MINUTES

Regular Meeting September 1, 2011

Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue

1. CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chair Hise called the Design Review Board called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m.

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

Absent: Estok Menton

Staff Present: Kim Jordan, Senior Planner

Jennifer Faso, Associate Planner

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Others present: Don Alameida

Kathy James

Beatriz Arkin

Lois Nash

Debbie Ornales

3. CORRESPONDENCE: None

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: - The minutes from the August 4, 2011 meeting are deferred to the next regular meeting.

5. AUDIENCE COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: None.

6. RIGHT TO APPEAL: There are no appealable items.

7. NEW BUSINESS – PUBLIC HEARING 3:10 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

7A. Site Development Permit File No. 11-09-SDP-PC. Conduct a public hearing and make Recommendations to the Planning Commission on the design and landscaping for proposed new building to be constructed at 511 Orchard Avenue, APN 002-340-45.

Staff:

- Requests the DRB review and make recommendations to the Planning Commission regarding Site Development Permit application file no 11-09 SDP-PC.
- The project is located outside of the Downtown Design District so the review of the project today is voluntary.
- Referred to attachment 1 regarding the checklist for determining project consistency with the Commercial Development Design Guidelines and staff is asking the DRB to comment primarily on the building materials, the building, use of awnings, shading features/sun exposure, and pedestrian orientation on the lot.
- It is necessary for staff to know if the DRB agrees with the applicant's comments for the different design guidelines.
- The Planning Commission is concerned that projects are designed with a high degree of energy conservation in mind such as are the eves of sufficient height, are the awnings adequately extended, is the building properly oriented where the project can take advantage of passive solar opportunities, are the trees planted appropriately to provide shade relief and other design features that address energy conservation.
The applicant and corresponding representatives, DRB members and City Staff introduced themselves.

Don Alameida, Project Architect:
• Talked about the site and commented on the other commercial buildings in the neighborhood.
• The proposed 13,800 sq.ft. development will be able to accommodate the majority of the District's need with the exception of the IT department, which may relocate to the existing facility. The intent was to design a nice looking building that is affordable. The Board of Trustees desired to have some sense of a having a traditional building with roof slopes.
• The project can accommodate 46 parking spaces.
• The ground floor footprint will include a UUSD meeting and teacher training room, human resources, business services, personnel commission rooms and conference rooms.
• The second floor footprint will include the superintendent’s office and ‘Ed’ services that provide many types of education-related assistance.
• The building orientation was chosen to comply with planning standards in terms of setbacks and other development standards without having to request a variance or any other deviation.
• The intent was to construct an architecturally pleasing building that everyone can appreciate and be proud of.
• The entryway to the building was created to make it inviting to different modes of transportation.
• There will be an access entry from the parking lot.
• Is of the opinion that providing access to the building from the street is also important so there is a ‘real presence’ from the street.
• Explained the proposed location for bicycle parking on the site for employees or other persons that would bicycle to the facility.
• Landscaping and/or one tree for every four parking space to comply with the UMC parking requirements.
• Landscaping will be provided in the front setback area, outer perimeter areas and where feasible on the site.
• The materials envisioned are predominately cement plaster. The access way and front of the building will be a stone veneer and advised of the color and size. The design/size/application of the stone will have that masonry look.
• The windows will be a commercial aluminum grade, dual glaze, low E2 glass. All windows on the south and east sides and a majority of the west side will be shaded for energy conservation purposes. The upper story will have a shading device over the windows and the lower story will feature a wood trellis having vegetative vines and in addition to providing shade will help soften the front mass of the building and allow for more privacy for those offices on the lower floor.
• The building was designed to be as sustainable as costs would allow.
• To help break up the mass, the building has portions that are designed differently with varying rooflines/pitches and demonstrated how this occurs on the site plans as opposed to a conventionally designed commercial building having single-ply roofing material. Cool roofing shingles and/or ‘Green’ roofing materials will be used.
• The eves will be tapered and the fascia will be aluminum or zinc. While copper is aesthetically pleasing, it is costly.
• The pitched roofs will have exposed rafter tails and the flat roof will have an overhang with an aluminum fascia. These features help to break up the mass of the building.
• City sidewalks are existing. Would like to provide pedestrian friendly walkways on the site where feasible either of stamped concrete or some other material. Also, provide for stamped concrete pathways to distinguish handicap areas.
• Will provide for landscaping to include street trees.
• Has been working with a professional landscaping consultant regarding the project.
• Will provide for additional solar panels, if feasible and if space is available.
• Explained where the transformer would be located.

Member Thayer provided written comments as follows:
1. Can it be recommended that a qualified, hopefully local, landscape professional be consulted as to species selection and placement.
2. Numerous species are way too close together.
3. Numerous species are incorrectly spelled.
4. Numerous species are incorrectly placed on the site.
5. “Mulch” is not an acceptable groundcover along the frontage of the property.
6. In general, a positive ‘you can do better’ approach with the applicant.

Chair Hise emphasized the importance the applicant review member Thayer’s comments relative to landscaping issues for the project.

DRB Questions:
Q1. Has energy conservation/usage been reviewed by a consultant?
Q2. Are the office windows operable?
Q3. The roof shingles would be of a lighter color in keeping with a ‘Cool roof?’
Q4. Asked about the quality of the stone; Does the stone extend up the tower?
Q5. Asked about the fascia regarding the exposed rafters?
Q6. What is the color of the stucco?
Q7. Has permeable paving been a consideration?
Q8. While aluminum windows last and are appropriate for a commercial building, but will they have a thermo break?
Q9. What are dimensions of the extended beams that come out from the eves?
Q10. Will the plans be reviewed by ‘DSA’ as the permitting agency or will you, the architect, deal with the current ‘UVC?’
Q11. Asked about the mechanical screens and whether they will be open to the sky? Why the need for the screens?
Q12. Asked about how the pattern of the stone and whether it would be vertically applied?
Q13. Requested clarification the windows will be aluminum and situated on the stone base; the metal veneer will come down at the corners and all around the windows.
Q14. What is the color on the anodized aluminum trim around the window?
Q15. How far back will the stamped concrete be? Will some of the sidewalk extend out to the parking area?

Don Alameida:
A1. Energy conservation in accordance with Title 24 is being reviewed. Explained how the project will provide for energy conservation taking into consideration the stairwell.
A2. The office windows are operable. There are some windows that will not be operable such as in the stairwell.
A3. The cool roof would be ‘Elk Shingle.’ Colors for cool roofs vary. Shingles will be of a brownish tone. The flat roof will also be a ‘cool roof.’
A4. The stone is of quality. The product name for the stone is ‘Real Stone’ and is of a quartz composition. The color is rather light to effectively blend with the color of the building. His preference would be to use more of a darker brown/terra cotta color for the stone. The stone will not extend the length of the tower, but will extend around the Board room. Above the stone cladding will be an aluminum panel and explained how this work in conjunction with the glass windows. The building will feature other treatments/accents to enhance the appearance and provide aesthetically pleasing character.

Explained how the gutters fit on the fascia. The gutters will be shank mounted and will likely be of zinc material and referred to the site plans concerning the portion of the building that will have a shingle roof and ‘half-round’ rain gutters on the fascia with shank mounts.
Will consider the use of natural wood of a quality grade underneath the eves for the pitched roof that would coincide with the aluminum fascia and possibly wood to ‘play-off’ the trellis.

A5. Explained how the exposed rafters fit into the design and more about the materials and accent features that will be included on the building.

A6. Natural stucco with a ‘sandy’ color appearance. The intent is to construct a building with the colors, materials and design that would complement the neighborhood. At this point the stucco color is somewhat darker than the stone. The intent is for the stone to be darker than stucco.

A7. Is consulting with a licensed civil engineer whereby some portion of the parking lot will have permeable paving in conjunction with a rock bed and explained how this would work. The water table in the winter is about five feet below the surface.

A8. Yes, the windows will have a thermo break that does not transfer heat and cold/moisture from one side of the glass to the other.

A9. Likely 3 ft. by 6 ft. that will tie into the frame work of the building.

A10. Will go by the California Building Code, which is what the City goes by.

A11. The wall to screen the HVAC on the rooftop will not be enclosed, but rather screened. The wall will be stucco.

A12. A vertical application deviates from how the stone is applied, but the manufacturer has assured the applicant this can be done.

A13. The aluminum windows will be situated on the stone base; Although minimal, the metal veneer will be used as infill between the windows and will be the same color as the window frames and/or an extension thereof.

A14. The anodized aluminum will be clear.

A15. Referred to the site plans and demonstrated the plans for the stamped concrete and sidewalk.

Staff comments:
- The following issues are typically raised by the Planning Commission:
  - Asked about the use of metal panels and where they are being used? The Planning Commission does not particularly like metal whereby the DRB is a little more mixed in this regard.
  - There may be an issue about the durability of wood versus metal with regard to the trellis.
  - There may be an issue regarding the lack of windows on the conference room. As designed, these windows are high and does not provide for a very pedestrian-oriented frontage.

Would like the DRB to comment on the aforementioned issues.

Don Alameida:
- Explained where metal is proposed to be used on the building. Metal will be used for the soffit where the flat roof is located and the infill between the windows and the grills.
- Is looking into treated wood that can be used for the trellis. Prefers the trellis is wood.

There was discussion concerning examples of materials that can be used for the trellis in terms of durability.

There was discussion about future use of the existing District building located on north State Street. DRB is concerned about possibly having another abandoned building in the community.

DRB comments:
- Applicant has done a good job with the design and with breaking up the mass by adding design articulations that do this effectively.
- Very important for any new building to provide for pedestrian and bicycle friendly accommodations as part of the design elements.
• While the application of wood on building can be beautiful is concerned that the rafter
tails on the building will deteriorate over time. Second growth lumber that is being used
today is not as durable as it used to be.
• Effectively coordinating the energy plan with mechanical engineers and mechanical
contractors appears to be amiss because there is a lot of wasted energy and money in
this regard.
• There are some elements about the proposed design that appear not to be ‘green’
compliant relative to permeable paving, the overhangs, and energy management and
other elements that will have to be review for compliance with the 2010 California Green
Building Code Standards.
• Regarding passive and active solar after review of California Green Code and completion
of the energy studies it is possible the windows will be upgraded to a higher performance
rather than Low E2.
• The trellis will work well, but it may very well be that something similar to this would be
nice for the second floor. While the sun shades fit the windows module, they do not fit the
sun that is making a streak across the sky. A trellis could lessen the energy consumption.
It may be the shades should be a foot wider that could save on energy costs. While costs
are a factor for the project, taking measures to less energy costs would be cost effective
in the long term.
• With regard to active solar, it would be prudent to have a consultant either a mechanical
engineer or consultant that just deals with solar to review solar installations and
calculations to look for ways to implement more solar collectors that would make the
building more independent.
• Member Thayer’s comments have some good points.
• Supports allowing for more shade over windows, which is really nice in the summer.
• Having a well landscaped parking lot with hedges between cars can lessen the mass of a
parking lot. Recommends having higher hedges as a screening device between cars in
the parking lot.
• It may be Nick Thayer could offer some assistance about the landscaping for the project.
• Encourage the use of bicycles by putting racks in both the front and the back of the
building.
• The project is good.
• Likes: the color palate with the lighter colors, building footprint with the building upfront
and the parking lot in the rear and to the north, and the stone darker than the stucco.
• Building will enhance the neighborhood.
• Does not like the solar shells on the upper level.
• The entrance, lobby, and tower needs to be revisited. As designed this area would not be
able to accommodate a large number of persons should there be a meeting of
importance where more than 94 persons would be in attendance. The seating capacity
for the meeting room is 94. There would be no place for the overflow persons to sit and
there is no place either outside or inside to go out on a break. There is not enough
sidewalk or outdoor space or even space in the lobby on a rainy day to handle a lot of
people. The way the building is positioned traveling along Orchard Avenue especially
going south and with the entrance at the corner why not change the entrance and make
the corner look like and be the entrance and provide space just outside where people can
congregate. The current design does not provide enough rain protection. The entrance is
an excellent location for the public space. It is just that as it is now the entrance, inside
and outside lobby seem to be limited and not appropriate for the kinds of crowds that can
occur at a school board district office. The entrance can be extended and opened up by
wrapping it around the corner while still maintaining the tower element at the stair. There
will be shading to the lobby area from the trees that will be planted in this area.
• Consider extending the overhangs three feet. This would architecturally complement the
style and character of the building and would provide shade to the second floor windows
in the summer time.
• Consider the three-foot overhand and provide for one continuous overhang/roof to accommodate added solar panels. As currently designed, the mechanical well for solar in this location will not be sufficient to handle the energy demand for this building in the future even as energy efficient as it is by today's building standards. As it is now, much of the roofline has been lost with the 'hips' placed on the roof for solar. With some reconfiguration the pop-out articulation would be possible and still be able to increase the capacity for solar. The pop-out articulation could work with a three-foot overhang. Allowing for one continuous overhang would improve the look of the building and overall function. It is a good design choice with the solar panels located on the south side of the buildings. However, there are not a sufficient number of solar panels for the square footage of the building even into the future. While the hips on the building are aesthetically pleasing, a 'dutch gable' may be nice where the hips would protrude more inwardly and the northeast access made longer by losing the pop-out articulation to provide for additional solar panels.

Don Alameida:
• Noted the rafter tails will be exposed, but not extend beyond the gutters. The rafter tails will not get direct rain.
• Coordinating an energy savings plan between mechanical engineers and contractors can be problematic but for new construction buildings must conform to the 2010 California Green Building Code Standards.
• Will be reviewing the California Green Building Code Standards.
• Will consider a trellis on the second story or extending the shades. Cost is a factor for this project.
• With regard to active solar, the intent is to have solar panels ready for installation later.
• Would like to know what landscaping species would be inappropriate so this can be discussed with the landscape architect. Is of the opinion he has one of the best landscaping consultants in the County.
• Is amenable to looking at encouraging the use of bicycles. Racks would have to be worked around the landscaping.
• Addressed the mechanical wells for solar as shown on the site plans and indicated with the shorter rafters there may be room for more solar panels.

Staff: Appears the DRB is fine with the way metal is being used on the building.

Chair Hise:
• The use of metal is fine with a change to the tower design and re-work the glass windows. In terms of design his issue is with the windows and not with the metal. The design presents a good use of metal because it is being used for accent purposes and works more appropriately than wood would.

Staff: Appears the Board is fine with wood being used for the trellis provided the wood is of quality and the dimensions are a good fit.

Chair Hise: The Board would have likely questioned this use more if the project was a FIP. Wood is appropriate provided the applicant is comfortable with the quality and the type of vine species selected. The vine species should not deteriorate the wood requiring a lot of maintenance. Maintenance for a school board could be an issue.

There was discussion about the effectiveness of landscaping and balancing this aspect with the trellis and the possible need to bring down the height of windows to provide that balance/continuity in keeping with a stark wall. However, the windows cannot be lower than the landings for the stairs.
Staff: Does the Board agree that to keep the stark wall it must be offset by a more transparent entry.

Board: A more transparent entry would be appropriate with maintaining a stark wall. Alternatively, this is an opportunity for some sort of a 'green screen' and/or wall to soften the mass and make the presentation more pedestrian friendly. This would also cool the building. The green screen would be placed away from the wall so it would not be such a maintenance issue. Having more of pedestrian cover and entry would make the building function better.

There was discussion about providing more bicycle parking by possibly eliminating one parking space.

Staff: It may be the UMC would allow the applicant to lose one parking space in lieu of bicycle parking and provide for an outdoor seating area. The Planning Commission would support providing outdoor space by losing a parking space. Staff will review the Code in this regard.

Don Alameida: Will review access for the project.

Lois Nash is pleased with the review and the DRB's comments/suggestions.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:


Discussion of this item was deferred.

9. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

None.

10. MATTERS FROM STAFF

None.

11. SET NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting will be October 13 at 3:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary