MINUTES

Regular Meeting
Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

November 14, 2013

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

2. ROLL CALL
   Present: Chair Tom Hise, Vice Chair Tom Liden, Nick Thayer, Howie Hawkes, Alan Nicholson,
   Absent:
   Staff Present: Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner
   Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary
   Others present: Butch Bainbridge

3. CORRESPONDENCE: None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes from the July 11, 2013 and September 19, 2013 meetings are included for review and approval.

   Member Liden/Nicholson approved minutes from the July 11, 2013 and September 19, 2013 meetings as submitted with Chair Hise abstaining from the July 11, 2013 minutes. Motion carried by all AYE voice vote of the members present.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

6. NEW BUSINESS:
   6A. Realty World/Selzer Realty Wall Sign. (File No. 13-21-SDP-ZA). Review and make recommendations to the Zoning Administrator on request for Minor Site Development Permit to allow a wall sign to be installed on the south elevation of 511 South Orchard Avenue, APN 002-340-38.

   Associate Planner Faso:
   • Gave a staff report.
   • The Project involves a new sign that does not face the street frontage and as such requires a Minor Site Development Permit to allow the sign at the proposed location.
   • The existing monument sign will remain and the proposed new sign will be an addition to the existing signage.
   • The required minor Site Development Permit findings are provided for reference in the staff report.
   • A Zoning Administrator hearing is required for a minor site development permit and therefore requests the DRB provide comments and a recommendation to the Zoning Administrator.

   Butch Bainbridge, Sign Contractor and Applicant Representative:
   • The applicant intends to recycle a sign for reuse and therefore the property owner may not be open to a new location for the sign.
Member Nicholson:
• While the Project meets all the City sign ordinance requirements for signage, the proposed sign does not aesthetically complement the building. The proposed sign essentially creates ‘visual clutter’ on the building.
• The existing monument sign is very tasteful and appropriately located.

Member Thayer:
• The existing monument sign is not clearly visible and the entrance/access to the building is not readily understood and this is likely the reason the applicant is proposing a sign on the building to advertise the business.
• ‘Signage essentially tells the world that something is poorly designed.’ If a sign is necessary to advertise that a building exists, something is wrong with the building to begin with or that the front entrance is not properly defined/oriented.
• Questioned whether the sign and/or letters for the sign should be of the size, scale and proportion being proposed.

Member Hawkes:
• Building owner should question whether he actually needs the sign.
• Does not help locate the building.

Butch Bainbridge:
• The wall sign will require some modifications so that it works/fit on the building.
• Acknowledged that the access/entrance to the building is not clearly defined for the building and this is the reason the applicant desires a wall sign.
• The letters will be lit; the background will not be lit.
• Having a sign at the driveway entrance is for the purpose of ‘way finding’ and may not define where the entrance to the building is. As such, additional signage is often proposed to more clearly define the entrance and/or actual location of a particular building. This approach for signage is typically used to define a campus for a business.

Member Liden:
• Is of the opinion there should be a design that better fits the size and proportion of the building.

Chair Hise:
• Also, acknowledged the proposed sign does not help locate the building.

DRB:
• Questioned whether the sign was really necessary. It may be that modifications could be made to the existing monument sign and/or to the landscaping so as to provide for more visibility of the existing sign.

DRB consensus:
• Was generally supportive of the proposed project. However, if the applicant would consider enlarging the monument sign and not putting the sign on the side elevation of the building they would be supportive of this.

Staff:
• Should the applicant proposed to enlarge the sign the Project would be required to go to the Planning Commission for approval of an amendment to the original site development permit that approved the monument sign.

M/S Liden/Nicholson recommends approval of the Project, as proposed. However if the applicant would consider enlarging the existing monument sign and/or make modifications to the existing landscaping allowing for better visibility of the existing monument sign and not installing
the wall sign, the DBR would be supportive of an amendment to the original Site Development Permit that included the monument sign. Motion carried (5-0).

7. OLD BUSINESS

8. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD:

9. MATTERS FROM STAFF:

10. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting will be Thursday, December 12, 2013. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

______________________________
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary