



**City of Ukiah, CA**  
**Design Review Board**

---

---

**MINUTES**

---

---

**Regular Meeting**

**May 8, 2014**

**Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue**

---

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **1. CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Hise called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 2:30  
8 p.m. in Conference Room #3.

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

12  
13 **Absent:**

14  
15 **Staff Present:** Kim Jordan, Senior Planner  
16 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

17  
18 **Others present:** Robert Axt  
19 Matt Bogner  
20 Ron Valente  
21 Charles Ackerley  
22 Paul Kelsey

23  
24 **3. CORRESPONDENCE: None**

25  
26 **Member Liden** recused himself from discussion of agenda item 6A.

27  
28 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from February 27, 2014 meeting are included  
29 for review and approval.

30  
31 **M/S Hawkes/Nicholson** approved minutes from February 27, 2014 meeting, as submitted.  
32 Motion carried by all AYE voice vote of the members present (4 - 0).

33  
34 **5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

35  
36 **6. NEW BUSINESS:**

37 **6A. World Gym Use Permit and Site Development, 203 South Main Street (File No. 145).**  
38 Review and recommendation on a request for approval of a Site Development Permit for  
39 a 3,500 square foot building addition and 1,500 square foot outside exercise (no  
40 equipment or structures) and removal and reconfiguration of the parking spaces in the  
41 front of the building at 203 South Main Street, APN 002-231-09.

42  
43 **Robert Axt, Project Architect** presented the Project and gave a description of the addition to the  
44 front of the building and free exercise area in front of the addition on the existing paved parking  
45 area.

46  
47 **Member Hawkes:**

- 48
  - Asked about the surface material for the exercise-free area.
  - Commented on the existing roof pitch and proposed plans for the roof extension.

49  
50  
51 **Robert Axt:**

- 52
  - The exercise area will be resurfaced. The material will be asphalt or concrete.

- Talked about drainage on the site and measures taken to resolve the issue through the use of a drop-inlet.
- The roof will remain metal.

**Senior Planner Jordan:**

- Gave a staff report and noted the Project requires a Site Development Permit and a Use Permit.
- The Project is located within the boundaries of the Downtown Zoning Code (DZC). Since the building is more than 50 years, the Project is subject to the DZC requirements for historic structures, which applies to buildings listed on the City's Historical and Architectural Inventory and buildings over 50 years old. Requirements not addressed by Table 13: Historical Building Standards are subject to the requirement of the DZC.
- The Historical Building Standards requires for new additions they be designed and constructed so that the character-defining features of the historic building are not radically changed, obscured, damaged, or destroyed in the process of rehabilitation. New design should always be clearly differentiated so that the addition does not appear to be part of the historic resource.
- The addition would be located in the existing parking lot in front of the building. This would remove most of the parking in this lot and bring the building closer to the street which is consistent with the intent of the DZC.
- Staff would like direction from the DRB on:
  - Preferred material for the exterior of the building. Applicant is proposing the use of stucco as shown on the site plans.
  - Awnings. Applicant would like to reuse the existing awnings which are non-functional and do not provide shade. While the DZC includes a requirement that all west and south-facing awnings are functional and provide shade, this project is not subject to this requirement but rather to the Historical Building Standards. Requests the DRB make a recommendation on the reuse of the awnings.
  - Exterior lighting. The existing building has building mounted exterior lighting. The Project proposes the re-use or install of the same exterior light fixtures. The existing exterior light fixtures are not consistent with the DZC requirements for being fully shielded and downcast. The lighting fixtures on the building are not fully shielded. The applicant can request an exception to the lighting requirements as part of the process. Staff requests the DRB review the proposed lighting style and provide a recommendation on the style of lighting and its compatibility or not with the design of the building.
  - Landscaping. Requests the DRB provide recommendations on plant species for infill purposes in the planter area in front of the building, west side of the exercise area, and/or other areas where landscaping would be appropriate.
- The DRB is required to make a recommendation on all Site Development Permit applications, but if there are use-related issues that affect the site design or building design this would also be the purview of the DRB.

**DRB Comments/Questions:**

**Member Hawkes:** The building has a lot of glass windows with the likelihood of more glass with the proposed addition that faces west and this may be an energy code issue. There would be solar gain during a summer afternoon. Asked if there is a way to mitigate that direct afternoon solar gain that would be so difficult to counter with just standard air-conditioning system.

**Robert Axt:**

- Acknowledged the existing awnings do not serve any functional purpose. Is of the opinion the awning for this building should be metal rather than canvass.

- Related to the building materials would like to maintain the character of the building as much as possible by using T1-11 on the low portion of the wall underneath the windows.
- Related to lighting, while the existing lighting is not completely shielded it is downcast and is of the opinion the lighting complies with the lighting standards and supports reuse. The existing lighting fixtures would help illuminate the exercise area. If the lighting were completely shielded and downcast questioned how the exercise and handicapped parking areas would be sufficiently lit without having to add more lighting fixtures outside.
- Would ask for an exception to the lighting requirements.

**Member Thayer:**

- Related to the outdoor workout area the site plan indicate the steps not currently existing from the parking area to the entrance must be ADA compliant/accessible and will likely have to be repaved. The slope must be normal where a 'cross-slope' cannot occur. Would like more information on the material for the entrance.
- Asked about 3-foot high fencing and what the Code says how this works with the grade to ensure consistency with the fencing requirements and a consistent fence height across the grade. How is this measured with regard to allowance for the grade of the sidewalk?
- Requested clarification related to the southern portion of the building and changes from asphalt to concrete paving in that it is not parking, but rather lost space? Noted a retaining wall exists on the north side of the site.
- Fence should be adaptive, 'cleaner looking' and consistent in height across the changing grade of the site in order to have more of a cohesive/uniform appearance. Fence should be simple and utilitarian rather than decorative in nature to be compatible with building. If the fence design is simple as opposed to creating a visual draw from the street front, then the planting strip becomes the most important focus to screen that space. The intent of a low fence is to demonstrate that activity is occurring and is an invitation to that space. Is of the opinion, people who are exercising do not really want to be seen from the street. Recommend readdressing the planting strip for architectural and screening purposes, particularly related to the exercise area.
- Add more landscaping so the site does not feel 'so built' and provide for green buffering.
- Related to building materials, there are plenty of other materials other than T1-11 siding. Is not certain whether or not T1-11 siding is allowed in the DZC. Recommends applicant look into other material options, such as cement/board panels, some type of material that is more 'progressive.' The building is utilitarian.

**Member Nicholson:**

- Asked about the slope of the new walkway. Will the walkway be level, 2% or less?
- Asked about the steps leading to the building and whether they will be ADA accessible?
- Asked about the landscaping requirements for the Project.
- Disappointed the Project is subject to the Historical Building Standards rather than DZC standards. The building was a former automobile showroom and garage and as such is of the opinion the building does not really have architectural significance. Related to sustaining more of a historic look in connection with historic building standards, recommends the windows and door openings have a vertical orientation rather than horizontal.
- While the architect has done an excellent job in preserving the historical integrity look and feel of the building and is compliant with the existing City Code standards, recommends the owner look into creating more of a DZC appearance, which would include vertical door and window openings. This design feature would fit better with the grid pattern. Preference would be the use of stucco for the new addition and on the existing building.
- The concept being good design can be good for business. From a design standpoint, important to capture more of the character of the building than completely trying to reproduce the original look and feel of the building that it once was.

1 **Chair Hise:**

- 2 • Asked if the two driveway entrances are existing and if there are plans to eliminate one of
- 3 the entrances and still provide for handicap accommodations.
- 4 • Asked for clarification that there is a 3.5-foot drop off in grade from the back of the
- 5 building to the asphalt behind the building.
- 6 • While attachment 3A photos of the staff report clarifies the stairway, the site plan does
- 7 show enough 'risers' for the stairs to be code compliant. Need to make certain the
- 8 entrances including the primary entrance to the buildings comply with City Code
- 9 standards. It does not appear the 'risers' are drawn correctly for this entrance to comply
- 10 with City Code requirements and this is a concern. Recognized that everyone but the
- 11 handicap parks in the rear of the building and use that entrance. The number of risers for
- 12 the other entrance at the south end of the building appears to be code compliant.
- 13 • Has concern that the parking spaces comply with City standards since there are no
- 14 dimensions on the parking.
- 15 • Supports the application of stucco around the building and replace the T1-11 siding that
- 16 is still remaining on the existing building with stucco.
- 17 • The back entry should be compliant with current Code standards especially since it
- 18 functions as the main entry.
- 19 • Emphasized the importance of making certain the stairway landing is building code
- 20 compliant. Again, it may be just drawn incorrectly.
- 21 • Awnings need to be opaque. However, is willing to go along with DRB's preference to do
- 22 something where they can be shown to be effective by modifying what is existing.
- 23 Supports use of the frame and put fabric or metal over them making them completely
- 24 opaque. While making the opening to the windows and doors a vertical design is a good
- 25 concept, it may be cost-burdensome to the owner of the building.
- 26 • Asked about the parking requirements for parking in setback areas because the parking
- 27 stalls could be reconfigured such that planter areas could also be reconfigured closer to
- 28 the building rather than having these areas out near the street.
- 29 • It appears there is 30 to 35 feet for cars to back up. Preference would be to remove one
- 30 of the driveways.
- 31 • Make certain driveway entrance to rear of building is code compliant and safe for travel.

32  
33 **Robert Axt:**

- 34 • The cross-slope that exists is very modest. The Project proposes new steps and walkway
- 35 from the sidewalk to the building entry of the addition that will be concrete. The Project
- 36 also includes removal of 10 standard parking spaces located in front of the building and
- 37 relocation and reorientation of the 2 existing accessible parking spaces with no
- 38 modification to the driveway.
- 39 • The new walkway will be level going to the area where it drops down where there will be
- 40 steps leading to the entrance.
- 41 • While the ramp on the north side of the building is non-compliant no modifications are
- 42 proposed to this rear elevation.
- 43 • In terms of accessibility related to the front elevation (location of proposed addition and
- 44 outdoor exercise area), it is relatively level to access the building from the parking lot.
- 45 Demonstrated how the street slopes and eventually levels out with the building such that
- 46 the parking area is level with the building.
- 47 • Talked about the existing landscaping, particularly between the World Gym and the Little
- 48 Brown Bear noting it to be extensive.
- 49 • The intent of the fence is to make certain people do not 'jump over' it to access the site
- 50 even though people can easily jump over a 3-foot high fence. Explained the plans for the
- 51 proposed fencing that would include a 3-foot tall metal fence to enclose the outdoor
- 52 exercise area and how this works for code compliance.
- 53 • Having two entrances to the site serves as a convenience since there is an existing
- 54 parking lot in the rear of the building and explained.

- 1 • Confirmed the difference in grade relative to the drop-off area and the asphalt in the rear  
2 of the building. Attachment 3A photos of the staff report shows the stairway at the rear of  
3 the building as well as the ramp that is not legal.
- 4 • Confirmed everyone but the handicap currently parks in the rear of the building.
- 5 • Would be placing considerable financial burden on the property owner having to  
6 implement vertical door and window openings on both the existing building and new  
7 addition.
- 8 • The Project is over-parked.

9  
10 **Ron Valente, Ron's Quality Construction**, acknowledged the walkway and steps from the  
11 parking lot to the entrance of the building must be ADA accessible.

12  
13 **Senior Planner Jordan:**

- 14 • Landscaping requirements will not be triggered for this project since the site is an existing  
15 development as opposed to new development and there is no change to the parking. The  
16 Downtown Zoning Code is very specific in this regard.
- 17 • There is some landscaping that is necessary in the empty planters located on the site.  
18 Some landscaping is being removed at the front of the site and staff is not sure whether  
19 there is an opportunity to replace this landscaping elsewhere on the site. Would like  
20 DRB's opinion on the removal and if the removed landscaping can or should be replaced.  
21 Is the DRB okay with this since the applicant is not proposing any landscaping?
- 22 • At no point can a fence be taller than 3 feet.
- 23 • The Project would be subject to different Code requirements with a completely different  
24 staff analysis if the building was not more than 50 years or was new construction and/or  
25 tear down and rebuild.
- 26 • Related to T1-11 siding, this type of siding is allowed outside the boundaries of the DZC.  
27 The only way the applicant would be allowed to use T1-11 siding is because the building  
28 is subject to historic building standards, already has T1-11 siding so that the DRB has the  
29 discretion. This is the reason staff is asking for DRB direction on the preferred exterior  
30 material.
- 31 • The Project already has a parking lot so the rules pertinent to parking in the setback  
32 areas do not apply.
- 33 • The parking lot cannot be reconfigured such that parking is shifted closer to the street  
34 because the objective of the DZC is to have parking further way from the street or  
35 situated in the back of buildings and not having parking in the front of buildings at all, if  
36 possible.

37  
38 The DRB questioned when T1-11 siding became historic.

39  
40 **Staff:** Essentially, T1-11 siding is allowed to be considered as a material because the project is  
41 subject to the DZC requirements for historic buildings/buildings over 50 years old.

42  
43 Windows

44 **Staff:**

- 45 • The DZC prohibits mirrored or opaque glazing. The proposed plans do not identify the  
46 type of glazing. The existing windows are tinted and partially see-through. The DZC  
47 requires 'clear glazing' and prohibits opaque/mirrored glazing. Is the DRB okay for the  
48 windows on the addition to have some tint?

49  
50 Awnings

51 **Staff:**

- 52 • The existing awnings on the building are non-functional. Consider reuse of the existing  
53 awnings in a way to make them more functioning.

1 **DRB:**

- 2 • Awnings need to be functional to address solar heat gain on the west facing elevation to  
3 provide sufficient shade and there are design types that can do this.  
4 • Consider larger size awnings with attachments that would be able to provide shade  
5 coverage for the exercise area. The attachments would have to be large enough to  
6 provide the structural strength necessary to allow for the extension over the exercise  
7 area.  
8 • The expense of removing awnings from the existing building and putting them back on a  
9 new building would not likely be economically feasible.

10  
11 **Robert Axt:**

- 12 • By placing awnings in front of the windows and extending them outward another 15 or 20  
13 feet would give the appearance of having a building with no windows at all on the west  
14 elevation. As such, a person's outward view from the window from within the building  
15 would be impeded.  
16 • No awning is going to work unless they are situated such that the sun exists above them  
17 and the awning is angled properly in relation to the sun.

18  
19 **Matt Bogner:**

- 20 • The existing awnings are louvered to address the angle of the sun throughout the day,  
21 but are not adjustable.  
22 • The angle of the awning is fixed, but the angle can be changed. The awnings are movable  
23 at the point of attachment. The blades themselves cannot be turned.  
24 • Is not supportive of metal awnings. Fabric awnings do not look good over time.

25  
26 **DRB** is fine with the color palate for the building.

27  
28 **DRB consensus related to Project conditions:**

- 29 • Use 'Title 24-energy compliant' high performance glazing for the windows with slight tint  
30 that meets City Code standards.  
31 • Okay to reuse of awnings if they can be modified to be functional.  
32 • Change exterior lighting to be consistent with the DZC requirements – downcast, fully  
33 shielded, etc.  
34 • Relative to exterior material, use stucco for the addition and on the existing building  
35 which is the material shown on the plans.  
36 • Simple design for the fence; complies with 3-foot height requirement and make certain  
37 the top of the fence provides a congruent line across the grade.  
38 • Provide dimensions on the parking to make certain the parking spaces and lot comply  
39 with Code standards.  
40 • Make certain the back stairway landing at the rear entrance of the building is code  
41 compliant.  
42 • Make certain entrance to the rear of the building is safe and compliant with Code  
43 regulations.  
44 • Ensure that when the parking spaces are restriped they are compliant with City parking  
45 code regulations.  
46 • Provide landscaping where necessary or where it needs to be replaced and provide a  
47 landscaping plan as required for all site development permits.

48  
49 **DRB consensus related to Project recommendations:**

- 50 • Consider more of a DZC look and feel/appearance by integrating vertical door and  
51 window openings (mullions) for the building and addition, thus modifying the look of the  
52 storefront.  
53 • Possibly look at whether having two driveways for the front of the building are necessary.  
54

1 **Staff:**

- 2 • The parking lot has to be re-striped. The City standard for a parking space is 9 ft. x 18 ft.  
3

4 **M/S Nicholson/Hawkes** to recommend approval of a site development permit application for  
5 World Gym subject to the project conditions and recommendations referenced above. Motion  
6 carried unanimously (4-0).  
7

8 **Matt Bogner:** Is fine with the Project conditions formulated by the DRB.  
9

10 **6B. Ukiah Valley Medical Center Emergency Department and ICU Expansion Use**  
11 **Permit and Site Development Permit, 275 Hospital Drive, 280 Hospital Drive, and**  
12 **404 East Perkins Street (File No. 46).** Review and recommendation to the Planning  
13 Commission on a request for approval of a Site Development Permit to allow: 1)  
14 expansion of the Ukiah Valley Medical Center emergency department and ICU, relocation  
15 of the helipad to the roof of the expansion, construction of new parking in the location of  
16 the existing helipad, modification of existing parking areas, installation of new parking lot  
17 landscaping and street trees, and relocation of the emergency vehicle entrance to the  
18 Ukiah Valley Medical Center located at 275 Hospital Drive; 2) construction of a new  
19 offsite parking lot on the parcel on the northwest corner of Hospital Drive/Hamilton Street;  
20 3) use of parking located offsite at 404 East Perkins Street (physical therapy building);  
21 and 4) relocation of the emergency vehicle access to the emergency department/hospital  
22 to Perkins Street via the two-way driveway at 404 East Perkins Street.  
23

24 **Member Liden** participated in the UVMC emergency department and ICU expansion use permit  
25 and site development permit discussion.  
26

27 **Charles Ackerey, UVMC Project Architect:**

- 28 • Gave a project description related to the ED/ICU buildings/architecture, interior  
29 renovations, exterior upgrades, circulation, parking, landscaping, project phases, and  
30 current studies being done for the purpose of providing for a more architecturally pleasing  
31 connecting/cohesive/functioning people/patient friendly hospital campus.  
32 • The approved ED/ICU project designed by HBE has been withdrawn.  
33 • Parking Lot 7 will be developed for 48 additional parking spaces with lighting,  
34 landscaping and a walkway.  
35 • Hospital Support Building (HBS) is currently on hold. The related element of electrical  
36 infrastructure upgrade, utility make-ready work new emergency and the removal of the  
37 existing hospital support buildings are moving forward.  
38 • UVMC proposes to construct an addition that will house the emergency room and ICU.  
39 As part of this addition, a new helistop will be constructed on the roof of the new  
40 structure.  
41 • Construction of a new parking lot in front of the hospital building is planned in the location  
42 of the existing helipad.  
43 • Relocation of the emergency vehicle access from Hospital Drive to Perkins Street  
44 through the existing two-way driveway at 404 East Perkins Street (physical therapy  
45 building) is included in the development plans.  
46 • Referred to the site plan that explains the expansion project and calls out the individual  
47 project components.  
48

49 **Staff:**

- 50 • As this time the DRB is looking at all the site planning and design aspects.  
51 • Recommends the DRB provide direction to staff related to site layout and pedestrian,  
52 bike, and vehicular connections between the various uses and sites.  
53 • This project proposal also includes 404 E. Perkins Street being used as a new  
54 emergency access.

- Lot 7 will become permanent parking lot. UVMC is currently under-parked.
- Requests the DRB comment on the project design, phasing, site layout, architecture, vehicle/pedestrian circulation. The Project is more comprehensive with the different phasing and the connections between the different parcels that make up the hospital campus located at 275 Hospital Drive. To clarify, 275 Hospital Drive is one legal parcel with two parcel numbers.
- Related to parking, there is unpermitted parking occurring on Lot 7. The hospital is required to provide permanent legal parking. The recently approved use permits for the Hospital Support Building and HBE ED/ICU expansion approved the use of Lot 7 for temporary parking during project construction.
- The hospital is not proposing parking on Lot 8.
- What staff currently envisions is that the application would be a Master Use Permit that would cover the previous approvals and/or what UVMC desires to carry forward from these approvals, Lot 7, the expansion of the ED/ICU and the new access from 404 Perkins Street.
- Clarified access to 404 E. Perkins Street is for use by emergency vehicles and not the public. Staff is concerned about this project proposal as it relates to pedestrian safety. As such, a focused traffic study is being conducted.

**DRB comments/recommendations:**

- Concerns expressed regarding the emergency access at 404 E. Perkins Street in terms of pedestrian safety.
- The new Project plans appear to be thorough, well-orchestrated/thought-out and able to meet community needs.
- Commented on the previously approved Hospital Support Building that is currently on-hold and if this will eventually come to fruition.
- The existing front entry has never been well-defined and is confusing. It appears from the plans that this will no longer be as problematic, particularly with good signage. Looking at the site plan, the front entry to the hospital is better defined. Still needs a primary front door from a visual standpoint when driving through and dropping off.
- Likes how parking is situated across the street that allows for a more uniform use and landscaping.
- Finds the signage approved as part of the HBE project under-designed.
- Likes that new architecture complements the existing building like that of the Pavilion Building, including the roof.
- Likes the landscaping, particularly the tree species selection that will provide adequate shade.
- Talked about on-site pedestrian and vehicle circulation on the hospital campus.
- Related to the matter of the trellises that formerly were designed for the Hospital Support Building would like to see this design feature continued on buildings where appropriate.
- Asked about plans for solar panels.
- Important to maintain good site lines with regard to landscaping for pedestrian and traffic safety purposes, particularly in and around the Pavilion Building. It may be that some of the landscaping will have to be changed and/or removed to accomplish this.
- Likes that there are open space areas designated on the plans that can be used for special events and community gatherings.
- Complimented Architect Ackerley on his professional ability to understand hospital campus design and how to make certain the hospital campus functions in the best and highest manner for the good of the community.
- Is pleased with the plans and is confident the Project will work really well for the community.
- Important to keep ground surfaces level and pedestrian friendly. To accomplish this, it may be the bio-retention area shown on sheet L1.1 may have to be 'moved down' some so as to create more usable space.

- 1 • Referred to plan, L1.1 and would like to see that interior open space areas have a  
2 pedestrian connection, have adequate space and pointed out an area on the plan that  
3 has too many trees that may interfere with the pedestrian connection/open space  
4 objective. It may be that some changes are necessary and/or some reconfiguring of  
5 landscaping and/or change in tree species to accomplish this and allow for a better  
6 organized space.  
7

8 **Charles Ackereley:**

- 9 • Commented on pedestrian circulation and connection of buildings and how this works for  
10 the better with the proposed new development and expansion project.  
11 • Confirmed the previous signage proposed for the Project is 'somewhat weak' and is  
12 being reviewed.  
13 • Metal trellises are an excellent concept and function effectively as screening devices.  
14 • Application/use of solar/photovoltaic systems is a consideration for the master plan of  
15 the hospital.  
16

17 **Staff:** Related to the area that may be problematic regarding the trees, asked the DRB to  
18 recommend some alternative tree species that may be more effective.  
19

20 **Member Thayer** will provide staff with alternative tree species for the area talked about on the  
21 site plans.  
22

23 **Staff:** Confirmed the DRB has made design recommendations regarding the hospital project but  
24 specified no project conditions.  
25

26 **M/S Liden/Thayer** to recommend approval of the Site Development Permit to allow the UVMC  
27 Emergency Department Expansion, Helipad Relocation, Emergency Vehicle Access Relocation,  
28 modified parking and off-site parking project move forward in the process with the  
29 recommendations made by the DRB, as referenced above. Motion carried (5-0).  
30

31 **Member Nicholson** asked with the proposed new design for the hospital asked about how the  
32 hospital plans to compensate for lost parking should the Hospital Support Building project  
33 happen.  
34

35 **Paul Kelsey, UVMC:**

- 36 • Commented on the hospital project from a design standpoint where the purpose and  
37 intent was to provide for a much more efficient, cohesive hospital campus that will better  
38 serve the public and employees.  
39 • At this point, administrative support-related functions will be spread out in areas that are  
40 currently unassigned and/or situated in modular buildings.  
41 • Talked more about the design and location of specific uses.  
42

43 **Staff:** From a planning perspective, staff has to look at the development plan as not being a true  
44 master plan since the hospital support building (HSB) is not presently included in part of the  
45 phasing plans. If and when the hospital decides to construct the HSB, they will have to find the  
46 parking for it.  
47

48 **Charles Ackereley:** Related to compliance with future parking requirements, advised the UVMC  
49 has purchased vacant property on East Perkins Street that can be used for parking.  
50

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

52 **Member Nicholson:**

- 53 • Has come to his attention in review of the World Gym project, there is a conflict of giving  
54 all historic buildings the same 'balance of power and/or creditability.' During the 1960s  
55 when lumber was an available commodity this was really the last time money was really

1 put into buildings with the use of lumber and lumber money. As a result, Ukiah has many  
2 buildings that are now really sub-standard and/or poor examples of good architecture  
3 compared to present design standards and yet these buildings fall under the purview of  
4 historical building standards due to their age. Proposes to investigate a realistic way to  
5 somehow integrate historic buildings, codes, and the new Downtown zoning code  
6 standards.  
7

8 **Staff:**

- 9
- 10 • The aforementioned would require an amendment to the DZC.
  - 11 • The reason the requirements are written as they are with a 50 year threshold is that this  
12 is the age typically used for environmental review required by the California  
13 Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The intent of the requirements was to encourage  
14 modifications to existing buildings to be consistent with the original design which for many  
15 buildings in the DZC have been significantly modified in inappropriate ways that removed  
16 much of the historical architectural features and character. Compliance with the DZC  
17 requirements also makes the project consistent with CEQA requirements. The  
18 alternative would be to have applicants have a historical evaluation of the building in  
19 order to determine if the building is historic. Most would not to do this and there would  
20 likely be push back to requiring this.

21 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

22 Despite public comments about the new Outdoor Dining Program, participants pay a monthly fee  
23 for the use of the parking space, and application processing fee, and a renewal processing fee.  
24

25 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

26 The next regular meeting will be Thursday, June 12, 2014.  
27

28 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

29 The meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.  
30  
31

32 \_\_\_\_\_  
33 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary