



# City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

---

---

## MINUTES

---

---

Regular Meeting

January 31, 2017

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

---

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Liden called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in Conference Room #5.

2. **ROLL CALL Present:** Member Hawkes, Nicholson, Morrow, Hise, Chair Liden

**Absent:**

**Staff Present:** Kevin Thompson, Interim Planning Director  
Shannon Riley, Senior Management Analyst  
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

**Others present:** Alpesh Jivan

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the September 15, 2016 and September 22, 2016, and October 6, 2016 meetings are available for review and approval.

**M/S Hise/Nicholson** to approve September 15, 2016 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (5-0).

**M/S Hise/Nicholson** to approve September 22, 2016 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0) with Member Hawks abstaining.

**M/S Hise/Hawks** to approve October 6, 2016 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (5-0).

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

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

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**

6A. Request for Review and Recommendation on a Minor Site Development Permit to allow exterior building improvements to include replacement of existing awnings, remove rooftop pyramid element over the main entryway and the addition of downward facing accent lighting along the main entryway at 1139 N. State Street, Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC). APN 001-360-25 File No.: Munis 2455-SDP-ZA.

**Interim Planning Director Thompson:**

- Member Nicholson submitted written comments regarding the KFC remodel that have been forwarded to the applicant and are incorporated into the minutes as attachment 1. In response to these comments, the applicant has requested today's DRB meeting be postponed to allow time to review the comments and possibly make revisions to the project.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

- DRB members have the option of submitting written comments to Planning staff regarding the proposed project that can also be forwarded to the applicant for review.
- Planning staff will schedule another DRB meeting when the applicant is ready for the proposed project to be reviewed.

**6B.** Preliminary Design Review for a Hotel at 1601 Airport Park Boulevard. There is no APN yet because of the recently approved Subdivision.

**Interim Planning Director Thompson:**

- Requested the DRB review/evaluate the elevations as shown in attachment 1 of the staff report and provide comments.

**Alpesh Jivan:**

- He and his family have been in the hotel business for many years in Ukiah.
- Welcomes input from the Board members.
- Would like the project to move forward toward development in a timely manner.
- The proposed design models that of Holiday Inn Express hotel prototype. The proposed hotel is a franchise.

**Member Nicholson:**

- Provided written comments regarding the Holiday Inn Express hotel project.

The aforementioned comments are incorporated into the minutes as attachment 2.

**DRB:**

- Asked about the 40-foot height limitation for buildings in the AIP and how this would apply to the proposed project.

**Interim Planning Director Thompson:**

- The applicant has requested a preliminary review of the proposed hotel project even though no site plan is included.
- While the Airport Industrial Park (AIP) PD Ordinance 1098 that governs development in the AIP has a 40-foot maximum height limitation for buildings, there is the opportunity to go higher through discretionary review approval.
- A slope analysis is necessary as it pertains to the Airport Land Use Plan and as it pertains to the 40-foot height limitation for development in the AIP.

The DRB discussed Member Nicholson’s comments relative to the design prototype he provided as an example that likely is to resemble the proposed design with the following comments:

- Proposed building has no architectural softening characteristics as required by the Ukiah General Plan.
- The plan is required to exhibit quality and sophisticated architectural design.
- The plan poses cheap, formula big box economy of materials and detailing and falls into the category of bland, cuboid, boxy, flat walled and plain.
- There is no design relief from large open blank walls with flush windows. There are no awnings, vertical or horizontal architectural elements/treatments to break up the cheap boxy appearance.
- The building does not acknowledge passive solar potential in the design.
- No lighting is proposed for review. The building signage proposed extends above the building parapet and this is not allowed in the general requirements of the zoning designation.

1 The DRB further discussed other relative project components that need to be addressed as  
2 provided for in Member Nicholson's comments regarding the proposed building prototype:

- 3 • Airport Business Park is a planned development zone with special classification for light  
4 manufacturing/mixed use designation. A motel is a R-2 occupancy and now, an allowed  
5 use.
- 6 • The preliminary proposal is only to look at the elevations, but to give this context, parking  
7 spaces are required to make parking mostly not visible from the street and landscaping  
8 coverage is required with street trees. The architectural facades for buildings situated  
9 along and facing Airport Park Boulevard is required to be consistent with the general  
10 requirements of the zoning code.
- 11 • The proposed building design is to have a similar character and detailing to the sample  
12 photograph provided as an example of the building type.
- 13 • Under general development requirements, architectural facades are to be designed to  
14 soften height, bulk and mass. A 40-foot height limit is specified and the proposal is 49  
15 feet 4 inches off the front door grade with a mechanical structure adding another 3 feet or  
16 so. If it is on the other side of the street it may be a 50-foot height limit that may exceed  
17 the allowed height limit.
- 18 • There is no mention of the square footage of the building, which is an essential  
19 requirement for planning of the project. We have no idea how it may or may not fit on the  
20 parcel with associated signage, parking, transformers, waste storage, view impacts and  
21 the like. It is not known if this proposal is compatible with the Airport Master Plan.  
22

23 After having discussed Member Nicholson's comments regarding the proposed project the Board  
24 is of the opinion the design and/or proposed Holiday Inn Express prototype is not architecturally a  
25 good fit for Ukiah and/or in keeping with the design guidelines established for commercial projects  
26 outside the Downtown Design District even though the project is located in the AIP PD that would  
27 govern this development. Acknowledged the AIP PD Ordinance 1098 does have specific site  
28 planning and design standards for commercial development as provided for on pages 8 through  
29 11 of the Ordinance.  
30

31 **Chair Liden:**

- 32 • Asked if 90 rooms is the standard for the Holiday Inn Express prototype?  
33

34 **Member Hawkes:**

- 35 • Would like to see a color isometric design rendering of the building. The design  
36 presented looks 'boxy.' It may be having a design rendering that shows the colors and  
37 textures, the building may not appear so boxlike such that he would have a better sense  
38 of how the building might look.  
39

40 **Member Morrow:**

- 41 • Are the elevation plans looking at the building from the east to west? Asked if the awning  
42 entry area is facing Airport Park Boulevard.
- 43 • It appears the building orientation is perpendicular to Airport Park Boulevard.
- 44 • Does the AIP PD have different parking requirements than the other City zoning  
45 ordinance designations?  
46

47 **Member Nicholson:**

- 48 • Original intent of the AIP was to allow for Light Manufacturing/Mixed use zoning  
49 classification, but this is not the course that has been taken in terms of development  
50 where the AIP PD Ordinance has had to be amended several times to provide for more of  
51 a 'Retail/Professional Office' and/or commercial zoning classification.
- 52 • Because he views the proposed building as being 'bland' in character went to the Holiday  
53 Inn website and found a multitude of other Holiday Inn Express building samples with  
54 architectural characteristics having a far superior design. While these design examples

1 may be an older design and possibly more expensive, he finds them much more  
2 appealing than the proposed design.  
3

4 **Alpesh Jivan:**

- 5 • Understands the DRB needs to see what is proposed in the way of parking, landscaping  
6 that would likely include LID features, pedestrian access and circulation, lighting,  
7 signage, and building design, color, and materials to be able to adequately review the  
8 project with a recommendation to the Planning Commission.
- 9 • He has not yet submitted a Planning application and the associated requirements that  
10 accompany the application. Today is only a preliminary look at the proposed hotel  
11 project.
- 12 • The prototype is 92 rooms.
- 13 • Is able to get samples of drawings of actual hotels that have been built.
- 14 • Confirmed the elevation plans are looking at the building north to south, parking lot.
- 15 • The awning entry area faces northerly.
- 16 • Generally discussed the location of the parking lot area, setbacks, building  
17 canopy/awning.
- 18 • Confirmed the other examples of Holiday Inn Express buildings provided by Member  
19 Nicholson are much older than the new 'formula blue' design the franchise has come out  
20 with. The proposed design for the hotel is representative of the new design concept for  
21 Holiday Inn Express buildings by 'IHG.'

22  
23 **Member Nicholson:**

- 24 • Is of the opinion the proposed design for the hotel is not appropriate for Ukiah and would  
25 support project denial if this is the best Holiday Inn Express hotel design the applicant  
26 can propose.
- 27 • Because the DRB is presented with a preliminary design without full documentation or  
28 site plan that addresses landscaping, parking, lighting, signage wanted to give some  
29 'honest' feedback. If there is no opportunity to change the design, he could not support  
30 the project.

31  
32 **Member Hise:**

- 33 • The AIP PD Ordinance 1098 specifically addresses buildings not having the appearance  
34 like the hotel building being proposed.
- 35 • Would like to see a building design that has some unique characteristics, fenestration, is  
36 architecturally pleasing, and a good fit for Ukiah.
- 37 • Asked about suggestions how to make the project more passive solar?

38  
39 **Interim Planning Director Thompson:**

- 40 • Confirmed the proposed project is subject to the parking requirements of AIP PD  
41 Ordinance 1098.
- 42 • AIP PD Ordinance 1098, Section 5, Site Planning and Design Standards for Commercial  
43 Development provides development standards relative to yard setbacks (front, side and  
44 rear and relief thereof), maximum building height and relief thereof, Minimum lot area,  
45 maximum lot coverage and relief thereof, building orientation, architectural design, signs,  
46 pedestrian orientation, lighting, energy conservation, outdoor storage and service areas,  
47 landscaping, Ukiah Airport Master plan compliance regulations, public utility easements  
48 and/or other guideline standards for development.

49  
50 **Member Nicholson:**

- 51 • Recommends providing for shading elements above the windows; could have  
52 architectural details that create a more three dimensional façade.

53  
54 **Member Hawks:**

- 1 • The proposed design resembles that of a 'courthouse with a city inner school  
2 appearance.'

3  
4 **Member Hise:**

- 5 • Concurs with Member Nicholson's comments and would recommend eliminating the fake  
6 stone on the building and is of the opinion this feature further cheapens the façade that is  
7 existing. It would not likely take too much design alterations to make the building more  
8 interesting in appearance.  
9 • As with most corporate designs there are categories of building samples depending upon  
10 how they assess the community the building will go in. The proposed design for the Ukiah  
11 Holiday Inn Express would not be acceptable in any Bay Area community today.  
12 • Ukiah does not want a building that is a 'cheap design pulled from a drawer of many  
13 design samples.' Again, the proposed design tentatively chosen for Ukiah would never be  
14 acceptable in any of the peninsula communities.  
15 • Acknowledged the building has some positive attributes that include color and texturing  
16 features that are architecturally pleasing. Is of the opinion there are too many  
17 architectural materials happening on the building.  
18 • Would likely support the sign on the building that is likely an exception to the Ordinance  
19 regulation governing the AIP.  
20 • Finds that the community design standards/guidelines established for Ukiah apply to  
21 most project types but are somewhat problematic when it comes to corporate  
22 developments likely because corporate entities are not familiar with Ukiah's design  
23 guidelines for commercial buildings.  
24

25 **Member Morrow:**

- 26 • Is of the opinion the Hampton Inn is a good example of what is a fairly imposing building  
27 that definitely fits a formula design but the way the property is landscaped with Redwood  
28 trees and such seems to 'shelter' the building so that it does not have the  
29 'overpowering/dominating' appearance when driving on Airport Park Boulevard.  
30

31 **Alpesh Jivan:**

- 32 • The new formula blue design like that selected for Ukiah has been the designated design  
33 for communities in the last five years.  
34

35 **Member Hawks:**

- 36 • The proposed building is large for Ukiah and it would be nice if it were attractive in  
37 appearance.  
38

39 **Chair Liden:**

- 40 • If the aesthetics of the design were modified some perhaps the building would not look so  
41 massive and overpowering.  
42

43 There was DRB discussion regarding the mechanical structure on the building and height noting  
44 this would bring the height of the building to 51 feet 8 inches.  
45

46 **Member Morrow:**

- 47 • The AIP PD Ordinance allows the maximum height of any building or structure to be 40  
48 feet, provided it complies with the side-slope criteria for the Ukiah Airport. Mechanical  
49 penthouse and equipment may extend an additional 10 feet beyond the maximum height  
50 provided it is adequately screen from view. Relief from the height standards may be  
51 granted through the discretionary review process if a finding is made that the proposed  
52 height is compatible with the scale and character of the development on adjacent and  
53 nearby parcels and would not have an adverse impact on the health and safety of the

1 general public. A 50-foot height or greater would be acceptable if approved through the  
2 discretionary review process.

3  
4 **Member Nicholson:**

- 5 • Height is not a problem for him particularly in that area of Ukiah.
- 6 • Is of the opinion the massing and architectural detail is 'so pathetically budget' that is the  
7 problem for him when looking at other comparable hotels in the neighborhood.

8  
9 **Chair Liden:**

- 10 • The proposed building design resembles that of a 1960s hospital.

11  
12 **Alpesh Jivan:**

- 13 • The architect for his project is not from Holiday Inn Express but rather from a firm he  
14 hired. Holiday Inn Express has given the architect the prototype for that particular building  
15 wherein the intent is to adjust the design to fit well architecturally in Ukiah.

16  
17 **Member Morrow:**

- 18 • How much can the prototype design be customized?

19  
20 **Alpesh Jivan:**

- 21 • Wanted to have this preliminary meeting to get feedback to see how much customization  
22 can be done.
- 23 • While the project has a boxlike appearance, views the project as a 'contemporary design'  
24 where the primary focus is on interior space rather than the exterior. Understands the  
25 importance of providing for an architecturally pleasing exterior design.

26  
27 **Member Hise:**

- 28 • Has knowledge of corporate images that have taken the 'box' and done a great job  
29 designing it without a lot of design elements added to it. While these type of box design  
30 buildings may stand out they are fairly flat and 'boxlike' and have the ability to make more  
31 of a design statement with the application of architectural pleasing treatments, color,  
32 textures, and materials that complement the building rather than trying to  
33 overcompensate in this regard with the application of design elements that are not  
34 architecturally pleasing and/or complementary. Is of the opinion the proposed project is  
35 basically a box building that does not have very much treatment or design elements with  
36 just the application of color and not in a 'very thought out' way.
- 37 • He made some suggestions as to treatment types and/or design elements that would  
38 complement the building architecturally.

39  
40 **Member Morrow:**

- 41 • Is it possible for the applicant to show the DRB different prototypes of Holiday Inn  
42 Express buildings?

43  
44 **Member Nicholson:**

- 45 • Based on his experience as a designer, there are not a lot of design options for corporate  
46 prototype building samples.

47  
48 **Alpesh Jivan:**

- 49 • He is moving from concentrated architectural designs and styles of buildings for more of  
50 a simple contemporary architectural style building and implement native landscaping  
51 trees/vegetation to enhance/complement that building that is a contemporary design  
52 rather than the traditionally unique style of architecture.

53  
54 **DRB general comments:**

- Would need to see a complete set of site plans in order to fully and appropriately evaluate the proposed project and make comments.
- Parking should not be visible from the street.
- Provide for less architectural detail and eliminate the fake stone.
- As designed, building prototype is not an architectural good fit for Ukiah.
- The box building can be fixed to be more architecturally interesting.
- Install landscaping to enhance the building architecturally.

**Member Morrow:**

- Related to the design aspects, asked the applicant to consider certain accents, accessories that would physically improve the appearance of the box structure that may include a pitched roof.

**DRB consensus:**

- Based on the discussion above regarding the design aspects of the proposed project would not support approval, as currently designed.
- Would be amenable to having a special DRB meeting to review the proposed Holiday Inn Express project when the applicant is ready to formally present the project.

**Senior Management Analyst Riley:**

- A hotel feasibility study was conducted for potential hotel development in the Downtown area and finds this document to be very helpful and informative. It may be the applicant and/or his architect may want to review this study for informational purposes. The study talks about what kind of hotels Ukiah can support.
- The Hotel feasibility study will be presented to City Council on February 15, 2017.

**7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

**8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

**9. SET NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting will be scheduled based on project need.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

---

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

From Design Review Board member Alan Nicholson

January 30, 2017

A response to a proposal from the Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise in the City of Ukiah to remodel the exterior of their existing building, requiring a Minor Site Development Permit

---

Today, KFC has more than 18,000 outlets in 115 countries around the world.



#### **KFC is getting a makeover.**

The chicken chain is now rolling out a new, fast-casual-inspired design that the brand began testing in 2014. Seventy percent of the brand's 4,500 restaurants will be updated by the end of 2017, using a revitalization strategy crafted by FRCH Design Worldwide.

FRCH describes itself as a "global brand experience firm specializing in fast casual concepts," which has previously worked with brands including McDonald's, California Pizza Kitchen, and Taco Bell.

The new design is intended to modernize the chain's appearance, with a cleaner and bolder look. The revamped locations include stark red and white walls, furniture, and decoration.

We simplified and stripped back the legendary Sanders, mixing heritage with a modern, flattened rendering of KFC's iconic founder. On packaging, we harkened back to the playful red bars of the 50's and bold black Col Sander's faces that had made KFC so unmistakable.

---

In reviewing the request for design review, I have some general thoughts on the design approach, as well as a few specific responses to the proposal.

The city of Ukiah has designated the Downton Design District and adopted Guidelines for businesses both in this district and outside this special zoning district to protect, preserve, and retain the local and unique character and charm of the downtown core and historic district. The City and Community of Ukiah are built on pride of place and preserving the historical and quickly disappearing charm of small town character.

KFC is in the process of revitalizing 4,500 franchises by the end of this year. The inspiration of this branding revitalization is a return to the early 50's and the origins of KFC. Cities across the world have been trying to evolve from this franchise fashion for fifty years. This creates a conflict in identity for both the City of Ukiah and the KFC franchise. When KFC went through the City Planning Commission for their last revitalization in 2007, they were required to reduce the amount of red striping, remove proposed red stripped awnings on the front of the building, and harmonize with the Guidelines and the neighborhood by adopting a more compatible neutral color palate.

The current proposal is an affront to and exhibits a complete disregard for the Design Guidelines and the Ukiah Municipal Code. The goals of KFC have always been to participate both economically and visually in their local community and be good neighbors. This is not an acceptable visual statement.

1. The building front or street elevation proposes removing the only element which ties this box to the local character, and that is the pitched entry roof. The roof must remain as an architectural connection to this historic city character.
2. The signage is out of scale and disproportionately big for the street façade. Colonel H. D. Sanders is way too big and needs to be reconsidered at a more modest size. Please refer to the Design Guidelines in the Signs section.
3. The existing monument sign will not match the new revitalized logo and image of the Colonel on the building. If the monument sign is to be altered or renewed at a future time, we request to see the proposed graphics and details.
4. The stark contrasting red and white color palate is jarring and not in compliance with the City Design Guidelines, and does not harmonize with the neighborhood.
5. The red and white striping on the building sides is unacceptable and out of context with the color pallet and character the city guidelines.
6. The Red building color on the rear and side elevations is unacceptable and does not harmonize with either its neighbors or the fabric of the City.
7. The whole color pallet is not appropriate in the civic and commercial environment of Ukiah. It can be revitalized and brought to a more contemporary aesthetic with neutral earth tone colors.

The applicant has not put forth a good faith effort to comply with the Ukiah Municipal Code, or the Design Guidelines in the Building Design section under Building Colors as well as Signage, and my recommendation is that the project application be denied as presented.

Thank you,

Alan Nicholson

January 30, 2017

From Design Review Board member Alan Nicholson

January 30, 2017

A response to a proposal from the Holliday Inn Express franchise in the City of Ukiah to build a new four story, 90 room motel at 1601 Airport Park Blvd. Pre-plan review for a Use Permit and Major Site Development Permit.

---

Airport Park is a Planned Development Zone with a special classification (K) for Light Manufacturing / Mixed Use Designation. A motel is an R-2 Occupancy and now, an allowed use.

This preliminary proposal is only to look at the elevations, but to give this a context, parking spaces are required to make parking (mostly) not visible from the street, typical landscaping coverage is required with street trees. The architectural facades for buildings situated along and facing Airport Park Blvd shall be consistent with sections General Requirements of the Zoning Code.

The proposed building is to have a similar character and detailing to the photo here as an example of the building type.

Under General Requirements, architectural facades shall be designed to soften height, bulk and mass. A 40-foot height limit is specified and the proposal is 49'-4" off the front door grade, with a mechanical structure adding another 3 feet or so. If it is on the other side of the street it may be a 50-foot height limit. It may exceed the allowed height limit.



There is no mention of the square footage of the building, which is an essential requirement for planning. We have no idea how it may or may not fit on the parcel with associated signage, parking, transformers, waste storage, view impacts, etc. It is not known if this proposal is compatible with the Airport Master Plan.

It has no architectural softening characteristics as required in the General Requirements. The plan is required to exhibit quality and sophisticated architectural design. The propose plan defines cheap, formula big box economy of materials and detailing. It falls easily within the definition of bland, cuboid, boxy, flat walled and plain. There is no design relief from large open blank walls with flush windows. There are no awnings, vertical or horizontal architectural elements to break up the cheap box cliché.

The building is required to be both shaped and oriented to take advantage of passive solar energy and solar collection in the winter. This building does not even pretend to acknowledge passive solar in the design. There are no solar shading or collection elements, there is no differentiation between a southern or northern solar exposure. Passive solar orientation is mandatory, active solar design is strongly encouraged.

There is no lighting proposal for review. The building signage proposed extends above the building parapet which is not allowed in the General Requirements.

Some example of design in Holliday Inn Express

