

**CITY OF UKIAH  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
Conference Room #3  
300 Seminary Avenue  
Ukiah, CA 95482  
January 25, 2018  
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, Hawkes, Nicholson, and Chair Liden

**Absent:** Member Morrow

**Staff Present:** Craig Schlatter, Community Development Director  
Adele Phillips, Associate Planner  
Julie Price, Project Planner  
Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

**Others present:** Cameron Johnson  
Douglas Gibson  
Peter Barrett  
Elias Tannous  
Nash Munes  
Issa Tannous  
Mo Mulheren  
Lawrence Mitchell  
Ulla B. Rand

**3. CORRESPONDENCE**

None was received.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The Minutes from the December 14, 2017 meeting are available for review and approval.

**M/S Hawkes/Hise** to approve December 14, 2017 meeting minutes, as submitted. Motion carried by the following roll call vote: AYES: Member Hise, Hawkes, Nicholson, and Chair Liden. NOES: None. ABSTAIN: None. ABSENT: Member 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. **Tackroom Mixed-Use.** Request for Review and Recommendation on a Site

Development Permit to allow for the construction of a two-story mixed use building including two apartments and commercial space at 1294 N. State Street. APN 001-370-36 & 37, File No.: 3069-SDP-PC.

**Project Planner Julie Price** presented the project as provided for in the planning staff report dated January 17, 2018, and noted:

- The project site consists of two parcels both zoned Community Commercial (C1), and the northerly one of which houses commercial buildings. The south parcel is vacant where the Jim's Sporting Goods & Liquor building formerly stood. The proposed project is mixed-use.
- The applicant is seeking Planning Commission approval of a Major Site Development Permit for the construction of a new two-story building to replace the former Diamond Jim's building that would include commercial space on the first floor and apartments on the second floor. More specifically, the first floor will contain two separate commercial spaces, each with a bathroom and access from the east (front) and west (rear) sides of the building. The space on the south side of the building contains two drive-through windows with an adjacent 12-ft wide drive-through lane to accommodate a potential commercial tenant requiring this use type. Circulation through the travel lane is one direction from west to east. The second floor of the building will contain two two-bedroom apartments, each with a balcony on the east side.
- The drive-through lane will result in new asphalt-concrete pavement. There are currently two driveways that access North State Street. The intent concerning the proposed project is to remove the north driveway and replace with landscaping.

**Elias Tannous, Project Applicant:**

- The proposed project involves the construction of a new building to replace the pre-existing building destroyed by fire.
- The intent is to provide a mixed-use project that will feature commercial and residential use components to include site improvements such as new paving and landscaping.

**Nash Munes, Applicant's Representative and Engineer:**

- Addressed site access as this pertains to the proposed removal of the north driveway and explained why and how this will occur.

**Project Planner Julie Price:**

- Acknowledged the proposed project has created more parking accommodations and landscaping opportunities.
- Reaffirmed the drive-through windows will be located on the far south side of the proposed building.
- The drive-through will be one-lane with access via Empire Drive and exit onto North State Street. The existing north driveway on North State Street will be removed.

**DRB questions:**

- What is the business type that requires the drive-through windows?

*Minutes of the Design Review Board, January 25, 2018, Continued:*

- Requested clarification that the site consists of two parcels. Is the proposed new building the only building on one of the lots?
- Asked about future plans concerning the north parcel.
- Is a Use Permit required for a mixed-use project?
- Referenced the site plans and corresponding design concept and asked about the location of the doors/access for the storage units behind the upstairs residential use that are not shown on the site plans.

**Elias Tannous/Nash Munes/Issa Tannous (Applicant):**

- The intent of the drive-through windows is to accommodate a business use such as a bank, ATM, dry cleaners, coffee shop, fast food establishment, etc.
- Confirmed the subject parcel currently consists of two parcels. The preference is to maintain two separate parcels.
- Confirmed the new building will be on a separate lot that is currently vacant and meets City setback requirements.
- Explained the history of the site and the changes made to the subject property as new owners.
- The storage units are essentially for light-weight use and explained the location, how they will be accessed, and their overall function.

**Associate Planner Adele Phillips:**

- Confirmed a Use Permit would be required and cited City Code in this regard.

**DRB comments on the site plans submitted:**

- Sheet A-02 - no closet shown for the hot water heaters.
- There needs to be a roof plan for better understanding of the overall project layout and/or potential impacts to the City.
- Trim color/primary wall finishes not clear for the various elevations. The legends showing the different material colors and stucco color are not clear.
- Would like to see consistency regarding use of the same materials for the stair railings, balcony railings, noting different styles are proposed. Project would look better aesthetically if stair, balcony and any other railings were consistent with regard to similar materials and building code compliant.
- Decorative crown molding does not wrap around the entire building to include all elevations if this is the intent of the project. Either there is crown molding or there is not.
- The front tower that appears to be a separate massing looks 'boxy.' If the intent is to do a crown on the rest of the building, it would be beneficial if gutters, downspouts, etc., or other architectural detail such as crown molding were shown on the site plans to assess their visual consistency with other elements of the building.
- Difficult to determine how far the awnings extend.
- Sheet A-04 – For consistency purposes best if placement of gutters, overhangs, awnings were shown on site plans.

*Minutes of the Design Review Board, January 25, 2018, Continued:*

- Building would present a more interesting design if a variety of color and building materials were used to create dimension and more visual interest. There needs to be uniformity of design throughout the structure and not limited to the front façade.
- Sheet LS-01 Landscaping, may want to consider an alternative plant species in place of Coyote bush, which requires substantial maintenance.
- Sheet C-01 – Front façade, east elevation asked for clarification what the four vertical lines on the drawing represent and noted they are not consistent with one another.
- Requested clarification the roof is flat.
- There need to be more doors.

**Project Planner Julie Price:**

- Revisions have been made to the site plans since they were distributed to Board members.

There was further discussion relevant to Sheet C-01 concerning the east front elevation treatments and colors/material board.

**Member Hise** is not pleased with the site plans, as submitted and as such, made notes on the plans for discussion purposes with comments as follows:

- Finds the landing for the stairs does not have sufficient space. The stair design lacks consistency and is drawn in three different ways. Is of the opinion none of the drawings for the stairs would work in terms of the riser size and they do not meet Building Code standards.
- The same windows look to be of different sizes and in different locations on the floor plans and elevation plans. Window size and location needs to be the same on all plans. The doors are not shown on the various elevations and the windows are in the wrong spot. There was a question about the roof material and the lack of consistency with the adjacent building.
- The drive-through window is not shown on the site plans.
- There is no architectural articulation concerning what the back of the building looks like.
- As indicated on the front elevation sheet, none of the columns drawn for the first and second floors are shown in the other plan sheets. Need to specifically show location of columns and how this design feature ties in with the other building treatments/materials and overall design concept.
- The locations and sizes of the entry doors are not shown/indicated.
- Suggests the DRB provide the applicant with some guidelines for redesign and submit complete plans for further review. The project plans, as submitted, are incomplete.
- The current drawings are incorrect and/or missing information. Would be willing to provide the applicant with the changes he noted on his set of plans.
- Is of the opinion the second floor storage units are not compatible with the residential use on the same floor and recommends thought be given to a redesign in this regard.

*Minutes of the Design Review Board, January 25, 2018, Continued:*

- The landing for the commercial use on the first floor should be larger and the doors set further apart.

**DRB:**

- Would be beneficial if the drawings were more detailed/technical in nature and showed how the proposed new building superimposed graphically fits in with the character of the neighborhood.
- No lighting program/system was specified for the doorways and stairs. Doorways and stairs require lighting.
- Some of the drawings have different dates.
- Need to decide whether to visually connect or disconnect the two buildings.

**Elias Tannous/Nash Munes/Issa Tannous (Applicant):**

- The site plans are more conceptual in nature where not every building design feature is shown/articulated and/or specifically drawn to scale.
- The hot water heaters may be on-demand type that will not be featured within the living space and explained how this would occur.
- The vertical lines represent suspension joints with stucco inside.
- The rooftop will be flat with a four-foot high parapet to break up the flat design.
- Confirmed gutter placement is not shown on the site plans. Acknowledged many design details are not shown on the site plans.

**DRB Consensus:**

- Supports the project concept.
- The plans are not yet fully developed.
- The project site consists of two parcels. A determination needs to be made if the proposed new building is to be an architecturally standalone project on the south parcel that is currently vacant where the Jim's Sport Goods & Liquor building formerly stood or design the new building to architecturally complement the existing commercial buildings on the north parcel.
- Would like the applicant to redesign the project for further review by the DRB.

**Elias Tannous/Nash Munes/Issa Tannous (Applicant):**

- The project plans were intended to be basic in nature where the intent is to make certain the concept of the project is well-received by Planning staff before a lot of time and money is invested for a project that was not going to work.

**Associate Planner Adele Phillips:**

- The Planning Commission will want to see a complete and accurate representation of what is being proposed.

**Motion/Second Hise/Nicholson** to recommend the applicant redesign the proposed mixed-use project for further review by the DRB and consider incorporating the design comments made by the DRB above. **Motion carried** by the following roll call vote: AYES: Member Hawkes, Hise, Nicholson, and Chair Liden NOES: None. ABSENT: Member Morrow. ABSTAIN: None.

b. **Ukiah Senior Apartments.** Request for Review and Recommendation on a Use Permit

and Site Development Permit to allow for the construction of a 31-unit, three-story multi-family senior housing development at the northeast corner of S. Oak Street and W. Gobbi Street. APN 003-301-54. File No.: 3248-UP/SDP-PC.

**Project Planner Julie Price** presented the project as specifically outlined in the planning staff memorandum, dated January 17, 2018 and noted:

- The applicant is requesting a density bonus and as such, is proposing the construction of a new three-story, 31-unit multi-family senior housing development that would include 27 one-bedroom units, 4 two-bedroom units and a community center.
- Access is via South Oak Street.
- Low Impact Development (LID) and storm water improvements are being proposed to include permeable pavers in the parking lot, a vegetated swale, and bioretention cells.
- Lighting, landscaping, and parking plans are provided for the project.
- Public comment was received regarding this project and is included in the minutes as Attachment 1.

**Cameron Johnson, AMG & Associates, Project representative:**

- Is currently working on getting emergency only vehicle access (EVA) from Rite Aid as it involves the Rite Aid parking lot. Rite Aid does not want this access to be a secondary access. The access is intended for emergency vehicles only.

**Ulla B. Rand:**

- Understands the proposed development is senior housing and asked if consideration was given to providing for a park/open space area as part of the project.

**Douglas Gibson, Pacific West Architecture:**

- His firm has completed about 30 senior housing projects.
- The developer intends to pursue solar photovoltaic should there be a utility incentive available in the way of grant funding or some other funding type. The California Building Code does require that new project be 'solar ready' at the time of issuance of the building permit. The units are designed to be highly energy efficient in accordance with the California Green Building code standards and explained how so in this regard.
- The units will feature private patios and individual balconies.
- Small seating areas are being provided because of space limitations. The site is somewhat restricted with regard to providing for a large open space area because the project is required to comply with storm water standards/regulations that involves maximum effective use of space.
- The overall design is typically 'North Cal Craftsman.'
- As part of the lighting package, accent lighting will be featured for the entryways in keeping with the craftsman architectural style. Where the larger gable elements are located a different type of decorative light will be provided. All lighting for the project will be International Dark Sky compliant.

**Ulla B. Rand:**

- Has a son with a developmental disability and asked if it were possible to combine this senior housing project to include persons with developmental handicaps.

It was noted the orientation of the building is not ideal for solar due to the lack of a south-facing roof.

**DRB Questions:**

- Related to site plan Sheet A4.2A, north and west elevations, asked about the material type for the gable, wall, and roof.
- Related to the west elevation, asked about the use of the stone veneer work and its effectiveness as an accent articulation on the wall.
- Asked about the utility area on the roof and its effective use thereof and whether there is some space for solar opportunity.
- Referred to Sheet C2 related to the location where surface water will drain/exit and asked if the corresponding bioretention cell is capable of handling all the surface water.

There was a general discussion regarding onsite drainage, retention mitigation measures, and location/use thereof that includes drainage drop inlets, bio-swales/bio-grasses, etc.

**Douglas Gibson, Pacific West Architecture:**

- Addressed the location where shingles will be used. The aesthetics for the south elevation was the result of a pre-development meeting with City planning staff where more articulation at Gobbi Street was asked for with the use of different materials/treatments as shown on the site plans. The walls 'popped out' so as not to have a flat appearance and the added shingle wall element provides for more visual interest. The same concept is reciprocated on the north elevation.
- The stone veneer treatment is a way to essentially break up the mass and call attention to the front elevation.
- The size of the utility area is sufficient enough for a mandoor and condenser units and explained the intent and how this works. Is of the opinion there would not be sufficient space for solar. Will explore the depth of this space to see if solar is possible to assist with increased energy efficiency.
- Related to drainage, the project engineers have done the calculations such that the volume of capacity and corresponding design is appropriate.
- Related to drainage and retention, the intent is that all runoff is contained onsite. Has knowledge that most jurisdictions do not allow storm water off-site. It must be treated and returned to the groundwater basin.

**Member Hise** referred to his observation of the drainage and water surface retention for a building on Orchard Avenue and it appears the excess surface water ultimately goes into the City storm drain system. Questioned the location of the drop inlets (DI) for the proposed project and noted the same design is likely true for the proposed development that all excess runoff from the subject property after treatment through drop inlets and/or other storm water mitigation measures eventually go into the City storm drain system. Bio-swales/bio grasses help with excess parking lot runoff.

**Douglas Gibson, Project Architect:**

*Minutes of the Design Review Board, January 25, 2018, Continued:*

- Related to the drainage in connection with the bio-swale as shown on the landscape/parking lot plan, the design is similar to that of Rite Aid where the excess water from the parking lot goes straight into the bio-retention mechanisms and any residual water connected to the drop inlet would essentially originate from the drive aisle. To this end, the design intent is to provide for water retention onsite in the planted areas and drop inlets for the residual excess water runoff.

**DRB Comments:**

- The project is well designed and has good character. Likes that the proposed development provides for extra density.
- Likes the materials selected for the project.
- Would like to see a functioning solar panel system as part of the project in terms of energy conservation, if possible.
- Member Hise does not favor use of the stone selected on Sheet A5.1 and recommended use of another type that is more consistent, a better fit, and more compatible with the other materials/treatments on the building. Referred to the 'River stone' on the sign base and suggested the use of this type of stone on the building would be more in keeping aesthetically with the overall design of the building. Approves of the color scheme chosen for the building. Is of the opinion the building will last well over time with the level of construction and design detail.

**Member Nicholson** asked if there was an architectural reason for the use of two stones for the project.

**Member Hise:**

- The site plan has a note that indicates the stone material will match whatever other material(s) is chosen for the building.

**Douglas Gibson, Project Architect:**

- The look of the stonework is 'ash' masonry. The intent is to have stone made of a more substantial, hardy scale type of material that would look like 'sandstone.'

It was noted the shingle type on Sheet A5.1 is for the roof. Detail C2 does not show the shingle texture for the wall and needs to be corrected.

**Douglas Gibson, Project Architect:**

- The wall shingle is a hardi-plank type of design product.

**Ulla B. Rand:**

- Related to solar opportunity, is it possible to flip the building orientation so that the southern portion of the building becomes the garage to take advantage of solar power by catching the sun from the south as opposed to putting the parking in the rear of the subject property.

**Douglas Gibson, Project Architect:**

- The location of the main access entry to the complex along the portion of North Oak Street essentially determined the orientation of the building in that the driveway

cannot be within a certain distance of the intersection. Therefore, the building cannot be flipped.

**Lawrence Mitchell, Architect:**

- Has a professional office across the street to the south and uses the Chase Bank parking lot. Is concerned the popular Chase Bank parking lot might be used by residents of the proposed development and asked whether the project has sufficient parking.

**Douglas Gibson, Architect:**

- A bonus density is being sought for the project which allows the developer by State law to provide the number of parking stalls proposed. As such, the average number of parking spaces calculates to .75 stalls per unit. While the development is a senior urban housing project with close proximity to public transportation and where many of the residents may not drive for one reason or another the intent is to comply with City parking standards, but if there was a way to scale back the number of parking spaces this would be helpful. Is of the opinion, parking for the project would not be a problem for the neighborhood.

**Project Planner Julie Price** clarified per City code 31 parking spaces will be required for the project and this calculates to one parking space for each one-bedroom unit and two parking spaces for each two bedroom units. However, the State allows for a 30% reduction that calculates to a minimum of 22 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing 28 parking spaces. This is three spaces less than required by City code and six spaces more than required by the State.

**Motion/Second Hise/Nicholson** recommend Planning Commission approve a Use Permit and Site Development Permit to allow the construction of a 31-unit, three-story multi-family senior housing development at the northeast corner of S. Oak Street and W. Gobbi Street, as presented. **Motion carried** by the following roll call vote: AYES: Member Hawkes, Hise, Nicholson, and Chair Liden NOES: None. ABSENT: Member Morrow. ABSTAIN: None.

- c. **Electric Utility Operations Facility.** Request for Review and Recommendation on a Site Development to allow renovation of an existing ±14k sf structure, as well as grading and several site improvements to house administrative and engineering offices, and vehicle and ware storage. APN 180-070-19. File No. 3308-SDP-PC.

**Associate Planner Adele Phillips** presented the project as outlined in the staff Memorandum dated January 27, 2018, and noted:

- The proposed project will be a combination major use permit and major site development permit.
- It is an adaptive reuse of an existing two-story building on Hastings Road as the new base of field operations for the City of Ukiah Electric Utility.
- The City Electric Utility will relocate its operations, administration, construction, and technical services to this location. The site will support the warehousing and distribution of materials, the servicing of equipment, parking of specialized utility vehicles, and storage of equipment used for construction and maintenance of the utility's distribution system. Offices and conference rooms will house business support services and allow hosting of safety education training.

*Minutes of the Design Review Board, January 25, 2018, Continued:*

- The entirety of the site lays within the FEMA Special Flood Hazard Area Zone AE, also known as the 'base flood' or '100-year flood area.'
- Entry to the facility will be controlled by defined path-of-travel and a new covered entryway in the northwest corner of the property.
- The building's interior will be remodeled to support many uses to include: administrative, engineering, and technical service; staff lockers, lunchroom, restrooms, and showers; inventory purchasing, shipping, and receiving; show room, meeting and training spaces and warehousing and storage of materials and equipment.
- Fencing is proposed for security purposes and is addressed on the site plans.
- The project site will provide parking and storage for Electric Utility service vehicles of many types. The site will also provide area for a ware lot or open storage for utility poles, vaults, transformers, miscellaneous hardware and cross arms.
- A drainage ditch runs along the southern edge of the property carrying surface water from the commercially developed areas on the west side of US Highway 101 due east of the Russian River. A new driveway and culvert to the south is proposed and will cross the existing drainage ditch will remain unmodified. The existing berm on the east side will be removed and the site graded to encourage draining to bioswales and a storm water retention and rain garden area.
- Parking for employees and the public will be provided along the north side of the facility, as well as paved pedestrian access.
- Landscaping will be provided along the perimeter of the site.
- The applicant is seeking relief from the UCC which requires parking lots with 12 or more parking stalls to have a trees between every four parking stalls within a continuous linear planting strip and the provision of 50% shading over all paved areas within 15 years of planting.
- In lieu of vegetation, the applicant is proposing partial shading by freestanding solar panel arrays. (see attachment 1 of staff memorandum).
- The applicant has submitted the LID documents for review by the Public Works Department.

**Lawrence Mitchell, Project Architect:**

- Confirmed the existing interior of the building will be renovated.
- The plans indicate one roof mounted solar panel and two freestanding solar arrays.

**Director of Public Utilities Mel Grandi:**

- The proposed project will be a huge improvement for the City Electric Utility Department.

**DRB questions:**

- Is it dangerous to have an exit and entry on a curve?

**Lawrence Mitchell, Project Architect:**

- The intent is to put signs to say 'watch for slow moving traffic.' The primary traffic on the road will essentially be large trucks for agricultural or City electrical utility purposes. The berm will be removed to increase visibility.

*Minutes of the Design Review Board, January 25, 2018, Continued:*

- The project is designed to look aesthetically pleasing despite the need for security fencing.
- The roof is corrugated metal with consideration for a standing seam roof type.

**Utility Director Mel Grandi:**

- Noted the aforementioned road is essentially one way and is the route the large electric utility trucks will take.
- One consideration given was the potential for flooding to occur in the area noting while other properties in the vicinity have experienced significant flooding in the past, this particular site does not flood and has a higher grade than the other properties in the area. The east-end of the area typically floods during very heavy rains.

**Associate Planner Adele Phillips:**

- Clarified that section of road being called out is actually in the County of Mendocino, Department of Transportation jurisdiction and they have reviewed and commented on the project. They have asserted that a standard commercial road approach shall be constructed in accordance with Mendocino County TOT standards to a minimum 18-foot width approved approach and a minimum of 20 feet from the edge of the county road to be paved and asphalt concrete or comparable surfacing to the adjacent road.
- Advised as an oversight, the DRB did not receive the photometric plan for the project.
- The DRB is required to review the proposed project because it is a major site development permit.

There was further DRB/staff discussion regarding the defined path-of-travel in terms of safety.

There was also DRB/staff discussion regarding the freestanding solar array as shown in attachment 1 of the staff memorandum in terms of location/placement, effectiveness, and/or any other potential issues/concerns/limitations associated with this system.

**DRB Comments:**

- The project will be a great space for the City Electric Utility.
- Finds the roof pitch on the building appropriate and in keeping with the solar panel.

**Motion/Second Hawks/Hise** to recommend Planning Commission approve renovation of an existing ±14k sf structure, as well as grading and several site improvements to house administrative and engineering offices, and vehicle and ware storage, as presented. **Motion carried** by the following roll call vote: AYES: Member Hawkes, Hise, Nicholson, and Chair Liden NOES: None. ABSENT: Member Morrow. ABSTAIN: None.

**7. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**8. MATTERS FROM STAFF**

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

---

Cathy Elawadly, Recording Secretary

**Adele Phillips**

---

**From:** Estok Menton <estok@mentonbuilders.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 25, 2018 1:30 PM  
**To:** Adele Phillips  
**Subject:** new project

Adele,

I am wondering if solar panels have ever been considered as part of the proposed new senior housing project on Gobbi St. which is being presented to the design review board this afternoon. This is certainly a prime location for solar access and a very conspicuous development for our community. I hope that planning, prepping and agreeing to be proactive regarding this opportunity is part of the discussion this afternoon and moving forward. I'm sure the senior tenants would be appreciative of lower costs and increased comfort afforded by this strategy as well.

Thank you,

Estok Menton

**RECEIVED**

JAN 25 2018

**CITY OF UKIAH  
BUILDING/ PLANNING DEPARTMENT**