
John Chan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Alan Nicholson
Estok Menton

STAFF PRESENT

Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner
Cathleen Moller, Economic
Development Coordinator
Cathy Elawadly, Recording
Secretary

The meeting of the Design Review Board was called to order by Acting Chair Liden at 1:00 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

Acting Chair Liden read the appeal process. For matters heard at this meeting, the final date for appeal is August 11, 2008.

4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

No one came forward.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 17, 2008 minutes

M/S Cole/Thayer to approve the July 17, 2008 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried.

6. NEW AND MODIFIED CONSTRUCTION

6A. Pre-application Review: Bob Axt/Siderakis: Comments on Pre-Application review for demolishing an existing apartment building on the northwest corner of the site; demolishing a small office building and shed on the southern portion of the site; demolishing the existing 'Farm Johns' building located up on the State Street frontage; and constructing new single-story buildings "A" (7,200 sq. ft.), "B" (7,500 sq. ft), and "C" (2,000 square feet). The project includes development of a full parking lot to serve the new buildings and adding landscaping throughout. The site is located at 1100-1120 South State Street (surrounding the Garden Café) APN 003-130-37. The Garden Café building and its parking lot are not a part of the project. The intent of the project is to create a small retail center on this underutilized property.

Associate Planner Faso commented the applicants and owners of the Garden Café desire to redevelop the site and have applied for a Planning Commission level pre-application review of their plans to improve the site.

The project involves:

- Demolishing an existing apartment building on the northwest corner of the site.
- Demolishing a small office building and shed on the southern portion of the site.
- Demolishing the existing Farmer Johns building located upon the State Street frontage and construct new single-story buildings “A” (7,200 sq. ft.), “B” (7,500 sq. ft.) and “C” (2,000 sq. ft.)
- The project also includes development of a full parking lot to serve the buildings and adding landscaping throughout. The Garden Café building and parking lot are not part of the project.
- The project intent is to create a small retail center.
- Staff is asking the DRB to review the submitted pre-application plans, discuss the design and architecture of the project with the applicants and provide comments/suggestions for the Planning Commission.

The DRB generally discussed the proposed building footprints and overall site layout relative to potential landscaping and planter areas, existing street frontage conditions relative to ingress/egress, utility location and potential easements, parking/location of parking lot trees/site circulation, pedestrian/customer friendly features within the proposed retail complex such as providing for a park-like setting, possible improvements to the area of Doolin Creek and the preservation thereof, how the existing Garden Café building fits with the proposed new buildings in terms of architecture and design, materials and color schemes and site layout and brief comments on design of the proposed new buildings.

The DRB further discussed the project with the applicants and architect later in the meeting favored utilizing the Commercial Development Design Guidelines Project Review Checklist intended to assist in determining project consistency with the Commercial Development Design Guidelines for the Downtown Design District.

7. FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM

7A. Continuation of 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). On June 12, 2008 the Design Review Board reviewed the proposed plans for Façade Improvements at this location and asked the applicant to submit additional information including revised landscaping plans and show materials for proposed fence.

Associate Planner Faso commented as follows:

- The applicant has applied for a FIG to upgrade and preserve an existing Victorian and garage in the C-1 Zoning District.
- The DRB has previously reviewed the FIG application.
- The original grant application included upgrade to landscaping and fencing, exterior paint, roof windows and turret extension.
- On June 12, 2008, the DRB determined only the proposed landscaping and exterior paint are eligible under the guidelines for the FIG program.
- The DRB also asked the applicant to provide the following information with regards to the proposed exterior paint, landscaping and fence to include:
 - Landscape plan to show type and location of proposed species.

- Show detail of proposed fence and trellis showing proposed color and materials. The proposed materials should be consistent with the existing building materials.
- Display sample of the proposed paint for the building.
- Attachments 2, 2-1 display general layout for landscaping including the name of the proposed landscaping features and Attachment 2-3 displays the design of the proposed picket fence.
- The proposed estimated costs for the work:
 - Landscaping/Fence (automatic sprinkler system, sod, tree shrubs, fence) = \$4,360 @ 50% FIG
 - Exterior Paint (preparation and paint exterior) = \$13,650 @ 50% FIG
 - Trellis (construct trellis at front entryway) = \$506.59 @ 50% FIG
- At the June 12, 2008 DRB meeting, the Board funding would be apportioned for the exterior paint only at 80% of the 50% FIG since portions of the building are not visible from the street. Furthermore, the Board determined that proposed energy efficient windows along with the proposed re-roof included in the original FIG application were not eligible under the FIG guidelines.
- The building has not previously received a FIP grant. The FIP grant allows for 50% of the eligible expenses to be considered for reimbursement with a lifetime maximum reimbursement of \$50,000 per storefront.

Chair Moser came to the meeting at 2:34 p.m.

The DRB/applicant discussed the project as follows:

- The DRB supported the proposed color scheme to include
 - Base – a pale moon yellow (very soft yellow)
 - Trim/pillars/gutters/3-foot high picket fence/ window trim – True white
 - Molding of windows, accent features on house – Burgundy color
 - Inner portions of windows and door – Dark blue
- The DRB were in agreement of the proposed color scheme.
- **Judy Waterman** eliminated the trellis from the project.
- In terms of the proposed landscaping, the DRB/applicant agreed the existing hedge should be removed. The DRB were in agreement concerning the proposed landscaping species selected to coincide with new color scheme of the historical building. While roses are typically associated with Victorian and/or historical buildings, there was a discussion concerning the rose species to be located along the picket fence line.
- The applicant favors having a lawn area.
- **Member Thayer** was not supportive of implementing lawn and recommended the watering system not spray over onto the sidewalk for water conservation purposes.
- **Associate Planner Faso** referred to Table 2, Recommended Eligible Costs and stated the total recommended costs will have to be re-calculated because preparation and paint exterior cost should be \$13,650 and trellis work was eliminated from the application.

M/S Liden/Thayer to recommend FRC approval of the FIG No. 08-02, as updated and with corrections to the eligibility costs as noted above. Motion carried.

Member Thayer requested Landscaping Plans be drawn to scale.

- 7B. Continuation of Façade Improvement Program No. 07-04.** John Chan: Consideration of upgrading an office building at 510 S. School Street, (002-271-03). On June 12, 2008 the Design Review Board reviewed the proposed plans for the Façade Improvements at this location as requested that the applicant explore the use of different color palettes.

Associate Planner Faso commented as follows:

- The applicant has applied for a FIG to upgrade an office building on School Street and Seminary Avenue.
- The DRB originally reviewed this grant request at the June 12, 2008 meeting and it was determined that in order for the proposed exterior paint upgrade to be eligible for grant funds, the new exterior paint must be a new color palate. It was further concluded the proposed asphalt repair for the parking lot was not eligible.
- The applicant has revised the color selection and the following improvements are proposed:
 - Exterior Paint** - Preparation for painting of building. The four-tone color pallet consists of:
 - Hancock Gray for the main body
 - Gray for the fascia and accents
 - Heritage Red for the front door
 - Savannah Moss for the accent
 - Drabware for the widow and eave accent
 - Bronze for the gutters
 - Gutters** - Install seamless gutters and pre-paint Bronze color
 - Front Doors** – Replace existing heavy wooden front door with glass doors.
- The building has not previously received a FIP grant.
- The Recommended Eligible Costs include:
 - Preparation and paint exterior - \$6,750 @ 50% FIG
 - Installation of seamless gutters - \$4,508 @ 50% FIG
 - Replace front door – (to be decided)

The DRB/applicants commented on the project as follows:

- **Member Thayer** made project recommendations and they include planting vegetative plants that do not require high maintenance and/or regular trimming and of a species having a seasonal rotation, vine over the existing fence with Purple Leaf Honeysuckle, remove the gate and corresponding poles on either side of the gate.
- The DRB highly favored the color scheme proposed for the building, as referenced above.
- Since landscaping was not part of the original FIG programs, funding for landscaping can be applied for as a Phase II component of the façade improvement project.
- The DRB favored maintaining the exiting heavy wooden front door ‘Heritage Red’ as opposed to replacing it with a glass door.
- The DRB favored ‘curved face’ aluminum gutters for the building.
- **Applicants John and Jan Chan** agreed with the Board’s recommendation and also agreed that landscaping is necessary to enhance the building improvements.

M/S Thayer/Liden to recommend the FRC approve FIG No. 07-04, as proposed and discussed above.

The DRB continued discussion of the Siderakis pre-application view proposed on S. State Street.

Architect Bob Axt and the applicants were present for answer questions.

Bob Axt commented as follows:

- He reviewed the site plans with the Board and visually demonstrated the proposed general layout the building footprints, landscaping, sidewalks, utility easements, proposed plans for Doolin Creek that borders the north side of the subject property. He explained the elevations for the new buildings in contrast with what would visually been seen from S. State Street and Talmage Road. He discussed the building elevations and rooflines and stated the theme for each of the three buildings centers around the ends of the buildings having a lower elevation than the other portions with identifying arched entrance ways.
- He confirmed while there will be an environmental study conducted to address potential significant impacts to Doolin Creek and/or other possible environmental impacts, the improvements to the north side of the property would be completed with Doolin Creek in mind.
- He stated the project represents a small shopping center and that the three new buildings proposed would be for commercial/retail use.
- He presented the color scheme for the exterior portions of the building and how they would effectively complement the design of the buildings.
- He noted the utilities would be undergrounded.
- He stated while the architecture of the existing restaurant does not match with the proposed new buildings, it may be that improvements may be necessary in some way. He is of the opinion that buildings on the site do not have to exactly match in design/architecture provided they are situated on the site effectively and all the other project components are a good fit.
- The buildings have accommodations for storage.

The DRB were concerned with such issues as:

- Is the remediation of Doolin Creek included in the project.
- How extensive is the landscaping.
- Would there be park-like areas within the shopping complex.
- The backs of the buildings should be architecturally pleasing since they would be visible from Mulberry Street, which is a City dedicated street.
- Questioned the drainage and what measures would be taken to control excess runoff on the site.
- Will the street frontage be re-done in terms of egress/ingress in conjunction with S. State Street and to appropriately the two cross walks adjacent to the site.
- Questioned walkability and access to the shopping complex.
- Do the plans effectively address usable space similar to Park Falls Plaza and Pear Tree Center.
- Questioned on-site circulation and parking in connection with building setbacks from S. State Street. It was noted parking in the rear of buildings

may not always be the best fit, depending upon the configuration of the site.

- The architecture of the existing restaurant does not match the new buildings.
- Will the existing street trees be replaced.
- Can exceptions to the parking requirement standards be made to allow for more of a compact area for a small park and/or rest area.

There was a brief discussion concerning the possibility of exchanging parking stalls for the Garden Café fully in compliance with the parking standards to allow for more open space for landscaping/rest areas. There will be separate parking designations for the new uses.

The DRB and applicants generally discussed the building elevations, signage wherein the signs for the retail business will resemble those designed for the Pear Tree Center sign program, building setback from S. State Street, depth of the site relative to parking and building footprints, proposed color scheme, architectural treatments including the archways, how the existing Garden Café fits into the project, landscaping and location of planter areas, parking and parking requirements, and other relevant site features. The DRB emphasize the use of the Commercial Design Guidelines Project Review Checklist.

The DRB provided a summary of comments relative to the informal discussion concerning the project as follows:

Member Moser supports consideration given to the site layout in connection with the viewshed from Talmage Road allowing for nice visual presentation.

Member Thayer suggests allowing for more detail as far as how the site interacts with the existing creek, existing street trees, and more public invitation for some of the open/outdoor areas, citing Pear Tree Center and Park Falls Plaza as good examples. Address how the southern portion of the property is remedied relative to the Creek bank and landscaping incorporated.

Bob Axt stated matters concerning the Creek would be addressed as a separate issue in an environmental study

Member Liden supports having walkable areas and/or a mini park/shaded areas wherein customers would be encourage to walk around to other stores in the shopping center rather than parking directly in front of the store they intend to shop. He also supports consolidating some of the linear parking stalls wherein the City standard for parking lots is one tree for every four parking stalls to allow for more outdoor space.

Steve Siderakis stated there will be sidewalks constructed in the shopping center.

Member Hise commented as Mr. Axt develops his design of the project, he favors a strong architectural theme. The Garden Café building should fit the architectural theme of the new buildings and the Planning Commission will likely desire the same. He expressed concern regarding Mulberry Street wherein the back of the buildings should have a design treatment that is visually pleasing. Mulberry Street is a dedicated City street and not an alley whereby visual presentation of the backside of buildings is

important. The trash/recycle enclosures should be part of the building architecture rather than the landscaping wherein a building is added for this purpose.

Box Axt stated a landscape strip exists between Mulberry Street and the site. Also, the existing buildings on the site are lower in elevation by approximately 3.5 feet.

Member Hise supports the restoration of the Creek/bank should be included in the future of the site, noting the issue of the Creek will come up during discretionary review. He further supports providing for a visual landscaping gateway from Talmage Road into the site, which may be cause to look at the City Code in this regard and possibly under-park the site by a few parking stalls.

Member Thayer supports the project involves a comprehensive landscape plan that additionally will allow for new planters at the north entry to the subject property. Whatever improvements are made to the new developments should carry over to the northern portion of the site that is developed with the restaurant to provide for a quality project.

The DRB supports improvements made to the backside of the existing restaurant.

Member Thayer supports the concept rather than requiring substantial architectural improvements to the existing building, that the site preparation/new development and incorporation of the landscaping features be completed such that the project blends nicely. There could be some variations to the architecture provided the design and improvements fit.

8. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

9. MATTERS FROM STAFF

None.

10. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT:

The next regular meeting will be August 28, 2008 from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:06 p.m.

Richard Moser, Chair

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary