

**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?

- 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.

- 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.

- 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