



City of Ukiah, CA

Design Review Board

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

September 18, 2014

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Hise called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. in Conference Room #3.

2. **ROLL CALL Present:** Chair Tom Hise, Vice Chair Tom Liden, Howie Hawkes, Alan Nicholson

Absent: Nick Thayer

Staff Present: Kim Jordan, Principal Planner
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
Shannon Riley

Others present: Mark Mountanos
Linda Mountanos

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:** None

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from June 12, 2014 meeting are included for review and approval.

M/S Liden/Hise approved minutes from June 12, 2014 meeting, as submitted. Motion carried by all AYE voice vote of the members present (4-0).

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

6. **NEW BUSINESS:**

6A. **Mountanos Planned Development Rezoning and New Precise Development Plan, 334 North Main Street (File No: 13-28):** Review and recommendation to Planning Commission and City Council on a Precise Development Plan to allow the development of one duplex on the vacant lot at 334 North Main Street, APN 002-186-02. Each duplex unit would be 550 square feet with one-bedroom, one-bath and great room. The living space would be located above the garage. Access to the garages would be provided from the alley located on the north side of the parcel. The Project requires City Council approval of a Rezoning to Planned Development and Precise Development Plan.

Mark Mountanos, applicant/property owner gave an overview of the proposed Project:

- Construct a duplex similar to another housing project on Main Street except for the roofline.
- Each duplex unit would be 550 square feet with one-bedroom, one bath and great room located above a two-car garage.
- While the subject lot is small the proposed residential development fits well.
- The Project will include landscaping, street trees and fencing.
- All plants and trees will be irrigated through an automatic drip system with timers.
- All Mountanos properties are effectively maintained/managed on a weekly basis related to landscaping and/or other associated issues with management/maintenance.

- 1 • Trash/recycling containers will be stored in the garages.
- 2 • A dividing fence will be included in the rear of the property between the two units for
- 3 privacy. Each unit may have a picnic table in their back area.
- 4 • The property is setback from the street.
- 5 • Access would be through an existing alleyway that leads to the two-car garages.
- 6 • While the development only requires one parking space per one bedroom, two parking
- 7 spaces will be provided in the garage.
- 8 • No guest parking is proposed on the site and is not required. Allowing for guest parking is
- 9 an option, but some of the landscaping would have to be eliminated on the north side of
- 10 the building to be able to make this accommodation.
- 11 • The original intent was that access to the site comes from Main Street. Understands
- 12 access from the alleyway that some improvements will have to be made. The alleyway is
- 13 essentially a driveway that requires no curb, gutter improvements. A utility pole exists at
- 14 the entrance of the driveway.
- 15 • The alley is a City-owned and is a two-way from State to Main Street.

16
17 **Principal Planner Jordan:**

- 18 • The application includes a zoning ordinance amendment to modify requirements for
- 19 rezoning to Planned Development (PD). A PD is required for this project because the lot
- 20 is less than the 6,000 sq. ft. minimum required in the C1 zoning district.
- 21 • Parcels less than ½ acre in size cannot be rezoned to PD unless the parcel complies with
- 22 specific requirements including being located in the Downtown Master Plan area as
- 23 shown in figure V1.2-KK of the Ukiah General Plan in attachment 2 of the staff report.
- 24 The Project is not located in the Downtown Master Plan area as shown in figure V1.2-KK,
- 25 but rather is located in the Downtown Master Plan area as shown in Figure 1 of the
- 26 Downtown Master Plan in attachment 2 of the staff report. As such, the application
- 27 includes an amendment to the zoning ordinance to refer to the Downtown Master Plan
- 28 area as shown in Figure 1.
- 29 • A Precise Development Plan is required as part of a proposed PD and City code requires
- 30 all Precise Development Plans be reviewed by the DRB. Applicants wanting to rezone to
- 31 PD must either provide a Conceptual Plan or a Precise Development Plan. The DRB
- 32 would make a recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council concerning
- 33 the proposed Precise Development Plan associated with the proposed PD rezoning.
- 34 Planning Commission and City Council will consider the DRB recommendation.
- 35 • The Public Works Department has specifically requested access to the site come from
- 36 the alleyway rather than from Main Street.
- 37 • Staff requests the DRB review and make comments concerning the Precise Development
- 38 Plan just like what is done for a site development permit i.e., design of the building, site
- 39 layout and make a recommendation.
- 40 • Provided samples of the color palate and type of siding that will be used on the building.

41
42 **DRB questions:**

- 43 • Requested clarification about the location of another residential project the applicant
- 44 developed in the area and noted it to be architecturally pleasing.
- 45 • Asked about the window type and color.
- 46 • Asked about the exterior materials.
- 47 • Asked if the security gates in the front will be metal?

48
49 **Mark Mountanos:**

- 50 • Confirmed the location of another development in the vicinity of the proposed Project.
- 51 • The windows are sliders, made of vinyl and white to match the doors.
- 52 • The siding is horizontal 'LAP siding' that will be painted but is unsure about the type of
- 53 material. It could be untreated cedar, pine. Provided a painted sample of the material.

- 1 • Confirmed the front gates leading upstairs will be metal and open so they can be seen
2 through.
3

4 **Member Nicholson:**

- 5 • Likes the Project design; Project fits well on the site, would be an appropriate addition to
6 the neighborhood that is currently underdeveloped and a good use for the purpose of the
7 Planned Development zoning designation with a Precise Development Plan. As such,
8 highly recommends the Planning Commission approve the proposed rezone.
9 • Applicant consistently designs high quality residential units that work and fit well in the
10 community and in neighborhoods.
11 • A very good use of the land. Likes the density which could be even greater.
12 • Good that there is landscaping at the front of the site.
13 • This unit type has been used for other projects in the City and years have been spent
14 perfecting this unit type.
15

16 There was DRB and applicant discussion concerning other development design options that
17 would work on the site.
18

19 **Member Hawkes:**

- 20 • Is there sufficient room to back out of the garage and how this works?
21 • Asked why 4-feet of 'CMU' is being used for the garage, whether this was for aesthetic
22 purposes, and why there are openings in the garage. Is this to prevent damage from
23 drivers who may hit the garage?
24

25 **Mark Mountanos:**

- 26 • Project provides 25 backup feet where only 24 backup feet is required and further
27 explained egress and ingress concerning site access.
28 • Tenants are required to park in their garage so as not to impede traffic circulation on the
29 site, allowing people to enter and exit the site safely.
30 • Clarified the reason for the CMU concrete block is that the site is in a Flood Zone and
31 explained where this occurs and how this designation affects his proposed Project.
32 • Noted there is just one portion of the proposed building that is in the Flood Zone.
33

34 **Member Liden:**

- 35 • Likes the proposed Project design concept as well as the fact the alleyway would be used
36 for access purposes.
37 • Development would complement and improve Main Street.
38 • The parcel has been vacant for a long time and the proposed development would block
39 the unattractive building located to the rear of the site.
40

41 **Chair Hise:**

- 42 • Related to building aesthetics, recommends using 'Colonial' panel design for the garage
43 door which could make the two units look more like two separate homes.
44 • The garage doors shown "squish down" the look of the elevation.
45 • As designed, the garage doors are the most prominent feature on the front elevation so it
46 is important they are attractive.
47

48 **Mark Mountanos:**

- 49 • Would be fine with the aforementioned recommendation concerning the garage door
50 and/or possibly upgrade to another garage door type such as wood.
51

52 There was DRB and applicant discussion concerning a possible mistake on the Flood Map that
53 shows parts of Main Street located in the Flood Zone and the process of getting FEMA to make a
54 change to the Map.

1 **M/S Nicholson/Hise** to recommend Planning Commission and City Council approve the
2 proposed Precise Development Plan associated with the proposed Rezoning to Planned
3 Development and requested the applicant considers the design comments made above. Motion
4 carried (4-0).
5

6 **7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:**
7

8 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:** Advised there are three projects that require DRB
9 consideration at the October 9 meeting that may take longer than two hours to review.

10
11 After discussion concerning the content of the proposed projects requiring review, DRB is of the
12 opinion two hours should be sufficient time to review them and would not need to meet at an
13 earlier time.
14

15 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

16 The next regular meeting will be Thursday, October 9, 2014.
17

18 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

19 The meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.
20
21

22 _____
23 Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary