1 2 Draft 3 **Planning and Transportation Commission** 4 **Verbatim Minutes** 5 October 24, 2012 6 7 **EXCERPT** 8 9 10

Chair Martinez: We are going to take a break and reconvene at 6:00. Oh yes. Commissioner Tuma has the floor.

11 12 13

14

15

Commissioner Tuma: Before we take a break I just want to put on the record that I will not be coming back after the break. That is due to the fact that my wife is an employee of Stanford University. The next two items relate to a project that would potentially be built on Stanford land and as a result I am not able to participate. Thank you.

16 17 18

THE COMMISSION TOOK A BREAK

19 20

Study Session

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

27 University Avenue: (6:00 – 8:00 p.m.) Two Hour Joint Study Session of the Planning and Transportation Commission and the Architectural Review Board/27 University Avenue **Public Meeting** The group will receive public comments and a presentation on the site planning and urban design concepts Council reviewed on September 24, 2012 for the area bounded by El Camino Real, University Avenue, the improved areas of El Camino Park and the Caltrain Station and Right of Way, the potential site of a new Arts and Innovation District. Included in the concepts are the relocation of the Intermodal Transit Center from Mitchell Lane to a transit circle at University Avenue and Urban Lane to enhance transit accessibility and capacity, improved connections across the site, and provision of an urban destination including a performing arts theater and contemporary office space. Questions from Board members and Commissioners will be received. Board member comments on various components, particularly height and urban design aspects of the potential project, may be made during the joint session if time allows.

33 34 35

36

37

Chair Martinez: Ok. We are going to, excuse me, resume our hearing. Welcome back to the October 24, 2012, hearing of the Palo Alto Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC). I'd like to welcome members of the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to our joint study session. And Secretary Ellner, do you want to call the roll?

38 39 40

41

42

Robin Ellner, Administrative Assoc. III: Commissioner Alcheck, Commissioner Keller, Chair Martinez, Vice-Chair Michael, Commissioner Panelli, Commissioner Tanaka, Commissioner Tuma. For the Board Members, Vice-Chair Lippert, Board Member Lew, Board Member Popp. Eight present. Sorry, I had to think about that.

43 44 45

Chair Martinez: Ok, you're not gonna call the rest of the Board? Or are we just going to make the assumption they're not here? Nine? Ok. Nine present for the record.

Ok we are going to undertake a joint study session with the Architectural Review Board for the consideration of a project to be proposed at 27 University and we're going to begin with a Staff report. Ms. French.

3 4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

1

2

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Hello, good evening, Amy French, Chief Planning Official. You received a brief report we pulled together last week as a cover memo for a few things that we thought you would want to have for this review. We do have a PowerPoint presentation to present to you. We have members of our project team and staff from the Transportation Division. And so we're here for your questions and discussion. We're eager to have some focus on urban design given the parties assembled up there on the dais, but there is no need to limit the conversation to urban design. Given the time we have we will be ending at 8:00. So without further conversation, I would see if our consultant number one, Bruce, would like to present. Okay, Bruce Fukuji.

13 14 15

16

17

18

19

Bruce Fukuji, Consultant: Good evening Architectural Review Board Members and City Planning, City Transportation, Planning and Transportation Commission and Chairman. It's really a pleasure to be here this evening. We're gonna have a fairly concise presentation we're gonna be making that really talks about the project. You know this is really an opportunity. Council's direction is really to seek your advisory input about what you think about this project proposal.

20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

The consultant role in this, myself, Bruce Fukuji of Fukuji Planning and Design and Dan Garber briefly is really, we're hired by the City to really look at how to come in and we really did some design review and then looked at how to work collaboratively with the project proposer on how to reshape that plan in a way to really advance the City's goals. And I think this is a project in process and in order to show you how far we've been able to advance that, but the main thing we got from the direction from Council is that by doing a master plan we really can kind of frame the opportunity of what this project can mean for the City and to think comprehensively about the site in its context. And the role the site has, both locally and regionally, and look at how to shape an appropriate vision to realize the potential of the site and how it can contribute to the quality of life of the people here in Palo Alto and contribute to the vitality of the City.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

So with that we have about 10 slides we're going to go through. And I'm going to present; Jaime Rodriguez is also going to present and so is Dan, Dan Garber. So our first slide here is the existing context, so this is the Caltrain right of way, excuse me, little shaky here. This is El Camino Real. Here's the arboretum and then Palm Drive and University Avenue right through here. And the original proposal is looking at the MacArthur Park and Julia Morgan relocating that and taking out the Red Cross building and looking at how to develop this site right here that really spans really from the Olympic Grove all the way to the circle around University Avenue. And what we looked at was a slightly larger area where we looked at both the existing transit center, historic transit depot there, the whole circle that's around University Avenue on both sides, part of the front of the Sheraton property on the Urban Lane and part of El Camino through here and along El Camino Park, right in through here. So that's really the, kind of the project area.

44 45 46

47

48

And what we're thinking about this site is really how can the site really be an area that is transforming really kind of a non-place realm in a way, transitional area between the downtown and Stanford University along El Camino, which is a very long regional boulevard. How can

October 10, 2012

that be done in such a way as to really create an attractive sense of arrival and destination for people arriving both by Caltrain and also by Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) via Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) or San Mateo County Transit (SamTrans) and also when you arrive to the station area as an entrance to both the downtown and to Stanford University. So we looked at that and there's several sort of assets and kind of liabilities and, you know, in a way with this site where assets and challenges with the site and certain unique opportunities I think that as we get into our conversation this evening we can kind of get into that more detailed without going through all that. All of you I'm sure know the area quite well.

Go to the next slide. So, this, this exhibit is the illustrative plan and it's a vision for the area based on how to accommodate the 250,000 square foot, which is slightly larger too in its net square foot office program, some retail, and the theatre program. But when we looked at this project what we started out doing was really looking at how to plan for the future of transit and how to do that in such a way as to not preclude opportunities for being able to expand bus transit service and transit connectivity and bus transit connectivity to Caltrain. And then how do we lay out kind of a walkable well connected district that meets a lot of the vision that was in the dream team plan and also was a result of the Stanford Medical Center Development Agreement around looking at how to do bicycle pedestrian connectivity in this area. So we looked at that and we looked at how do you really configure the building massing and height and orientation in order to really shape public spaces because one of the things the site really creates an opportunity for is how to create new public spaces and a new attractive destination arrival public space for downtown. And at the same time create a very walkable neighborhood or walkable district. And this also set the stage for creating designing sustainable architecture.

So I'm just going to identify the main features in the plan and then Jaime will be able to talk a little about the transit planning. The main features of the plan is that with, look at relocating the transit center that was right here along the Caltrain tracks, actually to creating a transit ring road where you'd actually have stops for buses on both the inside of the loop and the outside of the loop having a double sort of row, a median for stops and another row of stops here. That's kind of the key feature for relocating the transit centers, utilizing the underutilized area at the inside of that loop, expanding it and redesigning the intersections here to remove some of the sort of slip ramps to make for a much more coherent street circulation pattern. We have a two way streets that go through there two lanes with two continuous bus stops on either side. We extend an urban lane north and extend Quarry Road up towards the tracks and link those together to create a new street connection in through here. You have the El Camino ramp access right here and up by the major project access to below grade parking with four lanes entering here and three entering and exiting here. And then a pedestrian bridge above that, but really creating two districts. Two blocks, an urban block which has two office buildings that are designed to sort of two towers for each building; I'll talk about that more. And then a sort of theatre in the park block where you have the theatre in a major public theatre plaza here on this side right here.

The other features that we're looking at, with the plan, is that this is really kind of a pedestrian oriented sort of bicycle and slow street. It's much more urban street in terms of its design; it's not designed as a typical street section. And also we looked at how to increase connectivity to the downtown by having a, expanding the existing crosswalk platform connection that you have here for pedestrians, to widen that to be able to accommodate bicycles. So we looked at having a bicycle path here that would go from Quarry Road and the El Camino intersection connect up to the existing paths that are in El Camino Park, run along the tracks right here and then from this

place you can ramp down and connect up to your bicycle lanes that are on the other side. And it allows another way to get from downtown into the project area. While it's not kind of an at grade crossing, which would be sort of desirable. I think everyone would like to be able to walk right at grade. It is a below grade connection that's in there.

So those are sort of the major elements of the design without getting into more detail on that and I'm gonna let Jaime talk about transit.

Jaime Rodriguez, Chief Transportation Official: Thank you Bruce. Bruce talked a lot already about little details of the actual site plan as it relates to transit and transportation, but really one of the nice benefits of the concept plan that we have before us today is that it actually took transit into consideration before the site. And that's really, that's an unusual opportunity that we're usually presented with from a transportation perspective in that the transit agencies that we work with were very appreciative because if you look at the existing transit mall for example they kind of fit it in where it was that there was space available. And we thought it was very important to make sure that we take a different approach with this unique opportunity in trying to make sure that transit was gonna work first and foremost to meet the demands of the existing uses and we also wanted to also plan for the demands of transit uses in the future.

So one of the ways that we got to this layout here first is actually we worked very closely with the major transit partners in the area that are using the transit mall today so that involved regular meetings with the Stanford Marguerite staff, which is by far the greatest transit user in that area providing shuttling services to the Medical Center, to the University, and to other areas around town at the Research Park. We also worked with the Valley Transportation Authority that actually built the current transit mall that's located behind or at the site of the existing, of the proposed theatre. And we also worked with SamTrans who, you know, is a big user of that connecting San Mateo County to the north, but has historically had minimal opportunity to take advantage of the transit spaces because they couldn't really take what they can get after Stanford and the VTA has used up their particular stops.

So with the existing site we have about kind of 17 stops along with some kind of unofficial areas are used by transit. And then with the proposed site we end up to about 30 plus transit stops to meet the demands of the growth that the transit agencies foresee in the foreseeable future. But at the same time we also preserve opportunities to expand transit beyond that for say the next 20 to 30 to 50 years and that's one of the reasons why Urban Lane today is left as open as it is now and not made additional changes for transit because that's the growth area for the future.

So like Bruce mentioned, you know, the proposed relocation of the transit facility around a widened urban or University loop allows those transit agencies to take advantage of transit capacity from both sides of the road. That doesn't happen today. We have a wide inner loop, but it doesn't get any transit use. And at the same time that we take advantage of that space to connect pedestrians, bicycler users across the site and for a lot of the Council Members in the past, members of the PTC and Parks and Recs Commission has been a long standing concern of the community that you kind of get lost coming out of the transit mall. You don't really know which way to go to go to downtown. This solves a lot of those problems. And so with that Bruce did mention the connectivity to the downtown with the expanded or improved connection through the tunnel underneath the Caltrain tracks toward Lytton Avenue as well as the connections to the University tunnel from the transit mall. So again, a lot of great transit

improvements that will benefit the site. So with that I'll hand it back to Bruce to guide you through the rest of the presentation.

Mr. Fukuji: Can we go to the next slide? Ok. So, this next slide is talking about the, it's called a kind of parkland swap, which is really kind of four points I want to make about this. One is that there was a 2000 preforming arts theatre study that was done with the City and in that it had identified the area really kind of this area really right here. And on this map here, it's the same orientation, here's the Caltrain line and here's El Camino and the transit center and this is the office component and the theatre component. And then I'll explain the kind of coloration of what that map is, but the preforming arts theatre study located a theatre and said it should be in the El Camino Park north of Quarry Road to look at relocating some of the parking that's in there and moving the ball field north, the softball field north to be able to do that. Because they thought it would be a good, prominent, visible, transit adjacent location that could link Stanford and downtown and support downtown business through retail sales and restaurants and cafés and things like that.

So when looking at this project and looking at the project area, you know, the, this issue about why would there be a need for a parkland swap and part of it is this boundary right here, the yellow here and the red is the existing area that's defined by leases of parkland that the City is leasing from Stanford University. And in looking at that configuration you have a very narrow strip here along El Camino ramp [that's Oaks Savannah, Riparian], kind of remnant landscape that's in that area. And that extends north really right along through here, where the Olympic Grove is right here and here's where the ball fields are. So you have this active use to the north and have this sort of unimproved passive Oak remnant landscape open space area.

And so looking at this proposal it was decided that it would be appropriate to look at reconfiguring this boundary in such a way so that more urban development can happen actually at this very prominent location along University Avenue. And to take the underutilized parkland area, this really kind of remnant landscape and look at how it could be reconfigured to make more usable public space and to allow leasing to take place for the theatre and office in order for the intent of the Arts and Innovation District to be advanced. So what you have is the red area here is about 38,000 square feet of land that will be taken out of the lease area right here and then this green area right here would be added back in so there would be an equal area. and the reason for having it be an equal area is that Stanford in their leases to the City did not want to increase the amount of parkland that they're currently leasing it will have more land under parkland restrictions.

So in looking at that we said, well, you know, if you use sort of standards from like crime prevention to environmental design and other things there's some things about that area that are not necessarily safe or ideal in existing conditions especially around the bus transit center. And then we look at examples for privately owned public space and Manhattan has a lot of examples. I'm not saying that Manhattan has the right density for here; I'm just saying that they have a program where they've looked at how you create attractive public space even though it's privately owned. And we use some of the, kind of lessons learned from that to look at what to do and one of the main ones is that if you're creating new public space and that you want it to be active and vibrant it really needs to be part of the street environment.

So what we did is we looked the selection of what would be appropriate area to be included in park as being sort of the most attractive, pedestrian oriented, most vibrant places that are going to be part of this district. But we didn't include all of them. We only included as much as was necessary in order to balance it out. And originally we had the theatre included in that area. Here's the theatre right here. But it was felt that for the City to have more flexibility in its leasing arrangements with Stanford and to have it independent from the Park regulations and park standards so we took that out. So that's why it has a very unusual configuration. It's conceptual and if you have suggestions about other ways to do that I would like to be able to hear that. So, next.

So, the next three slides are really looking at the issue about building massing and, you know, basically the floor area that we're looking at here there's several ways of being able to calculate that. We haven't landed on the exact way to calculate it. Dan has provided some exhibits to show different ways of doing it. But it's kind of in the 2.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) range, which basically consists with your regional community commercial zoning that you already have in place that would be appropriate for an area like that. I'm not saying that that's the appropriate plan use for the area, but it's a density that's already accepted for areas such as this in the area. and then you actually have higher densities in areas permitted in this area also if it has housing for example. But what we looked at doing is that instead of having kind of lower rise development across the entire site, we looked at how do we actually have taller buildings to be able to have more open space that's usable on the site. For example, for transit use, for public plaza use, sort of plaza for the theatre, things like that. And also given that it's a transit oriented location it's a regional center, it's in a unique transitory location we thought that it would be appropriate to have the higher building heights and masses along University Avenue and along El Camino.

So there's some subtle things about what's happening with the heights and I just want to quickly go over those. So basically we looked at instead of having one large building, which was what was originally proposed, we looked at having two buildings. And then instead of just doing each building as one large mass we look at how to break the building massing up. Here's one building L shaped like this. It faces onto, across the depot in front of the University Avenue along El Camino with the highest height, sort of 10 stories along El Camino, then steps down to 9 along the depot at Mitchell sort of extension of Urban Lane on this side and then that it's sort of 7, 6 on the other side right here. And here's the theatre here, which is basically about 50 feet high and then has its fly tower which is 100 feet. So we thought that by doing this configuration higher here and it gets down lower we did some sun studies to make sure the public plaza in the back here that's over on El Camino and we can go to the next slide. It has that, has a better view of it. Yes.

So that this is looking at it really from above. Stanford Shopping Center, here's El Camino/ University Avenue the Caltrain tracks, here's the theatre and the 100 foot high fly space for that and Dan can explain more about the theatre massing, but this is the entrance right in through here. And there's a back, back of houses faces out along the Caltrain tracks. So it steps down and these buildings step down also to make sure there's enough sunlight that comes in throughout the day on this public, public plaza. And then given the shape of the plaza and size of the plaza we, we looked at what's an appropriate for the building heights for the size public space. And that is an appropriate height for this width space so you can actually in it be able to observe and see all the architectural features and not feel like it's too tall or overshadowing you.

And that for a longer, narrower space, especially something can be seen from El Camino Park, that's where we had the taller, taller building massing on that. Can we go to the last one?

2 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1

This slide, again to look at it from a slight different view here's a Caltrain tracks, here's Alma, here's the theatre, you know, part of why we turn the axis of the fly space east/west to the north/south is to help minimize its visibility from the downtown and also increase its visibility along El Camino because part of the theatre design by being on El Camino it has to be able to be accessible both when you're entering from Menlo Park and you're going along El Camino. And that then you can see how the building massing steps up six, seven, you know, nine, ten stories along that. Again, it looks like four buildings instead of one building. So that was a basic strategy which we employed in terms of the building massing.

11 12 13

So from here I'm gonna have, give it off to Dan. Dan's gonna talk more specifically about building heights and a little more about some of the architectural on this. Here's the, yeah.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

Dan Garber, Consultant: So these are the sections of the office buildings here. This is the, the office building mass it's along University Avenue. The 10 stories is built up through a ground floor at 20 feet and then remaining floors are 14 foot 6, with a mechanical room or level on top of 11 feet. The slightly shorter mass, the nine story mass is 147 feet built up in the exact same way. Yes, thank you for the reminder. And below that there are three levels of below grade parking. And then the section for the other, the other two, are built up in the exact same way but obviously they go to 7 and 6 floors.

22 23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

The concept section for the theatre operates as you see it here with the primary main stage on the left, which would seat approximately 600 to 650 people on a ground floor and a mezzanine or balcony area. A lobby space in the center and then the black box space with a rehearsal floors above that and the other administrative floors above that, although you don't see them specifically in this drawing. What's important about the way that this has been laid out is that the lobby really operates as a showcase for the mission of the theatre, which is to display both its main stage as well as its new works functionality in the black box as well as to be able to see up into the administrative areas and on the mezzanine level there's a, there's a costume shop and the rehearsal space is all the way at the top.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

There's both a public lobby on the ground floor which really operates as an extension of the ground floor plaza and is large enough to accommodate gatherings of both the populations of the theatre for regular theatre going events, but also for larger events that are not specifically theatre related be they large parties if it's rented out, if it's used by large organizations in the City, etcetera. There's then a secondary lobby on that second floor, which allows the public to access the, the rehearsal spaces which are also imagined to be utilized or made, provide access to the public when the theatre isn't using them and for other events that the theatre has that are not utilizing the two ground floor spaces. But all that is really centralized around this, this lobby. And that's the current concept of that. Bruce did you want to talk?

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

Mr. Fukuji: We, there's several rendering views. We thought we should just focus on one view. We spent quite a bit of time looking at what's the eye level, ground level experience for the pedestrian. This view is looking from El Camino Park, this is the extension of Quarry Road looking south and seeing here's the preforming arts theatre, here's the fly space, here's the theatre plaza designed really as a park which is heavily landscaped especially along the edge

October 10, 2012

along El Camino and the landscaping of El Camino as a boulevard. And here are the office buildings with ground floor active uses. I think that one of the things we were looking at is a space like this is a forecourt for the theatre could have anywhere from 600 to, you know, 700 people who can be in it during the peak. And we looked at peak times both during the sort of noon hour and also especially on Friday, Saturday, Saturday early evening before performances because you have both the black box theatre and you have the main theatre together. So we looked at how do you create a park like setting for doing that. And we can answer more questions about design issues around how we've accomplished that.

