



City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

March 3, 2015

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

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

2. **ROLL CALL**

Present: Vice Chair Tom Liden, Alan Nicholson, Howie Hawkes, Colin Morrow

Absent: Nick Thayer

Staff Present: Charley Stump, Planning Director
Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner
Kevin Thompson, Principal Planner
Shannon Riley, Project & Grant Administrator
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Others present: Bob Hayes
Ann Baker
Jim Langford

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the February 19, 2015 meeting are included for review and approval.

M/S Morrow/Nicholson to approve the minutes from the February 19, 2015 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried by an all AYE voice vote of the members present (3-0) with Member Hawkes abstaining and Member Thayer absent.

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. **517 North Main Street, (PEP Housing) Sun House Senior Housing Project; General Plan Amendment, Rezoning and New Precise Development Plan (File No.: 749):** Review and Recommendation on a Precise Development Plan to allow the construction of three two-story building clusters that will include a total of 42 affordable senior housing units, community center, and designated open space.

Assistant Planner Johnson:

- Introduced new City of Ukiah Principal Planner, Kevin Thompson.
- Member Thayer has submitted comments that are included in the minutes as attachment 1.
- The DRB previously reviewed the conceptual design for the PEP Housing project in January 2015. An official application has been received and staff requests the DRB make

- 1 final comments relevant to the landscaping and architectural design/color palate and
2 materials for the Project.
- 3 • The Project involves a General Plan Amendment to designate the site HDR (High Density
4 Residential) and a rezone to (PD) Planned Development, (R-3) High Density Residential
5 and a Precise Development Plan that is required to allow the construction of the three
6 two-story building clusters consisting of 42 units, community center, garden area, open
7 space/park area, parking accommodations and pathways.
 - 8 • Project includes: 1) 42 housing units; 2) 31 parking spaces; 3) (3) two story building
9 clusters with architectural style consistent with the Sun House; 4) A Community Center;
10 5) building roofs that are oriented to the south to maximize solar output; 6) screened
11 parking lots; 7) garden area; 8) onsite open space/park area.

12
13 The site plan addresses the project description as provided for on architectural sheets (A1.0,
14 A1.1, A2.0, A2.1, A2.2, A2.3, A2.4, A3.0, A3.1 and A3.2)

15
16 **Bob Hayes, Architect for PEP Senior Housing Project** referred to the site plans as provided
17 for on attachment 3 of the staff report and presented the Project:

- 18 • There have been very few architectural design changes since the DRB last looked at the
19 Project with regard to buildings 1, 2, & 3 and the Community Center.
- 20 • The angle of the Community Center has changed somewhat and is a bit more diagonal.
21 Has been working with the Sun House Museum related to access between the two
22 facilities.
- 23 • Explained in detail the location of the various facilities related to parking, open
24 space/courtyard area, the buildings, pathways, etc., and how they will interact/function for
25 the persons living in the complex.
- 26 • The site and building orientation/configuration were designed with the architectural
27 integrity of the Museum theme in mind.

28
29 **Ann Baker, Landscape Architect for PEP Senior Housing Project:**

- 30 • Very few changes have been made to the landscaping since the DRB reviewed the
31 conceptual plans.
- 32 • Permeable paving will be implemented for the parking area to help address water runoff
33 and explained the other associated benefits thereof. Further addressed how
34 paving/pavers will work for the site.
- 35 • Explained other changes made in and around the Community Center in connection with
36 the patio.
- 37 • Explained the objective of the arbor and corresponding location where the intent is to
38 screen the parking lot and provide more privacy in the park space.
- 39 • Explained the changes made to form related to one of the interior pathways on the site
40 and its relationship to the Community Center.
- 41 • The raised beds have been modified and addressed what is being proposed related to
42 the landscaping features and noted one of the beds will be wheelchair accessible.
- 43 • The form for the pathway connecting to the parking lot has changed.
- 44 • Focus has been to 'fill in' the plant choices/plant palate as provided for in the reference
45 sheets, L-1.0 and L-1.1 of the Landscape Plan: 1) Two arbors are proposed and
46 explained the aesthetics thereof; 2) Talked about shade plantings in and around the
47 walking paths between the PEP Project and the Museum Project; 3) Related to fencing,
48 the intent is to install split-rail fencing along the community pathway and demonstrated
49 the location such that the objective would be to 'echo' the Museum split-rail fence without
50 copying it. Explained fencing objectives related to the east side of the property that will
51 introduce the use of grape stakes on the back side of the property and explained how so
52 related to security purposes.
- 53 • Related to one of the pathways as shown on the site plans, intent is to align the edging
54 with the pavers to provide some relation between the different components of the Project.

1 **Member Hawkes:**

- 2 • Will cars park on the pavers? Will the base be nicely compacted?
3

4 **Ann Baker:**

- 5 • Confirm cars will park on the pavers.
6 • Confirmed the paving has an engineered base that will contain a permeable class 2 base
7 as opposed to a Class 2 Caltrans base having the same structural rating, but more
8 durable quality. Explained how the permeable paving will work in connection with the
9 pavers.
10 • The Project will feature stabilized aggregate pathways, one of which will have a 'Flag
11 Stone' border. The pathways are designed with safety in mind.
12 • Related to the plant palate that will feature such species as Valley Oak, Trident Maples,
13 fruit trees, Redwood trees, Persimmons to name a few and showed the various locations
14 thereof. Also, identified the shrubs that will be featured on the site.
15 • The parking lot will feature Trident Maples. Trident Maples do fine/tolerant in areas that
16 have higher groundwater.
17 • Talked about the 'micro-orchard' and tree species.
18 • Talked about how the landscaping that will help screen the site and provide shade.
19 • Talked about the rain garden and the plant species that will be featured.
20 • Explained the location of the native lawn that is proposed for the site. It can be mowed or
21 not and should not be cut too short.
22

23 **Member Hawkes:**

- 24 • With the landscaping being extensive does PEP contract with a landscaping business to
25 manage/maintain the landscaping?
26

27 **Vice Chair Liden:**

- 28 • Requested clarification the northern border will be shaded once the buildings are
29 constructed.
30

31 **Jim Langford, PEP representative:**

- 32 • A professional landscaping business is hired to maintain the landscaping. A warranty
33 comes with the plant palate for a specified period of time where any plant that dies will be
34 replaced.
35

36 **Ann Baker:**

- 37 • The plants around the storm water area also have a management plan as part of the
38 maintenance requirements for the Project.
39 • Confirmed the northern portion of the property will be have shade once the buildings are
40 constructed. Added, this area will have a lot of shade such that the huckleberry and
41 coffeeberry plants and other like species will do well.
42

43 **Bob Hayes** addressed the design of the buildings:

44 Building 1 - Building is intended to incorporate/integrate design similarities from that of the Sun
45 House Museum so PEP has been working with the Museum to accomplish this goal. Using
46 design renderings explained:

- 47 • Building roof would have pretty much the same slope the Sun House Museum has.
48 • Incorporated some of the beam overhang design from that of the Museum and showed
49 the details on the site renderings.
50 • Explained some of symmetrical feature design on the Sun House Museum that have
51 been incorporated into Building 1.
52 • Utilized some of the same window styles.
53 • While some of the design elements are being 'picked up' from the Sun House Museum
54 the intent is to do this in a different fashion and explained how so. The overall design for

- 1 Building 1 looks like a barn to the Sun House as if it were acting like a subordinate
2 building to the Sun House in a historic sense.
- 3 • The intent of the building configuration was to give that 'quiet' look/sense and explained
4 how the design features accomplish this objective.
 - 5 • Explained the entrance to Building 1 in connection with the courtyard/light-well area that
6 has a very linear quality to it and front and further explained how the tenants will enter the
7 units.
 - 8 • Explained that the 'quiet' roofs face the Museum property.
 - 9 • Likes the park side of the building from a design perspective.
 - 10 • The materials for this building include: 1) most part – board and batten; 2) CorTen steel
11 and demonstrated the location on the building where the intent is to provide architectural
12 enhancement to compliment the other materials to give the building that 'barn' look.
13 Described in detail how the materials work on the building to give that 'barn look'
14 character/appearance; 3) shingles. All buildings contain this intermix of the
15 aforementioned materials and/or some articulation/combination of the design thereof.
 - 16 • Sheet A2.0 shows first and second floor plan for Building 1.
 - 17 • Likes the appearance of Building 1, particularly with the linear design that is occurring.
18 The building looks like it belongs among Redwood trees. More Redwood trees will be
19 planted on the site.
 - 20 • The building has a nice 'harmony' to it, particularly with it being among the trees and
21 arbor.

22
23 **Vice Chair Liden:**

- 24 • Asked if there was a color rendering showing the relation of Building 1 to the building that
25 exists to the south.

26
27 **Bob Hayes:**

- 28 • Noted there is quite a bit of distance between Building 1 and the other buildings.
- 29 • Addressed Building 1 and the elevation where the balconies are located and explained
30 the low sloping of the roof and other contour features and how they collectively work for
31 the design and compliment the Sun House Museum. Solar panels will likely be installed
32 on the low sloping roof as it has a nice orientation for this type of feature. The intent is to
33 install as many solar panels on the roof as possible. The goal is to have solar panels on
34 all the building roofs that will effectively conserve energy for the units.

35
36 **Jim Langford:**

- 37 • Confirmed solar panels do assist with energy conservation and has resulted in cost
38 savings for other PEP housing projects.

39
40 **Member Liden:**

- 41 • Asked about the scale of the CorTen steel.

42
43 **Bob Hayes:**

- 44 • The aforementioned material will be corrugated and as far as related to scale the
45 material is all the same.
- 46 • Is of the opinion the use of CorTen steel will be architecturally pleasing and an
47 interesting material to use.
- 48 • Talked about the materials and materials palate, i.e., board batten/hardie board and
49 product type for the shingles.

50
51 Building 2 and 3

- 52 • All the buildings are two stories except for the Community Center.
- 53 • Showed location of the corridor.
- 54 • Talked about the balconies and location thereof as shown on site plan renderings.

- Discussed access and showed the location of the elevator.
- Talked about the elevation variations and how the symmetry design of the buildings, corresponding features such as the gables/building trim, building materials/color scheme and roof elevations/materials architecturally work well together.
- These buildings will feature 'Mansard roof' styles.
- Sheet A2.2 shows floor plans.

Principle Planner Thompson:

- Will the buildings feature roof-mounted equipment?

Bob Hayes:

- Confirmed there would be roof-mounted equipment, but not a lot because the mechanical equipment will be inside the units.
- Demonstrated the orientation/configuration of the buildings on the site and how they interface with one another with a park in the middle so as to provide for an effective/efficient/workable/comfortable living environment.
- Talked about the color palates for the buildings and noted Buildings 2 and 3 will feature a green, tan and brown palate and demonstrated how this works aesthetically.
- From the site renderings showed the Mansard roofs and location of solar panels.

Community Center

- Building 1 and the Community Center building are similar.
- Is a 'quiet' and simple building.
- Has a Hip roof in the middle of it with a hip entry.
- All the project buildings have similar styling/detailing.
- Showed on the color site/building renderings the elevation that faces the outdoor area and the parking lot. Explained the entry and the use of the French doors that extend/go out to the patio area.
- There are windows on three sides of the community center with windows that face the garden area and Museum.
- Explained the design features and discussed where the shingles and board and batten will be applied on the lower and upper portions of the building.

Cleveland Lane side of Buildings 2 and 3 (See sheet A1.1)

- No significant change from the presentation of conceptual plan other than a little more building detail.
- Explained the application of the shingles, board and batten, color elements and how they are used interchangeably to provide for a nice architectural appearance. Talked about balcony design/contour and how this works with the arbors, etc.
- Showed the location of the parking lots and parking behind the trash enclosures.

Cleveland Lane side of Building 1, Community Center (See sheet A1.1)

- Showed location of Building 1 related to location of Building 2 and 3.

Grace Hudson Museum side (See sheet A1.1)

- Showed location of Park, pathway, garden area.

Main Street side (See sheet A1.1)

- Showed the orientation of Building 1 as it relates to Main Street.

Building Colors

- Has established the color palates for the buildings, but will more fully work the color palates to make certain they are just right/appropriate during construction.

- Showed the color palate variations for each of the buildings, where they will be applied on the building in coordination with the CorTen.
- Explained how the color for around the window base essentially drives the color scheme for the buildings because the selection only has standard colors and are typically all dark colors.

Vice Chair Liden:

- Asked about the step-up grade between Building 1 and Building 2 and what will occur in this regard.
- Related to the front section of the site where the existing house is located asked about the intent of grade differential.
- Values the old Oak trees on the site and is hopeful the Valley Oak trees can be saved west of the parking lot area. Surprised at how open the area is to the south in terms of exposure to summer heat. Fortunately, the orientation of the buildings makes it so only the end units would essentially be exposed. Also, observed the view shed to the south is very unattractive especially from the second story units. It may be some type of awning/vine growth should be a consideration.
- The Project is really nice.

Member Hawkes:

- Asked if the color for the roof shingles is the same for all buildings.
- Referred to LACO report (attachment 1 of staff report) and questioned Table 1 data on page 2 of the report, the number of bedroom units for the Project does not calculate accurately based on the acreage for the site. The maximum number of bedroom units should calculate to 42. The table indicates 44 bedroom units and asked for clarification in this regard.

Member Morrow:

- Asked about exterior lighting.
- Related to the decrease in parking spaces observed seniors in this community use 'Dial-a-Ride' and asked if the Project can accommodate this type of vehicles on the site.

Bob Hayes:

- The intent is to make the grade a gentle slope moving easterly for grading and drainage reasons. Any sloping on the site will be 'gentle slopes.'
- The front section will be evenly graded except in the area of the water retention pond.
- Related to roof colors, to meet Green Building standards may do a cool roof on the flat areas that is typically a light color. Preference would be to do a dark color rather than a light color for the roofs.
- Does not have light fixtures samples available, but noted the fixture type is 'Craftsman' style. The lighting features are intended to be shielded and downcast. Talked about the locations for the lighting fixtures and what fixture type will be used in the parking lot.
- Referred to the site plans and explained how the small public transit vehicles can be accommodated on the site and/or it may be possible to provide a pick-up area in front of the buildings for quick in and out situations.
- Related to the number of bedroom units allowed, confirmed 42 bedroom units allowed for the Project. There should be 36 one bedroom units and 6 two bedroom units. For Building 1, number of one bedroom units should be 8 as opposed to 10.
- Acknowledged the end units facing southerly will be exposed to the hot sun. It may the cool roof will provide some relief and/or provide for some other design mitigation measures, such as an awning that would more appropriately shade these units. There are only two units that would be affected and showed which ones.

1 **Vice Chair Liden** requested Member Thayer's comments be addressed.
2

3 **Ann Baker:**

- 4 • Related to the Valley Oak trees, switched a Redwood tree to another Valley Oak tree that
5 will likely provide more shade than a Redwood tree.
- 6 • The west side of the site will be shaded because the Valley Oak trees are tall.
- 7 • Related to the Member Thayer's comment, 'can we use one of the smaller cultivar Ginkos
8 instead of the messy Chitalpa for the eastern parking lot. Wish we never put that tree on
9 the approved tree list, messy, gets mildew even in our heat and look silly for 10 years
10 until it matures,' noting her response, 'the Chitalpa has done well in Calistoga and the
11 Ginkos have been impossibly slow. I guess site specific is everything. I'm worried the
12 trees will have wet feet in this site and recommends Trident Maples.' The Trident Maples
13 will be planted close to the parking area on the west side as is possible and showed
14 location. Noted Member Thayer is fine with the Trident Maple suggestion.
15

16 **DRB consensus:**

- 17 • Likes the Project very much and supports approval.
18

19 **M/S Nicholson/Hawkes** the DRB supports the proposed PEP Senior Housing Project, as
20 presented, has no particular Project issues; Project is well thought out and as the Project moves
21 forward in the approval process all 'unknowns' will become evident and adequately addressed. Is
22 hopeful the Planning Commission supports the PEP housing design team recommendations at
23 the Planning Commission's stage of the Project process. (Motion carried 4-0).
24

25 **7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

26
27 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

28 **Assistant Planner Johnson** confirmed there will be DRB meeting on February 12, 2015.
29

30 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

31 The next regular meeting will be Thursday, February 12, 2015.
32

33 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

34 The meeting adjourned at 3:48 p.m.
35
36

37 _____
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Michelle Johnson

From: Nicholas Thayer <mail@lateafternoon.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 9:16 AM
To: Ann Baker Landscape Architecture
Cc: Michelle Johnson
Subject: Re: PEP Housing review at DRB

Sold! I like the Trident Maple suggestion.

Thanks, N

Nicholas Thayer
mail@lateafternoon.com
707-462-5133 office
707-362-0680 mobile

On Mar 3, 2015, at 9:09 AM, ANN <landarches@comcast.net> wrote:

Hmm, the Chitalpa has done well in Calistoga...and the Gingkos have been impossibly slow. I guess site specific is everything. I'm worried the trees will have wet feet in this site.

Trident Maples?

From: "Nicholas Thayer" <mail@lateafternoon.com>
To: "Michelle Johnson" <mjohnson@cityofukiah.com>, "Ann Baker Landscape Architecture" <landarches@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2015 9:05:51 AM
Subject: PEP Housing review at DRB

Hello Michelle (and Ann),

Best of luck today with the Design Review Board. I am sure the revisions will be well received. I will not be able to attend.

I am very supportive of the architectural and landscape architectural changes, particularly the permeable paving. I have only two comments on the landscape revisions (considering I was in on some of them!).

+ Parking lot trees in Western parking area for shade? I do realize that is great shade on the West side of this parking lot, but maybe a few more on the East side to help with Summer heat?

+ Can we use one of the smaller cultivar Ginkgos instead of the messy Chitalpa for the Eastern parking lot, 'Saratoga' perhaps? Wish we never put that tree on the approved tree list, messy, gets mildew even in our heat, and look silly for ten years until it matures.

Michelle Johnson

From: Nicholas Thayer <mail@lateafternoon.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2015 9:06 AM
To: Michelle Johnson; Ann Baker Landscape Architecture
Subject: PEP Housing review at DRB

Hello Michelle (and Ann),

Best of luck today with the Design Review Board. I am sure the revisions will be well received. I will not be able to attend.

I am very supportive of the architectural and landscape architectural changes, particularly the permeable paving. I have only two comments on the landscape revisions (considering I was in on some of them!).

+ Parking lot trees in Western parking area for shade? I do realize that is great shade on the West side of this parking lot, but maybe a few more on the East side to help with Summer heat?

+ Can we use one of the smaller cultivar Ginkgos instead of the messy Chitalpa for the Eastern parking lot, 'Saratoga' perhaps? Wish we never put that tree on the approved tree list, messy, gets mildew even in our heat, and look silly for ten years until it matures.

Regards, Nick

Nicholas Thayer
mail@lateafternoon.com
707-462-5133 office
707-362-0680 mobile