



City of Ukiah, CA Design Review Board

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

December 11, 2014

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

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 Hise, Vice Chair Tom Liden, Nick Thayer, Alan Nicholson, Howie Hawkes

Absent:

Staff Present: Charley Stump, Planning Director (present only for agenda items 6C and 6D)
Michelle Johnson, Assistant Planner
Trent Taylor, Support Services Captain
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Others present: Robert Palfox
Richard Ruff
Jason Howard
Judy Howard
Nohemi Sanchez
Francisco Sanchez
Haide Sanchez
Larry Mitchell

3. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the November 13, 2014 meeting will be available for review at the January 8, 2015 meeting.

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. **Shag Salon Site Development Permit, 633 South Main Street (File No. 620):** Review and recommendation to the Zoning Administrator on a Site Development Permit for modifications to the building facade located at 633 South Main Street, APN 002-302-25.

Michelle Johnson:

- The applicants will present the Project and provide a project description concerning the proposed modifications to the existing facade.

Jason Howard, applicant:

- Has purchased the former Computer Scene building with the intent to convert it to a hair salon with a beauty supply retail component. The business currently operates in the

- 1 Airport Industrial Park (AIP) and is moving the business to the new location. Is hopeful
2 the new location will be better for business.
- 3 • Not making significant changes to the existing building.
 - 4 • Provided a colors and materials board.
 - 5 • The existing facade is very unattractive and this is the reason for the improvements.
 - 6 • Explained in detail the proposed improvements and application thereof as provided for on
7 the site plans developed for the Project.

8
9 **Member Nicholson:**

- 10 • Asked about the intent of the existing exterior lighting?
- 11 • Project is a great solution.
- 12 • The 1x4-foot wood trim seems a little incongruous.
- 13 • Will the stone wrap the sides of the building?
- 14 • Asked about the proposed color palate.
- 15 • Asked about the awning color?

16
17 **Member Hawkes:**

- 18 • Requested clarification whether or not the facade modifications triggered the parking lot
19 improvements or is the intent just to change the configuration of the parking lot.
- 20 • Asked about the maximum number of persons that would likely be on the site at one
21 time?

22
23 **Member Thayer:**

- 24 • Will the existing tree in the parking lot be removed to reconfigure the parking lot?

25
26 **Jason Howard:**

- 27 • While a steel awning is proposed as part of the Project, the existing exterior lights will
28 remain and used primarily for security purposes at night. The lights will be moderately lit.
- 29 • The trim is existing and explained what the previous owner did to 'spruce' up the
30 appearance of this cinder-block building by providing some architectural accents.
- 31 • The plan is to 1) Remove the shingled facade on the front of the building and replace
32 with painted stucco to match; 2) Install tile on the lower 7 feet of the front facade; 3)
33 Install new windows that extend to ground level within the existing width of the opening
34 on the facade; 4) Install new double doors; 5) Install 3 new 6-foot awnings that are
35 stitched together to appear as one 18-foot awning; 6) Install the existing 'Shag' sign
36 above the awnings.
- 37 • The stone will be placed on the face of the building and extend around to the edges of
38 the building.
- 39 • The color theme will feature a light cream for the base of the building and a brown tone
40 for the trim.
- 41 • The awning will be black as will the channel lettering for the sign so the Project will
42 feature some black accents. Essentially the building will be creamy color stucco, brown
43 trim with black accents and stone in the front to complement the creamy color stucco.

44
45 **Judy Howard:**

- 46 • Based on the square footage of the building, the Project is one parking space short.
- 47 • The employees will not be able to park on site and will likely park across the street so
48 customers can use the parking lot.

49
50 **Jason Howard:**

- 51 • The existing ADA parking space is not compliant with City parking regulations so the
52 parking lot had to be reconfigured and to compensate for the one parking space the
53 Project is short bicycle parking will be added as there is no room in the parking lot to add
54 another space. Demonstrated the location of the ADA parking stall.

- Typically there are approximately five or six persons on the site at a time for the salon and retail uses. There are only four salon stations.
- It is doubtful anyone will use the bicycle rack. The bike rack is visible from inside the building.
- The problem with the tree in the parking lot is that it is 'messy.' As such, would like to remove and replace with a tree species that is not as messy.

Member Thayer:

- The Strawberry tree that is on the property or next door is worse in terms of creating a 'mess.'
- Recommends replacement of the existing parking lot tree for a deciduous tree that is not as messy having a single trunk so the sign is not blocked. Further recommends using the City street tree requirement list. A benefit is there are no overhead utility wires to interfere with the tree.

Judy Howard:

- Suggested the replacement tree be a Maple.

Member Thayer:

- Okay with a Maple tree. Select a species that will provide some shade on the west elevation. Removal of the tree in the parking lot will allow for reworking and striping of the parking spaces.
- Is of the opinion the bike rack is not sturdy enough and recommends implementing a type/make that is durable and can be anchored securely.
- Recommends paving the parking lot effectively so that it will not have to be resurfaced for six or seven years.
- Likes the Project.

Member Liden:

- Appreciates the site plans and noted them to be well crafted.
- Related to the choice of stone asked if the intent was to make it architecturally correspond with the stone on the building down the street. It may be that a different stone should be used.
- When initially looking at the site plans thought tile was going to be used in place of the stone. Is of the opinion tile would be very appropriate.
- In the absence of a cornice, which is likely acceptable and whether or not stone or tile is used, attention needs to be paid to the detail of the trim on top of the building after the stone or tile is applied and the awning is up. Again, the detail of the trim is related to whether stone or tile is used. Using the existing metal cap would be fine.
- The proposed Project is definitely an improvement.

Chair Hise:

- It may be a parapet cap is necessary.
- Recommends adding an ADA-related sign at the entrance of the parking lot.

Jason Howard:

- Clarified the type of stone is not the same and explained how so.
- Related to the detail of the trim, the existing metal cap will be used.

M/S Nicholson/Hawkes to recommend Zoning Administrator approval of Shag Salon Site Development Permit File No. 620 as submitted taking into consideration comments made by DRB above and make certain the City Building Official plan checks the Project for compliance with ADA/parking lot requirements.

1 There was discussion about:

- 2 • The proposed doors and the type of handles in terms of accessibility for wheelchairs.
- 3 • Whether or not restrooms are ADA compliant.

4
5 **Jason Howard** confirmed the bathrooms are ADA compliant.

6
7 Motion carried (5-0).

8
9 **6B. 499 North State Street Development Permit (File No. 598):** Review and
10 recommendation to the Zoning Administrator on a Site Development Permit for an
11 addition, parking lot modifications, and landscaping at 499 North State Street, APN 002-
12 152-07.

13
14 **Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- 15 • Presented the Project/project description and noted some improvements include an
16 addition to the existing building, provide code compliant parking stalls and drive aisles,
17 create a pedestrian path of travel, addition of more trees on Norton Street, repair the
18 existing irrigation system and add landscaping, etc.
- 19 • The new addition will architecturally match the existing paint on the facade.
- 20 • The intent is to replace the exterior lighting, particularly the existing floodlights to include
21 lights that are shielded and downcast; However, no formal lighting plan has been
22 proposed at this time.
- 23 • The existing freestanding sign will remain and there will be a new logo for the new
24 business. A copy of the new logo is provided for in the staff report.

25
26 **Member Thayer:**

- 27 • Has the City Public Works reviewed the most recent version of the site plans?
- 28 • Requested clarification about the proposed addition to the building as shown on the site
29 plans.
- 30 • Related to the 'No Parking' area asked about the plans in this regard. Also, asked about
31 repaving/restriping of the parking lot.
- 32 • Asked about the pedestrian pathway and how this will work.
- 33 • Asked about the prefabricated umbrellas. Preference would be Palm trees in this area.
- 34 • Would like to make certain a landscape plan is part of the Project.
- 35 • Related to the street trees on Norton Street would like to see something larger because
36 there are no overhead utilities in this location.
- 37 • Related to the street trees in front of the building on State Street can be a much larger
38 tree species and recommends Sycamore trees.
- 39 • Acknowledged the problem with the existing Purple Leaf Plum street trees on Norton
40 Street is that they do get hit and for this reason and other reasons this tree species
41 should not be on the City Required Street Tree list.
- 42 • To connect with the restaurant theme recommends including a Palm tree(s) as part of the
43 landscape plan.
- 44 • Make certain there is a landscape plan for the Project in place.

45
46 **Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- 47 • Confirmed the aforementioned inquiry that a landscape plan is required.

48
49 **Lawrence Mitchell, Architect, Representative for Applicants:**

- 50 • Related to the color palate for the Project, Planning staff has indicated any color changes
51 need to be proposed now or come back to the DRB for review later. Initially the intent
52 was for the color scheme for the building to remain the same, but the applicants would
53 like to change the color scheme. No color sample board is available at this time.
- 54 • Explained the aspects for the proposed addition.

- 1 • Confirmed the designated 'No Parking' area will remain because of the drive aisle. As
- 2 shown on the site plans commented on how the parking lot would function relative to
- 3 vehicular circulation/path of travel, etc.
- 4 • Repairs will be made to the parking lot.
- 5 • City Code requires a pedestrian pathway from the public right-of-way/sidewalk to the
- 6 primary entrance of the building. Explained how the pathway would function and noted
- 7 the driveway width will be reduced as discussed with Public Works.
- 8 • Related to the street trees on State Street, there is no parking lane so anything that
- 9 overhangs the sidewalk will get hit.

10
11 **Chair Hise:**

- 12 • Fine with moving forward on a recommendation concerning the design aspects of the
- 13 Project and review the color palate for the building another time.
- 14 • Asked what is being proposed for ADA parking and noted the site plans do not show the
- 15 striping of the corresponding loading areas and there is no associated signage.
- 16 • Supports the DRB review the color palate for the building.
- 17 • Asked if a landscape plan is required?

18
19 **Member Liden:**

- 20 • Is interested in seeing the proposed color scheme. Would be nice to see a 'fresh' color on
- 21 the building.
- 22 • Noted some of the shakes are starting to fall off the exterior walls of the building and
- 23 asked what measures will be taken in this regard?
- 24 • Asked about plans concerning the monument sign and logo for the restaurant.

25
26 **Member Nicholson:**

- 27 • Looking at the site from State Street finds it 'barren' in appearance.
- 28 • While he has no landscape formal recommendations per se, there is room behind the
- 29 monument sign for some landscaping that could include a Palm tree theme. As such, can
- 30 see an opportunity for a small Palm tree in this area or even a multi-trunk Palm behind
- 31 the sign that would help shade the seating area and something similar can also be done
- 32 on the corner of the site to create more continuity to what is occurring on the site. Noted
- 33 Palm trees come in different sizes so this may be a possibility. This option would give the
- 34 site 'more substance' in this area.
- 35 • Related to the restroom situation, if the existing curb remains this is not really ADA
- 36 compliant.
- 37 • Is fine with Sycamore trees as street trees in the front of the site.
- 38 • Likes the Project.

39
40 **Member Hawkes:**

- 41 • Is the business to be a seafood restaurant?
- 42 • Is fine with the Project and the suggestions made by the DRB.

43
44 **Lawrence Mitchell:**

- 45 • Related to ADA signage in the parking lot, there would be a van accessible and other
- 46 required signage posted in the designated handicap parking area. Consulted with the City
- 47 Building Official regarding the required standard size for the handicapped space that is
- 48 van accessible.
- 49 • Exterior wall repairs are necessary before the building is painted and to accommodate an
- 50 awning.
- 51 • Referred to attachment 1 of the staff report (project description) that talks about the
- 52 signage. The existing 10 x 4-foot freestanding sign will be refaced with new faces and
- 53 graphics and referred to the logo design that will accompany this sign.
- 54 • Confirmed the restaurant is a seafood restaurant.

- 1 • Related to the raised curb and since runoff flows away from the building in terms of
2 drainage the intent is to work the surface so it is level with the walking surface.
3

4 **Associate Planner Johnson:**

- 5 • Confirmed a landscape plan is required.
6

7 **Member Thayer:**

- 8 • Will the DRB review any interior improvements?
9

10 **Associate Planner Johnson:**

- 11 • Would defer the aforementioned question to Planning Director Stump, but this would be a
12 conflict because the Planning Director is also the Zoning Administrator and this Project
13 requires approval from the Zoning Administrator. However, it was noted the DRB can
14 continue review of the project and move forward accordingly and review the color palate
15 and landscaping plan at the next regular meeting in January.
16

17 **Member Nicholson** would like clarification regarding the tree that is growing under the fence on
18 the site.
19

20 **Chair Hise:** The aforementioned tree can be addressed in the landscape plan.
21

22 **Member Thayer:** The tree is invasive and could be left or removed.
23

24 **M/S Liden/Hawkes** to recommend Zoning Administrator approval of 499 North State Site
25 Development Permit based on the Project, as presented with review and recommendation of the
26 color palate for the building and landscaping plan at the regular January DRB meeting and the
27 tree growing under the fence can be addressed in the landscape plan. Motion carried (5-0).
28

29 **Planning Director Stump:**

- 30 • The three new City Councilmembers will be appointing three new DRB members and
31 three new Planning Commissioners.
32

33 **6C. Mutt Hut Outdoor Dining Site Development Permit, 732 South State Street (File No.**
34 **623):** Review and recommendation to the Planning Commission on a Site Development
35 Permit for outdoor dining in front of (South State Street) the Mutt Hut restaurant located
36 at 732 South State Street, APN 003-031-42. This project also requires Planning
37 Commission approval of a Use Permit.
38

39 **Richard Ruff, Architect and applicant representative:**

- 40 • The Project essentially involves an outdoor dining deck with seating for 34 persons in
41 front of the existing Mutt Hut building that is specifically addressed in the project
42 description of the staff report.
43 • The Mutt Hut floor elevation is about a 1.7 feet higher than the sidewalk where a ramp is
44 involved as part of the Project.
45 • The deck will be concrete with stem walls and a slab.
46 • The handrails and railing will be metal.
47 • The roof will be a 'membrane, porous down' roof.
48 • The drainage will be via gutters. A drainage plan will be provided although landscaping
49 features will also address runoff/drainage.
50 • Related to landscaping, the site has no room to really provide the required 20%
51 landscaping coverage where the applicant will likely seek relief in this regard.
52 • Additional parking is located across the street on Freitas Street and explained how the
53 parking is shared with another business establishment. This particular site does have
54 street trees that can count as part of the 20% landscaping coverage requirement.

- Attachment 1 of the staff report addresses the project description, landscaping, parking/parking requirements, occupancy, etc.
- For some reason, State Street has a large public right-a-way that is not being used and benefits the Mutt Hut for this project and explained how so.
- The applicant has recommended the one parking space in front of the restaurant be eliminated for safety reasons particularly for persons making a left turn onto State Street. The City Traffic Engineering Committee (TEC) has reviewed this request with a recommendation to City Council for approval. City Council will make the final determination.
- The existing monument sign in front of the restaurant will be removed and not relocated on the site.
- Commented on the electrical outlets and/or other utility-related hookups, etc., and location thereof on the site plans.
- Explained the other project features the outdoor dining facility will maintain in order accommodate the existing water meter and/or other restaurant systems necessary for its operation that will not be moved.
- The sprinkler control valves will be relocated.
- Noted the electrical feed to the restaurant comes from the north power pole and proceeds underground from the back of the sidewalk and will run under the outdoor dining deck to the meter, which is located on Freitas Street. The City Electrical Department has directed the applicant on how to proceed with electrical related changes that have occurred as a result of the Project.
- Confirmed the proposed outdoor dining establishment is approximately 620 sq. ft. and can accommodate 34 persons and referred to the site plans concerning the design of the seating/floor plan.

Planning Director Stump:

- The Planning Commission has the authority to be flexible with the landscaping.

Chair Hise:

- Asked about the location of the hanging sign on the site plans and asked whether or not the signage complies with the City Sign Ordinance.

Richard Ruff:

- The hanging signs will be located above the deck rail on the north and south ends. Planning staff calculated the signage for the site/project and the signage is compliant with City regulations.

Member Nicholson:

- Acknowledged the roof would be wire-proof membrane and the structure will be enclosed and asked about the ventilation system.
- Referred to site plan sheet S1.0 related to the roof framing and electrical plan.
- Noted there is soffit ventilation for the existing roof and asked if this will be covered up with the design of the proposed Project and inquired how the roof will be 'torched down' in connection with the existing roof and still provide for adequate ventilation.
- The signage appears to be 'generic' and asked about this. Will miss the monument sign that will not be relocated.
- Likes the Project. Would like to see more landscaping if it were possible because at this point the landscaping plan is undefined.
- Preference would be to retain the parking space in front of the Mutt Hut. While he understands the space may be a danger in some aspects, finds every other left turn scenario in the City to be a potential hazard for persons making a left turn onto State Street and views this as the beauty/routine of urban life. Finds the parking space to be important especially when the restaurant parking lot is full. If the Public Works is of the

1 opinion the space should be eliminated, is fine with this. Is of the opinion the parking
2 space is a convenience for patrons of the restaurant and preference would like to see the
3 parking space retained.

- 4 • Would like to find a better solution than 'Simpson T straps' to hold the frame together and
5 while this approach matches the architecture of the existing building finds the appearance
6 'clunky.'

7
8

Chair Hise:

- 9 • Related to sheet S1.0 does not see information concerning the insulation.

10
11

Robert Palfox:

- 12 • Sheet A2.1 addresses insulation.

13
14

Richard Ruff:

- 15 • The structure will include sufficient insulation so as to keep the heat off the roof and
16 explained the insulation type in more detail.
- 17 • Related to the issue of ventilation, the proposed project will be 2 inches away from the
18 existing roof so there will be air-space/a separation.
- 19 • Explained the roofing and how the ventilation system works as shown on the site plans.
- 20 • The new signage constitutes a 'placeholder' for now until the design for the signage has
21 been completed. The sign will likely have an oval shape with the Mutt Hut logo without
22 much language. Everyone knows where the Mutt Hut is located.

23
24

Trent Taylor:

- 25 • Is a member of the TEC and confirmed the committee has met regarding the parking
26 space in front of the restaurant and recommends City Council approve this request from
27 the applicant.

28
29

There was discussion about fixture types that hold the frame of the structure together in terms of
30 durability and aesthetics.

31
32

Member Thayer:

- 33 • Referred to sheet A1.1 and requested clarification regarding the return handrail on the
34 upper portion of the ramp and does this come out on the sidewalk side or the interior of
35 the building? Related to the landing area at the bottom of the ramp it appears the hand
36 rail starts on the exterior side and comes around and questioned whether this rail should
37 be placed on the inside. The concern is that 'nothing' protrudes into the public right-of-
38 way/sidewalk, including any containers. There should be no objects in the public right-of-
39 way space. The site plan is not clear in this regard and would like to have clarification
40 understanding about this detail.
- 41 • Is not particularly pleased with the design of the fixture types that hold the frame of the
42 structure but understands the need for a heavier weight material.
- 43 • Related to the landscaping, the addition of 'more is better' than what species are existing.
44 If the landscaping entails the new development taking into consideration the 20%
45 landscaping coverage requirement and the difficulty with compliance on the lot in this
46 regard, then it appears the other areas are not addressed on the west side of the
47 building. Preference would be to extend the landscaping to the service entrance on the
48 back side of the lot and extend to wrap around the corner. A lack of landscaping balance
49 on the site would be present if there is new landscaping in some areas and no
50 landscaping in other areas. The point is with regard to landscaping is that the front
51 portion of the site is being addressed leaving the back portion of lot without consideration.
52 It is to the owner's benefit to improve the appearance of the building even though it is the
53 'Mutt Hut' and the owner does not have to.

- Related to the species selection, finds some unsuitable aspects such that the sizes of the species are 'off' compared to the scale of the Project and recommends the species be reevaluated.
- Related the landscaping:
 - The Rosemary is fine; However, the Coast Rosemary is not hardy in this climate and tends to freeze.
 - The Manzanita is to large;
 - While the rose has thorns, species is suitable for its size.
- Related to the single street tree to be replaced, requested clarification as to the reason? Questioned the sidewalk is remaining except for those sections where the utilities are being repaired and is he reading this correctly on the site plans?
- It may be beneficial to add smaller scale trees inside the property rather than those species that protrude into the sidewalk area and cited areas where this would work.
- The site plans indicate plant materials in and around the concrete pad for the grease trap.
- Showed location on the site plans where new trees could be planted such that if the overall landscape coverage cannot be meet the required 20% coverage that the trees could make up for some of the deficiency in the landscaping.

Chair Hise:

- The issue is about 'length' and this can be directed in the path of travel such that it does not protrude/encroach in the public right-of-way.

Member Liden:

- Asked about the type of wood material for the structure?
- Asked about the plans for the railings?

Robert Palfox:

- Talked about the design and color of the fixture material for the frame and why this particular material was selected.
- To address the landscaping and/or potential lack thereof, the planting strip in the back of the building is filled with plants.
- Related to the planting of smaller trees and areas proposed, noted some areas would not benefit or it is not possible to plant trees such as in the area where there is a concrete pad for the grease-trap and referred to the site plans in this regard. Preference is to have no plant materials in and around the concrete pad for the grease trap.

Richard Ruff:

- Confirmed nothing is being done as it relates to the sidewalk. The only reason the street tree is being replaced is because somehow it was not initially staked up correctly.
- The wood for the new structure will likely be stained/painted to match the existing building.
- The railings will be powder-coated, black.

Member Nicholson:

- Does the DRB want to further discuss the landscaping and/or are DRB comments made above sufficient?

Richard Ruff:

- Is fine with the landscaping comments.

Planning Director Stump:

- The Planning Commission will review the landscape plan for the Project.

1 **M/S Nicholson/Thayer** to recommend Planning Commission approval for Mutt Hut Outdoor
2 Dining Site Development Permit, as presented with more focus on the landscaping aspects for
3 possible reconsideration as discussed above. Motion carried (5-0).
4

5 **Member Hawkes:**

- 6 • Requested clarification the City of Ukiah has an employee with landscape
7 architecture/design expertise on board.
8

9 **Member Thayer:**

- 10 • The City of Ukiah would benefit from having a person with landscape design
11 experience/expertise as staff.
12

13 **Planning Director Stump:**

- 14 • Confirmed the City does not presently have an employee with landscape design
15 experience but has in the past and recognizes the importance of having such a person if
16 this were possible.
17

18 **6D. AT&T Site Development Permit for a Wireless Telecommunications Facility, 300**
19 **Seminary Avenue (Ukiah Civic Center) (File No. 266):** Review and recommendation to
20 the Planning Commission on a Site Development Permit for a 105-foot tall Mono-Pole
21 Wireless Telecommunications Facility at the Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue,
22 APN 002-255-03. This project also requires Planning Commission approval of a Use
23 Permit.
24

25 **Assistant Planner Johnson:**

- 26 • The Project applicant was unable to be present due to weather conditions getting to
27 Ukiah.
28

29 **Trent Taylor** presented the Project:

- 30 • The proposed Project involves the construction and operation of a wireless
31 telecommunications facility (WTF) designed as a mono-tree that would include the
32 construction/operation of a 105 mono-tree WTF. The Project would utilize the existing
33 equipment enclosure and would run new conduit, fiber, and cables to connect to
34 equipment located in the existing enclosure.
- 35 • The Project was originally submitted as new antennas added to the existing lattice tower
36 where a structural analysis was prepared for the existing tower. The analysis determined
37 the existing tower could not support additional equipment. As such, the applicant revised
38 the Project to include removing the AT&T antennas on the existing tower and the
39 construction of a new tower designed as a mono-pine.
- 40 • The Ukiah Police Department manages the existing WTF tower.
- 41 • Edge Wireless initially installed the existing cell lattice tower with approval of a Major Use
42 Permit from the Ukiah Planning Commission. This tower was necessary in order to
43 upgrade the City's police and fire radio equipment because we have a full public safety
44 answering point here at the City of Ukiah. The City of Ukiah is also a regional dispatch
45 center because Ukiah Police Department also dispatches for Fort Bragg Police
46 Department.
- 47 • Found an upgrade to the tower was very expensive so a licensing agreement was made
48 with Edge Wireless to assist the City and explained the intricacies of the transaction.
49 Eventually Edge Wireless was bought out and acquired by AT&T, which was really a new
50 singular wireless business and noted this wireless business to be very complex. The area
51 where the tower is located the licensing agreement is now owed by AT&T or more
52 properly referred to as 'New Singular Wireless' that subleases to US Cellular so now the
53 City has two cell companies on City equipment. Recently, because of federal regulations
54 the City upgraded its safety equipment with future upgrades to be made over the next 25
55 to 30 years, none of which would ever maximize/compromise the current existing tower

1 service from the public safety perspective. However, it is the cellular matters that keep
2 getting more complicated. US Cellular approached the City last year wanting to go to the
3 next level since it is a very competitive market place. The tower at the City of Ukiah is
4 critical to the Ukiah Valley since it is the only downtown cell tower.

- 5 • When assessing the existing tower concerning an upgrade it was determined the tower
6 could not support additional equipment and explained the structural limitations in more
7 detail. The City was essentially going be 'pushed off' the use of the tower to
8 accommodate cellular use and this could not occur. One option is the tower could be
9 abandoned and given to the City or take the existing tower down and build a new one.
10 The option that was proposed in connection with the City managing the lease was to
11 install another tower. This option would leave the City not co-located on the same tower
12 with cellular providers thus giving the City the opportunity to expand. The new tower
13 would certainly be suitable for City needs for many years/decades to come. With the
14 rapid improvement/advancement of the cellular business and pressure for being
15 competitive in this market place and from the City management perspective of being able
16 to protect the public safety equipment is an issue the City must address relative to
17 capacity and effective function/service. Cellular company vendors offer hiring
18 subcontractors to work on the City tower and this has become a security issue in the
19 past. City public safety equipment is critical such that the system must always function
20 properly without failure of any kind. To effectively manage and protect our interest cost
21 factors are a consideration such that the City must weigh the benefit received from the
22 initial licensing agreement versus the benefit now. No one could predict how use of the
23 tower and value received thereof would play out since the initial licensing agreement was
24 initiated some time ago. Should the project move forward, the City Attorney would then
25 have to renegotiate the City's contractual relationship with the cellular companies. The
26 City just went through this process when new fiber cables etc., were installed and the
27 underground work involve where new rules about access were put in place.
- 28 • From a public safety and City perspective the benefit to installing a new tower would be
29 the ability to separate public safety from cellular issues all of which are critical to the
30 community. Allowing for effective cellular service for the community is a necessity and
31 with being able to technically keep up with the rest of the nation.

32
33 **Member Liden:**

- 34 • Is the proposed new tower a City idea or that of AT&T, a cellular company?
- 35 • Is there a problem with having another tower that requires security fencing?
- 36 • Has a problem with the new tower being a tree design. The existing tower is utilitarian in
37 appearance and to make the new tower a tree makes it look like a tourist attraction.
- 38 • It would likely be cheaper to install a regular utilitarian cell tower rather than a tower
39 having a 'tree' design.

40
41 **Chair Hise:**

- 42 • Would rather see a utilitarian looking tower than that of a tree design.
- 43 • His experience with mono-tree towers is that all the equipment on it can be seen anyway.

44
45 **Member Nicholson:**

- 46 • Would be nice if AT&T could put a tower on their building instead.
- 47 • Is fine with the tower being a mono-tree.

48
49 **Member Thayer:**

- 50 • A cell tower is a cell tower and should look like one rather than disguising it and making it
51 something it is not.
- 52 • A tower design as a tree is a way to appease the public who perceives that a cell tower is
53 ugly and is of the opinion a cell tower is fine. We need cell towers for public safety
54 reasons.

1 **Howie Hawkes:**

- 2 • Is fine with a regular mono-pole design.
3

4 **Trent Taylor:**

- 5 • AT&T originally wanted a mono-pole that would require fencing for security purposes. A
6 mono-tree does not need security fencing because it cannot be climbed without special
7 tools.
8 • Existing site constraints would be problematic with having to provide additional fencing
9 for a second tower.
10 • Will consult with AT&T concerning a change in the design and review how the security
11 fencing would work. It is important for AT&T to move forward quickly on this project
12 because of the need to have good cell service. AT&T will likely propose a mono-pole
13 unlike the existing lattice-type tower that currently exists at the City. A lattice tower cannot
14 support the latest technology.
15

16 **Planning Director Stump:**

- 17 • Acknowledged the existing cell tower when proposed was not well received by the public.
18

19 **M/S Liden/Thayer** to recommend Planning Commission approve an AT&T Site Development
20 Permit for a regular utilitarian WTF mono-pole rather than a mono-tree and/or pole that is a fake
21 tree design. Motion carried (4-0) with Member Nicholson abstaining.
22

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

24 There was discussion about the current condition of the Palace Hotel and the next steps to be
25 taken in the process of renovation.
26

27 **8. MATTERS FROM STAFF:**

28
29 **9. SET NEXT MEETING**

30 The next regular meeting will be Thursday January 8, 2015.
31

32 **10. ADJOURNMENT**

33 The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.
34
35

36 _____
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary