



**City of Ukiah, CA**  
**Design Review Board**

---

---

**MINUTES**

---

---

**Regular Meeting**

**January 8, 2015**

**Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue**

---

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **1. CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chair Liden** called the Design Review Board meeting to order  
8 at 3:00 p.m. in Conference Room #5.  
9

10 **2. ROLL CALL Present:** Vice Chair Tom Liden, Nick Thayer,  
11 Alan Nicholson, Howie Hawkes, Colin Morrow  
12

13 **Absent:**

14  
15 **Staff Present:** Charley Stump, Planning Director (present only  
16 for agenda item 6B)  
17 Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner  
18 Shannon Riley, Project & Grant Administrator  
19 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary  
20

21 **Others present:** Francisco Sanchez  
22 Nohemi Sanchez  
23 Lawrence Mitchell  
24 Holly Brackmann  
25 Ann Baker  
26 Linda Hedstrom  
27 Jim Langford  
28 Mary Stompe  
29 Bob Hayes  
30

31 **3. CORRESPONDENCE:**

32  
33 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the November 13, 2014 and December  
34 11, 2014 meetings will be available for review at the January 8, 2015 meeting.  
35

36 **M/S Nicholson/Thayer** to approve the minutes from the November 13, 2014 meeting, as  
37 submitted. Motion carried by an all AYE voice vote of the members present (4-0) with Member  
38 Morrow abstaining.  
39

40 **M/S Hawkes/Nicholson** to approve the minutes from the December 11, 2014 meeting, as  
41 submitted. Motion carried by an all AYE voice vote of the members present (4-0) with Member  
42 Morrow abstaining.  
43

44 **5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

45  
46 The DRB is required by the City Code to review and make a recommendation on all Site  
47 Development Permit applications.  
48

49 **6. NEW BUSINESS:**

50 **6A. 499 North State Site Development Permit (File No.: 598):** Continued from December  
51 11, 2014 meeting; review and recommendation to the Zoning Administrator on color  
52 board and landscaping plan for 499 North State Street, APN 002-152-07.

1 **Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- 2 • At the regular December 11, 2014 DRB meeting, the DRB reviewed the design aspects  
3 for a proposed site development permit with a recommendation to the Zoning  
4 Administrator for approval with the conditions that a color palate for the proposed building  
5 facade and proposed landscaping plan would be submitted for review by the DRB.  
6

7 **Lawrence Mitchell, Architect and applicant representative** referred to site plans:

- 8 • The DRB recommended the landscaping plan include a Palm tree by the monument sign  
9 and develop the landscaping around. Looked at Palm trees and could not find a species  
10 that would be compatible and/or work in this area. Recommends substituting a Palm tree  
11 for a Yuka plant and explained the proposed landscaping design for this area that would  
12 include groundcover and boulders. Proposes landscaping having a blue/gray color  
13 scheme that would complement the colors for the monument sign and building and  
14 referred to the proposed landscape modifications provided for on page 1 of the staff  
15 report.  
16 • Related to the existing 'Hollywood' wood shakes on the building in connection with having  
17 a coastal theme noted such colors range from bleached white to tan, brown or black. The  
18 existing Hollywood shakes are a bronze brown. Proposes to utilize the shakes on the  
19 building and explained the treatment used to get that coastal theme effect/appearance  
20 that would effectively lighten them. All shakes new/replacement and old will be treated to  
21 match and illustrated the desired color. The treatment will be lighter than what is existing.  
22

23 **Vice Chair Liden:**

- 24 • Referred to attachment 1 of the staff report and color palate for sign and building and  
25 asked about the trim color in terms of how dark. Questioned what the shakes will look like  
26 next to the blue color palate selected for the building trim, etc.  
27 • Asked about the doors?  
28 • Requested clarification the shakes will be the same color with the use of new in contrast  
29 with the older existing shakes.  
30 • Concurs it may be the blue color palate selected may not work and may need to be  
31 reviewed. Supports making the trim a lighter blue and with allowing the Zoning  
32 Administrator/Planning staff to revise the color palate if this is necessary.  
33

34 **Member Hawkes:**

- 35 • Cautioned blue is a difficult color to work with.  
36 • Is of the opinion property owner should not have to concerned about liability issues with  
37 the landscaping species because people need to pay attention where they are walking.  
38

39 **Member Thayer:**

- 40 • Yucca Whipple is not the most pedestrian-friendly of plants. Would recommend a plant  
41 species that does not have individual spines/thorns. The Red Yucca is a better choice  
42 and a more suitable replacement. Yucca plants are available in different colors such as  
43 yellow.  
44 • Can assist in the selection of a Palm tree that would be suitable for the site.  
45 Recommends a Guadalupe Palm that grows to a maximum of 20 feet in height, has a  
46 'clear' trunk and sheds older ones that is essentially a self-cleaning mechanism. A  
47 Guadalupe Palm would be emblematic of the restaurant cuisine, would not get too big  
48 such that the sign would be blocked from view and is hardy to about 12 or 14 degrees.  
49 • Related to the scale of the boulders proposed for the landscaping and asked from an  
50 aesthetic and/or color consideration if the boulders are granite or cobblestone. Any stone  
51 type would be more expensive than using planted material and questions whether or not  
52 the boulders are associated with an 'ocean front' theme. It would seem the ocean front  
53 theme can be effectively accomplished with plantings from a budgetary perspective.

1 Further questions whether the boulders add that much more aesthetically to the Project  
2 than if all the landscaping consists only of plantings.

- 3 • Finds that the typical foot traffic through the landscaped areas to be potentially  
4 problematic and could be a liability issue if certain plantings with spines/thorns are used.
- 5 • Related to the corner area of the site for landscaping purposes identified some plantings  
6 that would be appropriate and can make recommendations to the applicants in this  
7 regard.

8  
9

**Nohemi Sanchez, Applicant**

- 10 • Would be fine with a Guadalupe Palm.

11  
12

**Member Nicholson:**

- 13 • The intent of the Palm tree would serve as an 'identifier' for the theme of the restaurant.
- 14 • Finds the Project to be a nice fit. Has some problem with the blue color scheme in that  
15 blue changes with scale, but this would not stop him from approving the Project. Blue is a  
16 strong color. It may be the applicant can 'brush out' the blue color scheme to get the right  
17 balance and if that balance cannot be attained some tweaking of color may be  
18 necessary. The Project is conceptually acceptable. If the applicants find the color  
19 scheme does not provide the right effect, support they be able to consult with City  
20 planning staff/Planning Director to revise the color scheme if this becomes necessary.  
21 Would like to see the applicants able to get the right balance between dark and light and  
22 in contrast with the blue color palate selected.

23  
24

**Lawrence Mitchell:**

- 25 • Referred to Sheet A400 of the site plans and explained the color proposed for the trim  
26 and other building architectural features.
- 27 • As shown in attachment 1 of the staff report the band that extends around the building  
28 that is currently a bright orange will be a darker shade of blue (blue swede shoes) with  
29 the 'field' (faded denim) of the building painted a light blue. The window trim would also  
30 be a dark blue.
- 31 • All three public entrances will typically be Mill finish anodized aluminum with clear glass.
- 32 • Confirmed the treatment used for the shakes will make them the same color. The type of  
33 treatment used will likely change somewhat in the sunlight. The idea of the translucent  
34 treatment is to allow for a layering effect with the color such that the shakes will have  
35 lighter and darker areas.
- 36 • Related to the Yucca Whipple, the intent of the groundcover is to discourage people from  
37 walking through planter areas.
- 38 • The Palm tree should not block the sign from view and/or be a potential safety hazard.

39  
40

**M/S Nicholson/Hawkes** to recommend Zoning Administrator approval of 499 North State Site  
41 Development Permit File No. 598 with the above-referenced modifications to the landscaping  
42 using a Guadalupe Palm and with possible revision to the Yucca plants to a more pedestrian-  
43 friendly species and with consideration given to whether boulders as part of the landscape plan is  
44 really necessary in terms of costs for materials and, related to the color palate, DRB recommends  
45 approval as submitted but with the understanding that if the applicants are not totally happy they  
46 can bring this back to planning staff/Planning Director for revision. Motion carried (5-0).

47  
48

**6B. 517 Main Street (PEP) Preliminary Application (File No.: 646):** Review and  
49 recommendation on a Precise Development Plan to allow the construction of three two-  
50 story building clusters that will include a total of 42 low income senior housing units,  
51 Community Center, and designated open space.

52  
53

The Petaluma Ecumenical Properties (PEP) representatives introduced themselves.

54

1 **Mary Strome, Director of Petaluma Ecumenical Properties (PEP):**

- 2 • Gave a history of PEP and its function as a non-profit affordable housing developer  
3 organization that has been engaged/involved in other senior housing projects.  
4

5 **City Project & Grant Administrator Riley:**

- 6 • It is important to understand/remember there is a connectivity/association between the  
7 PEP senior housing project and the proposed Grace Hudson Museum improvement  
8 project and more specifically explained the connection.  
9

10 **Planning Director Stump:**

- 11 • The City currently owns the property proposed for the Precise Development Plan Project  
12 located at 517 Main Street that PEP intends to purchase.  
13

14 **Bob Hayes, Project Architect** introduced/presented the Project, referred to site plans sheet A1.0  
15 and corresponding schematic drawings and gave a project description relative to the project  
16 components and concepts for preliminary design review of the Sun House Senior Housing project  
17 that is a work in progress:

- 18 • Has been working with the Grace Hudson Museum proponents concerning the PEP  
19 project.  
20 • The proposed project consists of three-two story building clusters that will include a total  
21 of 42 low income senior housing units, a community center, and designated open space.  
22 Related to the concept site plan, building is two-story having a 'double loaded corridor.'  
23

24 **Member Hawkes:**

- 25 • Asked about the reason for having a double loaded corridor.  
26

27 **Member Morrow:**

- 28 • Asked about the use of the property adjacent to the Project on the west side.  
29

30 **Bob Hayes:**

31 Buildings

- 32 • A double loaded corridor means there is a unit on each side of the center corridor. There  
33 are other ways of configuring multi-family/multi-unit projects but incorporating a double  
34 loaded corridor is a cost efficient approach and also serves as a security measure for  
35 seniors. Further explained the double loaded corridor concept and the location where the  
36 corridors are connected with a balcony, where they are closed off, how access is  
37 provided on either side of the corridor and/or basically how the double loaded corridor  
38 works for the proposed Project. The cost savings by incorporating the double loaded  
39 corridor concept can then be applied to the building architecture on the outside.  
40 • The intent of the building type/architecture was to design them to be efficient in so many  
41 ways.  
42 • The site is 'very tight' to be able to accompany 42 units. The site plans are accurate even  
43 though the Project is at a preliminary stage so what is being advocated is what could  
44 actually happen.  
45 • Finds the concept of balconies to be a good thing for projects for a variety of reasons.  
46 • Related to the matter of parking, the intent was to conceal the concept of parking within  
47 the buildings so as not to appear obvious.  
48 • Explained the function and location of the community center as shown on the conceptual  
49 site plans and is located off/near the Museum park area. The community center is single-  
50 story and provides for kitchen, library, restroom facilities, and office space  
51 accommodations. The community center is a nice place to gather and socialize and have  
52 community/communal meals and enjoy different activities/special events. The community  
53 center is also where mail is received for persons residing in the senior housing project so  
54 this facility typically functions as a 'hub.'

- 1 • Building 1 consists of five units on the first floor and three units on the second story that
- 2 are accessed off a central area and demonstrated the location.
- 3 • Confirmed 'Professional Offices' are located adjacent and to the west of the Project.
- 4 • The Project has one elevator that can accommodate some of the units but not all and
- 5 explained the concept. The intent is to make as many of the units and/or at least 95% of
- 6 the units adaptable and the Project will exceed the accessibility code in this regard.

#### 7

#### 8 Street Edges of Project

- 9 • Main Street edge:
  - 10 ○ Explained that portion of the Project that touches Main Street and how it relates
  - 11 to the Sun House and Museum. The architecture of the Sun House is one of the
  - 12 most elegantly simple and well-proportioned structure having a nice porch on
  - 13 one side and great detailing.
  - 14 ○ Given the location in retrospect to the Sun House and Museum, finds that at the
  - 15 Main Street section of the site is like developing a historical preservation project
  - 16 and/or like adding to a historical structure. In this context, is of the opinion the
  - 17 senior housing project needs to be sensitive to the museum historical structures
  - 18 in the way of scale and proportion and architecture where the two-story element
  - 19 of the Project is located behind the Main Street edge and more formally
  - 20 explained the intent from an architectural/detail/materials standpoint. Some of
  - 21 the materials proposed are hardi-board and board-and-bat because of durability
  - 22 and compatibility with the Sun House/Museum. Finds it difficult to see a
  - 23 distinction between wood and hardi-board and highly supports the use of hardi-
  - 24 board.
- 25
- 26 • Cleveland Street edge:
  - 27 ○ In addition to the Professional Office buildings adjacent to the Project, Buildings
  - 28 2 and 3, the parking lot and some residential units are located along the
  - 29 Cleveland Street edge.
  - 30 ○ The site layout of the buildings/support utility buildings/entryways/other building
  - 31 design amenities etc., resembles that of a PEP housing project completed in
  - 32 Santa Rosa and explained the similarities as shown on the concept site plan.
  - 33 ○ Addressed the trash/recycling area and corresponding building design for this
  - 34 function and how this facility would help to screen cars from view in the parking
  - 35 lot. It is likely the trash/recycling structure will likely be open-ended and have a
  - 36 roof and look like the other buildings on the site.

#### 37

#### 38 **Member Nicholson:**

- 39 • Asked if the local trash/recycling company has been advised of the Project and its
- 40 proposed functionality.

#### 41

#### 42 **Bob Hayes:**

- 43 • Has not yet consulted with the local trash/recycling company to verify the proposed plan
- 44 is workable for the company in order to finalize the site plans.
- 45
- 46 • Museum edge:
  - 47 ○ Site plans concerning the Museum edge is not fully developed.
  - 48 ○ Explained some of the design concepts such as gables and the like that will
  - 49 architecturally fit well with the Museum. Noted there are a lot of trees in this area.
  - 50 ○ Is of the opinion the scale and proportion of the buildings on the Museum edge
  - 51 will work appropriately in keeping with the Museum.

#### 52

#### 53 **Member Morrow:**

- 54 • Asked about the setback between the path and the Project buildings.

- 1 • Asked about trees that are not shown on the site plans and whether or not they are  
2 located on the senior housing side of the path?  
3

4 **Member Hawkes:**

- 5 • Inquired if there is a fence along the path?  
6

7 **Member Liden:**

- 8 • Will the fence feature open spaces that people can walk through?  
9

10 **Bob Hayes:**

- 11 • The setback varies and referred to a site plan that addresses this matter. Advised the  
12 setback is 22 feet at the beginning and explained the setback increases as the pathway  
13 meanders along the Museum edge.  
14 • There will be a fence but it will be 'transparent' and/or a type that can be seen through  
15 and may not be that tall. Aesthetically, the fence will be in keeping with what the  
16 Museum improvement project is proposing to do.  
17 • The fence will have connection points that line up with the connection points of the  
18 Museum for pedestrian access that will not be locked so that seniors can access the  
19 Museum and/or the Museum could potentially use the community building. Deferred  
20 further discussion about the fence to landscape Architect Ann Baker.  
21 • Related to the trees not shown on the site plan, noted the trees are lightly shown. The  
22 trees are existing and are not exactly on the PEP senior housing side of the property. The  
23 intent is to plant more trees on the senior housing side. The trees are visible more from  
24 the road for the driveway rather than from the path.  
25 • The park is fairly open and demonstrated the location of the cluster of trees.  
26 • The community center will serve much as a hub for activities and this aspect of the plans  
27 has not yet been fully worked out. The building will be one story where the intent is to try  
28 and keep the PEP buildings and/or overall project in scale/proportion/context with the  
29 Museum in this area.  
30

31 **Ann Baker, Landscape Architect, PEP:**

- 32 • Related to the layout of the buildings, the intent was to develop the landscape character  
33 in connection with the Grace Hudson Museum side of the Project and as such reuse  
34 some of the landscape typologies/different types of plantings that are also proposed for  
35 the Museum improvement project site.  
36 • Is of the opinion the Grace Hudson Museum property and PEP site are connected having  
37 that 'natural' feel where the intent is to retain that feel with the landscaping that is being  
38 developed/presented.  
39 • Related to the preliminary landscape plan (sheet L1.0), the colored-in trees are native.  
40 The non-colored trees are generally not native. While the landscaping plan is in the  
41 preliminary stage, the two existing Walnut trees near the street are proposed for  
42 preservation.  
43 • Plan is to frame the entry to the parking lot with some large Valley Oak trees since these  
44 tree types dominate the site.  
45 • The selected parking lot tree species will come from the City-required parking lot tree list.  
46 • The parking lot is a very constrained area so it is important to have trees that perform  
47 well in an urban setting.  
48 • Referred to the large blank wall on the office building side of the site where the plan is to  
49 'frame' with Redwood trees.  
50 • Talked about the existing Redwood trees that are mostly on the Grace Hudson Museum  
51 site where the plan is to plant additional Redwood trees in this area on the PEP site.  
52 • Referred to the Popular grove that will be retained.  
53 • The existing Live Oak trees will be preserved that are in parking lot and showed where  
54 they will be extended.

- 1 • Finds it a nice effort to be able to walk down the community path that has different tree  
2 communities.
- 3 • Demonstrated the location of the Ash trees where there is a drainage ditch in the area.  
4 This allows for another opportunity to enjoy a tree community along the pathway.
- 5 • Talked about the pathway from the PEP site and where/how it connects to/interfaces with  
6 the Museum entry.
- 7 • A central corridor is proposed from Building 1 that will extend to the community path,  
8 which acts as the general access from the PEP site to Main Street. Provided a more  
9 general discussion about access on the PEP site and the primary pathway on the  
10 Museum edge.
- 11 • Having security fencing is important to seniors. Finds it desirable to install a split rail  
12 fence and/or something similar to cable trellis fence proposed for other parts of the site  
13 that prompts/promotes a rural and/or agricultural feel that is transparent.

14  
15 **Vice Chair Liden:**

- 16 • Requested clarification about any proposed fencing concerning the area between the  
17 PEP site and the Museum.

18  
19 **Bob Hayes:**

- 20 • The Museum Board Members/Guild and staff also asked about the fencing and the  
21 Museum director responded we do not want people from the Museum arbitrarily going  
22 through the Museum site and would like to see a fence that is open. A fence is a security  
23 thing for seniors.

24  
25 **Ann Baker:**

- 26 • Related to the fence and security concept, there has been transient use of the corridor  
27 coming from the rail trail for many years so as the site plans develop, the element of  
28 providing security will be more fully addressed with regard to fencing and lighting.

29  
30 **Member Thayer:**

- 31 • Is the path located on the Museum property?

32  
33 **Ann Baker:**

- 34 • The path actually meanders along the Museum and PEP properties so it exists on both of  
35 these properties. The fence would actually be located on the PEP side of the path. The  
36 path has different interpretative exhibits that are being developed for the Museum  
37 improvement project and explained as an example, there would be places along the  
38 pathway that tell stories about living in the Redwoods and/or show silhouettes of native  
39 people/sculptures or interpretations about how to manage storm water in urban creeks so  
40 there are different points of interest that follow the pathway.
- 41 • Native grass is proposed for areas of the Museum and showed where this might be used  
42 for the PEP project.
- 43 • A storm water plan will be developed for the Project and demonstrated the location of the  
44 rain water gardens for the Museum project. Further explained how the rain water gardens  
45 are interconnected/integrated with on-site drainage swales/inlets/landscaping features  
46 and City storm water system where the maintenance would likely be minimal.
- 47 • Indicated the area designated as a dog run that is located near the community garden  
48 area.
- 49 • The PEP will feature native landscaping, ornamental fruit trees, and berry bushes  
50 allowing for a landscaping mix to retain that native and agricultural landscaping feel.

51  
52 **Member Thayer:**

- 53 • Project has a nice balance of respecting the history of the larger site, noting orchards to  
54 be a part of the Sun House history.

- 1           • Likes that the landscaping will correspond with what is existing in the area.  
2

3 **Member Hawkes:**

- 4           • Likes the Project.  
5           • Will the Project provide different levels of care/support for seniors other than  
6 independent living?  
7

8 **Linda Hedstrom:**

- 9           • Confirmed the living situation is independent where the residents lease/rent the units.  
10           Some supportive services are provided and gave examples. The Project does not  
11 provide/offer transportation services and/or assisted living.  
12

13 **Member Morrow:**

- 14           • May have questions later on in the development/planning process.  
15

16 **Member Nicholson:**

- 17           • Impressed with the architectural planning and landscaping.  
18           • Likes the architectural planning related to lower single-story housing on the Cleveland  
19 Lane and tapering it off to the street edge.  
20           • As noted in his comments related to the interpretative garden plan for the Museum  
21 improvement project is alarmed that no one is concerned about the entryway to the  
22 Museum that is being closed-in with fencing. The interpretative garden to the Museum is  
23 not welcoming. The driveway is narrow having no signage and is of the opinion the  
24 Museum culture is more about security than it is about creating a welcoming  
25 state/condition to the community. Need to find a way to better announce the entrance to  
26 the Museum and with opening this up more to the public. On the other hand is pleased  
27 the PEP project is 'mirrored' to reflect the design/architecture of the Sun House Museum.  
28           • Does not support the installation of a fence between the Museum and senior housing  
29 properties and is of the opinion this presents an arbitrary message to the seniors and the  
30 public.  
31

32 **Member Morrow:**

- 33           • Does not support the fence.  
34

35 **Member Hawkes:**

- 36           • A fence does not promote the connecting of beings.  
37

38 **Planning Director Stump:**

- 39           • The DRB will not formally review the signage and changes to the Museum entrance but  
40 will be given plan updates showing what is being done. The Planning Commission will  
41 likely review the Museum project in January.  
42

43 **Mary Stompe:**

- 44           • It may be that people do not understand the senior housing project is separate from the  
45 Museum project. The intent of the fence is to provide some protection and living space for  
46 the seniors so while the two projects are connected there is some separateness.  
47           • For other similar senior projects, PEP ended up putting in fences when none were  
48 proposed initially. A fence serves as a sense of security to seniors even if it is  
49 transparent/open. The fence will feature gates.  
50

51 **Ann Baker:**

- 52           • The concept of the fence is relevant because the path is close to people's living space.  
53

54 **Member Nicholson:**

- 1 • It appears the Museum is pursuing a fence to keep the public from entering the housing  
2 development and asked if there is consideration to do something else other than to install  
3 an eight-foot tall fence.  
4 • Provided the DRB with a copy of his recommendations concerning the Interpretative  
5 Gardens/entrance regarding the proposed Museum Project that is incorporated into the  
6 minutes as attachment 1. Sees the main issue with the Museum Project is that the whole  
7 plan centers around the security issue and the need for fencing. Is of the opinion this is  
8 not the most community-based approach to take and is concerned with urban boundary  
9 and the aesthetics/presentation surrounding the area with fencing and walls. Shares this  
10 same perception concerning fencing with the PEP project.

11  
12 **Mary Stompe:**

- 13 • The height of the fence would not be eight feet, but rather install a three to four-foot high  
14 fence that would be open, such as a split rail fence that is open and transparent.

15  
16 **Vice Chair Liden:**

- 17 • The Project presentation was good and informative; Likes the architectural design and  
18 plans for the senior housing project.  
19 • Has some concerns about the fence but understands the reason for having it. Asked if  
20 landscaping would be an alternative solution to take care of the borders and/or barriers  
21 that are necessary? Would be okay with a short split rail fence.  
22 • Is of the opinion the proposed project would enhance the Museum considerably along  
23 with the other garden project located in the area.

24  
25 **Member Morrow:**

- 26 • Does the Project include plans for permeable surfacing in the parking lot?  
27 • Asked about the sidewalk widths?

28  
29 **Ann Baker:**

- 30 • The Museum has a split rail fence.  
31 • The intent is to provide for a lot of trees and grass as opposed to shrubbery/bushes so as  
32 to create a place where people feel comfortable walking, particularly at night.  
33 • Related to the application of including permeable surfacing, the civil engineers are still  
34 evaluating the concept.  
35 • Sidewalks would be complaint with City standards.

36  
37 **Member Thayer:**

- 38 • Asked about how the Museum Guild and Museum staff think about the senior housing  
39 project?  
40 • Is of the opinion there is something about architecturally mimicking a historic structure in  
41 that it takes away some of the energy of the Museum theme noting the importance of  
42 preserving the uniqueness thereof. There may be too much mimicking of the Museum  
43 design/architecture by the proposed PEP project. Finds the massing of the PEP housing  
44 project proportioned well with the size and scale of the Sun House.

45  
46 **Bob Hayes:**

- 47 • Intends to finalize the Project plans soon.  
48 • The Museum Guild and Museum staff like the Project.  
49 • There is some potential for adjustment to the materials/some design features so as not to  
50 draw too much from the 'energy' of the Museum theme. The PEP project can be better  
51 distinguished from the Museum by incorporating more modern accents.

52  
53 **M/S Nicholson/Thayer** the DRB unanimously is of the opinion the proposed PEP project is very  
54 good, is well-considered from the massing to the detailing and from the open space to the built

1 environment seem to work well and while not all of the DRB concerns are necessarily met, is  
2 further of the opinion the design team for the PEP project has a good feel for balancing the  
3 Museum and City wishes and the DRB concerns and therefore, approves and supports the  
4 concept plans to date. (Motion carried 5-0).

5  
6 **7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

7  
8 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

9  
10 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

11 The next regular meeting will be Thursday, February 12, 2015.

12  
13 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

14 The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

15  
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

