Regular Meeting

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Hise called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL
   Present: Tom Liden, Howie Hawkes, Tom Hise, Chair
   Absent: Alan Nicholson, Nick Thayer
   Staff Present: Kim Jordan, Senior Planner
                 Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner
                 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
   Others present: Charles Ackerley
                   Deborah Ganz
                   Freedom Smith

3. CORRESPONDENCE: None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: - December 8, 2011 & October 11, 2012
   M/S Liden/Hawkes to approve the December 8, 2011 and October 11, 2012 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (3-0) with Members Nicholson and Thayer absent.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

6. NEW BUSINESS:
   6A. Preliminary Review Ukiah Valley Medical Center – Hospital Support Building (File No. 13-03-PRE-DRB) Design review pre-application review of new a Hospital Support Building. 275 Hospital Drive, APN 002-160-08.

   Senior Planner Jordan:
   • Gave a staff report and noted the Support building is a standalone application. The DRB is being asked to make design comments concerning this project.
   • Provided the DRB with a copy of project comments from Member Nicholson. These comments will be incorporated into the minutes as attachment 1.
   • Introduced Charles Ackerley, Jennings Ackerley Architecture and Design.

   Deborah Ganz, Adventist Health: While the Hospital Expansion Project has been approved by the Planning Commission, the hospital is reevaluating the campus for ways to improve and provide for a more uniform/cohesive layout such that the design/color palate/materials/treatments are well coordinated so the presentation of the buildings/other structures/landscaping provide for a more welcoming/patient/pedestrian friendly environment.

   The Support building is not an OSPD project.

   Charles Ackerley, Architect: referred to the site plan for the proposed new Support building:
   • The Support building is currently being designed. While there is no formal design at this point, is asking the DRB for comments related only to the Support Building that would be located in the rear of the hospital campus. The intent is to improve the functionality and aesthetics of the other buildings/structures/existing roadway in the same location.
• Acknowledged the hospital is also reevaluating the campus layout and/or master plan as to how the hospital functions and is exploring options to make for a more balanced/harmonious/better functioning/attractive and more engaging environment for hospital patients and their families, visitors and hospital staff.

• Likes having a primary service entrance, designated parking areas and connected pedestrian/public corridors from building to building that help unify and more clearly define the campus and the various functions as opposed to a somewhat hodge-podge design layout.

• Is of the opinion the hospital complex has more of factory/industrial look. There is a need to make the hospital campus cohesive in a way that the buildings and connections to the buildings, parking area, entrance, and landscaping are more clearly defined, accessible, inviting and friendly. Consideration will be given to overall circulation on the site as it relates to parking and access that may include possible infrastructure improvements.

• Preservation of patient privacy and providing comfort are examples of highly important components to consider that can be accomplished with appropriate landscaping and nicely designed buildings with treatments that can provide privacy and comfort.

• UVMC would like to have the new Support Building completed by the end of this year.

• The Support Building is approximately 12,000 square feet and two-stories.

• The new support building is not directly associated with patient care.

• Commented on the functions of the buildings at the rear of the site which include receiving, material/product storage, medical equipment storage, repair area and linen/laundry and are essentially the ‘heartbeat’ of the hospital. These uses are currently scattered throughout the rear of the site and could be more efficiently arranged to serve the hospital. Many of these functions could be located in the Support Building. The rear of the site also has containers, an emergency generator and a collage of other things. The intent is to analyze these functions and make improvements as the hospital develops and grows.

• The proposed Storage building will feature office space on the second floor.

• Understands the building would need to be reconfigured and moved forward because a two-story building is not allowed in the B2 Airport Compatibility Zone without Mendocino County Airport Land Use Commission review and approval.

Staff: Confirmed that a determination would have to be made by the Mendocino County Airport Land Use Commission that a two-story is consistent with the B2 infill compatibility criteria.

DRB:

• Questioned plans concerning the roadway that dead ends at the back of Home Depot and finds this to be a very odd situation.

• Asked if plans include opening up the corridor on the back side of the hospital facility to accommodate trucks and other vehicles where the storage facilities/repair areas are located.

• Asked about the modular structures that were located near the physical therapy building.

• There was discussion about the parking on the site, particularly plans concerning the temporary/permanent parking lot on the northwest side of the campus.

• Questioned if the DRB is being asked to look at the design concept for the Support building whether attention is also to be directed as to how this fits into the grand scheme of plans for the hospital campus.

• Likes the concept of the Support building, but is really unable to comment on the design aspects because there is no design being proposed at this time.

• Rather than provide direction preference would like to understand the intent of the project.

Staff:

• It just happens to be that Hospital Drive ends at the back side of Home Depot.
• It may very well be the Support building is the beginning of the bigger picture for the hospital campus and while consideration is being given to the overall design of the campus there is only one application and this is for the Support building.

• The “overflow” parking lot currently being used by the hospital would be replaced by the permanent parking lot approved as part of the Hospital Expansion project. The overflow parking lot is allowed to be used during construction of the approved Expansion Project and would likely need to be used during construction of the Support Building for parking and construction staging. When the permanent parking lot is built, the overflow lot can no longer be used.

• Requests the DRB provide direction to the applicant that can be used for the preparation of the formal application. Design style that is preferred or not, site design concerns, etc.

• Need to be clear that the applicant is not required to and provide a “Master Plan” of the hospital campus as part of the Support Building Application.

Charles Ackerley: There is an access driveway from E. Perkins Street where the physical therapy building is located that goes along the back side of hospital facility where the support buildings are located.

Freedom Smith, Ukiah Valley Medical Center: The modular structures have been merged into the job site.

DRB comments related to the design of the new Support building:
• Agrees with Member Nicholson’s Project comments.
• Project should be people centered.
• Provide for outdoor space for employees and visitors. People should be able to have a connection with the outdoors. The outdoor space could be covered.
• Provide good landscaping.
• Provide energy efficient components, possibly green-walls, address heat island effect of west facing windows.
• Provide for nice color pallete.
• Do not mimic design of hospital/Birth Center. Design for the Support building would not really be meaningful without full concept of the master plan for the hospital campus and how the design of other buildings architecturally ties in with one another.
• Recommend relocating the two-story part of the building to be outside of the B2 Airport Compatibility Zone to avoid going to the Airport Land Use Commission. Going to the ALUC is uncertain and would delay the project.
• Focus on providing adequate pedestrian and bicycle access to all buildings and provide adequate pedestrian circulation and bicycle parking. Bike and pedestrian issues are important to our community.
• Make certain the backside of the hospital has adequate pedestrian and bicycle access.
• The generator facility is in an unsuitable location.
• The backend of the campus is unorganized and needs to be improved.
• Likes the design and welcoming feel of the ‘Pavilion’ building.
• Does not need to see the master plan for the site as it relates to the architecture as part of the formal application for the Support building.

Deborah Ganz: Emergency funding has been received to replace and possibly relocate the emergency generator.

Charles Ackerley: Will provide colors and materials from the “master palette” for the hospital campus for the formal application for the Support Building. This would be the “palette” that is intended to be used throughout the hospital campus over time which will be based on a design that fits with Ukiah and/or Mendocino County image and the fact that the Project is a hospital. A “Master Plan” for development of the hospital campus will not be provided as part of the Support Building application.
7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD: None

8. MATTERS FROM STAFF


Shannon Riley, City Project and Program Analyst:

- City Council authorized staff to develop an Outdoor Dining Structure Program for Downtown Ukiah.
- The Program is modeled after the successful pilot project at Patrona and will extend to eligible restaurants in the Downtown core.
- Program guidelines are being developed.
- Intent is to avoid ‘cookie-cutter’ appearance and allow for businesses to personalize their outdoor dining structures as much as possible within the Program guidelines in compliance with City safety and design standards/encroachment regulations, etc.
- Would like DRB input regarding fencing, floor surface, furnishing standards (tables/chair/umbrellas and umbrella stands/lighting/portable heaters/trash receptacles/other decorative items).
- Provided examples of outdoor dining structures used in San Francisco and Long Beach and asked for the DRB to comment and make recommendations thereof (See attachment 2). Noted the difference between the Parklet in San Francisco and the program the City is proposing is that the Parklets are truly public parks even though they are typically located near a restaurant and can be used by anyone.
- Also provided are materials/product specifications from Bison (See attachments 3, 4 & 5).
- The outdoor dining structures in Ukiah will basically be the property of the restaurant which would be responsible for maintenance, providing insurance, and for compliance with all City rules/regulations.
- Asked the DRB to review the draft Program and make recommendation.
- A number of city jurisdictions limit large tables in outdoor dining. (No bigger than a four-top)
- With regard to the Parklet bottom right (see attachment 2), would think there would be some kind of small barrier on the back of the wooden bar/table so food/dishes and the like do not fall into the street.
- Related to tables and chairs, plastic or resin chains are prohibited. Such chairs get ‘grimy’ and are light weight so they tend to get blown around. Some cities suggest specific materials for chairs, such as wrought iron, fabricated steel, etc.

DRB comments regarding Parklet examples from San Francisco and Long Beach (attachment 2):

- Questioned the design related to the outdoor dining example with the barrels. The design appears to be ‘choppy.’
- Do not like the row 2, left side example (see attachment 2) which looks like a corral.
- Likes the outdoor dining structure on the bottom left of the examples. The materials appear to be ‘Bison’ and the design is pleasing/welcoming and less cluttered than some of the other examples. Likes the use of landscaping in this example provides green space and a barrier between the street and outdoor dining area.
- The design and choice of materials/accessory décor relative to the outdoor dining structure example bottom right is interesting. The barrier can act as a table and people sitting on the stool seats can look at traffic while eating. The sidewalk extends outward, the design is simplistic yet very appealing/inviting.
- Outdoor dining structures should be level and supported as the floor transitions from sidewalk to structure. Member Liden cited an example in Virginia where brick and sand are used. The transition between the sidewalk and outdoor dining was nicely achieved and highly pleasing aesthetically.
• Member Liden supports allowing florescent colors for umbrellas, rather than prohibiting them. They can be used well.
• Height of railing should be no more than 36 inches.
• Presentation is important.
• Structures should not appear or be cluttered for safety/privacy/aesthetic purposes.
• Materials and surfaces used should have the ability to be power-washed.
• Use of redwood for the floor of the structure is not a good idea because it can be slippery in the winter.
• Important to extend the sidewalk outward.
• Provide for some type of railing system for outdoor dining structure.
• Landscaping should be encouraged. Planters are okay and can be effective a barrier/separation between the structure and the street.
• Make sure there is some way to maintain underside of structures in order to remove debris/garbage which can accumulate under decks and create unpleasant odors/smells.
• Likes the brick and sand approach. There is an advantage to having a permeable surface. Also, this would prevent debris from getting under the surface and creating odors.
• Likes the concept of having ‘patio-type surfaces.’ Could be brick, tile, or other types of materials used for patios.
• Structures should be ADA accessible and need to have a foundation.
• Platform structures are okay provided they are level with the sidewalk with a smooth transition from sidewalk to outdoor dining area.

There was discussion concerning surfacing using sand and the technique used.

Chair Hise:
• Supports having guidelines with basic concepts because some people will want to do more and others less. Some people may only want tables, others tables with planters, and others may want a well-defined structure and take a more architectural approach. Guidelines are necessary to steer way from ‘anything goes’ kind of design and to prevent clutter.
• Has seen patio work done with sand and square pavers that are very effective and provides for a nice appearance. This technique is actually less costly than concrete. Is familiar with mixing sand with cement and this too is an effective technique.
• Wood decking and railing is expensive and is not typically durable. There are prefabricated materials available that are longer lasting.
• With the right design, benches would be acceptable. Benches function great as boarders.
• European Café themes are well-known for using small café tables. The reason large tables are likely prohibited is to be able to seat a small number of people like European café’s do. Restaurants that have a sideyard typically have larger tables for outdoor dining.

DRB: While Patrona’s outdoor dining structure looks good, it is not level with the sidewalk. It is a platform.

Member Liden:
• Referencing Patron, one does not expect to have a ‘deck’ on an asphalt surface where people park their cars. The structure is not level with the sidewalk.
• Likes most of the design concepts in the examples of outdoor dining structures featured in attachment 2.

DRB comments regarding Bison products and material brochure (attachments 3, 4 & 5)
• Provides nice examples of patio surfacing. Sees that Bison provides prefabricated concrete and stone surfacing materials of different design and character.
DRB comments:

- Likes the concept of outdoor dining. Patrona outdoor dining was a nice addition to the Downtown.
- Would like to see other outdoor dining establishments in the Downtown.
- The design examples would be useful for the Program because the outdoor dining structures need to be attractive. The examples of outdoor dining structures could act as design guidelines that provide ideas and samples of materials that could be used. Do not like the “corral” with trellising or the barrel with tree in attachment 2. Likes the idea of trees and landscaping, but the barrel in the middle of the barrier/railing is odd.
- Structure should provide for a happy medium between being able to relate to pedestrian activity on the sidewalk and having the sense of being safe and separated from the street because this represents the fun of eating on the sidewalk.
- Inquired about how the Program would work and what would be the boundaries? Could someone do an outdoor dining project on Perkins Street?
- While the program should have guidelines and standards for compliance, creativity should be encouraged.

Staff:

- There would be a standard package that people can choose from. If someone wants to do something different than the standard package, the DRB can review the project.
- While neon colors would not likely be a good choice and hence prohibited, it could be such colors would be appropriate for a project. The DRB would be able to make this determination.
- While the program boundaries have not been determined, they will likely be limited to the Downtown core, primarily because unlike other areas this area does not already have onsite areas to accommodate outdoor dining and can only use the sidewalk or other right-of-way for this.
- Perkins Street outside of the downtown would not be included in the Program boundaries.

Chair Hise asked about the requirements for a barrier.

Staff:

- The matter of barriers is being looked at as they relate to safety, ABC requirements and/or other city/public right-of-way/encroachment requirements.
- Does the DRB want to consider planters as fencing?

DRB: Encourage planters as fencing.

Floor Surface

Open to different techniques; Likes materials from Bison. Most effective if sidewalk is extended and make certain all surfacing is level with the sidewalk.

Would like to see a variation in surfacing materials. Does not want to necessarily see all brick.

Furnishing Standards

Tables & Chairs

- Are necessary provided they are maintained, safe for persons. Plastic chairs should be allowed provided they have some architectural design where the plastic is mixed with stainless steel and/or the like.
- Metal tables and chairs look nice. Cautioned though some metal tables and chairs can get too hot in the afternoon sun. Table cloths would be an option.
• Likes staff’s recommendations concerning materials permitted on page 2 of the staff report.
• Agrees all plastic or resin tables and chairs should be prohibited.

**Member Liden**: Supports considering fluorescent colors rather than prohibiting. They can be very attractive if used in the right context. Also okay with stripes and patterns.

**Staff**: Design concepts and colors for outdoor dining should not be distracting.

**Umbrellas & Umbrella Stands**
• Should be encouraged. They also provide shade.

**Lighting**
**Member Liden** likes the concept of kerosene lamps.

**Staff**:  
• Kerosene lamps would likely be a fire hazard since portable heaters are allowed.
• The City has specific requirements regarding lighting.

**DRB**: Likes staff’s recommendation regarding lighting as provided for on page 2 of the staff report.

**Portable Heaters**
• Good idea.

**Trash Receptacles**
• All outdoor dining establishments must be kept clean. City staff is discussing the technical aspects of this.

**Other Decorative Items**
• Awnings provide for a nice accent provided they do not extend into the public right-of-way.

9. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT
The next meeting will be Thursday, March 14, 2013. The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

__________________________
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
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.

As an introduction, I refer you to a letter I composed in 2009 as a response to a proposal for an addition and remodel to the emergency entrance area on the West side of the existing Critical Care Unit. Although it was written for a different building proposal, it is still relevant to the current proposal.

In reviewing this proposal, I couldn’t help noticing the omission of the name and purpose of the new Support Building. No mention is made of the relationship to the neighborhood or the existing campus. So I looked at the Adventist Health Center purpose and meaning from their website:

We provide Spiritual Care
- A hospital that cares about the spiritual needs of patients and families. Our goal is to create a healing environment, as reflected in our mission statement.

Patient Focus (Our Mission Statement)
- We provide care in a way that is sensitive to the physical, mental, and spiritual needs of patients.

Employee Focus
- We strive to provide a work environment where every person is respected and appreciated, with the dedicated professional who is proud and accountable.

Community Focus
- We strive to be good corporate citizens through giving, volunteering, and advocating.

Our Healing City

Does the new building respond to any of these goals?

A prospective healthcare campus design addition must not only address the challenges of creating technologically and sustainable building systems, but also the human element of healthcare. Designing for patients, visitors, staff, and families in the healthcare environment involves consideration of operational efficiency and capital cost concerns with evidence-based healthcare design. In a successful healthcare plan, the architecture of both the spaces delivered and the building itself supports the goals of the hospital.

The Adventist Medical Center has another opportunity here and now to unify its campus and become a model healthcare project for the City of Utah.

The starting point is always a unified color palette. Color can have profound psychological and physiological impact on humans and the built environment. Color and architecture go hand in hand. Color is the language of form, and is also the language of emotion. Through exterior color, we influence our landscape and interface with our surroundings by way of cultural.
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Sharing ideas and the emotional associations of color. A dual-celled Hospital Drum is an expanding architectural curiosity and an important identity of campus planning.

A major benefit is to do something right with the Outpatient Clinic; the building has a strong presence with the main entrance in an interesting and understandable relationship and color harmony. It complements an area that has a distinctive identity. However, it stands alone. The rear of the building is a singular, featureless façade that is not a coherent part of the overall design.

Following are some specific suggestions for improving the proposed Support Building:

1. Provide pedestrian bulb-outs of all crosswalks to enhance pedestrian safety and promote a more walkable city.
2. Provide real pedestrian shelter and weather protection at every arcade rather than an abstracted metaphor.
3. The west elevation is an underdeveloped idea and offers no height loading dock with no pretense of softening through scale, massing, building details or landscaping. Perhaps the use of a single tower could have some horizontal relationship to the north façade instead of being an isolated tower. The entry along the west façade will be an inefficient energy drain and an interior, a seasonable pedagogical experience. The north street façade is assumed to be a single story window with the height of the building with no human engagement.
4. The building massing is bland and may not be a suburban business park or highway infrastructure. It relies on high performance glazing and has no relationship to its environment or the city of Union design guidelines or historical context. It has no relationship to any of its neighbors or neighborhood, and creates further discord amongst its architectural neighbors.
5. Although the presentation is very ordinary, there is a glazing discrepancy for the screening of the vehicular service areas. A single window along the western border does not create a narrative and leading environment for landscape.
6. There are other strategies for building design beyond the addition of a “Standing and Program Diagram.” Perhaps the design team could move beyond the programming, and scheme phase and into design development before financial decisions.
7. Provide a proposal for a coherent color palette program.

Respectfully,

Alan Nielsen, Associate AIA
Good Buildings Make Good Neighbors

Now is the time to consider the healing power of architecture. Just how much difference can architecture make to health?

There is nothing new in the idea that architecture can be an aid to healing. Historically, hospital buildings were designed in a city, as an expression of philanthropic ideals, sending patrons and employing architecture and design to inspire patients, staff and the community to be good neighbors.

Hospitals are where we celebrate our most intimate and touching but also our most harrowing and emotional moments. They should be among the most important and profoundly symbolic spaces we inhabit yet it is not inherent. Instead they are largely the result of dimly defined orifices, poorly planned, unquestioned orthodoxy and, too often, planning and architecture.

How can architecture contribute to healing? Nowadays, large buildings such as hospitals are required to meet a complex amalgam of physical, aesthetic, social and symbolic functions. Finding ways to deliver these features is a major challenge for modern architecture. Before even thinking about what a project will actually look like, the architect must identify the intended functions of the project and its footprint.

Many architects think that great design comes from great programming. They thrive on data, ideas, algorithms, codes, and other non-physical models. Then, at the end, they quietly create their program, leaving the aesthetic skills of our profession with very little to say. But the product fails at the end because the designer has never failed.

Everything they do is an objective outcome based on business value, creativity and innovation. On the other hand, are subjective processes that do operate in this rationalist manner.

Much detailed research has been done on the workplace environment, on the effects of architecture on staff, on performance and on profit. In every instance studies show that workers react positively to building architecture. As a result, they feel happier, healthier, more able to work harder and more productively. As a result, profit increases.

The design of hospitals on the other hand, which are unique and complex structures compared with even the most sophisticated business office, is being led to design-build contractors, with architects reduced to implementers of a larger private finance controller. Quality in architectural design is pushed to the periphery of staff. Where it appears, it is used sparingly in the design of space, instead of in the treatment of an interior. Architecture is purely cosmetic.

The argument for decent public architecture is one of cost. It is true that hospital buildings are largely expensive to construct, far more than offices, housing or even...
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Unfortunately, for the communities that HBE (Hospital Building & Equipment Company) provides design/build health care facilities, design excellence and the concept of creating a healing community is not part of the program. The current building proposals for the City of Utah cannot be distinguished between an auto-body repair shop, a strip mall or a budget concrete mule.

As the HBE Mission Statement proudly announces, "Our entire process is structured to deliver the most value for your design." The key to their success is providing low-cost structures. So much so that the possibility of enduring market-driven design or being a good member in building a healing from the company culture.

Also unfortunate is that the proposed building is in the face of the Adventist Health Care in Utah. This is a rare opportunity for the public expression of their beliefs and a chance to make a statement of a healthy, healing quality of life in the community. Good buildings
deserve great neighbors.

Allen Nicholson
June 7, 2011
Parklet Examples from San Francisco and Long Beach
Parklet in Three Diagonal Parking Spaces (San Francisco)
Pavement to Parks
San Francisco: Divisadero Street

San Francisco’s Mayor Champions Parklet

The "green" movement is expanding beyond improving the earth’s environment to improving pedestrian environments. Once little-decked corridors like San Francisco have become areas of concrete where automobiles swarm like schools of fish.

San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom is countering this trend by reclaiming lots of space for people by converting lots of space into parks. One recent project is a “parklet” built on a curbside deck outside the Polk Bicycle Gallery, which was once a public parking space. The raised structure is made of recycled materials and constructed with Bison’s VersaWall pedestal, framing and bracing systems. The raised hardwood deck includes a level surface off the sidewalk.

Bison Highlights
According to Andy Faust, project manager for Pavement to Parks, they "get the same effect as a $100,000 concrete buildout at a fraction of the funds!"
Pavement to Parks
San Francisco: Divisadero Street

Project Information

- **Project Location:** San Francisco, CA
  - In front of Spanish Bistro Café, West side of Divisadero Street, between Mission and Grove Streets
- **Owner:** City of San Francisco
  - Landscaping maintained by Mission café
- **Architect:** RSF Architecture and Planning
  - Architects: RSF Architecture
- **Project Manager:** Michael Pavlov
  - District Director: San Francisco Public Works
- **Contractor:** Mission Bump
- **Dock Support:** Bump Warehouse Adjustable Dock Supports
- **Existing Fences:** Bump Ramification HIC Certifiers
  - 50-6000, 30-1000
- **Usable Street Space:** 21 ft. x 6 ft.

"Pavement to Parks is a collaborative effort between the Mayor’s Office, the Department of Public Works, the Planning Department, and the Municipal Transportation Agency."