



# City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

---

---

## MINUTES

---

---

Regular Meeting

June 12, 2014

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

---

---

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

2. **ROLL CALL Present:** Chair Tom Hise, Vice Chair Tom Liden, Howie Hawkes

**Absent:** Nick Thayer, Alan Nicholson

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

**Others present:** Mary Ann Lance, Jim Bowen  
Richard Ruff, Robert Palafox

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from May 8, 2014 meeting are included for review and approval.

**M/S Hawkes/Liden** approved minutes from May 8, 2014 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried by all AYE voice vote of the members present (3-0).

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

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**

6A. **Orrs Creek Homes Planned Development and Precise Development Plan, 123-129 For Street (File No: 258):** Review and recommendation to Planning Commission and City Council on an amendment to an approved Planned Development and Precise Development Plan for the development of four lots at 123, 125, 127, and 129 Ford Street (APNs 002-121-20, 21, 22, and 23). The original approval included the development of each of the four parcels with one townhome and one second unit. The proposed amendment and new precise development plan would revise the project to remove the second units from the project and develop each of the four parcels with one single-family home.

**Senior Planner Jordan:**

- In terms of background, in 2007, City Council approved the Orrs Creek Planned Development (PD) and Precise Development Plan. Approval is good for three years unless otherwise extended by the Planning Director provided it is demonstrated substantial work is being done toward obtaining a building permit. It was demonstrated that some work on the Project was being done so the three years were extended for an additional three years. The initial Precise Development Plan included site and architectural plans for four vacant parcels. The six years have now expired and the project was not constructed. The City has received an application to retain the PD zoning of the parcels and new Precise Development Plan, which is essentially now a new PD and Precise Development Plan project. The Project includes:

- 1           ○ Development of each of the four vacant parcels with a single-family residence
- 2           without a second unit for a total of four units;
- 3           ○ Two-car tandem garages for each residence with a garage door on the front and
- 4           rear of the garage with access provided from Ford Street and from the driveway
- 5           at the rear of the parcels.
- 6       • The applicant has proposed three alternatives to the plans as designed:
- 7           ○ Option 1 represents plans the applicant initially submitted.
- 8           ○ Options 2 and 3 represent alternative plan proposals with Option 2 being the
- 9           preferred project plan.
- 10       • For Option 2 all four parcels would be accessed only from Ford Street with gravel used
- 11       as the material for the driveway such that:
- 12           ○ The rear garage doors and rear driveways are eliminated on all lots. No
- 13           easement agreement between the neighbors is necessary.
- 14           ○ The gravel driveway does not need to be created on the easement.
- 15           ○ The backyard areas in all lots are larger due to the elimination of the rear
- 16           driveway.
- 17           ○ No additional parking will be available on the rear driveways of Lots 3 and 4.
- 18           ○ Utility boxes can be accessed from the easement.
- 19       • Would like the DRB to focus on the preferred design alternative (Option 2), since this is
- 20       the property owner's preferred alternative.
- 21       • Related to Orrs Creek, important to get the parking and corresponding pavement away
- 22       from the Creek. Option 2 provides an opportunity to design some bio-swailes between
- 23       the houses along the rear of the parcels, and increase the size of the backyards. Based
- 24       on discussions regarding the Project between staff, the applicants, and the civil engineer,
- 25       Option 2 would require modifications to the existing easement/maintenance agreements
- 26       and appears to be feasible.

27  
28 There was a brief introduction of the persons attending the meeting.

29  
30 **DRB:** Asked about the red line on the site plans would be the revised fence line.

31  
32 **Mary Ann Lance:** Confirmed the fence line for Option 2. The fence line may be modified

33 depending on how the easement is changed. It may be the back yard would be further enlarged.

34 The way the driveway exists currently there is blacktop that goes to the border of where lot 4 is

35 located and referred to the three parking spaces for the back house (adjacent parcel, not part of

36 the Project) on the site plans. This is the location of the existing pavement. The residents of the

37 rear parcel would still be able to access those parking spaces.

38  
39 **Richard Ruff, Project Architect:**

- 40       • The property was subdivided at one time into four vacant parcels with one remainder
- 41       parcel developed with a single-family home. The intent at that time was to develop each
- 42       of the four vacant parcels with one residence and one second unit for a total of eight
- 43       dwelling units. The garages located at the rear of each parcel would be accessed via an
- 44       extension of an existing driveway/alleyway.
- 45       • The driveway/alleyway is an easement for use by a separate property owner and has to
- 46       stay and demonstrated the location on the site plans. The separate property owner has
- 47       the right to use the easement to get to his property. This property owner is also
- 48       relinquishing some of his property as part of the easement.
- 49       • Demonstrated the location of the driveway on the site plans. Option 2 eliminates the
- 50       driveway, but the easement still exists.

51  
52 **Staff:** Based on conversations with the applicant, City Public Works Department, and civil

53 engineer that deal with easements and access, and utilities, there is an opportunity to change the

54 alleyway easement. Option 2 would require modification to the existing easements. In the City's

1 opinion, there is a benefit to Option 2 and the change to the easements. The changes to the  
2 easements are details that will have to be worked out.

3  
4 Easement

5  
6 **DRB:**

- 7
- 8 • While the easement will remain, the four driveways that go into the back of the garage will be eliminated.
  - 9 • Will the existing sidewalk be eliminated?
  - 10 • Asked how the fencing in of the backyards would work with the swale areas between them.
- 11

12  
13 **Staff:**

- 14
- 15 • The reason for revising the easement is to be able to push the fence back as far as possible to provide for maximum yard space.
  - 16 • There has been discussion about the ability to accommodate a drainage swale along the driveway so a determination would have to be made about what side of the fence the drainage swale should be located on.
  - 17 • Confirmed the sidewalk would not be eliminated.
  - 18 • Talked about the location for the drainage swale and how it would work in relation to the opportunity of addressing any potential impacts to Orrs Creek in connection with implementation of a water treatment system consistent with the City's current MS4 permit from the State. Providing for appropriate drainage is an important element because the Project is located in close proximity to Orrs Creek.
  - 19 • While the plan for a bio-swale onsite is feasible the details of the design have not been worked out.
- 20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 **Mary Anne Lance & Jim Bowen, Applicant:**

- 29
- 30 • Related to Lot 4, would not be able to put a fence along the property line which extends down the center of the easement because the house behind has to be able to have access. Would like to move the fence closer to the property line for Lots 1, 2, and 3 and put a bio-swale on the south side of the fence with utilities (electric, cable and phone) on the north side of the fence. By putting the bio-swale on the south side of the fence eliminates the possibility of homeowners impeding onto that drainage system and any run-off generated from the lot behind could also drain into the bio-swale.
  - 31 • The property elevation drops downward toward the drainage system. The elevation is approximately two feet higher around Orrs Creek and then slopes down to the corner where the drainage system and sidewalk are located. There is essentially a natural downward flow in the direction of the proposed bio-swale that goes away from the creek.
- 32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 **Richard Ruff:** The property owner that has the established easement would have to give up some of the easement in some fashion for the backyard of Lot 4 to be extended to his property line and showed the location of the property owner's lot in relation to the easement. When the original easement was dedicated talked about the former project and the location of the easement. Modification to the existing easement can easily be done on one side because 'it belongs to the Project.'

42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 There was DRB discussion concerning the location of the existing driveway, locations of the easement and potential modifications to the easements in order to make the proposed Project doable for the applicant and adjacent property owner.

49  
50  
51  
52 **Staff:**

- 53
- 54 • Acknowledged Architect Ruff's comments related to the easements and noted the parcel to the south would be the only parcel affected by modification to the easement.

- Not providing driveway or access to the rear of the parcels would be preferable for the fire department, since this would prevent people from parking along the driveway which could block emergency vehicle access. The existing driveway provides adequate access to the residence to the rear of the Project, so there is no need to extend this driveway to serve this parcel and residence.

**Jim Bowen:** If an improved easement is to extend all the way through to the back parcel, there is a good chance the easement would have to be widened. Widening of the easement would have to be agreed upon by the property owner and that is a concern.

**Staff:**

- When the PD and Precise Development Plan were initially approved for the lots, the standards for fire access were different. This access is now required to be wider.
- If gravel is used as the driveway material it must be compacted and constructed to support emergency vehicles in order to comply with Fire Department requirements which would make it no longer pervious. If there is an opportunity to create yard space, use of asphalt or gravel is not the recommended approach. Allowing for usable outdoor space for the residents is important.

**Member Hawkes:**

- Raised the issue of parking on the street and noted it is also important to provide parking onsite as opposed to encouraging street parking. Cited an example in another state where access to the homes was provided via an alley located at the rear of the development. There was no street access to the homes.
- Related to the aforementioned discussion concerning driveway easement and proposed alternative Option 2 likes the idea of having a back entrance and recommends completely eliminating the front driveway entrance to the garage, which appears to be the current for development trend.

**Staff:** Related to the aforementioned comment, the DZC requires alley access. From a staff perspective there are places where this approach does not work very well or where there are other considerations that may be more important. The proposed project may be one of those situations where making the backyards larger, providing greater setbacks to Orrs Creek, and addressing runoff through the use of swales are more important issues than providing rear access. The purpose of the drainage swales would be to treat the runoff prior to entering the existing DI and then into Orrs Creek. There would be no drainage swales without giving up the rear access.

**Member Liden:** Likes the concept of having a rear garage entrance and cited a residential complex approved in the Talmage area where the parking/access was designed for the rear of the complex. It also allows for privacy for persons washing cars and/or tasks associated with cars having garages in the rear of the development.

**Mary Ann Lance/Jim Bowen:**

- Currently resides in a complex where garages are located in the rear of the building. There are no garages in the front of the property and access is via an alleyway also located in the rear of the building. Residents are required to park in the garage because the rear of the property constitutes a fire zone where no parking is allowed.
- Acknowledged while it may be aesthetically pleasing to look at a house that does not have a garage in front whether or not it promotes people being outside on the street front having a garage in front of the house is debatable because they park in their garages and stay in their house without going out in the front yard at all.
- Resides in a complex where there is concrete in the alleyway and asphalt in the front so basically it is double the amount of impervious paved areas where runoff is not captured in bio-swales. There is very little lawn space for the water to drain into. Does like the

1 concept of having the garages for the complex located in the rear of the property for  
2 aesthetic reasons.  
3 • As it is now relative to the proposed project, the driveway takes up a lot of space. Related  
4 to the existing rental unit and discussion concerning the existing driveway and  
5 corresponding easements asked if a person living in the house behind the Project would  
6 rather have a fence located along the shared property line or have a driveway/alleyway  
7 with cars going right in front of the house? This is one of the reasons for proposed Option  
8 2 as the preferred alternative.  
9

10 **Member Liden:** Not having asphalt in the rear of buildings allows for more private living space  
11 for residents and is a benefit.

12  
13 **Staff:**

- 14 • There is more yard space in front of the homes than in the back.  
15 • The DRB can review the three options as described on page 2 of the staff report. Staff's  
16 preference is Option 2. The DRB can elect to go with the original design as provided for  
17 in Option 1.  
18

19 **DRB:**

- 20 • Will the homes be sold as single family dwellings?  
21

22 **Mary Ann Lance:** Confirmed the units will be single family dwellings and sold at market rate.  
23

24 **Chair Hise:**

- 25 • Is of the opinion the revised plan with the fenced backyards will help in selling the homes.  
26 • Option 1 would likely have made it more difficult to market the homes. Option 2 provides  
27 for more usable space which will be a selling point for most people.  
28

29 **Member Hawkes:**

- 30 • Asked if a PD is required to accommodate low income families and/or provide for  
31 affordable housing.  
32 • Do any of the three options suggest eliminating the driveways in the front?  
33 • Design appears to be a good opportunity to eliminate the driveways in the rear, construct  
34 garages in front and park in the front. Has no knowledge if there is a better solution  
35 besides Option 2 because he was not present for the discussion concerning drainage, lot  
36 line adjustment possibilities/easements.  
37 • When there is an opportunity would rather see parking in the rear.  
38

39 **Staff:**

- 40 • Providing for affordable housing project is not a requirement of a PD.  
41 • Sometimes PDs are used for affordable housing projects that typically need smaller lots  
42 and reduced setbacks in order to make the development economically feasible.  
43

44 It was noted none of the three options propose elimination of the driveways in the front.  
45

46 **DRB consensus:**

- 47 • Is okay with Option 2.  
48

49 Parking & Setbacks

50  
51 **Richard Ruff** generally commented on the design elements:

- 52 • Related to elevations/rooflines, homes will have hips, gable roofs, etc. and referred to the  
53 site plan, sheet A1.2.

- 1 • Front driveways are shared by two houses (lots 1 and 2, lots 3 and 4) in order to
- 2 minimize curb cuts and referred to the location on the site plans.
- 3 • General mix of materials, siding, bat board and possibly some stucco.
- 4 • Addressed the color board relative to the color schemes proposed for the houses.
- 5 • The fencing that will go in between the houses facing the street would be decorative.
- 6 • Each home will have a front porch.
- 7 • Overall design of the homes is essentially a simple/practical approach so that the project
- 8 costs make the project economically feasible.
- 9 • The lots will be landscaped in the front.
- 10 • The site was initially subdivided for the purpose of constructing townhouses with second
- 11 units. It is a pretty dense site. The type of design consideration given makes the project
- 12 doable and referred to the site plans, sheet A1.1 and explained the design measures
- 13 taken to reduce the density, including the elimination of the second units.
- 14 • Talked about the initial plan that provided for tandem parking for two cars back to back
- 15 eliminating two-car garage door in front and allowing for a garage door on the front of the
- 16 garage facing Ford Street and a second garage door facing the easement alley behind
- 17 the houses. However, the way the discussions are going with regard to Option 2, will
- 18 likely add a window in place of a garage door in the rear, eliminating the access to the
- 19 garage in the rear.
- 20 • There will be driveway parking in front of the garage for a car. Basically three cars could
- 21 be on the site at one time and there would be three parking spaces offsite on the street.
- 22 Of course the alleyway made more room for parking but it is not necessary to park more
- 23 cars.
- 24

25 **Staff:** The zoning ordinance requires that a single family dwelling provide two parking spaces that  
 26 are independently accessible. A tandem garage is not independently accessible. There is another  
 27 section of the zoning code that says tandem parking can be approved by the Planning Director. In  
 28 this case, the approval of tandem parking would be done by the City Council. Would need  
 29 feedback from DRB as to whether or not in this particular case tandem parking is appropriate or  
 30 not and why or why not.

31  
 32 **Member Liden:** With the depth of the garage two cars can fit.

33  
 34 **Staff:** Since only two parking spaces are required, the Planning department would likely be fine  
 35 with saying one of the required spaces is in the driveway, one of the required spaces is in the  
 36 garage, and leave the remaining space in the garage that could accommodate another car,  
 37 storage, or other use which is how people often use this type of space. Again, only two parking  
 38 spaces are required unless the DRB is of the opinion this project should be required to provide  
 39 the three parking spaces that would fit.

40  
 41 **Member Hawkes:** Related to parking, is fine with tandem parking. The garage could be made  
 42 shorter allowing for more space in the backyard.

43  
 44 **Mary Ann Lance:** As designed, could not make the garage shorter because of the upstairs unit  
 45 that is over the garage.

46  
 47 **Chair Hise:**

- 48 • The Project provides two tandem parking spaces in the garage and one parking space
- 49 in the driveway. Would support tandem parking in this situation because of the small lot
- 50 size and that there will be single family dwellings on the lot. The additional space in the
- 51 garage is the equivalent to a storage unit and could be used for this purpose or as work
- 52 space of some type or another. Cannot imagine a garage being too clean to be able to
- 53 accommodate a second car. How the project is getting the necessary living space/  
 54 square footage on dense lots is that the homes will have a second story.

- Ford Street is one of the most densely-parked neighborhoods in Ukiah.
- Asked about setback compliance.

**Member Hawkes:**

- There will be at least two cars for a house this large. One car will be in the driveway all the time and with tandem parking there will be some switching around of parking spots.
- Is okay with the tandem parking situation.

**Staff:**

- Acknowledged Ford Street is a very densely-parked neighborhood and noted the City's Traffic Engineering Committee recently approved removal of the 'no parking' restrictions on part of Ford Street, which allows for more on-street parking in the neighborhood. The TEC's action is completely independent of the proposed project.
- The setback requirements for PDs differ from other zoning districts. The DRB needs to make certain they have no issue/concern with the setbacks.

**Richard Ruff:**

- Stayed with the previously approved setbacks. Side yard setbacks increased by making them single family dwellings rather than townhouses with common walls. The rear setback has increased because of the removal of the large garage and use of a tandem garage which allows for more rear yard space. There will be more yard space when the fences are adjusted.
- No change to the front yard setbacks. Did not want to lose rear yard space. All that can be done in the front is for people to take advantage of the porches.

**Chair Hise:** How is the setback determined? Is the front setback to the porch or to the house?

**Staff:**

- A porch can encroach six feet into the required setback. Referred to staff's analysis on page 3 of the staff report related to the setbacks. The PD zoning is intended to allow Projects to vary from the zoning requirements. Asked the DRB to review whether or not the proposed setbacks for this Project which small lot sizes and is located in a dense neighborhood are acceptable.
- Acknowledged that several people have inquired about the subject property and previously approved townhome and second unit project. No one until Ms. Lance has come forward with an application for this site.

**Chair Hise:**

- The required front yard setback to the dwelling is 15 feet for the R3 zoning district. Taking into consideration the porch, staff determined the front yard setback to the dwelling is 11.5 feet and that this setback is acceptable for a PD setting.
- Is fine with a 3.5-foot difference.

**Member Hawkes:**

- Is fine with the setbacks for the houses.
- The development could have been one townhouse in terms of a better fit for the lot that would provide for more space. Has no knowledge what the market rate for townhouses or condominiums is in Ukiah.
- The housing market has been depressed for some time but with a more revitalized market hard to tell what type of development would economically be the best fit.

**Richard Ruff:** Townhouses were initially a consideration and what was previously approved. For economical and/or other reasons, the applicant's preference is to construct individual single family dwellings on the lots. Townhouses require homeowner/driveway agreements that are not

1 required for single family dwellings. There may be, however, some other type of common  
2 agreement necessary for the homes.

3  
4 **Member Liden:**

- 5 • Related to setbacks for the Project, there is no setback for any of those old houses on  
6 Ford Street. There were constructed right on the street with cars parked in front.
- 7 • The proposed development fits with the location and is workable.
- 8 • Likes that the houses will have backyards. Is of the opinion the former project consisting  
9 of one large townhouse unit was not a good fit for the neighborhood.
- 10 • Likes the project.

11  
12 **Chair Hise:** The proof of whether or not the proposed project is a good one is if the homes sell.

13  
14 There was Board/applicant discussion about comparable homes in Ukiah and what they are  
15 selling for.

16  
17 Fencing

18  
19 **DRB:** Fine with proposed fencing/gates.

20  
21 Design/Materials/Elevations

22  
23 **Mary Ann Lance:**

- 24 • Would like to eliminate the stucco in the front porch area where the door is located and  
25 replace with horizontal siding. This would eliminate the busyness from an aesthetic  
26 perspective and is also a cost factor. This is the only change being proposed to the  
27 design.

28  
29 **Member Hawkes:** Would it be too expensive to have more variations in the facades?

30  
31 **Jim Bowen:** The changes in the rooflines provide design variations.

32  
33 **Mary Ann Lance:** Each home has a different color scheme making them dissimilar.

34  
35 **Member Hawkes:**

- 36 • Breaking up the window arrangement on the front elevation is a possible way of making  
37 the homes different.
- 38 • Could vary the door style.
- 39 • Essentially likes the project, as designed.

40  
41 **Richard Ruff:** Design variations can be made to the porches. Right now they are open.

42  
43 **Mary Ann Lance:** Was not a plan consideration to put a full-sized glass window as the door.

44  
45 **Member Liden:** Could change the railing designs so they differ for each home.

46  
47 **Mary Ann Lance:**

- 48 • The reason for the proposed metal railing design is so vines can grow without it being  
49 wood which requires periodic maintenance. This type of railing aesthetically softens the  
50 appearance of the porch area.
- 51 • Objective is to provide for a nice project while keeping costs down as best possible.

52  
53 **Chair Hise:**

- Application of three material types on the homes appears to be 'busy.' Has a problem with the application of both vertical and horizontal siding rather than with stucco with horizontal siding or stucco with vertical siding. Using both vertical and horizontal siding does not provide for a harmonious design and appearance.
- From a side view perspective, the two hip roofs will not be attractive. Likes the gable end detail that is on two of the elevations and recommended doing the same on the hip to give it more interest. The gables will provide a lot of interest for the front elevation.
- Recommends using two materials, i.e., stucco and vertical siding or stucco and horizontal siding.

**Member Hawkes:** Asked about the board bat siding and the plan in this regard. Explained the application process for board and bat so it looks good. The intent is to get the bats closer together. Understands board and bat can be costly.

**Richard Ruff:**

- Material will likely be rough sawn plywood with a 2 inch bat.
- Related to use of board and bat, cost is a factor because of the need to have a shear ply and the siding work done at the same time such that the application of the bats cover the nails.

**Jim Bowen:** Material costs add up quickly.

**Member Liden:**

- Is concerned about the selling price of the homes. Important to keep the price down.
- From an aesthetic perspective has some concern about the side views.
- Would be okay with modifying the use of the stucco in the front and still provide for some design variation.
- Would like to see a simple low cost variation to the window patterns on the garage doors to allow for individual character/variety.
- Likes the Project.

There was DRB/applicant discussion concerning:

- Color schemes and corresponding color variations selected for the homes and garages.

**Staff:** What is the DRB's opinion about having no direct access from the garage to the house? This is a project question Planning Commission typically inquires about.

**Richard Ruff:** Acknowledged there is no access from the garage to the house and people would have to exit the garage to enter the house. Direct access from the garage to the house is not necessary and addressed the reasons this was not part of the design where the primary factor in this regard is about efficient use of space. To have a door from the inside of the kitchen accessing the garage takes away from wall space that could have another use, such as for cabinets/counters. The only other alternative was to access the garage from the living room such that now without having the rear door to the garage is of the opinion would negatively compromise the design and reduce space that could be used for an entertainment area, for instance. Acknowledged, there would be no room for an access door underneath the stairs to the second story.

**DRB:** In terms of design feasibility discussion about possible locations for an access door from the living room relative to finding an appropriate placement for a television, for instance.

**Mary Ann Lance:** Related to the necessity of having direct access to the garage asked about preferable location, i.e., taking away of the kitchen area or access from the living room around the base of the stairs.

1 **Chair Hise:** It may be best to utilize the access door from the house to the garage because of  
2 the potential for the garage to be used for storage. If two cars are parked in the garage, it would  
3 be a tight fit to navigate around to go outside in order to enter the house. A direct access door  
4 from the garage to the house will likely be a request of the homeowner. Should plan for a space  
5 during construction in which to install a door that provides direct access from the garage to the  
6 house in the event the buyer wants one.

7  
8 **Jim Bowen:** Is fine with providing an option to the buyer homeowner to install a direct access  
9 door from the house to the garage as part of the floor plan design options.

10  
11 **Member Liden:** Could provide direct access from the kitchen although it would take away  
12 counter space. Possibly have the door swing open into the garage rather than into the kitchen.

13  
14 **DRB consensus:**

- 15 • Fine with the color palates selected for the homes and proposed variations in the color  
16 schemes.
- 17 • Recommended changing the window patterns for garages and/or using a different style  
18 garage doors to create variety and to prevent the houses from looking the same.
- 19 • Use stucco in front with horizontal siding or stucco with vertical siding, but do not mix the  
20 horizontal and vertical siding. Use quality siding that is aesthetically pleasing.
- 21 • Okay with not providing landscaping for the fenced-in backyards and landscaping only  
22 the front yards.
- 23 • Floor plan and site plan shows location that would provide a direct access door to the  
24 garage can be constructed and would be optional. Also necessary to provide for light  
25 switches to accompany the door so a light can be turned on both ways. Let homeowner  
26 decide location of the door, direction of the door swing, and whether or not they want  
27 direct access from the garage to the house.

28  
29 **Jim Bowen:** Confirmed trash/recycling containers will be located in between the houses in the  
30 side yard and referred to their location on the site plan.

31  
32 Landscaping

33  
34 **DRB:** Understands landscaping plan is still being evaluated by staff.

35  
36 **Mary Ann Lance:**

- 37 • If the fence is pushed back toward the rear property line, requests no landscaping be  
38 required for the rear yards and demonstrated the location on the site plan.
- 39 • The front will have no lawn but rather native, drought tolerant plantings.

40  
41 **Jim Bowen:** If the fence is pushed back the existing in-ground utility boxes will be eliminated  
42 and demonstrated the location on the site plan.

43  
44 **Staff:** Confirmed the aforementioned area is the area that would be replaced by the bio-swale for  
45 the drainage.

46  
47 **DRB consensus:** Fine with landscaping plan concept.

48  
49 **Staff:** Does the DRB want to see the revised Project (no garage access from rear) back for  
50 review and recommendation prior to the Project moving on to Planning Commission?

51  
52 **DRB consensus:** Understands the revised Project (no garage access from rear) and does not  
53 need to see the revised Project prior to the Project going to Planning Commission.

54  
55 **7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

**8. MATTERS FROM STAFF**

**Senior Planner Jordan** advised she will be out of the office for approximately six weeks on medical leave beginning tomorrow.

**9. SET NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting will be Thursday, July 10, 2014 provided there is an item ready to review.

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

---

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary