



# City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

---

---

## MINUTES

---

---

1  
2  
3 **Regular Meeting**

**June 13, 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 3:02  
7 p.m.

8  
9 **2. ROLL CALL Present:** Vice Chair Tom Liden, Howie Hawkes  
10 Nick Thayer, Chair Tom Hise  
11 **Absent:** Alan Nicholson  
12 **Staff Present:** Kim Jordan, Senior Planner  
13 Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner  
14 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary  
15 **Others present:** Richard Ruff  
16 Wayne Stephens  
17

18 **3. CORRESPONDENCE:** None

19  
20 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the April 11, 2013 and May 9, 2013  
21 meetings are included for review and approval.

22  
23 **M/S Liden/Hise** to approve May 9, 2013 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0).

24  
25 **M/S Liden/Thayer** to approve April 11, 2013 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (4-0).

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

28  
29 **Staff:** Provided the DRB with a copy of comments submitted from Member Nicholson for the  
30 three projects being reviewed today and these comments are incorporated into the minutes as  
31 attachment 1.

32  
33 **6. NEW BUSINESS:**

34 **6A. Saucy Outdoor Dining Program Permit.** Review and make recommendations on  
35 request to use patio surface materials not allowed under the outdoor dining structure  
36 program. The proposed structure would be located at 108 West Standley Street, APN  
37 002-224-14.  
38

39 **Staff:** The outdoor dining facility has been referred to the Board for consideration and  
40 recommendation on the proposed surface type – poured in plan concrete. This is not a pre-  
41 approved surface type in the Program Guidelines. Features listed in the Guidelines under  
42 “Design Standards” require Board approval for a deviation from the standard. Since “Surface  
43 Type” is listed as a Design Standard and poured in place concrete is not listed as a pre-approved  
44 surface type, DRB review and approval is required. The applicant has already met with staff to  
45 discuss the use of this material.

46  
47 **Senior Civil Engineer Kageyama:**

- 48 • Has reviewed the proposed project and finds the use of cement as a surface type to be a  
49 creative solution, particularly as it relates to any pavement irregularities and explained  
50 technically how so.
- 51 • Has some concerns about the mounting brackets that go into the curb. The curb should  
52 not be damaged in the process.

- Drainage issues have been adequately addressed.
- Likes that the outdoor dining structure is removable in part.
- From a Public Works perspective, sees no problem related to the streets and supports approval of the Project.

**Richard Ruff, Project Architect** referred to the site plan (AO.1):

- Commented on the installation process and noted separation sheets will be placed on the existing pavement and concrete poured.
- Has no knowledge yet whether the concrete will be colored/stained to match the floor color inside the building.
- The 'forms' will be removed, edges cleaned and stained so the platform will be aesthetically pleasing and have that clean appearance.
- The handrails and other related items will be bolted to the concrete slab instead of down through the pavement. It is difficult to achieve anchorage on pavers that are in sand.
- The Mendocino County Health Department is very pleased with the Project because cement will prevent food from collecting underneath the structure. The structure can be easily pressure washed and cleaned.
- Assures that the proposed concrete platform can be easily removed if this is necessary with the help of a small forklift. With the removable slab plan all joints will be caulked. The intent is to get the expansion joints deep into concrete so that if sections of the structure need to be dismantled/removed for various reasons they can be reattached easily.

**DRB:**

- What is the minimum thickness for the platform/slab?
- Asked if the patio surface will contain rebar. Sidewalks typically do not use rebar so that repairs can more easily be made.
- If City Public Works finds the Project in compliance with public works-related issues, has no problem with the Project except possibly for aesthetics.
- Likes the Project and the concrete platform is a good solution. The concrete is both a physical structure and 'a finished' product. Essentially the pouring of concrete over concrete is a good idea with the application of a slip sheet to separate the two structures. It is important if the platform were to be removed for repairs, it be put back as it was originally.
- Recommends effective use of joints that are durable in the event the platform has to be dismantled for street and/or other types of repairs.
- Recommends a bond be required so that is there is damage to the sidewalk/street, there is money available to pay for the repairs and the City does not wind up paying for the repairs. Could this be tied to an Encroachment Permit?
- The comment made by Member Nicholson pertinent to ADA access was noted.
- Related to the tables on the sidewalk and the corresponding Bar Rails required by ABC, if 3ft. 9 inches as shown on the site plans from the sidewalk to the bar rails/roped area is sufficient room for pedestrians?
- There was discussion about the type of finish that would be appropriate to use for the structure.
- Is there a certain amount of sidewalk space the business needs to leave for public access? 3ft. 9 in. does not appear to be very much space for the sidewalk/pedestrian access and the outdoor seating area.

**Member Liden** has observed the sidewalk space and tables that are outdoors right now seem to work sufficiently and is acceptable. The proposed Project will actually make the situation better because there will be less of a curb drop-off.

**Member Thayer:** There will be some congestion, but this is anticipated with outdoor dining.

**Richard Ruff:**

**Design Review Board**

- The minimum thickness should be about 3 inches and this will be more toward the center of the street. The dining structure will be sloped back toward the gutters to be able to accompany spills and rainwater.
- Confirmed rebar will not be used.
- The bar rails are removable and sit on pedestals. The bar rails can always be moved closer to the building.

**Planning Staff:** The need for the business owner to provide a bond in the event there was damage to the right-of-way was not included as a requirement of the Program.

**Senior Civil Engineer Kageyama:**

- Confirmed the City Encroachment Permit does not require a bond.
- Some agencies do require a bond and is of the opinion this is a good idea.
- If the circumstance were such that the structure was abandoned, the responsibility for dismantling it would likely fall to the City. The City currently has no ordinance in place that requires a bond for an outdoor structure operating in the public right-of-way.
- The owner of the building may have to withstand a certain amount of utility risk in the event the sidewalk/street has to be dug up for some unforeseeable reasons. Architect Ruff has indicated that if certain sections of the platform need to be removed, they can easily be recast.

**Planning Staff:**

- The applicant is required to have an agreement with the City for the actual leasing of the space as part of the general requirements for the Outdoor Dining Program. Has no knowledge whether or not a bond is required as part of the lease agreement. Planning staff has not been part of any discussions related to what is included in the lease agreement for the structure.
- Related to the bar rail, Architect Ruff indicated the bar rail can be moved in more toward the building so it does not hang over the sidewalk.
- A 48-inch is the required clearance for the pedestrian path on the sidewalk. Staff has informed the applicant, that as shown, the facility does not comply with this requirement and the plans will need to be revised to comply. The applicant has indicated that the bar top can be shifted to provide the 48-inch minimum clearance.

There was discussion regarding the yellow curb loading zone and the parking markers as shown on the site plans in the location of Saucy's and Uncorked and how parking works.

**DRB consensus:**

- The proposed surface is consistent with the types of surfaces the Board had in mind when helping to develop the Program guidelines.
- Approves of the poured in place concrete as shown.
- Approves of including poured in place concrete as an approved surface type for the Outdoor Dining Program, subject to staff review and approval. Future Outdoor Dining Facilities proposing this type of surface are not required to return to the Board for approval.

**M/S Liden/Hawkes** to recommend the proposed Outdoor Dining Facility move forward.

**6B. Stephens Residential Planned Development** (File No. 13-13-REZPD-SDP-PC-CC). Review and make recommendations to Planning Commission on application for Planned Development and Site Development to construct four one bedroom apartments with parking and one second unit located at 312 For Street, APN 002-101-15 & 002-101-14.

Setback requirements and site planning

1 **Senior Planner Jordan:**

- 2 • The property is zoned PD. No regulations were included in the PD for the two parcels  
3 included in this Project.  
4 • Staff requests DRB input on the Project, including: 1) the proposed 5-foot setbacks for  
5 the second unit which would be constructed above the garage located on the interior lot  
6 and 2) the 15-foot street side setback required on Myron Place and Ford Street but not  
7 provided by the Project. The second unit should be setback 10-feet from the rear and  
8 side property lines, primarily to address privacy concerns. The units on the corner lot  
9 should have a 15-foot setback all the way around Ford Street and Myron Place.  
10 • Since the Project is a PD, deviations from the required setbacks may be approved when  
11 there are reasons to support the deviations.  
12 • Member Nicholson's provided comments regarding the Steven Residential PD related to  
13 the setback standard for the one bedroom apartment over the garage and the design  
14 concerning the four one bedroom apartments in two new structures.  
15

16 **Richard Ruff, Project Architect:**

- 17 • Related to the second unit dwelling above the garage, the existing garage has a 5-foot  
18 rear setback and a 5-foot side setback. The required two story setback is ten feet. To  
19 accomplish this, the north wall has to move 5 feet to the south and the east wall has to  
20 move 5 feet to the west. The off-set bearing walls necessary would add to the cost of  
21 engineering and construction. Also, the unit would be reduced considerably from 736 sq.  
22 ft. to 527 sq. ft. Rezoning to PD-Residential allows the applicant to request maintaining  
23 the 5-foot rear and 5-foot side setbacks for the second floor unit.  
24 • Privacy impacts to the adjacent properties can be mitigated with window replacement and  
25 glazing options and/or other mitigating measures.  
26 • The existing house was built when on-site parking was not required. The Project  
27 includes the one parking space required for the second unit which is provided in the  
28 garage.  
29

30 **DRB:** Does the garage structure have an adequate foundation to accommodate a second story  
31 structure?  
32

33 **Richard Ruff:** The plan is to use a 'post and beam' scenario. The foundation was constructed in  
34 the 1980s so it is not necessary to replace the foundation. Reinforcing with footings on the  
35 corners and middle section should be sufficient to accommodate a second story.  
36

37 **Richard Ruff:** Related to design considerations and compliance with setback requirements,  
38 proposed pulling the whole front building back 4 feet because there is 30 feet between carports to  
39 make vehicular maneuvering on-site very easy. The interior court could then be 26 feet. These  
40 modifications would allow for 4 addition feet on the corner.  
41

42 **DRB:** Would support pulling the front building back 2 or 4 feet to better comply with the setback  
43 requirements for the corner lot that rounds from Ford Street into Myron Place and still provide for  
44 adequate parking space in the interior of the lot. Agrees a 30-foot allowance between carports  
45 should be sufficient room for cars to maneuver.  
46

47 **Planning Staff:** The storage and laundry building is 5 feet from the back property line because  
48 this is the requirement. This creates unusable space. Asked if the DRB would support having the  
49 building closer to the property line for the purpose of creating more space on the actual site.  
50 Since the Project is a PD, deviations from setback standards are allowed, it makes sense. In this  
51 case, there could be more usable space for the tenants or additional landscaping.  
52

53 **Wayne Stephens:** There are Redwood trees on the north property line of the adjacent neighbor  
54 so having a structure close to the property line could compromise the root system of the trees.

1 There may potentially be drainage issues associated with having the structure situated closer to  
2 the property line.

3  
4 **Richard Ruff:** The building could be moved closer to the property line if the root system of the  
5 trees can be avoided. It is possible to go around the root system area.

6  
7 **Member Thayer:** It is not a good idea to move the storage/laundry building closer to the property  
8 line because of new growth tree spouts that occur when tree roots are stressed. These seedlings  
9 are a nuisance and have to be routinely cut.

10  
11 **Chair Hise:**

- 12 • Recommends moving the detached storage/laundry building more toward the property  
13 line and making the building more compact and/or square in design and place the  
14 building in the corner.
- 15 • There would be less impact on the trees. The building would have to be reconfigured to  
16 figure out the various entryways for the tenants.
- 17 • Consolidating the building into the corner would not affect access for the tenants because  
18 there would be a common walkway and the privacy of tenants with the fencing would  
19 remain private.
- 20 • The space between the property line and the detached storage/laundry building is  
21 essentially wasted space and of no use to anyone.

22  
23 **Richard Ruff:**

- 24 • Redesigning the building is a possibility.
- 25 • Would like to keep the present design and proposed location because the plan is to  
26 provide fencing on the site so the back courtyards remain private.
- 27 • Explained how the tenants would access the storage/laundry building so as to avoid  
28 having to go through the carports of other tenants.
- 29 • Having the doors on the second floor facing one another is for security purposes.

30  
31 **Member Thayer:**

- 32 • Does not see how moving the detached accessory into the corner would be beneficial.
- 33 • With four units on that particular site does not really allow for a lot of privacy for the  
34 tenants residing there.
- 35 • Supports impacting the trees on the neighboring property as little as possible. If the trees  
36 were non-existing, it would make sense to reconfigure the location of the laundry/storage  
37 building.
- 38 • Would like to see fencing where feasible, particularly off the back corner of the lot.

39  
40 **Planning Staff:** An arborist report may be required to ensure that the Project does not damage  
41 the trees on the neighboring property.

42  
43 **DRB:**

- 44 • While it may be a good idea if the apartments were moved back 2 or 4 feet to better  
45 comply with the 15-foot setback requirement for corner lots, is fine with what has been  
46 proposed because visually this would not make a difference. One cannot tell where the  
47 property line is. While it may be a 'bit tight' at the corner of Ford Street and Myron Place,  
48 the curb and sidewalk lines are in place and not compromised by the development. The  
49 Project is consistent with the curb, gutter and sidewalk requirements. The development is  
50 only a 'little tight' at the corner where Ford Street turns into Myron Place.
- 51 • Could consider if there is a way to move the detached laundry/storage building more  
52 toward the north property line, but is fine with what has been proposed if this is not  
53 feasible.
- 54 • Likes the parking plans as shown on the site plans. Likes there are not two driveways on  
55 two different streets.

1 **Materials, elevations, colors & landscaping**

2  
3 **DRB:** Asked about the elevations for the different buildings.

4  
5 **Richard Ruff:**

- 6
- 7 • The existing residence is a building on 'its own' such that everything else wraps around it.
  - 8 • Related to the corner lot project, below each one bedroom unit is a carport with two parking spaces for a total of 8 parking spaces.
  - 9 • The four storage spaces and the laundry room are accessible to all tenants.
  - 10 • Cars enter on a 20-foot wide driveway from Myron Place.
  - 11 • Explained the proposed materials.
  - 12 • The existing residence will eventually be painted the same color palate as the new buildings/units. The intent is to build the apartments and later paint the existing residence because this building was painted not long ago.
  - 13 • The second unit above the garage will be painted when the existing residence is painted.

14  
15  
16  
17 **Wayne Stephens:** Confirmed the apartments would be constructed first. After the apartments are rented, the second unit would be constructed and the existing house and second unit would be painted to match the new buildings.

18  
19  
20  
21 **Chair Hise:**

- 22
- 23 • Likes the color scheme selected.
  - 24 • Would like to see the existing house painted at the same time the garage and second story unit is painted to aesthetically unify all the structures on the two parcels.

25  
26 **DRB:** Further discussed the siding and roofing materials that are proposed for the Project.

27  
28 **Member Thayer** referred to the landscaping plan and list of plant species proposed for the Project:

- 29
- 30 • For the street trees, recommends applicant review the City Master Street Tree List.
  - 31 • The proposed list for the Medium Tall plant size at maturity is essentially plants that are 12'-12' at maturity. Recommends being more conscious about size of plants at maturity.
  - 32 • Related to the trellis wall plantings, questioned whether it would be beneficial to enclose the patios.
  - 33 • Some of the species on the plant list could be used as 'fill-ins' to provide for a more cohesive landscaping appearance.
  - 34 • The plant list is extensive and could be more refined, but in general will work for the Project.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 **Richard Ruff:** For the patios, suggests berms.

41  
42 **Planning Staff:** Street trees are required and the applicant can select tree species from the City-approved Street Tree List.

43  
44  
45 **DRB consensus:**

- 46
- 47 • The Project addresses the matter of density well. Proving higher density housing and not "sprawl" is a good idea.
  - 48 • Likes the Project, as designed.
  - 49 • Approves of the setbacks for the apartments. The setbacks may be less than required by the R-3 zoning district; however the PD allows the approval of reduced setbacks. The reduced setbacks are consistent with the setbacks on Myron Street. The reduced setback close to the corner will not be noticed due to the location of the property line to the radius of the curb. There is adequate line of site, so additional setback is not required and the Myron Place is not a busy street since it is a cul-de-sac.
- 50  
51  
52  
53  
54

- Approves of the 5-foot setbacks for the second unit. The second unit does not need to be setback the 10 feet required by the zoning ordinance. This allows for a larger, more functional unit and the setbacks are consistent with the neighborhood on Myron. It does not appear that the matter of potential privacy impacts to the neighbors will be a problem. The windows for the second story are fine as proposed and do not need to be opaque or clerestory in order to provide privacy.
- Applicant needs to review the City's Approved Master Street Tree List and select species from this list.

**DRB Conditions of Approval:**

- Require use of a brown color shingle for the apartments/other structures to match that of the existing house and a material sample be provided to the Planning Commission.
- Require the existing house to be painted when the second unit is constructed above the garage in order to tie the two units and the Project together

**M/S Thayer/Hawkes** to recommend approval of the Project with the associated notes as provided above. Motion carried (4-0).

**7. OLD BUSINESS**

**6B. Mendocino County Historic Society – Annex Building** (File No. 13-07-UP-SDP-PC). Review and make recommendations to Planning Commission on the revised plans for a new annex building at 603 West Perkins Street, APN 001-339-03.

**Planning Staff:** The DRB has reviewed this design at a previous meeting and gave preliminary approval to the conceptual drawings presented. The applicant has provided formal plans for DRB and Planning Commission review. The focus of today's meeting is to review the complete submittal with focus on the colors and landscaping plan.

**DRB:** Asked about the color of the roof for the new building.

**Richard Ruff:**

- The siding is hardi-board.
- The roof would be asphalt shingle and the color is intended to match the museum building.

**Planning Staff:** A roof sample is required as part of a Site Development Permit.

**DRB:**

- Would be okay with the applicant submitting a roof sample to staff for approval.
- It is difficult to determine the true color of the museum building roof from the photo provided.
- It is likely the roofs should match.
- Would like a roof sample of the existing museum building as well as a roof sample for what is being proposed for the new building. The roof color for the museum may not be compatible with the colors proposed for the annex building.
- The color of the roof for the archival annex building should not be lighter than the roof of the museum building, but rather darker in color.

**Planning Staff:** Recommends adding a condition that the roof sample must come back to the DRB after Planning Commission review.

**Member Thayer:**

- The plant selection is somewhat accurate for a historical site. There is an opportunity for the landscaping to match the architecture a little more if the intent is for the landscaping to reflect that historical aspect.

- 1 • Is concerned about the landscaping being in proximity to many of the existing trees
- 2 knowing the trees have not been irrigated over the years.
- 3 • Noted some of trees species selected indicate moderate irrigation, but this is not
- 4 accurate. To this end, recommends substituting Dogwood that would be located in close
- 5 proximity to the existing trees for a native Redbud or Eastern Redbud.
- 6 • The Lilac trees are fine. They are somewhat drought tolerant for this area.
- 7 • There are a few plant species selected that are proposed for the sun that should be in the
- 8 shade, such as the Helleborus orientalis (HEL).
- 9 • Referred to the Planting Plan and recommended species labeled 'H' be relocated to a
- 10 shaded area and consider Lavender (LAV), Coreopsis Hybrid (COR) or Penstemon
- 11 Hybrid (PH).
- 12 • Along the interior property line, may want to substitute Vibernum (V) for 'PT.' 'PT' may be
- 13 too large for this location.
- 14 • Plant species of bright colors are good for historical sites.
- 15 • Erigeron (E) is a good choice and would be a good substitution for the 'PT' areas since
- 16 the Pittosporum wants to be a small tree.
- 17 • The landscape plan lists other plant possibilities for shade and sun as well as for large
- 18 and small shrubs some of which are not familiar.
- 19 • Since the building is on the National Register, it may be that the landscaping should likely
- 20 have an official review process that is subject to precise methodology/protocol.
- 21 • The plantings shown at the corner of Church and Dora streets will require a maintenance
- 22 plan and commitment to care for the landscaping. If this cannot be done, could simplify
- 23 the plantings here by just using ground covers from the carpet family (white or red) and
- 24 rosa (various).
- 25 • The bark path is a functional element that is not historically accurate. A pebble path
- 26 would be more historically accurate.
- 27 • Overall, does approve of the landscape plan.
- 28

29 There was DRB discussion about pathways and what types of materials might be the most  
 30 historical accurate. The bark is certainly acceptable. The intent is to maintain a 'quiet theme' for  
 31 landscaping and such in a museum setting.

32  
 33 **Member Thayer:** Highly recommends the Rosa various (R) as part of the landscaping plan  
 34 related to small shrubs/ground cover.

35  
 36 **DRB:** Landscape designer needs to correct the 'north' arrow on the landscape plans.

37  
 38 **DRB consensus:**

- 39 • Correct the north arrow on the landscaping plan prior to plans going to Planning
- 40 Commission.
- 41 • Likes that the Project no longer impacts the trees.
- 42 • Likes Member Thayer's landscaping recommendations.
- 43 • Agrees with applicant's recommendation to use hardi-board with 4 inch exposure.
- 44

45 **DRB Condition of Approval:**

- 46 • Sample of roof color to be provided and to return to the DRB for review and approval.
- 47

48 **M/S Hawkes/Liden** to recommend Planning Commission approval of the Project, as proposed  
 49 with the condition related to the roof and Member Thayer's landscaping suggestions. Motion  
 50 carried (4-0).

51  
 52 **8. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

53  
 54 **9. MATTERS FROM STAFF:** Discussion about the DRB's role in reviewing projects.  
 55 Recommended that the Board's recommendation to the Zoning Administrator, Planning

1 Commission, or City Council include any conditions of approval and/or recommendations  
2 for changes to the Project. The recommendation could also be that the Project returns to  
3 the Board with the revisions recommended by the Board prior to moving on to the next  
4 step in the process.  
5

6 **Chair Hise:**

- 7 • Asked staff to follow-up on the Board's previous inquiry as to conflict of interest rules that  
8 apply with the Board.  
9

10 **Staff:** Will follow-up and report back to the Board at a future meeting.  
11

12 **10. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

13 The next meeting will be Thursday, July 11, 2013. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.  
14

15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary  
17