MINUTES

Regular Meeting
November 13, 2014

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

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

2. ROLL CALL
Present: Vice Chair Tom Liden, Nick Thayer, Howie Hawkes, Alan Nicholson

Absent: Chair Tom Hise,

Staff Present: Kim Jordan, Principal Planner
Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Others present: Ann Baker
Sherrie Smith-Ferri

3. CORRESPONDENCE:

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from October 9, 2014 meeting are included for review and approval.

M/S Hawkes/Nicholson approved minutes from October 9, 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. Grace Hudson Nature Education Project Site Development Permit, 531 South Main Street (File No.: 569): Review and recommendation to Planning Commission on a Site Development Permit for the Grace Hudson Nature Education Project, 531 South Main Street, APNs 002-281-26 and 002-281-31.

Ann Baker, Landscape Architect referred to the site plans for the construction of the Grace Hudson Museum Nature Education Project and presented the Project:

- The Museum site improvements are designated according to area:
  - Area 1 pertains to wild garden and everything except trees & garage.
  - Area 2 is the Pomo Plants Courtyard to include entrance paths, boardwalk, kiosk interpretive signage, pergolas, entry gate, wood and wrought iron fencing and outdoor materials prep area.
  - Area 3 is the entryway and parking lot to include high albedo paving, solar panel shade structure, stormwater garden, bioswales, landscaping and irrigation, entry path from Main Street and entry sign for Cultural Center.
  - Area 4 pertains to Sun House landscape and security fence and gates.
- Sheet 0.1 shows the entire museum campus that was gifted to the City for the purposes of a museum giving particular attention to the Project elements as shown on the site plans that include: entry court, community courtyard, waterworld, salmon run (See sheet WF.03, Salmon Run Plan), graywater garden, pedestrian connection, parking lot,
perimeter fencing, various garden and waterworks areas (see sheet WF.01, water feature site plan), swale/wet meadow area, classroom area that will host educational workshops/seminars/programs and other elements listed on the ‘Major Site Elements’ of the site plans. Explained the classroom area is considered to be one of the more progressive structures in that it has a butterfly roof and incorporates a strict graywater landscape concerning drainage on the site as well as other aesthetically pleasing features.

- Gave a project description and talked more about the ‘major site elements’ for the Project as shown on site plan sheets 0.1 & 0.2 as they relate to drainage and the City stormwater system, parking and/or other infrastructure/site improvements and features.
- Sheet 0.3 specifically outlines the Museum Nature Education Project components and location thereof.
- Recommended review of sheet L6.00 that represents a 3D view of the site for purposes of better understanding of the project components.
- Explained the managing consideration given the existing large Valley Oak tree on the site that is in decline. There will be exhibits about the Oak tree that include information/art exhibits/sculptures and about animals and birds that use oak trees.
- There will be exhibits about grasses, Chaparrel plant community, and fire exhibit area and showed the location.
- The Brush Arbor area will be used for events and explained the design and materials being used and noted this area overlaps onto mobile native sod area that can seat up to 200 people for larger events/seasonal festivals around harvest times. There will be exhibits inside the area about the ‘cultural values and sustainability/the sharing of resources’ in terms of harvesting such that the seating is more than is necessary. This area can be thought of as more of a cultural space.
- Talked other areas that will be used for exhibits that talk about the Ukiah Valley and subsequent changes that have occurred over time.
- Talked about the ‘basket circle’ area and significance thereof that will include a famous mosaic done by a local artist.
- Garden areas will provide information about the vegetation and corresponding animal habitats.
- Explained about the ‘artistic gallery and/or sculpture gallery and function that will include sculptures as featured in ‘Pomo stories’ and associated artifacts/artistic elements.
- Consideration was given as to how best to protect the exhibit areas and Sun House Museum from potential vandalism and/or other negative activities and referred to the fencing for the site.
- Provided a material/colors sample board and explained the use/design and significance thereof for the Project. (See sheet MS1.01)
- Related to the illustration for the wall and fencing as provided for on sheet L7.04 where the intent is to have very permeable sections around the Sun House and referred to sheet L7.05 to illustrate the design concept. Explained how the fencing would work with/embrace the existing historic split rail fence that is located in front of the Museum. The fence details are shown on sheet L7.06. There is a taller cable wire fence behind the pedestrian connection/split rail fence. The intent is to make the security fence as invisible as possible. Did not want to put anything in front of the Sun House where the concern is vandalism and/or the attraction/taking over by undesirable/transient persons frequenting the area like what happened to the Museum park.
- Sheets L7.01 through L7.03 show the landscape details and plantings. Sheet D1.02 represents the existing tree list.
- Sheet A2.02 represents the garden entry and conference room plans.

DRB:
- Asked about the museum and connection to the community garden area in terms of access.
Member Hawkes:

- What is the intent of a Brush Arbor?

Sherri Smith-Ferri:

- Related to the museum property, development of the Stormwater Garden is to essentially address drainage which concerns the land behind the parking lot fence and is where the community garden is currently located. Access to the community garden comes from Cleveland Lane. People do not go through the museum property to access this garden.

Ann Baker:

- The Brush Arbor is a particular kind of structure that essentially consists of poles and very similar to a ‘round house’ in shape only not as permanent (sheet A2.01, Brush Arbor & Outdoor Shelter plans). The brush arbor is what provides shade and resembles a ‘ramada’ with open sides such that in the summer provides a cool area. The ‘brush’ component will actually feature a cloth fabric. The arbor will not have any plant/vegetation growing on it. The concept is best displayed on sheet L6.00. The permeable cable wire fencing coming around the Sun House can be seen on this drawing. Behind the Brush Arbor a section turns into part of the watershed block which gives way to the cable wire fencing in the garden area. The intent is to make certain people can believe they are in a natural space even though there may be other uses and activities occurring in the area and a diversity concepts also occurring in the surrounding neighborhood that compete with the natural environment. The Project was intended to create an environment having an interest and promotes ‘quiet.’ Would like to see the park area that has for years been neglected nicely developed and highly complementary to the other uses on the site.
- Referred to sheet L7.04 and explained the two indentations in the wall section accompanying the street trees that are out on the street. The street trees will not be planted at the curb but rather next to the wall that will allow access to the greater swale/wet meadow area behind.
- The fence/wall concept is an opportunity to include a story by putting including a basketry pattern on the wall which is repetitive (sheet SI1.01 and SI1.02, signage & perimeter fencing graphics). Would like to propose a new sign at the corner of the driveway as well as a sign for the Sun House. Would like to have permanent signs that announce the exhibits. The Museum changes exhibits approximately quarterly.
- The focus was how to effectively work the new fence and gates with the split rail fence that is not in the best condition. The Project objective is to strike a balance with what is existing in terms of structures and landscaping and what is being proposed as part of the grant project and to have them harmonize nicely.
- Talked about the lighting concepts (sheet E2.01 lighting plans). Is required to light the ADA path of travel in the parking lot to comply with Title 24 regulations. LED motion detection high efficiency lights will be used.
- Sheet A2.01 includes the Brush Arbor & outdoor shelter floor plans; A2.02 includes the garden entry & conference plans; A2.03 includes the Museum & public room floor plan. Exterior elevations for some of the other components are also included in the plans.

Member Liden:

- Asked about alternative options on how to best utilize space.
- Asked pedestrian walkways/trails.
- Asked if the resident unit on the property adjacent to Museum will go away with the new senior housing project?
- Would the meeting room size be reduced?
- Asked about the space behind the Museum offices and whether this would be made more accessible to the public or will it be retained as a ‘private space’ for staff purposes?
- The working circuit on the campus to get from one element and/or area to another is a loop scenario?
Member Thayer:

- Related to effective use of space noted the historic landscaping designation and corresponding components connected to the Sun House cannot be altered and must remain consistent with the architecture even if this is not the best use of space.
- Acknowledged the intent is to construct a fence to protect the Sun House and Museum.
- Asked about the restroom configurations that changed the entrance experience at the drive-court. Requested clarification regarding the intent of side-courtyard next to the community room and noted this area to also be fenced.
- Referred to L6.00 and asked about the ‘bump-outs’ on the back side of the fence in the conference room area.
- Asked about access and pedestrian connection on the Museum campus.
- Asked if there were plans to purchase land that may be available behind the Museum property.

Ann Baker:

- Any landscaping/design features added to the Sun House historic area has to be of a different material so as to differentiate the designs. Want to be able to distinguish what is historic and what is not. Related to the fencing the intent is to provide for some type of security without disrupting the historic component of the Sun House. Sheet L7.04 represents the fence elevations.
- Referred to sheet L6.00 and talked about the parking situation. The drive isles for the parking lot have been reoriented for efficiency purposes and explained the design. Everything new with regard to the parking lot is permeable. Demonstrated the use and location of bioswales/landscaping and how the drainage and retention for the parking lot work.
- Sheet C1.05 represents the detail of the drainage as it concerns planter/swale/rain garden/walking path areas. Sheet C1.02 represents the proposed grading and drainage plan.
- Explained the area to the south of the site has been identified as a separate project, which is called the ‘South Community.’ Explained how the pathway connections would work for the Museum Project. Addressed the museum parcels and the proposed senior housing site to the south. Noted it would be difficult to put a trail entirely on the Grace Hudson property due to the location of the redwood trees along the south property line. Instead the plans show a pathway that meanders on and off both properties. The intent is for the pathway to connect the Museum campus and senior housing project. In order to do this, the fence between the properties would need to be taken down.
- Confirmed the existing residential house will be removed when the senior housing project comes to fruition. Signage in this area will be placed where appropriate.
- Referred to sheet L7.05 and explained a separate entrance was created without having to go through the Museum and this is what the gate on the right of the plans is about. The gate on the left was originally construed as the main entrance into the garden area, but the design has changed so that the entry into the garden area is directly from the interior of the Museum area (sheet A2.03). Intent is to have a separate entrance/gateway into the education garden, so people can flow easily from the parking into the garden directly, particularly for special events without having to go through the Museum entrance.
- Confirmed the side courtyard fencing will be removed and is unnecessary since the main entrance concept has been changed. Live plantings rather than a fence will provide the separation to the side courtyard.
- Related to the bump-out question, the boardwalk area where one would walk out from what is now the existing conference room has been enlarged. The intent is to provide sufficient room for exhibits. A person would be able to come from the Museum and conference hall where exhibits are displayed and onto a deck area and explained how this would work more effectively. This would also allow for a straight line shot into the garden area. Would be able to see the garden area from the reception desk.
• Related to the main public meeting room for the Museum, the City Conference Center now takes care of all meeting room scheduling/renting for public facilities so from a museum perspective the space can be used for events if the space is open on the calendar and not rented. The conference room was space that was reserved for museum use. We have asked the City if the Museum could be in control of its own scheduling for use of the conference room rather than the City Conference Center so the Museum can reserve the use of the facility for Museum board meetings, etc. However, noted for purposes of the Museum renovation project and because the conference room is a triangular shape, it is possible part of this space can be designated for Museum use only and could accommodate eight people. The City will make the final decision.

• Discussion about access to the restrooms and how this works with the renovation and associated changes. The intent is to make certain the different project elements are connected.

• What is envisioned in terms of access/pathways and pedestrian/vehicle circulation on the Museum site is to not only provide the necessary connections but make it easier to navigate on-site in a safe and effective manner and explained the process of how access would work in the driveway area in front of the Museum.

• Related to classroom/office space, found if different groups are doing tours/seminars/workshops when these groups are talking at the same time it is very distracting. For this reason, designed the front area so it is possible for groups to start a tour in different areas. One of the Project elements of particular importance is to create an ‘environmental literacy’ and/or nature education area along with the cultural education. A component of the environmental literacy program is to increase the redwood tree plantings on the site where there are other redwood trees. This will also feature a pedestrian path. In this way, people can learn about Redwood trees, walk through the wetlands and navigate back through the Pomo plant area. These areas will feature exhibits. There are plans to develop the very narrow space behind the Museum and use it in an interesting/interpretive way also having a pedestrian connection to the overall Museum campus. The objective is to have a ‘working circuit’ of elements having a connection throughout the campus.

• Confirmed the working circuit is essentially a loop having gates where the elements may not be open to the public at all times and where these elements would close down when the museum staff is gone.

• Acknowledged consideration has been given to possibly expanding the Museum site to include land at the rear of the Museum, but this has not been workable at this juncture.

Sherri Smith-Ferri:
• With the proposed plans for the construction of the nature education project, it will be more convenient having the Museum more accessible to the public for possibly longer periods of time unlike how it has been functioning particularly with the negative activity that has occurred in the Museum park for a very long time.

Member Nicholson:
• Provided the DRB with a copy of his recommendations for the project and comments (attachment 1).
• Sees the main issue with the Project is that the whole plan centers around the security issue. Is of the opinion this is not the most community-based approach to take and is concerned with urban boundary and the aesthetic meaning and/or symbolism expressed in the surrounding fencing, walls and entries.
• Part of the appeal of the Hudson property throughout its history particularly when the Hudsons were alive was that it was an open, welcoming destination for Native Americans, Europeans, and essentially for all ethnic groups with the wide-open entry porch and welcoming totem pole and other such features on the house. The feeling he gets now is ‘keep your hands off this property, don’t come in unless we grant you entry’
where there is a very strong perimeter definition that does not provide that welcoming ambience. As designed, plans do not provide that procession from the urban streetscape to the park and educational gardens. As for the Museum, it serves as a structure having no real sense of identity being located to the rear of all the other elements. There is currently an unmistakable lack of consideration for the public entrance. There is neither a reference for pedestrians or vehicle traffic announcing a welcoming element in the entry procession, but merely a hole in the perimeter fence for people to find their way to the back door and Museum.

- Recommends moving the fence back and integrating it into the landscape thus softening the exterior perimeter of the security system and push some of the garden area out to the sidewalk in order to better connect the urban streetscape with the Museum instead of the surrounding security barrier that greets people at the entrance.
- Finds the Hudson house slightly ignored and sees this aspect as the identity of the whole project. The Museum is secondary to the Hudson home. The Hudsons designed and lived in their home in a way they felt comfortable and with expressing themselves to the community. A very good effort was made on their part to uphold this expression. In keeping with the greatly admired design vocabulary created by the Hudsons, recommend creating an appropriate and welcoming entry through the use of trellises with a design that exhibits the spirit of the existing arts and crafts expression or even something more contemporary that has an inherent symbolism, which could include signage, lighting and the mailbox.
- Again, finds the function of the new perimeter fencing disrespectful. Would like to see fencing that openly welcomes/translations some of the past symbolism of the house. If the fence was brought almost half way back to create a front yard facing the street where the fence somehow pulled back from the perimeter in order to allow the landscaping to extend outward to the streetscape. Would like to make certain what is contained inside the fence blends well with the other elements of the Project so as to provide for one cohesive, welcoming community/campus that is in keeping with what the Hudsons were doing.

**Member Thayer:**

- Is of the opinion the historic nature of the Sun House does not allow for stepping into the space and creating a new purpose. The lawn area is historic as well as other existing vegetation and trees in the area so to step into this historic space with something new is not allowed because the Sun House is a national historical landmark and there are rules related to historical landscapes.
- Noted the grant appropriations do not cover anything for the Sun House. It is already on its own ‘track’ for funding so you cannot move into that space. The grant funding for the current project comes from the State.

**Member Nicholson:**

- Has worked on historical projects before where additions and invading of said space is allowed.

**Member Thayer:**

- His point is if a particular space has a purpose, cannot invade the space with something new otherwise it is no longer has a historic purpose.
- Acknowledged the fence does ‘have a different story-line’ with a different purpose.

**Member Liden:**

- It may be the security fence could be pulled back with the split rail fence left in the front. Has a problem with the split rail fence being located too close to the security fence.

The DRB discussed the perimeter fence and how much space would be appropriate between the new fence and the split rail fence.
Ann Baker:
- It is has been her experience there is less visual impact having both fences next to one another. Preference would be to have no fence, but unfortunately there are security threats to the building so something has to be done in this regard.
- With the security fence behind the split rail fence, you do not see the full six feet of the new fence and only see what is above the split rail fence. Is of the opinion there is less visual impact than when they are separate and there is no issue with what to do with dead space between the fences.
- An issue with regard to design is the site layout and the way the Museum is located behind the Sun House. The way to get to the Sun House for tours is by way of the Museum and not from the street.
- The intent is to make the security fence as invisible as possible.
- Over the years there have been problems with graffiti and other types of issues on the part of the public causing problems to the Sun House. It has been questionable whether or not the house can be saved and this is the reason for the perimeter fencing all around the house. Finds the fence type interesting.

Member Liden:
- When thinking about historical private houses that have become museums particularly on the east coast these structures are fenced and typically done in the architectural style of the house that is being preserved. This is not the case with the Sun House Museum.

Ann Baker:
- Acknowledged the aforementioned comment and noted the problem is the existing fence that is split rail and only three feet in height. This is the dilemma.

Member Nicholson:
- The problem is that the center of focus is the Museum and that the Sun House is accessed via the Museum and finds this to be a problem because it is difficult for the public to identify what is occurring because there is only a very small advisory sign. Is not really supportive of the proposed new signage and is of the opinion the signage could be improved upon immensely and more appropriately announces what is happening on the site. If the signage is all happening at the street level, there is no potential for layering of information about what is occurring on the site as one drives up the Museum driveway. The sense one gets is like driving up to a service center. If the current situation regarding the driveway is not part of the grant budget, make this a phase 2 or 3 project that shows there are plans for improvement. As presented, the driveway element is not well thought out. In fact the entire fenced perimeter area is not well thought out.

Ann Baker:
- Agrees with Member Nicholson regarding the design of the driveway and the sense of like driving up to a service center and acknowledges there is room for improvement. The current situation demonstrates an unmistakable lack of consideration for the public entrance and noted this issue has not yet been resolved.

Member Thayer:
- Related to the driveway and corresponding signage, the property is an institution and not a commercial establishment so the regulations about parking, signage can differ.

Principal Planner Jordan:
- Will review whether or not this type of project requires a sign program and if so would be reviewed as part of the site development permit.

Ann Baker:
• We are in the process of developing signage that works with the other elements of the Project.
• Looked into the concept of installing trellises and/or other structure types at the driveway entrance to aesthetically work with the Sun House Museum design features. Trellises and/or possible other design concepts must be developed to handle trucks that use the driveway. There are large exhibit trucks that access the driveway to the Museum.

Member Nicholson:
• The trellis could be an archway design and large enough for trucks to pass through.
• Asked about alternative plans with the potential extension of Clay Street, particularly with regard to the public right-of-way and what would happen to the garden in this area?

Member Thayer:
• Is the perimeter fencing around the Sun House part of the grant appropriations?
• The perimeter fencing cannot really be done in phases because of the intent to provide protection for the Sun House.
• Likes there are new trees around the front entrance and that there is a native iris garden.
• Any thought given to chip-sealing of the existing asphalt? It is likely chipped stone is more durable as a paving material than other types. Explained the process using ‘DG’ and concrete and how nice the finished product.
• Likes the design concepts for the proposed Project.
• Cautioned cannot introduce new landscaping concepts. Existing designated historical landscaping features must remain separate and distinct.

Ann Baker:
• The fence is a component of the grant because it serves to protect the outdoor exhibit space.
• Noted the Live Oaks do not need much irrigation so the intent with regard to the surrounding garden was to use plants that require minimal water.
• Related to the front entrance/driveway and inner circular planter the intent is to create more of a plaza-like space by removing the curb and feathering out the grade so that it drains properly and provides expansive space for event purposes.
• There are plans to renovate the existing concrete but no formal decision has been made whether or not to start completely over. It is likely the existing concrete will be replaced and includes a ‘basketry pattern’ and other design features/patterns as shown on the Landscape material plans, L1.01 and L1.02.

There was discussion about tree species that are appropriate under a sidewalk and the plan for those existing root systems that are problematic. The Cottonwood trees will be retained and noted there was once a stream that flowed through the area where the Cottonwood trees are located.

Ann Baker:
• There are plans for cut-out planters with small trees in the front of the Museum that will provide shade and offer some ‘softening effect’ along the Museum wall that will arc out and be visually interesting.
• Related to sheet L6.00, the front area is to be designed such that the landscaping and other design features will create a ‘plaza feeling’ and be much more welcoming. Demonstrated the location of the pedestrian pathway from the parking lot into the front entrance area.
• Parking improvements will be permeable and/or aggregate system providing for a rustic appearance. The parking lot will be no bigger than it is now.
• There will likely be some chip-sealing of asphalt giving an aggregate appearance and showed the location. Explained the process and noted a more eco-friendly material is
used in place of asphalt that gives a rustic, aggregate look. Talked more about the paving materials that will be used and their design effect.

**Member Hawkes:**
- Does not have a better solution for the perimeter fencing around the Sun House Museum.

**Ann Baker:**
- Consideration is still being given to the perimeter fence concept. Would like to have a fence that is beautiful from the street and within the site. The intent is to balance cost, security and other issues related to the fencing. Prioritizing improvements and costs is necessary because there is only so much grant funding. The primary focus has been on external improvements and how best to balance the elements involved with aesthetically pleasing results the community can be proud of.
- Museum is aware of Clay Street possibly extending through to Peach Street and improvements associated with the extension, curb, gutter, sidewalk, street trees. So consideration is being given as to what constitutes the public right-of-way, and/or the other potential issues involved with the frontage improvements along the Clay Street project frontage. Related to potential loss of the garden area along Clay Street, noted the property line for the Museum to be further out than where the fence is being shown. The museum team has been talking with Public Works. It is like the 'City talking to the City' as to what makes sense about the Museum and the streetscape. The design concept is for the Project to be a pedestrian friendly. Acknowledged there are some very nice trees along Clay Street that we do not want damaged by new sidewalks and/or frontage improvements. The City has just hired an engineering firm to develop a cross-section for Clay Street. The Museum Project team does not have complete survey information for Clay Street. The large Valley Oak on the northern section of the property needs to have a plan because it is an important tree. Talked about other trees in this area of the property and needs to survive.

**Member Hawkes:**
- Inquired about the design team and who PGA Design is.

**Ann Baker**
- PGA Design is a landscape architecture firm and instrumental in doing the plans/construction details. This firm drafted the 3D view of the landscape plan and has an expertise in historical landscapes. Discussed the Project design team.

**Member Liden:**
- The perimeter fence is essential.
- Related to the Tea Garden in Golden Gate Park/De Young Museum in San Francisco, noted the garden has a nice feeling and this is attributed to the fact a fence encloses the site. People are aware the fence exists and personally does not find it ‘a big deal.’
- Fences are a big deal in China, particularly in Beijing China. Sites are enclosed with very large fences.
- The Museum has not had a fence so this will be new feeling. While there is no real solution to the fencing issue, is of the opinion once the fence exists will present a nice feeling.
- Good job done in figuring out the fence issue. Only concern related to the fencing is that the split rail fence is located so close to the perimeter fence. Understands the perimeter fence is a necessity. Is of the opinion the fence issue will play itself out.
- The signage for the Project needs work.
- Understands the changes related to the conference room with the expansion of the garden area.
Member Thayer:
- The Tea Garden fence in San Francisco is in keeping with the architecture of the interior, which is not the case for the Museum Project.

Member Nicholson:
- Signage should be integrated into the information architecture that takes people from the street to the Museum and parking area. The signage could be some sort of totem/vertical or multiple vertical element that could be integrated into the front porch of the Sun House. If such a structure cannot invade the historical front lawn area, then it needs to invade the space where the garage is located on the south side.
- Signage should be all about ‘information, architecture and information landscape’ expressing the message that needs to be communicated. If signage is well-orchestrated it could be ‘radically contemporary’ without having to exactly match the theme/vocabulary of the Sun House. Signage does not have to be ‘redwood,’ could be stainless/galvanized steel, glass or masonry. Signage is about the aesthetic interpretation and integration of the arts and crafts.

Senior Planner Jordan:
- Referred to sheet D1.01 related to the tree removal plan and asked the DRB to comment on the proposed tree removal.
- Related to the perimeter fence, Member Nicholson has been very clear about his concerns. Sounds like the other members are accepting of the fence/wall due to the security concerns and need to protect the exhibits.
- It is likely the DRB would like to see a Sign Program for the Project if it is determined signage is part of the Project and such a program developed.

Member Thayer:
- Is fine with losing trees to gain better trees.
- Although the American Persimmon is not historic, it is native to the eastern US. Has no problem removing some of the trees that are not historic knowing the new trees proposed will be a better fit and in keeping with the Project goals.
- Trees are essentially an ‘idea’ and people plant trees in ‘bad places’ that sometimes have to be taken out and replaced with a better tree species that is a better fit for the area.
- The mindset and conservation thereof pertains to how the landscape was used and moving forward to how we interpret those values today with the new landscape ideas as they relate to rainwater harvesting/water infiltration, function of the wall/fence and the like.

Member Hawkes:
- Has no problem ‘losing a tree for a bigger idea.’

Member Liden:
- Was at the Museum today and standing outside the front door and noted a tree near that area to be very beautiful and asked if this tree is going to be removed? Found the experience of looking at the trees very nice.
- Noted the existing sculptures that were donated were damaged.
- Is fine with what he observed today and with retaining those trees in front of the Museum.
- Understands there was a root problem at the front entrance that is professionally being taken care by removing the tree creating the damage and is fine with this approach.
- Would like the Planning Commission to know the DRB talked extensively about the perimeter fence and to make certain the Commission understands the value of the Project and why the wall/fence proposed is necessary.

Ann Baker:
- The tree is a Valley Oak. There are also Walnut trees in the area.
• The sculptures will be removed.

There was discussion about the trees in front of the museum and about the perimeter fence in terms of placement and aesthetics.

Member Nicholson:
• Is fine with the tree removal plan. The removal and new planting proposal have been done very responsively/professionally.
• The City will benefit greatly by the new landscape plan not only with the addition of new trees, but an entire garden to go with them. Is of the opinion the loss of certain trees is actually ‘a gain.’
• Asked about the masonry material product that is being used for the Project.
• It may be that signage is not part of the Project at this time.

Ann Baker:
• Referred to attachment 2 of the minutes and talked about the ‘Watershed Block’ and its use for projects.

M/S Nicholson/Thayer to recommend Planning Commission approve the Grace Hudson Nature Education Project Site Development Permit with: 1) consideration given to the DRB’s comments related to signage and the perimeter fence/wall; and 2) with the condition that the updated signage/sign program return to the DRB for review and approval. Motion carried (4-0).

7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:

8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:

9. SET NEXT MEETING
The next regular meeting will be Thursday December 11, 2014.

10. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 5:11p.m.

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
Grace Hudson
Nature Education Project

City of Ukiah
Design Review Board
November 2014
I attended the public design presentation by the design team for the Nature Education Project in August 2014 at the Grace Hudson Cultural Center. Since that time I have been considering the proposed planning and design of the project.

I am concerned with the urban boundary and the aesthetic meaning or symbolism expressed in the surrounding fencing, walls and entry's.

The Museum and Gardens are destined to become a multi-cultural destination and attraction as a local, regional and global example of inspiring and educational collections. It is our obligation to bring its full potential as a world class cultural development.

Part of the enduring relevance of the Hudson home is that it presents itself with an open doorstep and welcoming spirit of inclusion. There is currently an unmistakable lack of consideration for the public entrance. There is neither a reference for pedestrians nor vehicle traffic announcing a welcoming element in the entry procession, but merely a hole in the perimeter fence to find your way to the back door and museum.

I would propose consideration of pulling the perimeter fencing into and integrating it as part of the landscape instead of a surrounding security barrier to the public. This way the garden becomes part of the urban experience and softens the .

The second consideration would be to use some of the greatly admired design vocabulary existing in the Hudson grounds for inspiration in creating an appropriate and welcoming entry. Perhaps trellis's in the spirit of the existing arts and crafts expression or something more contemporary but with the inherent symbolism. This could include signage, lighting and the mail box apparently in use.
Introducing Watershed Block

Watershed Block is a beautiful, sustainable, and resilient alternative to conventional concrete masonry block. Watershed Blocks are produced from a blend of naturally occurring and recycled aggregates, clay minerals, ordinary cement, and pozzolanic binders. Our proprietary process creates durable structural masonry blocks that reflect the character of regional soils.

Environmental Advantages

Cement is energy intensive and causes 7% of global CO2. Our special manufacturing process uses locally sourced aggregate to attain the strength and durability of conventional concrete blocks with less than half the cement, reducing embodied energy by 50-65%.

Texture + Color

Watershed Blocks express the color palette and material composition of local soils that vary region by region. Individual production expresses the unique geological attributes of local sites.

Benefits + Features

- Qualifies for LEED points
- Beautiful appearance
- Resilient design
- Small carbon footprint
- High thermal mass
- Natural materials
- Low maintenance + long service life
- Unique blend of technology + tradition

Technical Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>4 x 8 x 16&quot;, 6 x 8 x 16&quot;, 8 x 8 x 16&quot; Bondbeam blocks avail. 6&quot; x 8&quot; High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>115 to 125 lbs/ft³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight per block</td>
<td>Approx. 30 lbs for 8&quot; block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressive strength</td>
<td>&gt;1900 psi (C90-13 compliant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max water absorption</td>
<td>≤15 pcf (C90-13 compliant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear shrinkage</td>
<td>≤0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet dry durability</td>
<td>≤5% weight loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal conductivity</td>
<td>0.81 – 0.93 W/m²°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustical reduction</td>
<td>40-50 dB (40 cm wall 50kHz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification</td>
<td>Alternate Materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Basalt Road - Napa, California - 94558

www.watershedmaterials.com

(707) 224-2532
BLOCK SELECTION GUIDE

Standard Block Heights - 8", 6", 4"

Double Open-Ended Bond Beam Block Heights - 8", 6"

Sample Block Colors

*additional block shapes and colors available upon request.