MINUTES

Regular Meeting  July 14, 2016

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Liden called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. in Conference Room #3.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Member Nicholson, Morrow, Chair Liden

Absent: Member Hawkes

Staff Present: Kevin Thompson, Principal Planner
           Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Others present: Bob Theis
               Eric Crane
               Tracy Thieriot
               Ferdinand Thieriot

3. CORRESPONDENCE:

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from the June 2, 2016 meeting are available for review and approval.

M/S Morrow/Nicholson to approve June 2, 2016 minutes, as submitted. Motion carried (3-0).

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. CrossFit Firefly 510 South State Street, APN 003-031-41 (File No.: 1944 SDP-PC):

Review and recommendation to Planning Commission for a Major Site Development Permit for the addition of a second story to an existing single story commercial building, for a total of 9,700 additional square feet at 510 South State Street; for office space, lockers, storage and additional training space.

The DBR members and corresponding meeting attendees introduced themselves.

Principal Planner Thompson:

- Explained the project details/objective of converting the existing building located at 510 S. State Street into a CrossFit studio for fitness purposes.
- The project intent is best explained in the ‘project description’ submitted by applicants, dated July 6, 2016.
- Changes will be made to the building as shown on the site plans in attachment 3 of the staff report that also shows the various elevations, proposed parking, building floor plan, signage and landscaping proposed for the project.
• The staff report addresses the project details, including staff's analysis concerning bicycle
and vehicle parking, landscaping, etc.
• Personal Services and Personal Improvement Facilities require one parking space for
each 350 square feet of gross leasable space. Based on the proposed 9,700 square feet,
28 parking spaces are required and this will include 11 standard parking spaces and one
handicapped parking space. Also, based on the central location of the proposed project
in the Downtown area, the availability of existing street parking and the maximum amount
of 15 CrossFit Firefly members using the studio at one time, the applicant may not be
able to meet the parking requirements where staff is working with the applicants on
possible ways to mitigate the parking. Should the applicants not be able to comply with
the parking requirements, the Planning Commission has the discretion to give relief from
the parking requirements in the C-1 zoning district provided a finding is made there is a
unique circumstance associated with the use or property that results in a demand for less
parking.
• Requests the DRB review and make comments concerning the design aspects of the
project with a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Chair Liden:
• Asked about the changes proposed for the building.

Bob Theis, Project Architect:
• In addition to the existing original building, there is a 15-foot addition that fronts School
Street proposed for removal.
• The building is located on S. State Street and South School Street and because of the
nature of the two streets the ‘feeling’ is to turn the building around such that front of the
building would be on S. School Street rather than S. State Street. Even though the
building will have doors on State Street, the intent is for the building entrance to front
School Street. What would be seen on the School Street façade is a 50-foot addition to
the original building.
• It was determined in order for the gym to have a ‘real’ front door having a presence on
School Street is to install a 16’ x 16’ door on the west elevation that folds up similar to a
hangar door used to house aircraft. The fold-up door would open into a large lobby space
that functions more like a courtyard inviting people inside the building. (see page 1 of
attachment 3)

Chair Liden:
• Requested clarification the 15-foot addition would be removed and the footprint replaced
with a two-story structure.
• Will the existing height of the building remain the same?

Member Morrow:
• Asked if the building will maintain a uniform height, front to back.

Bob Theis:
• Confirmed the building will maintain a uniform height.
• The height of the existing box building will ‘fundamentally’ remain the same. As such, this
allows us to provide for two-stories on the back of the building.
• The construction theme or queue for the building is that of the 1930s that essentially
signifies downtown Ukiah, which is around the same time the Courthouse, schools and
other relevant buildings were constructed. The best way to match the character of
downtown Ukiah is to take our queue from that time period.

Tracy Thieriot, Applicant:
• Provided the DRB with a photograph of how the building and site presently looks including a Google-earth photograph demonstrating the location of the site in correlation/connection with other properties also located in the Downtown area.
• The intent is to tie-in the building from a design perspective with the other buildings in this block in an effort to bring ‘some life’ to this area of town. Acknowledged while there is a certain vibrancy that has been returned to the Downtown, it has a ‘bookend’ on it. The block where the proposed CrossFit gym is located is one of those ‘bookend’ blocks where the intent is to bring more energy to it.

Member Nicholson:
• Asked about what happens to the State Street side of the building that becomes the backdoor?

Bob Theis:
• What will transpire is the storefront façade will be moderately transformed into an office building with high windows as shown in attachment 3. Two doors will remain on the State Street side of the building should the situation on ‘State Street get reversed’ at some point in this area and become more vibrant. The objective is to bring forth some change to the character of the building.

Member Morrow:
• How is cement plaster distinguished from stucco?
• Likes the project and corresponding proposed design improvements.
• Would like to see some sort of gate or archway to give the presence of a courtyard on the School Street side because the building is set so far back from the street.
• While Chinese Pistache is a good choice, there are many on School Street.
• It may be a installing a metal structure on the School Street side of the building that matches with the signage would aesthetically accentuate the courtyard area since the building is so far back from the street.

Tracy Thieriot:
• Cement plaster is the same as stucco and the building will feature this type of plaster.
• Addressed the project and site plans related to compliance with the City parking requirements and noted with regard to the parking lot still intends to install planting wells and apply low impact development (LID) standards where feasible. Supports applying sustainable building concepts as much as possible for the remodel project of the building.

Bob Theis:
• Applicant Tracy Thieriot is a plasterer and as such as an architect has gotten into the habit of distinguishing cement plaster from that of lime or earth plaster.
• The intent is to essentially provide as much greenery as possible including the application of LID principles. (see attachment 3 of the staff report relevant to parking/landscaping).
• Bringing the signage out to the street is a consideration.

Chair Liden:
• Asked about the surface area for the parking lot on the west elevation.

Member Morrow:
• Is there bicycle parking?

Bob Theis:
• Concrete is proposed for the central area so the exercise elements of CrossFit can take place in the parking lot. Asphalt would be used for the parking spaces.
• Confirmed 10 bicycle parking spaces are proposed that would be located inside the gym facility rather than outside.

It was noted the site plans do not show the bicycle parking designation.

Tracy Thieriot:
• The revised site plans show the location of the bike racks inside the CrossFit studio and discussed the proposed location.

Member Nicholson:
• Will the roll-up door be left open during business hours?
• Related to the first floor plans is there a door between the entry/lobby area and the studio?

Ferdinand Thieriot:
• Whether or not the roll-up door will be left open would pretty much be weather dependent.

Tracy Thieriot:
• The preference would be to have the door open so as to allow for an ‘open’ atmosphere.

Principal Planner Thompson:
• Would like to see the plans include a north/south elevation.

Bob Theis:
• With the type of activities CrossFit Firefly offers clients would likely be looking to cool off.
• The entry/lobby area and studio is all one space and referred to the first floor plans in attachment 3 of the staff report.
• Related to the north/south elevation of the existing box-like building there is a minor height differential because of the parapet.

There was DRB/applicant discussion regarding the existing roof materials that is essentially referred to as a combustible ‘torched down’ type of roof where the reroof solution would be to have ‘noncombustible framing/noncombustible roofing’ with no parapet.

Bob Theis:
• The existing building is ‘type 3’ construction, which means noncombustible hardi-walls, and combustible roof construction. In his discussion with the City Building Official it has not been determined whether the improvements/renovation would be under type 3 construction or default to type 5 construction.

Member Nicholson:
• Asked about the side yard setback requirements.
• Related to the State Street façade asked if the door was a single door?

Tracy Thieriot:
• There are no windows on either side wall of the building.

Bob Theis:
• The building is currently designed as two store fronts with two doors. The intent is to maintain the pair of doors that will be recessed so they do not open directly onto the sidewalk. (See attachment 3 of the staff report). The doors will open into one open space rather than two separate areas. The doors and window will have metal frames.
Member Nicholson:
- How does a person understand that State Street is not the primary entrance?

Tracy Thieriot:
- Signage will be provided to direct the public about the location of the primary entrance.
- While the State Street side of the building will be accessible the intent is to encourage/direct people to use the School Street entrance so as not to interrupt programs/workouts in progress. The School Street entrance is where the parking for the facility will be located.

Ferdinand Thieriot:
- A person looking from the door windows on the State Street side can see across the gym facility to the primary entrance on School Street so it will be clear there is another entrance. What we do not want to occur is for people to walk into the CrossFit studio from the State Street side and through the middle of a workout session, which could become a liability issue.

Member Morrow:
- Will the CrossFit studio have a State Street or School Street physical address?

Tracy Thieriot:
- Does not have an answer about the potential address. Right now the address for the building is the current State Street address. It would likely make sense to change the address from the current State Street address to School Street.

Chair Liden:
- Asked about drainage and run-off from the roof and how this matter has been addressed.
- Is pleased to see the building is being refurbished because it has been in need of a makeover for a long time.

Bob Theis:
- Related to drainage the intent is to frame up and install a metal roof over the top of the existing roof having a single slope with a standing seam to a gutter. As such, runoff from the roof would immediately drain into the gutter.

Eric Crane:
- Explained in more detail how drainage would work for the project and how the runoff will slope to the east flow into a gutter and into a drop inlet system.
- Clarified the new roof will not be visible past the existing parapet. The roofline would essentially begin behind the parapet where it will slope to the east such that all runoff will flow into the gutter and into a drop inlet.

Member Nicholson:
- If the runoff slopes to the east what will occur on the north and south sides of the roof?
- Asked if the signage on State Street will be painted?

Tracy Thieriot:
- There will be a blade sign on the east elevation and talked about the logo and sign program for the project.

Bob Theis:
- Regarding the State Street sign no determination has been made about the exact nature of the materials but confirmed the sign will not be painted on the building nor will it be
The sign will be integrated into the stucco in a manner that will be architecturally pleasing having 3-D lettering.

Member Nicholson:
- Related to the signage that will essentially be carved into the plaster asked about the thickness of the stucco, i.e., ¾”?
- Sees the project does not meet the City parking requirements.

Tracy Thieriot:
- The aforementioned stucco will at least have a minimum thickness of 7/8” to accommodate the sign so that it will appear ‘shadowed’ having depth.

Chair Liden:
- Asked about the plans for the landscaping and referred to the landscaping plan in attachment 3.

Tracy Thieriot:
- Referred to the City’s recommended tree list and asked if the applicant can only choose from this particular list.

Member Morrow:
- The list is a suggested tree list.
- Sees while the landscaping plans include many Chinese Pistache, these do tie-in with the current landscaping species found on School Street.

Chair Liden:
- Referred to correspondence received from local citizen, Pinky Kushner, who commented on the project that she would like to see more planting/greenery on the School Street side and noted while some parking spaces would be lost in order to provide for more greenery it would soften the appearance of the site.
- Supports installing as much landscaping as possible that would also help screen unattractive structures on adjacent properties.

Tracy Thieriot:
- Is still working on the parking and landscaping plans for the project.
- While she is not completely certain whether it is necessary to seek relief from the City parking standards, when considering parking accommodations for the project may possibly be looking at a six parking space reduction which is less than originally anticipated when doing the parking calculations.
- As part of parking assessment for the project did conduct a street study and determine there is ample off-street parking in the area.
- It may be necessary in order to ‘soften’ the appearance of the site and provide for trees/vegetation that some of the on-site parking would be lost and therefore, a reduction in parking would be requested.

Member Nicholson:
- Asked about the sidewalk improvements and ADA ramp accessibility on School Street.
- Understands the ramp cannot exceed an 8% slope.
- Requested clarification the ramp will have truncated domes.
- While he has concerns about drainage, it appears the City Public Works department does not think this is a problem. Is not sure where the excess parking lot runoff will drain to. Hopefully it will not drain into the building.
The sidewalk on School Street is relatively narrow so the accessibility ramp across the entrance of the parking lot is being designed to slope in such a way so a disabled person can easily, safely and successfully use it and explained the concept of the design.

Confirmed the ramp will have truncated domes.

Acknowledged there is a creek and City storm drain system located north of the property.

**Member Nicholson:**
- Sees the ground slopes toward the City storm drain system.

**Principal Planner Thompson:**
- The City Public Works department has reviewed the curb cut/ADA accessibility ramp and is okay with the design.

**Eric Crane:**
- Further elaborated on the design of the accessibility ramp and noted the design is not your typical curb cut profile. The plans for the curb cut do not provide for a cross slope so 'a person goes down, across and up the ramp where the parking lot side would be lowered such that the transition was not the typical 'go up to go down' type of scenario. Understands the proposed accessibility ramp for the project does meet the required ADA standards.
- Acknowledged none of the ADA criteria/principles would be disregarded.
- School Street is the high point of the property and the parking lot slopes downward to the east where runoff flows into the drop inlets and on into the creek. All drainage on the School Street frontage will be sufficiently addressed.

**Tracy Thieriot:**
- Provided color samples to the DRB for the building and sign that will feature:
  - Building: Zydeco (window trim), Crown Gold (door/window trim), Duct Tape Grey (stucco);
  - Logo sign on west elevation: Drive-in Cherry, Water Chi, Tuscan Sun.
- The aforementioned color palates are proposed and may not be the final choice.

**Member Nicholson:**
- The proposed color palate is good for 'starters.'
- Would like the applicants to consider other color palates in the event the colors, once applied, may be too intense and not a good fit.
- Making a decision about color schemes is difficult when the samples are just that and not an exact indication where the intent is to make certain the final results are aesthetically pleasing where a change may be necessary.

**Principal Planner Thompson:**
- Once a color palate has been approved by the DRB/Planning Commission and if an applicant wants to make a change the Planning Director can authorize that change as long as the color is in substantial compliance with what was originally approved.

**M/S Nicholson/Morrow** to recommend Planning Commission approve CrossFit Firefly as submitted with possible consideration given to creating a stronger street identity on the School Street side.

**Discussion:**

**Member Morrow:**
- Recommends creating some sort of sidewalk presence that could be in the form of a monument sign mounted in the landscaping or possibly a raised placard.
DRB:
- Applicants can make the determination what sidewalk presence would be appropriate particularly in relationship to the façade and signage on the building as well as the size/scale of the building.
- While not proposing a change to the proposed landscaping the Chinese Pistache is an acceptable tree species but a substitute species could be a consideration from the City’s recommended tree list as approved with discretion by the Planning Department.
- Likes the project.
- Project adds character to the street frontages.
- Allow for some latitude regarding the proposed color palate for the building should a change be necessary.

Eric Crane:
- While creating a stronger street identity is a good idea, people will come to the gym based on the very nature of the business.

Member Nicholson:
- The DRB makes design recommendations for projects for the good of the community.

Motion carried (3-0).

7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:

8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:

9. SET NEXT MEETING
The next regular meeting will be scheduled based on project need.

10. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary