



City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

MINUTES

1
2
3 **Regular Meeting**

July 11, 2013

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

6 **1. CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chair Liden** called the Design Review Board meeting to order
7 at 3:02 p.m.

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

18 **3. CORRESPONDENCE:** None

19
20 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the June 13, 2013 meeting are included
21 for review and approval.

22
23 **DRB** made the following corrections to the June 13, 2013 minutes:

24
25 Page 8, DRB Consensus, add: 'Agrees with applicant's recommendation to use hardi-board with
26 4 inch exposure.'

27
28 **M/S Hawks/Thayer** to approve June 13, 2013 minutes, as amended. Motion carried (4-0).

29
30 **5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

31
32 **6. NEW BUSINESS:**

33 **6C. Feibusch Building.** (File No. 13-16 SDP-PC) Review and recommendation to Planning
34 Commission on request for Site Development Permit and Major Exception to make
35 exterior modifications to 199 South School Street, APN 002-226-07.
36

37 Staff gave a staff report.

38
39 The DRB reviewed the Project description provided for in the staff report and that of applicant in
40 his letter dated July 3, 2013 as well as the site plans and made the following comments
41 recommendations and conditions of approval for the Project:
42

- 43 • Project would be a good addition to Church Street.
- 44 • Project would create a more pedestrian-oriented façade.
- 45 • As designed, the size of the upper windows compared with the bottom windows, makes
46 the building look top-heavy. Recommends modifying the size of the window openings to
47 be weighted to the lower floor. This could be done by increasing the size of the window
48 openings on the lower floor, decreasing the size of the openings on the upper floor,
49 and/or modifying the weight of the lintils/sills.
- 50 • Referred to the site plans and made recommendations about maintaining the keystone
51 design as well as recommendations about the lintel types.

- 1 • Recommends stucco over precast stone for the sill rather than stucco over foam which
2 looks “cheap/tacky” (used downtown Windsor as an example).
- 3 • Consider providing a stucco reveal between the windows in the location of the proposed
4 signage. Unclear from the plans if this is what is proposed here.
- 5 • Okay with the awning design, color, and material.
- 6 • The project would result in the removal tree/shrub in order to install the new entry. Okay
7 with the removal of the tree/shrub.
- 8 • Recommends planting street trees on Church Street which could help with energy
9 conservation. If this is not required of the Project, consider a partnership whereby Releaf
10 may be able to provide the trees which would be installed and maintained by the
11 applicant.
- 12 • Look into signage placement to better enhance the building aesthetically.
- 13 • Construction of the Project will result in damage/removal of much of the existing
14 landscaping. Recommends a condition of approval be applied to the Project requiring the
15 replacement of damaged/removed landscaping.
- 16 • Windows on the ground floor should be required to have clear glazing, especially if this is
17 to be a retail space. The upper floor could have tinted glazing.

18
19 Staff noted clear glazing of the ground floor windows is required in the DZC.

20
21 **Kevin Brogan** will consider:

- 22 • Slightly modifying the size of the windows so that the windows do not look ‘top heavy’
23 and provide for more of pronounced/stout building appearance.
- 24 • Revisit site design with possible changes to lintel types and materials and type of glass.
25 Will consider maintaining keystone architecture.

26
27 **M/S Nicholson/Hawkes** to recommend Planning Commission approval of the Project with
28 conditions requiring the replacement of any damaged/removed landscaping and clear glazing of
29 the ground floor windows as required by the DZC.

30
31 **6A. Shell Office Addition.** (File No. 13-14 SDP-ZA) Review and recommendation to Zoning
32 Administrator on request for Minor Site Development Permit to allow a 376 square foot
33 addition to existing commercial property located at 206 South Oak Street,
34 APN 003-014-05.

35
36 **Staff:** Gave a staff report.

37
38 **DRB comments:**

- 39 • Is highly supportive of the property owner making improvements to and investing in the
40 property and with the plans to make it ADA accessible.
- 41 • The building is small and simple. The modifications overwhelm the building and are too
42 eclectic.
- 43 • As designed, the Project lacks the appropriate scale and proportion, includes too many
44 design styles and materials.
- 45 • The Project should include consistent design, materials, and details throughout – new
46 building and modifications to the existing building.
- 47 • As an example of the number of materials, the existing section of the building includes
48 brick, tile, stucco, wood, unidentified material for the rounded pillar, and downspout.
- 49 • As an example of the design styles, the existing building is a simple mid-century
50 contractor builder constructed building, constructed using simple materials, simple design
51 style, and exhibiting clean uncomplicated lines.
- 52 • The Project includes three different roof lines: hip roof for the new building, parapet and
53 shed roof with parapet for the south portion of the existing building, and retention of the
54 flat roof for the north section of the existing building. Roof style needs to be consistent
55 throughout to make the design cohesive.

- 1 • Questioned if the proposed parapet on the existing building was being proposed to meet
- 2 a building code requirements.
- 3 • The Project includes different types of windows and trim. The window styles and trim
- 4 treatment should be consistent throughout the new building and the modifications made
- 5 to the existing building.
- 6 • If the Project is to be a Mediterranean design, the Project needs to fully commit to that
- 7 design for the new building and the modifications to the existing. The sample material for
- 8 the roof is not appropriate for a Mediterranean style building and should be clay; the
- 9 wood trim and pillar should be removed.
- 10 • As an alternative, the Project could retain the existing simple mid-century modern design
- 11 for the new building and the modifications to the existing building. This could include
- 12 creating an addition on the north side of the property that would create a “U” shaped
- 13 courtyard; an addition with a roof for the existing and new building over all of the
- 14 courtyard that ties the buildings together. In this case, the existing materials would be
- 15 used for the new building and could be upgraded in a manner consistent with the existing
- 16 building and mid-century modern design.
- 17 • The Project as designed is not consistent with other buildings in the area, does not reflect
- 18 a design known to Ukiah, and is not internally consistent.
- 19 • Project should include a landscaping plan.
- 20 • Unable to support the Project as designed based on the above.

21
22 **M/S Thayer/Hawkes** to recommend the Zoning Administrator deny the Project as designed.
23 Motion carried (4-0).

24
25 **DRB** provided the following recommendations should the Zoning Administrator be in a position to
26 approve the Project:

- 27 • If the owner prefers a Mediterranean design, the Project be designed to use this style
- 28 throughout for the new building and the modifications to the existing building. This would
- 29 include: consistent roof lines, materials, window and trim styles, exterior building finishes,
- 30 and appropriate scale and proportion.
- 31 • If the owner prefers to continue the simple modern style of the existing building, the
- 32 Project be designed to use this style for the new building and the modifications to the
- 33 existing building. This would include: consistent roof lines, materials, window and trim
- 34 styles and materials, exterior building finishes, and appropriate scale and proportion.

35
36 **6B. Orchard Plaza Sign Program Amendment.** File No. 13-12 SDP-ZA). Review and
37 recommendation to zoning Administrator on request for Minor Site Development Permit
38 to allow an amendment to the Orchard Plaza Sign Program.

39
40 **Staff** gave a staff report.

41
42 **DRB** considered the site plans and project description submitted by the applicant and made the
43 following Project comments and recommendations:

44
45 Sign 1 Legalization of one unpermitted 4-foot by 4-foot freestanding sign located within
46 the parking lot between Stars and CVS (shown as # 16 on the site plan).

47
48 Recommended denial of the legalization because the size and location of the
49 sign is a hazard to the vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the parking lot
50 and the site and use already have adequate signage.

51
52 Sign 2 Legalization of one unpermitted 3-foot x 10-foot sign on north elevation of the
53 former location of Sears (shown as # 1 on the site plan).

1 Recommended approval of this sign with the condition that the sign can only be
2 used by the tenant that occupies that space. The DRB recommended approval of
3 this sign rather than having the sign box be painted to match the roof.
4

5 Sign 3 Abandonment of the existing Stars Restaurant sign located on the north elevation
6 of the Stars building (shown as # 19 on the site plan).
7

8 Recommended approval of the abandonment of this sign only if the sign structure
9 is removed and the roof is repaired to match the existing roof. If the sign box
10 cannot be removed and the roof repaired to match the existing roof cannot be
11 done then the DRB is not supportive of this sign.
12

13 Sign 4 Approval of one new 4-foot X 10-foot LED sign on the north elevation of Stars
14 Restaurant facing Chevron (shown as # 17 on site plan).
15

16 The DRB recommended denial of this sign based on the following:
17

- 18 • The design is out of character with the existing signs for this use and the
19 Orchard Plaza.
- 20 • The center and the restaurant already have adequate signage.
- 21 • The rotating of the words and visual messages is visually distracting and
22 detracts from the character of Orchard Avenue (a major city thoroughfare)
23 and the shopping center.
- 24 • Depending on the frequency and number of text and visual images, the sign
25 could be a hazard and distraction to motorists.
- 26 • Recommends denial because the LED sign would add visual clutter to the
27 building and site since the building and site already have numerous signs. If
28 the Zoning Administrator is in the position to approve the new LED sign,
29 recommends that the sign be static for at least five minutes and only display
30 words not pictures.
- 31 • If the Zoning Administrator is in the position to approve the new LED sign
32 recommends that one of the existing Stars signs be removed in the effort to
33 reduce visual clutter on the building.
34

35 **M/S Nicholson/Hawkes** to recommend denial of the LED sign with a condition that if the Zoning
36 Administration is in a position to approve the LED sign one of the existing Stars sign be removed
37 to reduce visual clutter on the building and with recommendations to the Zoning Administrator
38 regarding the other relevant signs as referenced above. Motion carried (4-0).
39

40 **7. OLD BUSINESS**

41
42 **8. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

43
44 **9. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

45
46 **10. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

47 The next meeting will be Thursday, August 8, 2013. The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.
48
49

50 _____
51 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary