DATE: October 4, 2019
TO: Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board
FROM: Dexter O'Connell, Associate Planner
530-879-6810, dexter.oconnell@chicoca.gov
RE: AR 19-18 (Truhe Office) -- Cohasset Road at Elisha Court, APN 015-120-076

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board adopt the required findings contained in the agenda report and approve the project, subject to the recommended conditions.

Proposed Motion

I move that the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board adopt the required findings contained in the agenda report and approve Architectural Review 19-18 (Truhe Office), subject to the recommended conditions.

BACKGROUND

The applicant proposes construction of an office building of 5,094 square feet on a 0.4 acre site at the northwest corner of Cohasset Road and Elisha Court, about 350 feet north of Lupin Avenue (see Attachment A, Location Map and Attachment B, Architect’s Project Description). Proposed alongside the building is a parking lot providing a total of 18 parking spaces and connecting to Elisha Court. The site is designated Office Mixed Use on the City’s General Plan Land Use Diagram and zoned OR-AOB2 (Residential Office with Airport Overflight Zone B2 Overlay).

The proposed building would be set back 18 feet from Cohasset Road and 10 feet from Elisha Court (see Attachment C, Site Plan). A new parking area would be located to the west of the proposed building. Of the 18 spaces mentioned, one is accessible. The required number of spaces for the proposed office is 14. Additionally, four bike parking spaces are provided on the south side of the structure, adjacent to Elisha Court.

The proposed building would feature a simple appearance (see Attachment E, Colored Elevations). The front (easterly) elevation would have two entrances, separated by about half the total width of the structure and allowing for the potential divisibility of the space. The lightly-gabled roof is in grey shingle, with (SW “Jade Dragon”) green accents on the hardiplank cross panels. The south and west elevations would feature a repetition of large windows. Windows and windowed doors would appear on the east elevation as well. Accent trim and doors would be in a maroon shade (SW “Fireweed”), and the lower three feet of the structure would be belted with a veneer of mixed stone. The majority of the exterior of the building would be a (SW “Choice Cream”) buff stucco (see Attachment F, Color Board).

The conceptual landscape plan adds a variety of trees including Elms, Ashes, and Pistaches (see Attachment G, Landscape Plan). Shrubs and groundcover would meet the city’s
requirements, and two new street trees (crepe myrtles) would be planted as well. Parking lot shade is estimated to reach 52 percent at full tree maturity. A new trash enclosure would be located at the northeasternmost corner of the property. The enclosure would be CMU block, stuccoed to match the façade of the principal building and covered with a metal shed roof.

DISCUSSION

The proposal would result in development of a vacant lot along the Cohasset Road corridor with a utilitarian structure. The proposed office shell is very similar to other nearby one-story stucco- or brick-finished office buildings. The proposal is consistent with several General Plan policies, importantly those that encourage airport compatibility, compatible infill development, and neighborhood compatibility (LU-4.2, LU-4.3, LU-4.4, LU-7.1.1, LU 7.1.2, and CD-5). Condition #3 has been added to ensure General Plan consistency by requiring the recording of the avigation easement. Though the building is proposed as a shell, conversations with the architect and members of the public strongly suggest that dental offices will be the primary occupants upon construction.

The project is marginally consistent with the City’s adopted Design Guidelines (DGs). The building design offers continuity throughout all four elevations in both colors and materials, consistent with DGs 1.2.22 and 3.2.33. The project incorporates appropriate massing, fenestration, and materials (DG 2.2.11), and avoids a monotonous roof design (DG 2.2.25).

The design is challenged by several DGs that encourage a pedestrian orientation and discourage providing excessive automobile parking (DGs 1.1.13, 1.1.14, 1.1.15 and 2.1.27). The design encourages visitors to walk through the parking area to enter the building, resulting in partial consistency with DGs 2.1.21 and 2.1.22. Bicycle parking is located close to the main entrance (DG 2.1.32), though it would not be covered and protected from the elements as encouraged by DG 2.1.31. The scale and character of the project would not overwhelm the neighborhood (DG 1.2.13), and its massing, scale, and form respond to the context of surrounding structures (DG 3.2.12).

To achieve better consistency with Design Guidelines, Condition #5 has been added to require a structural cover over the bicycle parking area. Because of consistency with the surrounding auto-oriented neighborhood context, it is somewhat justified for the site design to be auto-oriented. Therefore, with conditions to improve DG consistency, staff supports approval of the project.

The proposed plan meets all applicable setback, parking, and landscaping requirements.

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

Environmental Review

The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under Section 1.40.220 of the Chico Municipal Code, and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15332 (Infill Development Projects). This exemption applies to infill projects which are consistent with the general plan and zoning; are on sites less than five acres in size within the City limits; are substantially surrounded by urban uses; have no value
as habitat for endangered, rare, or threatened species; would not create any significant
effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and can be adequately served by
all required utilities and public services.

Architectural Review

According to Chico Municipal Code Section 19.18.060, the Architectural Review and Historic
Preservation Board shall determine whether or not a project adequately meets adopted City
standards and design guidelines, based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable specific
   plan, and any applicable neighborhood or area plans.

   The proposal is consistent with several General Plan policies, importantly those that
   encourage airport compatibility both generally (LU-7.1.1), and more specifically through
   Condition #3 to require an avigation easement (LU-7.1.2) for new development within the
   Airport Overflight zone. Further General Plan consistency is with policies that encourage
   compatible infill development (LU-4.2, LU-4.4, and CD-5) and encourage neighbor
   compatibility (LU-4.3).

2. The proposed development, including the character, scale, and quality of design are
   consistent with the purpose/intent of this chapter and any adopted design guidelines.

   The project is sufficiently consistent with the City’s adopted Design Guidelines (DGs).
   The building design offers continuity throughout all four elevations in both colors and
   materials, consistent with DGs 1.2.22 and 3.2.33. The project incorporates appropriate
   massing, fenestration, and materials (DG 2.2.11), and avoids a monotonous roof
   appearance (DG 2.2.25).

   The design is challenged by several DGs that encourage a pedestrian orientation and
discourage providing excessive automobile parking (DGs 1.1.13, 1.1.14, 1.1.15 and
2.1.27). However, the scale and character of the project would not overwhelm the
neighborhood (DG 1.2.13), and its massing, scale, and form respond to the context of
surrounding structures (DG 3.2.12).

3. The architectural design of structures, including all elevations, materials and colors are
   visually compatible with surrounding development. Design elements, including screening
   of equipment, exterior lighting, signs, and awnings, have been incorporated into the
   project to further ensure its compatibility with the character and uses of adjacent
   development.

   The proposed structure’s orientation away from the street is compatible with surrounding
development, which is also primarily utilitarian, single-story, and automobile-oriented. The
proposed structure is adjacent to similar small single-story office buildings and, though
those are primarily clad in brick instead of stucco, their character is compatible. The
proposed structure is also adjacent to a subdivision of garage-forward homes, and its
utilitarian appearance is also compatible with those structures. Appropriate lighting is
proposed, and exterior equipment will be properly screened from view by walls and
4. The location and configuration of structures are compatible with their sites and with surrounding sites and structures, and do not unnecessarily block views from other structures or dominate their surroundings.

The location and configuration of the proposed structure is compatible with the surrounding development, which is primarily single-story. No views will be blocked and most surrounding development is auto-oriented, meaning that this does not represent a change to the principal development pattern of the area.

5. The general landscape design, including the color, location, size, texture, type, and coverage of plant materials, and provisions for irrigation and maintenance, and protection of landscape elements, have been considered to ensure visual relief, to complement structures, and to provide an attractive environment.

The proposed landscaping will provide visual relief around the new parking area, and retaining the large existing tree will provide an important transition as new trees grow to full maturity. The variety of trees selected will provide an attractive environment to the west of the structure, with water use patterns that meet the city’s requirements.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All approved building plans and permits shall note on the cover sheet that the project shall comply with AR 19-18 (Truhe Office). The approval documents for this project are date stamped August 21, 2019.

2. All wall-mounted utilities and roof or wall penetrations, including vent stacks, utility boxes, exhaust vents, gas meters and similar equipment, shall be screened by appropriate materials and colors. Adequate screening shall be verified by Planning staff in the field prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

3. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, record as a separate instrument an Avigation Easement granting the right of continued use of the airspace above the proposed parcel by the Chico Municipal Airport and acknowledging any and all existing or potential airport operational impacts.

4. Proposed project signage shall be permitted through a separate sign permit in compliance with CMC 19.74 (Signs).

5. Provide a structural cover over the bicycle parking area, or relocate the bicycle parking to a covered location within 20 feet of the front building entrance.

6. All trees not approved for removal shall be preserved on and adjacent to the project site. A tree preservation plan, including fencing around drip lines and methods for excavation within the drip lines of protected trees to be preserved shall be prepared by the project developer pursuant to CMC 16.66.110 and 19.68.060 for review and
approval by planning staff or the Urban Forest manager prior to any ground-disturbing activities.

7. The applicant shall defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City of Chico, its boards and commissions, officers and employees against and from any and all liabilities, demands, claims, actions or proceedings and costs and expenses incidental thereto (including costs of defense, settlement and reasonable attorney’s fees), which any or all of them may suffer, incur, be responsible for or pay out as a result of or in connection with any challenge to or claim regarding the legality, validity, processing or adequacy associated with: (i) this requested entitlement; (ii) the proceedings undertaken in connection with the adoption or approval of this entitlement; (iii) any subsequent approvals or permits relating to this entitlement; (iv) the processing of occupancy permits and (v) any amendments to the approvals for this entitlement. The City of Chico shall promptly notify the applicant of any claim, action or proceeding which may be filed and shall cooperate fully in the defense, as provided for in Government code section 66474.9.

PUBLIC CONTACT

A notice was published in the Chico Enterprise Record 10 days prior to the meeting date, notices were mailed out to all property owners and tenants within 500 feet of the project site, and a notice was placed on the project site. The meeting agenda was posted at least 10 days prior to the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Location Map
B. Architect’s Project Description
C. Floor and Site Plan
D. Elevations
E. Colored Elevations
F. Color Board
G. Landscape Plan
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Greg Peitz. 383 Rio Lindo Ave, Chico, CA 95926. gregpeitz@sbcglobal.net
Hood Family Trust. 2373 Oak Way, Chico, CA 95973
Brian Firth, Landscape Architect. 627 Broadway, Suite 220 Chico, CA 95928
Dr. Mark Truhe. 650 Rio Lindo Ave #10 Chico, CA 95926 matruhe@sbcglobal.net
File: AR 19-18
PP Ambo
SP Sawley
AP O’Connell
Re: Architectural Review
Truhe Office Building

The Truhe office building is a commercial office building shell with anticipated tenants being dentist offices.

The building's architecture is intended to have a residential form and scale to help fit in with the surrounding residential and low rise office character of this stretch of Cohasset Road. (DG 3.2.11) The building exterior has a dutch hip style roof with architectural composition shingles. The gables are sided with shingle style cement board siding and painted with an accent color with the fascias and gutters painted a contrasting color for accent. The main body of the building has a smooth texture stucco siding with a faux stone wainscot around all visible portions of the building. (DG 3.2.31)

Parking is located on the east side of the parcel to minimize its' visual impact from Cohasset Road and to provide safer ingress and egress onto the public street. (DG 3.1.24) The trash enclosure is located at the rear of the parking to provide easy access and minimum visual impact. Utility meters and AC units are all located on the north side of the building hidden from view by a 6' solid cedar fence. (DG 3.2.28)

The two building entrances have a prominent elevated cover and accent colored doors for easy identification and architectural identity. (DG 3.1.11, 3.2.23) Both of the building entrances have easy pedestrian access from the public sidewalk at Elisha Court, making the use of public transportation very convenient. (DG 3.1.21)
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ATTACHMENT 'D'
TRUHE OFFICE BUILDING

STUCCO - 'SHERWIN WILLIAMS' - CHOICE CREAM - SW 6357

HARDI SHAKE SIDING - 'SHERWIN WILLIAMS' - JADE DRAGON - SW 9129

TRIM - 'SHERWIN WILLIAMS' - FIREWEED - SW 6328

DOORS - 'SHERWIN WILLIAMS' - FIREWEED - SW 6328

STONE VENEER - 'ELDORADO STONE' - MOUNTAIN LEDGE - SIERRA

ROOFING - 'OWENS CORNING' - DURATION PREMIUM - DRIFTWOOD
TRUHE DENTAL OFFICE

TREE REMOVAL PLAN

Prepared for:
DR. MARK TRUHE
CHICO, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1"=10'-0"

ATTACHMENT: "G"

DATE: AUGUST 13, 2019
PROJECT NUMBER: 2164
DRAWN: JBB
DATE: AUGUST 13, 2019

Prepared by:
BRIAN FIRTH LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT, INC.
627 BROADWAY, SUITE 220, CHICO, CALIFORNIA 95928
PHONE: (530) 899-1130
www.BFLAdesign.com

TREE MITIGATION TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE SPECIES</th>
<th>DIAMETER (DBH)</th>
<th>REMOVE/RETAIN</th>
<th>Mitigation Requirement</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHINESE PISTACHIO</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>TO REMAIN</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRANE MYRTLE</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRANE MYRTLE</td>
<td>2&quot; &amp; 4&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLYWOOD JUNIPER</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLYWOOD JUNIPER</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLYWOOD JUNIPER</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLYWOOD JUNIPER</td>
<td>18&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALLEY OAK</td>
<td>2&quot;</td>
<td>REMOVE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DBH OF QUALIFYING TREES REMOVED: 64".
11 REPLACEMENT TREES OR IN-LIEU FEES FOR 11 TREES IS REQUIRED.

NOTE

1. OBTAIN WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM THE CITY OF CHICO URBAN FORESTER PRIOR TO THE REMOVAL OF ANY TREES.
TRUHE DENTAL OFFICE

PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN

WATER USE

LANDSCAPE IRRIGATION

SCREENING NOTE

VICTINY MAP

ATTACHMENT: "G"
TRUHE DENTAL OFFICE
PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLANTING PLAN

Prepared for:
DR. MARK TRUHE
CHICO, CALIFORNIA

SCALE: 1" = 10'-0"

SOLAR INFLUENCE

COHASSET ROAD
ELISHA COURT

PROPOSED OFFICE BUILDING

TREE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>LATIN NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>CONTAINER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERSICARIA CHINENSIS</td>
<td>WITH AUTUMN LEAVES</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>15 GAL, STD. FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAGAROSTROEMIA INDICA</td>
<td>'CENTENNIAL SPIRIT'</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15 GAL, STD. FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEDRUS ATLANTICA</td>
<td>'GLAUCA PENDULA'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>15 GAL, STD. FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYPRESSOCYPARIS</td>
<td>PIPERIDIFOLIA</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>15 GAL, STD. FORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LARICOSTRUM</td>
<td>SEQUOIA</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15 GAL, STD. FORM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHRUB LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>LATIN NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SPREAD</th>
<th>CONTAINER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COTONUSSPINOSA</td>
<td>SPINOSA</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>1 GAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LATEXHERBACEA</td>
<td>ACUMINATA</td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUNGARIA</td>
<td>CALYFICIA</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROSEUM</td>
<td>'AGNES'</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>5 GAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRACTIONESPIRACULaty</td>
<td>15 GAL</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHADE CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SHADE AREA</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PARKING AND BACK-UP AREA</td>
<td>5,630 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PARKING AND BACK-UP AREA</td>
<td>5,630 SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL SHADE AREA PROVIDED</td>
<td>2,943 SF</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE QUARTER SHADING</td>
<td>1,884 SF</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALF SHADE</td>
<td>942 SF</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUARTER SHADE</td>
<td>628 SF</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOILS STATEMENT

STANDARD SOIL AMENDMENTS WILL BE APPLIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF AN ANALYTICAL SOILS TESTING LABORATORY.

TO P DRESSING

ALL NON-TURF LANDSCAPE AREAS SHALL RECEIVE A 3" MINIMUM LAYER OF 2"-3" WAX ON BARK MULCH TO P DRESSING. UNLESS AN ALTERNATE TOP DRESSING HAS BEEN SPECIFIED ON THE PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN.

PARKING LOT LANDSCAPE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKING LOT PLANTS</td>
<td>5,630 SF</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING LOT LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>5,630 SF</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENT: "G"