MINUTES

Regular Meeting August 13, 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, Nick Thayer, Alan Nicholson, Howie Hawkes
   Absent: Colin Morrow
   Staff Present: Kevin Thompson, Principal Planner
                 Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner
   Others present: Steve Honeycutt

3. CORRESPONDENCE:

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from the July 9, 2015 meeting are available for review and approval.

M/S Nicholson/Thayer to approve July 9, 2015 minutes, as submitted Member Hawkes abstaining. 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).

Associate Planner Johnson provided the DRB with the following documents:
   - Comments from Member Morrow dated August 13, 2015, incorporated into the minutes as attachment 1.
   - Revised plans dated August 13, 2015, incorporated into the minutes as attachment 2.

Steve Honeycutt, Applicant
   - Acknowledged attachment 1 of the staff report for reference purposes represents the project architect’s response to DRB meeting comments of July 9, 2015.
   - Thanked the DRB for their corroborative efforts concerning the design aspects of the proposed project.
   - Since the last DRB review of the project, applicant has engaged in percolation tests and a geotechnical report/study. The test indicates there is 15 feet of very high type clay, low perk soil. As such, drainage is somewhat compromised in trying to find effective ways to...
manage/contain runoff onsite. With the present soil conditions only some of the storm water runoff can be managed/contained on the site. Something has to give because not all the water can drain into the soil for the interim should there be a significant amount of rain, particularly at one time. Because of the soil conditions, it takes longer for water to drain into the ground on the site.

- Public Works staff and civil engineers Rau and Associates have reviewed the drainage issue where a different approach is being taken to address the situation than originally assessed/evaluated where the intent is to initiate/integrate the right kind of water retention treatment at 100% effectiveness.

- What is presently occurring with regard to water falling on the site and whether it is reaching a pervious surface or not is only going down into the surface 2 to 21/2 feet before reaching mostly an impervious layer. As such came up with a system that relies more on ‘under drains’ that is basically referred to as a ‘manifold system’ for draining at the clay layer. The intent is to drain the site and take water through the soil and through the aggregate cleaning the water up along the way as per the adopted LID Technical Design Manual requirements/guidelines. This methodology has been accomplished. Rau and Associates will submit the formal drainage report shortly.

- The revised landscape plan does not show all that is being done to address drainage on the site.

- Again, water will be captured on the site via an under drainage system using wide permeable gutter pans and valley gutters. After the water has percolated down to the clay layer it will be picked up and moved to storage locations and demonstrated how this works on the drainage plans. The intent is also to slow the water down detain it before it discharges into the City’s storm water drainage system and demonstrated the location on the plans.

- Further explained the drainage system that will feature permeable gutter pans with the curb itself consisting of solid concrete which is what is necessary for durability all in connection with an underground drainage system that helps the site drain properly.

Member Nicholson:
- Asked about the aggregate soil.

Steve Honeycutt:
- Is working with a geotechnical engineer and other professional to formulate soil that will consist of two types, one which will be less permeable for use structurally for the building pads themselves with the other soil being more permeable and includes some of the local red sand that holds 35 to 40% of its weight in water without being ‘crushable’ so as to get adequate compatibility/structural integrity and water retention all at the same time. More importantly is to attain permeability laterally and demonstrated how this works. What is trying to be achieved with regard to the drainage on the site is to have practical functioning processes work with the downspouts that drain into bio-retention swales. The original concept of using bio-swales and maximizing surface vegetation to clean up the water has not changed.

- The subject property sits higher than the Rite Aid property. As such, retaining walls and/or other drainage systems are necessary to keep water on the site and move it into the sumps for collection and showed the location thereof. A storm water leaching system is another component of the drainage system that is used in connection with gutters and downspouts. Sump pumps can be used for discharge into subsoil as an alternative to a piping system that transports storm water to a discharge point.

- Explained when water comes off the downspout it goes into turf grass and into a sump where it is collected/stored before going into the City’s storm drain system. All runoff is treated/cleaned up 100% to rid of sand, suspended solids, and the breaking down of hydro-carbons as they come across and go in the permeable pavements and substructure with the aggregates before it goes into the City’s storm drain system. The end result with regard to the drainage system is both qualitative and quantitative.
functioning. There will be no significant changes in the landscaping except for what was
modified relevant to Member Thayer’s comments as addressed in the applicant’s
response to the DRB comments in attachment 1 of the staff report.

- There was discussion today with staff and civil engineers about landscaping on the site
  relative to the structural soil type and ability to provide for permeable tree wells, etc., and
  showed the specific locations on the site plans. There was also discussion about other
  issues on the site including low areas as shown on the site plans as being a retention
  area and how best to relieve it from excessive runoff particularly with the soil type. The
  civil engineers are looking at specific problem areas with regard to drainage issues and
  soil with some potential plan deviations in order to fine tune the drainage system to make
  certain all system components work interchangeably and are effectively coordinated such
  that the system works/coincides with the landscaping and infrastructure/utilities. Noted
  the site has size limitations where good planning and design is necessary so that
  building, utilities, drainage systems, landscape all coordinate properly and fit on the site.
  - The aesthetic design change from the original plan is the deletion of the pavers where the
    intent is to not let this affect the overall quality of the site. The pavers have been replaced
    with permeable areas and showed the location.
  - The site will have decorative features at the entrances to help define the project and
    showed the location.

Member Nicholson:
- What comprises the permeable material?
- Asked if permeable concrete would be for both the sidewalk and the parking area.

Member Hawkes:
- Related to drainage will there be any pumping required?
- Do you expect the runoff from to be the same after the project is completed as it is now?
- Parking lots have hydro-carbons.

Member Thayer:
- It may be that water simply cannot go into the ground because of soil conditions where
  tree planting does help.
- Acknowledged the proposed drainage plan is a good model for modern site development.
- Requested clarification all the paving that was described as asphalt is now permeable
  concrete.
- Requested clarification as to how the drainage system works with regard to runoff from
  the pavement and vegetative collection and clean-up such that essentially surface water
  is taken off the pavement while receiving water from other site sources into the vegetative
  retention areas.
- Suggests evaluating ‘poured in place’ permeable concrete versus permeable pavers that
  are individually placed because the concrete may need to be cleaned such that this
  becomes an element of maintenance. Not that the paver itself could not become clogged
  with some material on the top it is that the pores are so small in poured in place concrete
  that it has to be vacuumed. This is a problem for parking lots having poured in place
  concrete because it has to be vacuumed to get the pores cleaned.

Steve Honeycutt:
- The permeable material is concrete. What is essentially occurring with regard to drainage
  is the clean-up of the hydro-carbon, leaves, suspended solids, etc., as the water goes
  underneath through the permeable pavement down to the aggregate layer.
- The sidewalks are 5-feet wide so there would be no benefit to having permeable
  sidewalks/pavers because there is ‘permeation’ on both sides of the sidewalk.
- Confirmed no pumping will be required where the hope is with the aggregation process
  and functioning under drains water can be effectively captured, processed, and stored in
the event of ‘second storm.’ Is confident with the measures in place with regard to the
drainage system, as discussed above, should be able to effectively contain the excess
water on site, process it properly with a final discharge into the City’s storm water drain
system. Further discussed how the drainage systems functions and the discharge
locations.

- The intent is to detain the water onsite for as long as possible and have as much possible
‘perk’ in the soil.
- It was estimated when Payless store was in operation there was 95% runoff from the site.
When the building was torn down and being a Type D soil runoff was reduced to 89%. So
89% of the water that currently falls on the site leaves the site. When the proposed
project is complete the percentage of runoff will be much less, cleaner and slowed down.
- Composition roofs release sand residuals with the rainwater runoff over time that has to
be caught out of each downspout via a retention/vegetative swale area before going into
the rest of the system.
- Clarified the project will feature vertical concrete and a permeable valley gutter pan. The
parking area will be asphalt and there are two stamped concrete strips at the entrance.
- Talked about runoff, vegetative collection, retention and clean-up with regard to drainage.
- The problem with permeable pavers is that they have to be removed to do any cleaning.

Member Thayer:
- Related to permeable pavers the whole logic behind segmented pre-cast concrete pavers
of any kind is that they can be removed.
- From a maintenance and cost perspective would recommend pavers taking into
consideration the scale of the project.

Chair Liden:
- Related to drainage, with a project like this would the City require some kind of a
maintenance/inspection schedule to make certain ‘everything is clean’ since many of the
areas will get clogged that may include drainage pipes.

Member Hawkes:
- Is pleased to see the applicant is embracing the permeable soil options.

Member Thayer:
- Under new State regulations developers can no longer continue to do development
without compliance with State drainage regulations as it pertains to the City’s recently

Steve Honeycutt:
- Preference would be the concrete because the hope is the project will feature larger boyd
ready-mix concrete.
- Pavers will be incorporated to slow water runoff.
- No maintenance schedule is required. Related to sediments from the roof, etc., would be
pretty well ‘cleaned out’ before it reaches the drainage pipes because the sediment has
to go through soil matrix of vegetation and aggregate before it reaches the drainage
pipes so sediments would have been flushed out.
- Regular maintenance should not be an issue because Gullion, Inc. intends to continue to
own and maintain the property into the future. Maintenance and operation is not
something Gullion, Inc. takes lightly.
- There are machines that can perform maintenance specific to drainage systems.

Assistant Planner Johnson:
- Will check with Public Works about maintenance/inspection requirements in association
with the building permit relative to the drainage system that is costly to install where the
intent is to have it function properly for years to come. Another approach would be to research other areas/cities to see what they do concerning maintenance since drainage has now become a 'spot-on' issue for projects.

Member Thayer:
- Related to maintenance/inspection of drainage systems, there are performance guarantees that are generally held with a bond where someone has to do the inspections.
- Acknowledged the proposed drainage system for the project is collectively better than any standard development idea.

Chair Liden:
- Supports having a maintenance schedule in place.
- His concern related to the drainage system is not so much quality but rather quantity such that the system continues to function well into the future.

Steve Honeycutt:
- What would be relatively easy to measure is water quality at the outlet. Other than this, it would be difficult to look at underground functions.
- Related to quantity and quality, the site is currently clogged where the objective is to clean it up and slow down the water runoff.

Member Thayer:
- It is difficult to know the life span of the material that will be used for the drainage system where the only thing to do is to vacuum and do regular maintenance to surface areas.

Steve Honeycutt:
- Has always been skeptical of pervious concrete. There is always going to be a clogging issue related to dust and breakdown of leaves, etc.

Chair Liden:
- Clogging can also occur in the perforated piping.

Steve Honeycutt:
- It is best to think in terms of a leach line and all of the suspended solids the drainage system will deal with. If the system is treated properly, it will continue to function. The project will have less and much cleaner water as a result of the proposed drainage system designed for the site.
- The design objective was not to sacrifice the aesthetics of the pavers, but rather to formulate better treatment and retention.

Chair Liden:
- Asked if the DRB had questions regarding the project architect’s comments as provided for in attachment 1 of the staff report.

Member Nicholson:
- Asked about the proposed color scheme and contrast intent.
- What is the intent of the sidewalk area (corner area) at the intersection of Gobbi Street and Oak Street.

Member Thayer:
- Recommends planting Regal Mist Pink Nuhly in the corner.
- Likes that the roof pitch increased.
- Acknowledged there is Chinese Pstache along S. Oak Street.
- Is fine with the tree planting list.
• Asked if there are trees in the intervening space between the property line and the parking lot.
• Would like trees in the parking lot if this could happen.
• Related to bio-infiltration sod mix that is a blend of different sod as selected on the landscape plans the practical reality is one-half of those species will die. As such, recommends an alternative species native to the northern hemisphere that can be drought tolerant and more of a mow-free blend of sod for use as a bio-infiltration material. This material is simply rolled out and gets established quickly and no weeding is required.
• The concern is if this material is in between the median strips for the parking area it is going to get stepped on so best to use low species type that are mow free. This species should not be the native version and named the ‘Fesque’ types associated with this version. Taller species are available. The intent would be for the material to look like a ‘parkway.’ Fesque types should be more heat and drought tolerant and would not need the same level of care because the sod is intended for a parkway and/or indentation strips. Likes bio-infiltration sod and Delta Blue Grass that has a mow-free product and can be native or non-native. Showed the location on the site plans where this non-native blend of Fesques would work best. The cost is approximately $.42 a square foot. Is of the opinion the aforementioned sod would perform better than what is proposed for the median strips.
• Noted the Crape Myrtle that is defined on the eastern boundary is pretty much located near the water collection box and suggested another place on the site. Sees that other Crape Myrtle bushes are proposed in other locations.

Chair Liden:
• Likes the proposed color scheme.
• The roof height proportionately fits well within the contours of other roofs in the neighborhood and the western hills.
• Asked about the storage facilities on the site. People need adequate space to store things/belongings. Storing items on balconies is not aesthetically pleasing.
• Very important for projects to provide for adequate storage facilities onsite.

Member Nicholson:
• Previously talked about relocating a tree on the site and referred to the location on S. Oak Street. Asked about whether or not relocation is a possibility.
• Requested clarification the sidewalks will be regular concrete.
• Asked if the Planning Department is pleased with the proposed project?

Steve Honeycutt:
• The units will feature multiple door colors.
• Referred to the color samples and talked about the base and trim color scheme that works well with a dark roof. There are three color palates on the accent walls.
• The corner area can be irrigated where the preference is to plant drought tolerant vegetation.
• Related to the building aesthetics, roof pitch increased to a 7 and 12-foot pitch. The higher pitch will provide for better ventilation for the upstairs residential units.
• At the recommendation of DRB made the roof a darker color.
• Because the site is constrained with underground electrical/storm drain systems it is not possible to plant another tree for the project and showed the location where one would be feasible.
• Confirmed there will be no trees in the intervening space between the property line and the parking lot. This area contains mostly shrubs with mulch.
• Confirmed there is one existing street tree at each entry on Gobbi Street and Oak Street. There was discussion about adding another street tree and showed the location but it is
not possible due to utility/storm drain systems. Confirmed one tree will be removed and showed the location.

- Is of the opinion the soil mixes that will be put on the site will help enhance the growth and sustainability of the landscaping.
- Confirmed the only changes to the proposed project from the DRB’s previous review of the project are the response to the DRB comments and the matter of the pavers. The intent is to make good use of each area of land and cited examples thereof.
- Identified the location of the gutter pans where reference is typically given to curb, sidewalk and gutter pan that actually carries the water. The gutter pan in this case is the permeable concrete.
- Looked into doing more mini-storage projects in the community and noted Ukiah has many mini-storage facilities.
- The stairwells can be used for storage purposes as well as closets etc. There is not sufficient space on the site to provide for mini-storage facilities.

There was more discussion concerning the color palate and brick material, parking lot and what the best approach would be in terms of landscaping for the ‘corner area.’

**Principal Planner Thompson:**

- Is fine with the progress being made, particularly with regard to the proposed solution to the drainage issue on the site.

There was discussion regarding the perimeter fencing.

**Member Nicholson** summarized the DRB’s project comments/recommendations:

- Likes the project.
- DRB has added landscape specifications material for the corner area.
- Appears bio-retention is being sufficiently addressed such that water retention on the site should not be problematic.
- The color schemes for the buildings are fine.
- Gladding brick is acceptable.
- Proposed parking layout is acceptable.
- The revised changes to the site plans are fine.
- Related to the site plans, the delineation between the private versus public parking is a nice addition.
- Related to comments from Member Thayer pertinent to the landscaping could be some potential conflicts with the bio-retention swales in the initial landscaping plan with the hope the property owner will consider the comments.

**M/S Nicholson/Thayer** to recommend Planning Commission approval concerning the design aspects of the proposed Gobbi Street Complex located at 680 South State Street as discussed above.

**Discussion:**

**Steve Honeycutt:**

- The intent is to coordinate between the recently developed LID Technical Manual standards by moving plants/vegetation around as appropriate while maintaining the initial landscape concept.

Motion carried 4-0.

7. **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**

8. **MATTERS FROM STAFF:**
9. SET NEXT MEETING
The next regular meeting will be Thursday, September 10, 2015.

10. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

______________________________
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
I have had something pop up that is going to prevent me from making it to this meeting. Overall, I am supportive and am pleased with the applicant's effort to address our concerns. I am glad to see the fleshing out of storage for the units. The only new concern I might have is with the question of how the project might effect the view of the hillside when one looks west from State St. If it is blocked by the rite aid there is no issue, but if it rises significantly above, that would effect that view.

Sorry to have to miss this meeting.

Colin

On 8/7/2015 4:24 PM, Michelle Johnson wrote:

Good afternoon,

This is a reminder of the Design Review Board Meeting Thursday August 13th at 3:00 p.m.; Conference Room 3, at the City of Ukiah Civic Center. If you are unable to attend please let me know as soon as possible. The packets went out in the mail today Friday August 7th; however I have attached a copy of the Staff Report for your convenience. Please let me know if you do not receive your packet by Tuesday August 11th.

Have a great weekend.

-Michelle

Michelle Johnson
Assistant Planner
City of Ukiah
Planning and Community Development Department
300 Seminary Avenue, Ukiah, CA 95482
(707) 463-6206
www.cityofukiah.com

--

Colin Morrow
The Law Office of Colin Morrow
308 S. School St., Ste. J
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Fax: 707-234-8025
Email: colin@morrowlegal.com
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