



# City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

---

---

## MINUTES

---

---

Regular Meeting

July 9, 2015

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Liden called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in Conference Room #3.

2. **ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chair Tom Liden, Alan Nicholson, Colin Morrow

**Absent:** Nick Thayer and Howie Hawkes

**Staff Present:** Charley Stump, Planning Director  
Kevin Thompson, Principal Planner  
Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner  
Shannon Riley, Project & Grant Administrator

**Others present:** Steve Honeycutt, Guillon Inc., Project Manager  
Matt Gallaway, Project Architect

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the May 14, 2015 meeting are available for review and approval.

M/S Nicholson/Morrow to approve May 14, 2015 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (3-0) of members present.

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

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

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**

6A. **Gobbi Street Complex 680 South State Street, (File No.: 1111):** Request for Preliminary Review and Recommendation of a Major Use Permit & Site Development Permit for a proposed 26 unit multi-unit residential development on the NE corner of W. Gobbi Street and Oak Street. 680 S. State Street (APN 002-301-55).

**Principal Planner Thompson:**

- Project is multi-unit residential development consisting of 26 units (8-two bed units and 18-one bed units), 38 vehicle parking spaces, 4 bicycle parking spaces and landscaping.
- Property is zoned C-1 and is a permitted use that requires use permit approval.
- Applicant is seeking some project exceptions related to onsite parking and landscape coverage.
- The project is located in Airport Compatibility Zone C and the Mendocino Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) will make a recommendation/determination whether or not the project complies with the Airport Compatibility Zone C in terms of density.

- 1 • Requests the DRB comment on the design aspects as it relates to site layout and  
2 elevations.  
3

4 **Steve Honeycutt:**

- 5 • Asked about the process for approval of the project and requested clarification the intent  
6 of the today's DRB meeting is a preliminary look at the project.  
7

8 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 9 • Confirmed the process and noted the DRB will first review the project from a preliminary  
10 perspective and later review of a formal application with a recommendation to Planning  
11 Commission for approval.  
12

13 **Matt Gallaway:**

- 14 • Acknowledged there is a housing need in Ukiah, particularly rental units.  
15 • Has previously meet with planning staff to generally discuss the project objectives where  
16 some project concerns were raised related to compliance with City parking and  
17 landscaping standards such that modifications were made to the site plans.  
18 • Related to the issue of parking and compliance with City parking requirements the intent  
19 is to utilize on-street parking along the South Oak Street side of the project. To take  
20 advantage of on-street parking accommodations designed the front of the units on the S.  
21 Oak Street side so they face the street.  
22 • From a design perspective relevant to onsite drainage and compliance with the Low  
23 Impact Development (LID) standards the City has adopted has provided for mitigation  
24 measures to effectively address all storm water runoff on the site. With input from the  
25 project landscape architect and project civil engineer is of the opinion runoff from the site  
26 can be effectively mitigated with the installation of bio-swales. Drainage/geotechnical  
27 studies will be conducted for the project such that the preliminary/conceptual approach  
28 and end result will likely be to handle the runoff with bio-swales.  
29 • The design of the units is 'straight forward' where the intent was to design for comparable  
30 market rate without 'over-designing.'  
31 • The project location is 'prime' for residential use particularly with the opportunity for the  
32 applicant to gain positive accreditation for designing/providing sustainable and/or LEED  
33 certified housing-related components. The C-1 zoning district allows for multi-unit  
34 residential development.  
35 • The proposed project is proximate to so many service locations in town.  
36 • Would like to use brick as a material treatment that would also architecturally  
37 complement the design of existing the Rite Aid building.  
38

39 **Steve Honeycutt:**

- 40 • Most project applicants wrestle with maintaining cost effectiveness and complying with  
41 corresponding market rates.  
42 • The intent is to maximize the number of residential units such that the project pencils out  
43 financially and provides more housing opportunities for the community.  
44 • If the proposed housing project works well the plan is to do more projects of this nature.  
45 • While the intent is to provide for a nice design that fits well in the neighborhood must be  
46 practical in terms of cost effectiveness when it comes to the selection of materials and  
47 treatments. It is possible to provide for a nice project without 'maximum financial effect.'  
48

49 **Chair Liden:**

- 50 • Asked about the rental fees and how they will be determined.  
51

52 **Steve Honeycutt:**

- 53 • Rental fees have not yet been determined and/or finalized. The applicant will have the  
54 information when the DRB has a formal review of the proposed project.

1 **Member Nicholson:**

- 2 • Is of the opinion the proposed project appears to be well-thought out and is an
- 3 appropriate project for the City and neighborhood.
- 4 • Related to the landscaping plan, likes the tree and plant selection. Asked about the
- 5 concept for the bio-swale and storm water retention plan for the project.
- 6 • Requested clarification that all of the drainage can be effectively addressed through the
- 7 use of bio-swales as opposed to having a manmade retention system.
- 8 • Is fine with the building orientation and the fit on the site; Finds the roof pitch 'too normal'
- 9 compared to other recently approved projects, such as the PEP Senior Housing project
- 10 that incorporated craftsman architecture into the design. It is not to say the design should
- 11 have more arts and crafts to it but the roof pitch of 5 and 12 feet seems to be
- 12 uninteresting. Is of the opinion the roofline needs 'more character' such that it is
- 13 emphasized slightly in a more interesting way and in keeping with the anticipated budget.
- 14 • Is fine with the design of the façade and asked about the window design/treatment and
- 15 would they be recessed?
- 16 • Preference is the darker color, higher contrast palate for the buildings.
- 17 • Design-wise, nice that the doors have character and are distinct having color variety
- 18 other than typical/ordinary color schemes.
- 19

20 **Member Morrow:**

- 21 • Requested clarification if the other doors that are different colors are patio doors? Are the
- 22 doors intended to be a mix of colors?
- 23 • Has consideration been given to the roof color? Asked if a darker roof would be a
- 24 consideration? A darker colored roof would emphasize the difference in the color
- 25 schemes for the buildings allowing for a nice presentation.
- 26 • Inquired about the color renderings shown in terms of color accuracy.
- 27 • Questioned the proposed four bicycle parking spaces for the whole complex and finds
- 28 this 'anemic' since the residential project is in a central location that is close to services
- 29 and retail establishments where people can travel to and from by bicycle. Such bicycle
- 30 parking accommodations may be acceptable for a restaurant but not for a residential
- 31 facility where many more people may have bicycles. Would like to see more bicycle
- 32 parking for the complex.
- 33

34 **Chair Liden:**

- 35 • Likes concept of green doors.
- 36 • Concerned the color palates talked about may not be distinctive enough and could fade
- 37 overtime and become about the same color. Related to the color board samples, color
- 38 scheme should be distinctive and have contrast.
- 39 • Is of the opinion the storing of bicycles and/or other items on balconies is not visibly
- 40 attractive. Supports having personal storage area available. An alternative to a garage
- 41 would be to have small storage units for tenants to put items such as bicycles.
- 42

43 **Matt Gallaway:**

- 44 • In general, primary site indications are that the existing site is relatively flat. There is a
- 45 rather large drop-off from the sidewalk on the S. Oak Street side to the property and
- 46 explained the drainage plans for this area and use of bio-swales before discharge into
- 47 the City's storm drain system. Some permeable paving may be provided to assist with
- 48 drainage on the site. A final drainage plan will be provided.
- 49 • Confirmed drainage on the site will likely be through the use of bio-swales but other
- 50 methodologies/systems will be looked at in connection with the 'priority list' for
- 51 compliance with the City's adopted LID Technical Design Manual standard. Will likely be
- 52 okay without the mechanical component of diverting the rain water leaders using
- 53 downspouts and gutters but further review is necessary in this regard.

- Is of the opinion there is not a significant increase that needs to be made to change the pitch. The arts and crafts type of design typically has lower sloping rooflines. Understands while presentation is important a composition roof limits how the roofline can be contoured in terms of pitch. A pitch of 3 and 12 feet is as low as the roof can go with a composition roof where the preference is to begin with a pitch as low as 5 and 12 feet.
- It is possible to change the pitch to create more of an interesting roofline pitch.

**Steve Honeycutt:**

- Is fine with adding character to the roofline provided the 'A' look does not conflict with the increased height.
- Related to the 'California gables' asked if the DRB is looking to increase their widths or just increase the pitch of the roof?
- Preference is for the windows to include trim from an aesthetic perspective. Acknowledged the proposed windows are plain.

**Matt Gallaway:**

- Both the pitch of the roof and widths of the California gables would be increased thus increasing the visibility.
- Talked about the two-tone color palate. Would like the body of the building to be a darker color and the trim a lighter color. Referred to item 'E' on the color board and recommended incorporating a trim element around the brick. The color scheme and application thereof, trim, use of brick and window treatment and/or other design articulations should make the building 'pop' and have more character.
- Explained how the color palate would be applied to give contrast.
- Likes a green color for the doors as an accent color. Right now as presented the doors are 'portabella brown.'
- Confirmed the main entry doors are downstairs and are of different colors.
- The applicant is not particularly supportive of the green color for the doors.
- Preference would be a mix of colors for the doors. The site drawings show two different door colors.
- To preserve and enrich color tone for the buildings intent is to use acrylic and/or latex topcoat on the plaster.
- Explained the third color palate sample was actually the original proposed and ended up more 'peachy' than anticipated and this is not the color palate desired.
- Looked at roof colors and also thought about the idea of changing the color scheme from roof to roof and/or from unit to unit. Having the roof the same color would allow for a more integrated/unifying appearance. Preference is the charcoal color for the roof.
- Related to the various color palates being discussed, the preference is to use a two-tone color scheme for the base color with a darker roof color. The color renderings do not produce a true color palate.
- Related to bicycle parking/storage, applicant looked at common and storage areas and the discussion was that if some balconies were provided and/or lower level patios this might allow people to feel more comfortable storing a bicycle or barbecue. It is likely bicycles would be stored inside the residential unit. Has no problem adding a few more bicycle parking spaces.
- Related to the topic of storage areas such as in garages and noted there is not sufficient width on the site to provide for a 'park under approach' for a garage and still be able to maintain the number of units necessary for the project to pencil out financially. The 'park under approach' for a garage is a consideration for other sites the applicant is looking at in Ukiah.

**Steve Honeycutt:**

- 1 • Some of the other potential residential sites being looked at in Ukiah are not as walkable  
2 and/or as well-located as the proposed project site. Would hope that bicycles would be  
3 stored inside the units.
- 4 • Consideration is being given to providing for adequate screening and tree placement.  
5 Acknowledged providing for sufficient landscaping is very important and will be  
6 addressed in the final landscape plans.
- 7 • Related to the issue of street trees, noted the project will eliminate two street trees and  
8 showed the location where replacement alternative(s) species could be planted.  
9

10 There was applicant/DRB discussion about the locations for street trees and/or replacement  
11 locations and appropriate tree species as shown on the site plans.  
12

13 **Chair Liden:**

- 14 • Referred to pages 5 and 6 of the staff report, Site Development Permit findings and  
15 asked if the DRB had any comments.  
16

17 There was DRB discussion concerning lighting accommodations on the site, such as wall  
18 sconces  
19

20 **Matt Gallaway:**

- 21 • The matter of lighting has not been fully worked out. Preference would be to install  
22 lighting that does not have a lot of presence and prefers lighting systems show the effect  
23 of lighting without seeing the visual source of the light. Once a wall sconce is installed, it  
24 establishes the 'vernacular of the architecture.' Preference is down-lit soffit lighting. Will  
25 need to decide on some type of parking lot light fixture/system
- 26 • There are developments credits available for the installation of solar and there has been  
27 discussion about implementing a solar structure along the north side of the site and with  
28 the type of site design and building orientation this can occur.  
29

30 **Shannon Riley:**

- 31 • The City of Ukiah Public Utilities Director may be able to assist with questions about solar  
32 systems and credits earned for installation.  
33

34 **Member Morrow:**

- 35 • Asked about the reason why one roof is higher.  
36

37 **Matt Gallaway:**

- 38 • The roof is higher because the unit is larger such that the roof is wider.  
39

40 **Shannon Riley:**

- 41 • Related to bicycle parking and corresponding accommodations it is her experience as a  
42 business owner in the downtown that even though a sizeable bike rack may be installed  
43 for convenience purposes people tend to park closest to their visibility citing an example.  
44 Recommends the project provide for adequate space to park a bicycle such as the patio  
45 area.  
46

47 **Matt Gallaway:**

- 48 • It may be beneficial to distribute space throughout the site where it may be convenient for  
49 people to park their bicycles.  
50

51 **Steve Honeycutt:**

- 52 • It may be that once drainage for the site has been studied and worked out this could  
53 affect/change the landscaping plans.  
54

1 **DRB consensus:**

- 2 • Related to color palate, preference is higher contrast having a second accent color that
- 3 does not necessarily have to be the green palate that was discussed above.
- 4 • Proposed roof pitch is not a good fit and recommends the architect change the pitch to be
- 5 more architecturally pleasing.
- 6 • Add more bicycle parking.
- 7 • Possibly look at potential storage areas and/or allow for space on the site where people
- 8 can park their bicycles.
- 9 • Is okay with the proposed lighting concept and allow applicant to exercise discretion in
- 10 this regard.
- 11 • Add another street tree to the north side of the site near the entry driveway on Oak
- 12 Street.
- 13 • Preference is darker roof color.
- 14 • Recommends the project move forward in the approval process.

15  
16 **Principal Planner Thompson:**

- 17 • The DRB will have the opportunity to review the formal application and site plans.

18  
19 **7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

20  
21 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

22  
23 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

24 The next regular meeting will be Thursday, August 13, 2015.

25  
26 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

27 The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

28  
29  
30 \_\_\_\_\_  
31 Cathy Elawadly, Transcriptionist