



# City of Ukiah, CA

## Design Review Board

---

---

### MINUTES

---

---

1  
2  
3 **Regular Meeting**

**April 11, 2013**

4  
5 **Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue**

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

8  
9 **2. ROLL CALL Present:** Vice Chair Tom Liden, Howie Hawkes,  
10 Alan Nicholson, Nick Thayer, Chair Tom Hise

11 **Absent:**

12 **Staff Present:**

13 Kim Jordan, Senior Planner  
14 Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner  
15 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

16 **Others present:**

17 Robert Palafox  
18 Richard Ruff  
19 Leonard Winter  
20 Dr. Paul W. Poulos  
21 Freedom Smith  
22 Charles Ackereley  
23 Deborah Ganz

24 **3. CORRESPONDENCE:** None

25 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: - March 14, 2013**

26 **Member Liden** made the following correction:

27 Page 5, line 50, change 4 by 6 foot to '4 by 6 inch.'

28  
29 **M/S Hawkes/Hise** to approve March 14, 2013 minutes, as amended. Motion carried (5-0).

30  
31 **5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

32  
33 **6. NEW BUSINESS:**

34 **6A. Mendocino County Historic Society – Annex Building** (File No. 13-07-UP-SDP-PC).  
35 Review and make design and landscaping recommendations to Planning Commission for  
36 a new annex building at 603 West Perkins Street, APN 001-229-03.

37  
38 **Staff:**

- 39 • Member Nicholson has prepared some photos of the site and of accessory building to  
40 provide a context for discussion concerning the proposed new building (included as  
41 attachment 1 to these minutes). This is important since the museum property is located  
42 in a highly architectural significant center of the westside historic district. Also included for  
43 discussion are design examples of barn-like structures in other areas that may be  
44 appropriate for the proposed new building.
- 45 • Staff presented the staff report which provides the general requirements the project is  
46 required to comply with - General Plan, Zoning, Airport Zone, listing on Historical and  
47 Architectural Inventories, approvals required for proposed project. Most important to note  
48 is that the museum building is on the National Register.

49  
50 **Richard Ruff, Ruff & Associates:**

- 51 • The Held-Poage Museum is growing and needs storage space to store documents  
52 properly, meeting space, research work rooms and receiving area.

- 1 • Site plans show the layout of the new building in context with the existing museum  
2 building, floor plans, and design characteristics for each of the elevations.
- 3 • The Mendocino County Historical Society has submitted an application for a Use Permit  
4 and Site Development Permit to construct a new 3,000 sq ft accessory building with  
5 associated landscaping and parking that will be two-stories with approximately 1,500 sq ft  
6 on each floor.
- 7 • The proposed museum addition building is designed to blend with rather than detract  
8 from the existing original Queen Ann residence and will function as a secondary  
9 serviceable structure to the museum building.
- 10 • The Held-Poage Home and Library is listed in the 1885 Ukiah Historical and Architectural  
11 Inventory and the 1999 Survey Update and the property is listed in the National Register  
12 of Historic Places.
- 13 • The proposed building has no windows and the garage doors are nonfunctional but are in  
14 keeping with the existing museum style of providing for an overall reminder of grand  
15 homes with carriage houses.
- 16 • While there is some landscaping on the site, additional landscaping will be provided and  
17 maintained by staff/volunteers where drought resistant plants and trees will be installed  
18 with a proper irrigation system. A landscaping plan has not been developed for the  
19 project since this will be a volunteer effort.
- 20 • The intent was to save the existing trees on the site. There are three trees, two Cork  
21 Oaks and One Redwood that can be trimmed and the section of the foundation on the  
22 east side of the building can be hand-dug and encountered roots cleanly cut.
- 23 • Applicant is asking for an exception to be granted to maintain parking space number  
24 three because it is located in the 20-foot setback area of a corner lot on West Church  
25 Street and this would allow for five on-site parking spaces including a handicap parking  
26 space.
- 27 • The intent was to match/complement design elements from 'carriage houses' and the  
28 museum building to provide for an aesthetically pleasing project.
- 29 • Related to materials project will include 8 inch hardi-plank siding that will be painted to  
30 match the existing historical building.

31  
32 **Staff:**

- 33 • With regard to compliance with setback requirements, the lot has three fronts – Perkins,  
34 Dora, and Church and one side.
- 35 • The lot is zoned R1, Single Family Residential.
- 36 • Only one parking space is allowed in the front setback. The Use Permit process could  
37 allow more than one space in the setback.
- 38 • The existing museum building is publicly owned and has operated as a museum for many  
39 years. A use permit is required for the expansion of the museum operation as well as to  
40 legalize the museum use. A site development permit is required for the new building.

41  
42 **Dr. Paul Poulos:**

- 43 • The intent of the project is to provide for an environmentally safe building to store and  
44 properly prepare/care for historic documents and photographs for archival purposes  
45 which is not presently the case. It is essentially an 'archival' building.
- 46 • The intent is to also save the trees and other vegetation on the property.
- 47 • When the museum building went into the historic registry, it was just the building and not  
48 the rest of the lot. Since this time other structures have been built and are not part of any  
49 historical significance.

50  
51 **DRB:**

- 52 • What is the 'plate height' on the second floor compared to the floor of the second floor?
- 53 • Is the roof pitch the same as the garage structure?
- 54 • Does the existing building have a foundation?
- 55 • Do the dormers have real windows?

1 **Richard Ruff:**

- 2 • Plate height is 10, 11 and 6. The roof is an open slope that extends to a 6 foot height for
- 3 the interior and levels off.
- 4 • The roof pitch is pretty close to that of the garage structure.
- 5 • Confirmed the existing building has a foundation.
- 6 • There are no windows in the building since this is an archival building. The windows and
- 7 doors are fake.

8  
9 **Dr. Paul Poulos:**

- 10 • The proposed new building is an archival building and features no windows. The dormer
- 11 will be framed to look like a window. The intent is to have the aesthetically pleasing look,
- 12 but non-functional.

13  
14 **Richard Ruff:**

- 15 • Related to roof height and the roof sloping upward, the intent was to provide for the least
- 16 amount of volume that would have to be heated or cooled for energy conservation
- 17 purposes.

18  
19 **Robert Palafox:**

- 20 • The neighbor on Church Street has a problem with roof height. If the roof was any taller,
- 21 it could overpower the existing museum building.
- 22 • The building will not be really seen from Dora Street because the trees are being
- 23 retained.

24  
25 **DRB:**

- 26 • Does not support the scale and proportion of the roof. Thinks of older historical buildings
- 27 as having steeper roofs. Supports the roof pitch be increased and lacks context.
- 28 • Does not really like the overall design of the building. While the building has some
- 29 historical flourishes it has a suburban look rather than a building that architecturally works
- 30 with a historical building. The building is basically a big box with a pitched roof. The
- 31 appearance would be enhanced if the roof pitch were steeper. Building needs more
- 32 articulation. The new building is entirely out of context with the existing museum building.
- 33 • Siding is very important and would like to see a 4 inch hardi-plank siding which is more in
- 34 keeping with historical buildings.
- 35 • Related to energy conservation, the roof volume/pitch can be achieved with the use of
- 36 insulation or possibly lower the plate height.
- 37 • No plans were provided to compare the proposed new building with the existing building.
- 38 • Does not approve of the fake windows, doors, etc.
- 39 • Possibly take the center section of the building and reconfigure to give more character
- 40 and allow an exception to the setback requirements to give more space.
- 41 • There would be much better street presence if the building had some 'pop-out' features
- 42 and/or somehow 'bump-out' the building.
- 43 • Noted the garage on the property does not draw attention. However, the new structure
- 44 and where it will be situated in alignment with the museum building is somewhat
- 45 pretentious and would draw attention away from the museum building which should not
- 46 occur. The focus should remain the museum building.
- 47 • While the building is a support building, it could be done a lot more authentically and in a
- 48 more aesthetically pleasing manner without spending more money.
- 49 • The Held-Poage building is located in the very center of Ukiah's historic district on one of
- 50 the busiest streets in a residential area. As designed, the new building will impact the site
- 51 for generations to come. We should be striving for an aesthetically pleasing building
- 52 rather than a compromised building designed for mediocrity and convenience.

53  
54 **Richard Ruff:**

- 1 • Consideration was given to creating pop-out features but determined this was not in  
2 keeping with a barnlike appearance, which is the intent.  
3 • Noted the renderings of barns provided by the DRB are not in keeping aesthetically with  
4 Queen Anne architecture.  
5

6 **DRB:** Has observed other Queen Anne style buildings in the westside neighborhood that have  
7 bay windows and/or bump-out features.  
8

9 **Richard Ruff:** Barns typically do not have bump-out design characteristics.  
10

11 **Leonard Winter, Director Historical Society:**

- 12 • The intent is not to take away from the Held-Poage building by constructing something  
13 that is equal or even nicer than the Held-Poage building.  
14 • The new building will not be readily seen because it will be located behind the trees. The  
15 trees are taller than the roof.  
16

17 **DRB:** There should be no problem making the roof taller.  
18

19 **Leonard Winter:** Having a taller roof will likely be a problem with one neighbor.  
20

21 **DRB:** Asked if it was possible to extend the height of the roof by one foot and adjust the plate  
22 height without upsetting the neighbor?  
23

24 **Dr. Paul Poulos:**

- 25 • The primary concern with the neighbor is preservation of privacy.  
26 • It may be possible to extend the height of the roof since the building essentially has no  
27 windows and there would be no one looking down into her yard.  
28 • One concern with doing a 'bump-out' in the middle of the proposed building would mean  
29 an old Cork Oak has to be removed and he does not want to lose this tree.  
30 • Is of the opinion the old trees on the property have a certain amount of historic value.  
31 • Consideration has been given how to make the proposed building more aesthetically  
32 pleasing by adding bump-outs while preserving trees. However, the plans formulated to  
33 accomplish the 'carriage house style' type of design that was the objective was not able  
34 to be depicted.  
35 • The design intent is to depict a carriage house and not a barn, which is the reason for the  
36 larger double hinged doors to indicate where the carriages were kept. The center part of  
37 the structure was thought to be where the hay was brought in through the central door.  
38 As such, the Historical Society is looking for an old 'Jackson Fork' that would be part of  
39 the outside architecture on the south end of the building.  
40

41 **DRB:** Suggested taking the center section of the structure and raise the pitch so that it carries  
42 through and breaks up the monotony of the roof.  
43

44 **Richard Ruff:** The aforementioned design was a consideration. The Historical Society Board  
45 has looked at many building designs. The Board has selected the design being talked about  
46 today.  
47

48 **DRB:**

- 49 • Does not like that the windows, doors and other accessories are non-functioning and  
50 fake, but rather pasted on abstractions. These decorative features do not fit into the  
51 historical context.  
52 • The proposed building resembles a 'Craftsman' type of design and this is not the intent.  
53 The existing building pre-dates the 'Craftsman' era.  
54 • Likes that an effort is being made to store historical collections properly.

- 1 • The building design should depict more appropriate character. The design details could  
2 be simple and should be appropriate for the era.  
3 • If possible, important to save the trees in and around where the building is to be situated.  
4 It is likely the root system will be compromised by the building foundation, compromising  
5 the structural integrity of the tree and making it possible the trees will fall over.  
6 • Related to on-site parking, if there are two cars in the compact spaces that are straight in,  
7 the handicap space would be problematic for cars getting out of the space. Alternatively,  
8 it could be all the cars in the parking area could back into the street to get out and leave a  
9 buffer area that could be planted with landscaping to soften the appearance because as it  
10 is now the parking lot exposes the existing buildings to the public. There is some  
11 landscaping that partly shelters this exposure now. If the parking was perpendicular to  
12 the street there would be five parking spaces and allow for more landscaping. A variance  
13 would be required for the setback on the parking. These are possibilities worth exploring.  
14

15 There was more discussion about the building height and how this could be accomplished to  
16 provide for a building having more character, such as adding pop-outs.  
17

18 **Richard Ruff:** Allowing persons to back out onto Church Street is not a viable solution.  
19

20 **DRB:**

- 21 • As designed, the parking lot does not provide adequate back-up space and people will  
22 have to back out onto Church Street.  
23 • It appears the entire parking lot is non-compliant. Cars do not have enough backup space  
24 to turn a car around and exit the parking lot fronting out. Some of the spaces have no  
25 backup space at all, making all five parking spaces non-compliant.  
26 • Most of the parking is on-street now. Is concerned how ADA parking would work and  
27 compliance with City standards. Can ADA parking be provided on the street?  
28 • The scale noted on the site plan, if correct, means the parking does not work.  
29 • Questions whether the proposed building should be aligned with the existing structure  
30 and how this works with the use/function of the building(s) and the zoning. It may be the  
31 building should be located more in the rear of the property where the shed is presently  
32 located. The building presentation would be less intrusive and/or less noticeable. The  
33 new building should not compete with the primary building.  
34

35 **Richard Ruff:** What can be done is to shift the handicap space over one space and provide for  
36 more space.  
37

38 There was discussion how to reconfigure the parking lot and still provide adequate circulation and  
39 a pedestrian pathway.  
40

41 **Staff:**

- 42 • Related to the function of the building and parking, the project requires a Use Permit  
43 which provides an opportunity to reduce the amount of parking provided. The applicant  
44 can comment on the parking needs.  
45 • Does the DRB have an opinion about possibly removing the trees where the proposed  
46 building is to be constructed and coming up with a planting plan to replace those trees  
47 that could allow for more building articulation and character?  
48 • What is the DRB's preference regarding parking as proposed versus reconfiguring the  
49 parking lot to 90-degree spaces with vehicles backing onto Church Street? What if this  
50 required a Variance?  
51

52 **Leonard Winters:**

- 53 • The only persons that use the existing parking lot are the two historical society  
54 volunteers.  
55 • Visitors typically park on Dora Street.

1 **DRB Consensus - Parking:**

- 2 • Sees the value of retaining the existing parking lot. There is a direct line of site to the  
3 parking lot proposed. Should better screen the parking lot.  
4 • If someone is using the new building, the parking lot would be the most convenient.  
5 • Okay with reducing the parking if it is not needed and would not be used. Would be okay  
6 with a handicap space and two spaces or a handicap space and three spaces. The  
7 handicap space could be located more to the east where people would have easy access  
8 to the sidewalk.  
9 • Church Street is a quiet street and should not present a problem with people backing out  
10 of the parking lot onto Church Street.

11  
12 **DRB Consensus:**

- 13 • If the trees were to remain this could compromise the structure of the building since the  
14 trees are so close to the structure. Given the amount of pruning the trees may need, this  
15 could structurally compromise the trees such that they fail and fall and damage the  
16 building.  
17 • It may be better to remove the trees now and replant if the result is that the modifications  
18 to the tree would compromise their health and structural integrity and reduce their  
19 longevity.  
20 • It is likely the neighbors will not want the trees removed.  
21 • The building provides a long, flat front with no articulation and needs to some visual relief.  
22 Provide some articulation/consider a bump-out in the center section. This would make  
23 the building look less like a box.  
24 • Consider a steeper roof pitch by lowering the plate and raising the ridge.  
25 • Does not support the design and details of the building. Would like to see the artificial  
26 'tacked-on' flush mounted details removed from the building. These details greatly  
27 detract from the museum historical structure and are the type of details found in new  
28 suburban residential subdivisions and are not appropriate for this building.  
29 • While the Historical Society Board has made a decision that 'simpler is better,' there are  
30 so many taken-on details, this building would detract from the historic museum building.  
31 Should be using simple period details for the building.  
32 • The detailing for the new building does not fit with the detailing in the neighborhood. It  
33 would not take much detail to make the building fit more aesthetically pleasing and  
34 compatible with buildings of that era that exist in the neighborhood.  
35 • It may be best to rethink the design concept and location of the building and maintaining  
36 the historical trees on the property.  
37 • The project needs to include plans that show the new building in context with the existing  
38 building to better understand the relationship. The applicant should provide a perspective  
39 from the street and/or other plans that provides the context and relationship between the  
40 two buildings.

41  
42 **6B. Ukiah Valley Medical Center – Hospital Support Building**  
43 (File No. 13-09-UP-SDP-PC). Review and make design and landscaping  
44 recommendations to Planning Commission for a new Hospital Support Building at 275  
45 Hospital Drive, APN 002-160-08.

46  
47 **Charles Ackerley, Jennings Ackerley Architecture, Design consultant, Applicant:**

- 48 • The support building is not an OSHPD building.  
49 • The intent of the design for the proposed new hospital support building is to enhance the  
50 campus and in terms of the functional aspects of the building this will include making the  
51 buildings on the east side of the hospital campus function cohesively with the support  
52 building.  
53 • The support building is intended to centralize hospital support functions, i.e., loading  
54 dock, receiving, supply, biomed, housekeeping linen storage dietary storage,  
55 maintenance, and administration that are currently distributed throughout the site in an

- 1 assortment of buildings. All of these functions would be located on the first floor, except  
2 administration which would occupy the second floor. As part of the project, new parking  
3 areas are required as well as compliance with 20% landscaping coverage standard and  
4 other associated landscaping requirements for parking lots and street trees.
- 5 • Presently hospital administration is situated in the center of the hospital that is space that  
6 could be put to better use for patient care because of its prime location. As such, hospital  
7 administration will have offices on the second floor of the hospital support building.
  - 8 • The location of the proposed support building makes very good sense and is a location  
9 that would best serve the hospital because of the activities associated with support types  
10 of uses. It is also a heavily traveled staff area.
  - 11 • Related to the design aspects of the support building the intent was to provide for design  
12 elements and materials that would be used for future modifications to the hospital  
13 buildings.
  - 14 • Is hopeful his design concepts will be adapted to other buildings such as providing for a  
15 green wall and/or other vegetative/design feature that will screen the building and  
16 windows from the hot summer heat, provide more attractive view from patient rooms, and  
17 is aesthetically pleasing.
  - 18 • Providing adequate pedestrian access is one of those critical aspects that helps make a  
19 hospital work.
  - 20 • Related to hospital design, everything needs to be next to each other. In doing so, must  
21 make certain each department has the right adjacency within the facility. This is the  
22 reason hospitals look and feel the way they do. All hospital departments have strong  
23 adjacencies to one another.
  - 24 • Related to the proposed project, the intent is to collect and unify corridors and maximize  
25 space to its best and highest use as opposed to the existing random assortment of  
26 wasted space and corresponding inefficiency of service for the facility.
  - 27 • Provided design plans for 'make ready work.' Consideration must be given to the design  
28 and architectural aspects of these 'make ready work' projects because of their connection  
29 to the support building and overall campus aesthetic appearance. The make ready work  
30 would include the relocation of the emergency generator, fuel storage and similar uses  
31 that are scattered throughout the site.
  - 32 • The support building provides for many functions and includes storage areas and a  
33 loading dock.

34  
35 **Charles Ackerley:**

- 36 • Related to the first floor, intent was to make a clear line of corridor for effective  
37 circulation. Elaborated on employee entrances and how this works in terms of maximizing  
38 efficiency/service in coordination with a future parking lot.
- 39 • Important to make certain there is sufficient space for the different functions the support  
40 building will provide.
- 41 • When establishing the second floor, wanted the structure over the general storage area  
42 from an acoustic standpoint. The second floor will house the administrative offices and  
43 has the largest square footage.
- 44 • Demonstrated the design aspects/objectives for the different elevations as shown on the  
45 site plans as they relate to appropriate screening of the building, service efficiency, open  
46 space, effective circulation, and aesthetics.
- 47 • Commented on the proposed materials and use thereof as shown on sheet A-3 to  
48 provide for a very architecturally pleasing building.
- 49 • Commented on other architectural features, such as canopies/other architectural features  
50 and how the central plan concerning the project as shown on sheet A-1.1 fits with the  
51 existing support structures and how the unification of these functions tie in with the  
52 support building project. While lines define space not all design aspects have been  
53 formulated/defined for what will be.
- 54 • The intent is to give consideration to the weight of the building and with keeping it as light  
55 as possible.

- The intent of the design was to provide for a pleasing configuration such that the elements that comprise the structure are well coordinated and function properly.
- Referred to the plant list and commented on the landscaping and placement of trees/vegetation as shown on the landscaping plan.

**DRB:** Asked the applicant to comment on design aspect objectives for the different elevations as shown on sheet A-3.

**Charles Ackerley:** Elaborated on the building composition and clarified the location of the columns and steel beams and how they are integrated architecturally. The steel beams are exposed.

**DRB:**

- Likes the open space areas provided for in the project.
- Likes the landscaping proposal and selection of plant/tree species.
- Likes the location of the loading dock.
- While approves of the metal entry canopy proposed and corresponding function as shown on sheet A-3, important to make sure canopies/other forms/angles and corresponding functions are consistent/uniform and do not stand out. It may be the canopy for the loading docks should be smaller/shorter.
- Possibly provide for more shading that can be integrated for the southern elevation but do not compromise the design in doing so. Could be vegetation/trellis or awnings.
- Likes the design; composition of the structure; good addition to the neighborhood.
- Would like the support building architectural features to tie in/unify with that of the Outpatient Pavilion building on the hospital campus so as to provide some design continuity.
- Related to the thermal mass on the west facing, if the material is stone will heat up structure. Need to possibly rethink how this functions.
- Appreciates consideration given to City documents regarding landscaping/tree selection.
- Related to the landscaping perspective understands the scope of work is on the back side of the building. More clearly define what landscaping is proposed for Phase I and define what might be proposed for Phase II landscaping.
- Related to the selection of tree species, appreciates that the applicant consulted with the City's recommended trees for parking lot, landscaping/screening trees.
- There appears to be a lot of landscaping going on in the spaces designated for landscaping, provide sufficient space for pedestrian access through the parking lot and make certain the species work well with the building and corresponding elevations and does not have that 'over done' appearance.
- Appreciates there is pedestrian access through the site and to the pedestrian entry. Make certain the access pathways are connected to the building entry.
- Related to the work area/staff lounge, likes that is area feeds into an open space area.
- While there is no setback requirements as it relates to the outdoor staff lounge area, recommend that the landscaping more effectively ties in with the scale of the building. Could consider making this area larger.
- Could substitute Incense Cedar tree for Redwood tree for trees on corner areas fronting Hospital Drive as shown on sheet L1 to more appropriately have the landscaping match, i.e., tall, thin tree and deciduous tree as they repeat species across the street front. The two end trees should be taller such that the appearance is softened and alerts that an entry exists and to create a defined landscaping feature.
- Related to the green wall, there are very few successful green walls. May want to consider whether worthwhile because it is unlikely maintenance persons will provide the necessary care for upkeep. Could have a green wall effect without actually planting onto the wall.
- Use vines on trellises where feasible. They are typically fast growing and provide for effective screening. The structure for the green wall needs to be commercial grade.

- 1 • Make certain sufficient number of trees in parking lot and that the tree species provide  
2 sufficient screening.  
3 • Likes that landscaping is hardy and durable.  
4 • Likes that the back service area will be improved aesthetically and how the different  
5 support uses will function more uniformly.  
6 • Likes the project, as designed.  
7

8 **DRB comments on other related project aspects:**

- 9 • Related to the backside of the hospital campus, discussion about whether or not it was  
10 necessary to construct a cinderblock wall for screening and aesthetic purposes.  
11 • Discussion about the utility functions on the backside of the hospital and screening.  
12

13 **Staff:**

- 14 • For the 'make ready work', if the applicant wants to include this in the project going to  
15 Planning Commission, does the DRB feel that they need to see the design and materials  
16 of this before it goes to Planning Commission or could there be a condition that the  
17 details are left to staff or return to the DRB? The applicant may want to move forward to  
18 Planning Commission for a decision on the project including the 'make ready work' before  
19 the design details are completed.  
20

21 **DRB:**

- 22 • Would ask that if metal is used for the screening of those functions it is sympathetic to the  
23 new construction.  
24 • Is fine with moving forward with the 'make ready work' moving forward as part of the  
25 project going to Planning Commission. The details for the materials can return to the  
26 DRB as a condition.  
27

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

29  
30 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

31  
32 **9. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

33 The next meeting will be Thursday, May 9, 2013. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.  
34  
35

36 \_\_\_\_\_  
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary  
37