

**CITY OF UKIAH
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Conference Room #3
300 Seminary Avenue
Ukiah, CA 95482
October 19, 2017
3:00 p.m.**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Liden called the Design Review Board meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. in Conference Room No. 3, Ukiah Civic Center, 300 Seminary Avenue, Ukiah, California.

Chair Tom Liden presiding.

2. ROLL CALL Present: Member Hise, Nicholson, Hawkes, and Chair Liden

Absent: Member Morrow

Staff Present: Adele Phillips, Associate Planner
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

Others present: Steve Honeycutt, Guillon, Inc.

3. CORRESPONDENCE

None was received.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes from the July 20, 2017 and August 3, 2017 meetings are available for review and approval.

M/S Hise/Nicholson to approve July 20, 2017 and August 3, 2017 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried by the following roll call vote: AYES: Member Hise, Nicholson, Hawkes, and Chair Liden. NOES: None. ABSTAIN: None. ABSENT: Morrow.

5. COMMENTS FROM AUDIENCE ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Note: The DRB is required by the City Code to review and make a recommendation on all Site Development Permit applications.

6. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Request for Review and Recommendation to the Planning Commission regarding an application for Major Use Permit, Major Site Development Permit, and Variance to allow the construction of a 35-unit multi-family residence at 215 Norton St. (APN 002-153-04) and 345 N. Main Street (APN 002-153-30); File No. 3085-UP/SDP/VAR-PC.

Adele Phillips, Associate Planner provided an overview concerning the scope of the proposed multi-family development, and noted:

- The proposed project involves a Major Use Permit, Major Site Development Permit, and a Variance.

Minutes of the Design Review Board, October 19, 2017, Continued:

- Additional site plans concerning the dimensions and floor plans have been submitted and referred to Sheet AO.1 for the Main Street Village project.
- The proposed project consists of two City-owned parcels that would be developed with a 35-unit multi-family housing complex. The Norton Street parcel is zoned High Density Residential (R3) and the Main Street parcel is zoned Community Commercial (C1). Multi-family residences are a permitted use in the R3 zoning district and a permitted use with approval of a use permit in the C1 zoning district. A Variance is required for the reduction in parking. The C1 zoned parcel is located in the Downtown Parking and Business Improvement District and the Variance is the mechanism that allows for a reduction in parking for new development existing within the district. The R3 zoned parcel built into the R3 zoning code is a means of requesting a parking reduction through the discretionary permit process.
- Samples color boards are available for review.

Steve Honeycutt, Project Manager and applicant's representative:

- Talked about the site plans and design.
- Recognizes Ukiah has a storage in housing stock for citizens and would like the project to come to fruition for this reason. Also, there are people who lost their homes in the recent wildfires that need housing accommodations.
- In term of walkability explained how the project interconnects with other pedestrian-friendly pathways in the area.
- Is of the opinion for proposed project is a good fit for the neighborhood and community.

DRB questions:

- Asked about pole lighting for the parking lot and lighting on the building. Has concern that lighting might be too bright and cited the City Rail Trail as an example of a brightly lit facility. Proposed that the lighting for the project have a drop diffused lens.
- Related to the General Plan goal and policies, will the project provide for solar?
- Asked how the noise from the HVAC units will be mitigated. The site plans indicate the units will have a visual shield. The noise could be intrusive to the neighborhood, particularly to the adjoining two-story apartment complex next door. It may be necessary to conduct a sound study.
- Will the heating units be electric or natural gas?
- Asked about the five-foot setback with regard to the southern side of the property as it relates to fencing.
- Requested clarification that for residential zoned areas the setback is 10 feet.

Steve Honeycutt:

- The intent is to provide for future solar capability.
- The air-conditioning units will be mounted on the roof where the barriers around the units would act as a sound shield as well as a screening mechanism.
- It is likely the HVAC system would be electric and with gas for operation of the stoves and water heaters, for instance, but no final determination has been made in this regard. Understands that Title 24 standards must be met concerning this aspect of the proposed project.

- Acknowledged the fences are somewhat erratic but the project provides for a five-foot setback to comply with the zoning districts.

Adele Phillips, Associate Planner:

- The project involves the C1 and R3 zoning districts, and as such, R3 setbacks requirements apply for the project. The setbacks for the front and side yard are five feet and 10 feet for the rear setback for the two-story structure.
- Referred to site plan AO.1 and talked about the footprint of the buildings and corresponding setbacks.

Steve Honeycutt:

- The old building to the north encroaches into the setback area according to today's setback standards.

There was DRB discussion concerning the distance between the buildings and requirements thereof, building square footage, setbacks, bicycle and vehicle parking and design type, and providing for sufficient sidewalk widths.

Adele Phillips, Associate Planner:

- One of the criteria of the zoning code is that when there is two-story, multi-family structures near one another, assurances of privacy must be provided and asked how this matter will be addressed.

Steve Honeycutt:

- Related to privacy assurance for the residents is open to discussion how this can most effectively be accomplished.

There was further DRB discussion whether or not a proposed housing development with 35 units is too dense in terms of having quality living space and privacy.

Member Hise does not support approval of the proposed project, as designed. The site design resembles that of a hotel, particularly with the parking spaces essentially right up against and/or within four feet of the bedroom windows allowing anyone to walk right past these windows such that there would be no privacy and the shades likely always drawn as a result. Is of the opinion this is no way to live. Would like to see the project better designed.

DRB comments regarding the proposed project:

- Install diffuser lens on all down lighting;
- Recommend solar PV installation or provide for future capability; Provide for a project description how solar can be accommodated based on California Green Building Code standards and Title 24; Reasonable acoustic buffer for HVAC system on roof;
- ADA compliance for the parking spaces required and also sidewalk widths adjacent to the parking spaces as it pertains to safe path of travel.
- Mailbox roof appears to be too close to the curb and needs to be pulled back.
- Make certain the project complies with the City Zoning Code pertinent to privacy assurance with regard to placement of bedroom windows when there are two-story buildings adjacent to one another or on adjacent properties.

Minutes of the Design Review Board, October 19, 2017, Continued:

- Review site plans to address any potential issue with full sun exposure on south elevation;
- Look at drafting site plan discrepancies pertinent to the property line, roof overhang, and check dimensions/square footage for the 'pop-out' and ADA path of travel and/or other connected issues associated with privacy, parking, etc., and possibly provide for some type of screening in this regard.
- Make certain the parking for the project is consistent with the UMC City parking requirements regarding parking space sizes for standard/full size and compact spaces as well as meet the back up space requirements for approval by the public works department.
- Would like to know the square footage per unit and total square footage for the project.
- Project should meet California Green Building Code standards.
- Project meet City code regarding daylight plane related to shading structures outside the property line.

DRB Optional Considerations:

- Consider anticipated electrical costs versus gas that does require compliance with the California Building Code Title 24.
- Determine the proposed color scheme for buildings is a good fit for the neighborhood.

Motion/Second Nicholson/Hawkes to recommend Planning Commission approval to allow the construction of a 35-unit multi-family residence at 215 Norton Street and 345 N Main Street to incorporate the above-referenced comments into the project design. **Motion carried** by the following roll call vote: AYES: Member Hawkes, Nicholson and Chair Liden NOES: Member Hise. ABSENT: Member Morrow. ABSTAIN: None.

7. **MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

DRB discussion regarding DRB packets and the need to see full size landscape and site plans should City staff elect to have paperless packets.

8. **MATTERS FROM STAFF**

None.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary