



# City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

---

---

## MINUTES

---

---

1  
2  
3  
4 **Regular Meeting**

**March 17, 2016**

5  
6 **Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue**

---

---

7 1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Liden called the Design Review Board meeting to order at  
8 3:06 p.m. in Conference Room #5.

9  
10 2. **ROLL CALL Present:** Member Nicholson, Hawkes, Morrow,  
11 Chair Liden

12  
13 **Absent:** Member Thayer

14  
15 **Staff Present:** Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner  
16 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

17  
18 **Others present:**

19  
20 3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

21  
22 4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the February 25, 2016 meeting will be  
23 available for review and approval.

24  
25 The DRB approved the February 25, 2016 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0).

26  
27 5. **AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

28  
29 The DRB is required by the City Code to review and make a recommendation on all Site  
30 Development Permit applications.

31  
32 6. **NEW BUSINESS:**

33 6A. **Ellie's Mutt Hutt 732 South State Street, (File No.: 1610 SDP-ZA):** Review and  
34 recommendation to Zoning Administrator for a Minor Site Development Permit for the  
35 addition of a 448 square foot accessory building on the north west property line located at  
36 732 South State Street, APN 003-031-41.

37  
38 **Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- 39 ▪ Gave a staff report.
- 40 ▪ Noted the siding will be hardi plank, the color for the building will be Pebblestone Clay to  
41 match the color of the existing building and the roof shingles will be Pewter Gray.
- 42 ▪ The existing shed on the site will be removed. Has no knowledge about the plans for  
43 use of the concrete slab that will remain after the shed is removed.
- 44 ▪ Attachment 3 represents the site map/plan for the project (Sheet C-1, A-1 and A-2) for  
45 discussion purposes.
- 46 ▪ Since landscaping is a requirement for the Site Development Permit asked if the DRB is  
47 okay with only the addition of one tree or is there a desire for more landscaping.
- 48 ▪ The outdoor dining project approved last year is not going to happen so whatever  
49 landscaping was approved for this project is not a part of the new project.

50  
51 **DRB:**

- Is pleased to see the Mutt Hut is proposing the addition of a 448 sq. ft. accessory building for use as office space, storage space for dry/bulk supplies, a new walk-in refrigerator and two new public restrooms.
- Made the following comments:

Roof (shingles):

- The site plans (A-2) indicate the roof would be a 'wood shake' to match the existing restaurant building.
- Not sure whether 'shake roofs' are allowed anymore. It may be wood shakes are specially treated for fire proofing reasons or imitation made.
- Would like to see a shake roof or the equivalent provided it does not look like fake wood shakes in place of the Pewter Gray fiberglass shingles shown in attachment 1 of the staff report.
- The roofing material needs to be 'appropriate' and comparable to the existing roof for the restaurant.
- Preference is a wood shake roof as per plan to match the existing structure unless unfeasible to do.
- If it is determined a wood shake roof is unfeasible, is fine with allowing the Planning Director to make a decision about the roof type based on the DRB's roofing preference.

Electric Panel:

- Relocate the electric panel to the north side of the building where it is not visible to the public and supports a recessed flush located on the north side for the panel or the panel put into its own alcove. The corresponding electrical pipe need not be exposed. The conduit to weatherhead should be located behind the siding and/or hidden in the wall.
- Asked about the location where the City electric wires come into the existing building and where the wiring will come into the accessory building. According to sheet A-1 it appears the power is coming in from the north side of property. Overhead wires do run along State Street and there is a power pole right between Beverly's Fabric and the Mutt Hut so it is likely power will be coming from the north portion of the property. Having the electric panel on the north side of building is perfect particularly if the power comes from the north because all corresponding electric facilities will be out of sight.

Landscaping

- While one new Chinese Pistache Tree is proposed to the Freitas Street planter on the south west portion of the property would like to see more trees, if feasible.
- Do the City parking lot shade requirements apply to the proposed project?
- Would like to see more street trees on the State Street frontage. Is of the opinion this area is barren.
- Discussed areas where more trees could be added. It is possible to add two Chinese Pistache trees in the planter area on the west side of the property. Chinese Pistache trees do not have a big root system so they make good street trees.
- It might be nice to have a planter in and around the slab area after the shed is removed.

**Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- Even though the proposed project involves an existing parking lot based on how the UMC is written, it must meet the 50% shade coverage requirement. Due to the small size of the parcel and/or other constraints compliance with the landscaping shade coverage requirement is not possible without removing parking spaces which make the project non-complaint with the parking requirements. However, there are opportunities to add to the

1 landscaping. The DRB can determine whether or not it is fair and reasonable to ask the  
2 applicant to provide for more landscaping, i.e., by planting more trees and taking out the  
3 existing Junipers, for instance.

- 4 • Planting more trees along the State Street frontage may be problematic as it was when  
5 consideration was giving to the Outdoor Dining project, but there is an opportunity to add  
6 more trees in the back parking lot where the outdoor eating area is located and this would  
7 require removal of some Juniper.
- 8 • A large Redwood tree does exist in the area where the shed is presently located so it  
9 may not be a good idea to add another tree in this location.
- 10 • It may be the garage/recycling may go in the same location where the shed is now. The  
11 applicant/owner will have to find a suitable location for the trash/recycling and have a  
12 plan in this regard. Understands trash/recycling facilities now require the enclosure be  
13 covered, but will confirm whether or not this new regulation pertains to dumpsters and not  
14 to trash/recycling containers.
- 15 • Will talk to the applicant about the location for the trash/recycling bins/containers because  
16 it appears the plans do not specify a location.

17  
18 **Chair Liden:**

- 19 • It may be the existing shed should not be removed and used as an enclosure for  
20 trash/recycling.

21  
22 **Member Nicholson:**

- 23 • Every street curb in Ukiah is lined up with trash/recycling containers when it is that  
24 particular street's day for trash/recycling pick-up and finds this condition not to be  
25 aesthetically pleasing.
- 26 • Related to potential increasing the landscaping features, the applicant does not  
27 necessarily have to put in more Chinese Pistache trees in the planter area located on the  
28 property line to the west. They could be of different species. This would be a matter for  
29 Member Thayer to make this recommendation concerning appropriate selection of  
30 landscaping species/trees.

31  
32 Landscaping

- 33 ▪ It may not be a good idea to plant another tree in the same area where the large  
34 Redwood tree exists that is located near the existing shed because it would likely  
35 be too shady for a tree to grow.
- 36 ▪ There was more discussion concerning changes to the landscaping that will  
37 include: 1) removal of the Juniper bushes; 2) Add two new trees and  
38 groundcover/vegetative landscaping in the existing planter on the property line to  
39 the west; 3) Provide for live groundcover/landscaping species in the existing  
40 planter next to the entrance to the parking lot on Freitas Street; 4) Add one new  
41 tree and live groundcover/landscaping in the existing planter on State Street.
- 42 ▪ Requested staff ask Member Thayer utilize his landscaping expertise to work  
43 with the applicant regarding the selection of the landscaping species for the  
44 different planter areas.

45  
46 Shed (trash/garbage issue)

- 47 ▪ There was discussion whether the shed structure should be retained and used  
48 for trash/recycling purposes such that with having two buildings next to one  
49 another they should be architecturally consistent/compatible. However, the shed  
50 is clearly 'a shed' so it may be not so important that it architecturally match the  
51 other buildings. The existing shed consists of redwood.
  - 52 ▪ Preference would be for the shed to be retained.
  - 53 ▪ Does not want to see trash/recycling displayed on the Freitas Street side of the  
54 building. It is visually an eyesore.
- 55

1 **Member Morrow** referenced the site plans (Sheet C-1) and noted it appears the slab from the  
2 shed proposed for removal will be used to store trash/recycling bins. This area will be fenced with  
3 a gate.  
4

5 The DRB is fine with the aforementioned location for storage of trash/recycling and noted this  
6 would be a significant improvement from what typically occurs where the Mutt Hut displays  
7 trash/recycling on the Freitas Street side of the building.  
8

9 **Member Nicholson:**

- 10 • It is not acceptable to put trash out on the sidewalk. It should be a project condition not to  
11 allow trash on a sidewalk.  
12

13 **Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- 14 • The project is a site development permit and not a use permit where the project findings  
15 differ. However, this may be the opportunity to enforce the situation of not allowing trash  
16 on the sidewalk as a public nuisance and will look into the matter. The proposed project  
17 is an opportunity to get the trash/recycling off the sidewalk on Freitas Street and stored in  
18 the fenced area where the shed is currently located.  
19

20 The DRB discussed the fencing material type appropriate for the trash enclosure area. The  
21 material should likely match the siding on the new annex building or at least be architecturally  
22 compatible. It may be the fence should consist of cedar board rather than hardi board like the  
23 siding on the annex building. The fence should be painted/stained to be compatible with the color  
24 of the new annex building.  
25

26 **Assistant Planner Johnson** will check to see if the trash/recycling area requires a roof.  
27

28 Noise

- 29 ▪ Discussed the issue of potential noise impacts from the refrigerator compressor.
- 30 ▪ Noted a lot of noise is generated from traffic on State Street so noise coming  
31 from the compressor would not likely be an issue. It is doubtful the compressor  
32 would make that much noise.
- 33 ▪ It was noted the compressor would be mounted on the roof behind a parapet wall  
34 so it unlikely noise would be an issue.  
35

36 The DRB further discussed the electrical panel location and access for reading of the electrical  
37 meters and noted this will be visually seen from Beverly Fabrics.  
38

39 Miscellaneous

- 40 ▪ Maintain a five-foot free zone for ADA access per City code.  
41

42 **Chair Liden** referenced attachment 2 of the staff report (City of Ukiah – Commercial  
43 Development Design Guidelines Project Review Checklist) and it does not appear the project is  
44 out of context with this document.  
45

46 **M/S Nicholson/Morrow** the DRB highly recommends the Zoning Administrator approve Ellie's  
47 Mutt Hut site development permit to allow an accessory building based on 1) landscaping  
48 changes as discussed above that will include the addition of 3 new trees in addition to the  
49 proposed Chinese Pistache tree, one of which is to be located on Freitas Street and State Street  
50 and two additional trees in the existing planter area on the property line to the west. The applicant  
51 will consult with Member Thayer, the DRB landscape expert, on appropriate plant materials. In  
52 addition to the trees recommends low shrubbery, plants or groundcover appropriate to the  
53 existing micro-environment; 2) related to the annex building recommends wood shakes to match  
54 the existing shakes on the restaurant building as per plans from Bob Axt, Architect; 3) Related to  
55 the new annex building recommends moving the electrical panel to the north side of the building

1 and set flush with riser pipe to weatherhead enclosed in wall; 4) Maintain per City code a five-foot  
2 free zone for ADA access; 5) recommends the fencing for the storage area be per the plan and  
3 of a compatible color with the new annex building; 6) approval of the project is conditioned on  
4 removal of any trash/recycling on Freitas Street. Motion carried (4-0).  
5

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

7 **Member Hawkes:**

- 8 • Would like the DRB to discuss Member Thayer absences from meetings. His presence  
9 and professional landscaping expertise is crucial with helping to shape projects into an  
10 architecturally pleasing product.  
11

12 **Chair Liden** will contact Member Thayer about his absences from meetings and his future intent  
13 with serving on the board.  
14

15 **Chair Liden:**

- 16 • The agenda document should contain the term, 'Agenda.'  
17 • Would like staff to make certain the DRB is properly noticed of an upcoming meeting to  
18 ensure attendance.  
19

20 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

21 There was a brief discussion about the proposed zoning ordinance change regarding the 50%  
22 shade coverage for parking lots in 15 years and the problem with projects having existing parking  
23 lots being able to meet the 50% shade coverage standard in which exceptions are typically  
24 requested. The question in this regard is whether we should continue to allow exceptions or  
25 formulate new standards for projects with existing parking lots. As it is now, projects with parking  
26 lots cannot meet the landscaping standards and typically seek relief. This gives staff the  
27 opportunity to change the landscaping and possibly ask for more landscaping that allows for a  
28 nice finished product.  
29

30 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

31 The next regular meeting is April 14, 2016.  
32

33 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

34 The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.  
35

36  
37 \_\_\_\_\_  
38 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50