Mr. Garber: I'll simply add that we have a variety of backup slides depending on what sorts of discussions you want to get into. We can, as well as the rest of the presentation that was made to Council, but we've, they've asked us to shorten it up so we can focus on your questions rather than the presentation at the moment.

Ms. French: I just want to add one thing too is there were some questions I neglected to mention earlier from two of the Planning and Transportation Commission Members and those have been provided, a answers via e-mail and at places at the back table as well.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Ok. Excuse me. I think I'm not gonna be able to say very much, but Assistant Planning Director do you have anything that you want to add at this point?

Aaron Aknin, Assistant Director: Yeah, I just wanted to add one comment, something that Chair Martinez and I spoke beforehand is that this is a great, the Council sent this back to the ARB as well as the PTC because they really wanted to hear from you. And so as you're looking at this I agree that we should probably focus on urban design issues as a joint commission and committee because we are here for, you know, another hour and a half and the Commission as well as the Board are each gonna get another shot at providing comments. But rather than saying, you know, I like this or I don't like this please do describe aspects of each component that you do like or don't like so that could provide better direction both to Staff and to the Council as we move forward.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Good. I couldn't have said it better myself. Let's open the public hearing. We don't have any speaker cards or do we? If there's anybody from the public cares to speak you will have three minutes. And if you can give us a card after?

Bob Moss: I'll give you a card. Interesting looking at the proposal and the justifications for it, but as I've said several times before it's completely out of scale, not only with this portion of Palo Alto but Palo Alto in general. It, it totally violates the El Camino design guidelines which I'm familiar with because I'm one of the people who created it, the design guidelines in the '70's. And the normal justification for asking for increased density and increased height is a developer can make money and in this case the profit would offset building the theatre, but the developer, Arrillaga, has already said that when the buildings are built he's going to donate them to Stanford. So the only financial benefit to him is the tax write off he gets from donating whatever is built. So he can't argue that he would have to have something of this scale in order to justify building the theatre.

Second, when we put in the Comprehensive Plan a goal to have higher density near transit, it was supposed to be focused on higher density housing not higher density commercial or office space.

City of Palo Alto October 10, 2012 Page 8 of 48

And so this violates the original intent of higher density near transit stations. And because of the size of the project it would generate thousands of jobs, which is going to exacerbate the jobs/housing imbalance. And you know of the fight we're having right now with Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) about how many housing units they want us to build in Palo Alto something like this goes in and they'll say, "Oh, you got that many more jobs you got to put in more housing." And be back up to 12 or 15 or 18,000 housing units, which we'll have to fight them on. So, to quote what some of the Council Members said when this first came up, shorten the height of each floor. You don't need a 14 foot floor. 10 or 11 is plenty. Reduce the scale and the size of the buildings and reduce in that case the demand for parking and traffic impacts. That intersection is very heavily impacted by traffic.

So what we should be doing is scaling it down to perhaps 50 or 60 feet, reducing total area appropriately. That would reduce the need for parking and reduce the traffic and it would put it more in scale with the rest of the City. There are only four buildings in Palo Alto that are over 140, over 100 feet tall. Only one, 101 Alma, is over 140 feet. We don't need this.

Chair Martinez: Thank you. There are no more speakers. Commissioners and Board Members can, can you hear me at all? So following the Assistant Planning Director's suggestion why don't we see if we can have a conversation around urban design issues. I'm not gonna say that it should be limited, but for the PTC we have a follow up meeting where we can talk about zoning and traffic, regional planning issues that may not be the greatest opportunity. So if we want to open it right now let's begin our conversation about the site plan, the building height, circulation, preservation, things that we share a common focus on and if that's not too limiting let's see where it takes us. And we're just gonna allow each Board Member/Commissioner three minutes. Ask a question, make a comment. If there's a follow up by anyone else we will continue on the line of that question and then we'll move on down the line. So what we're going with Board Member Lew. Three minutes.

<u>Board Member Lew</u>: So thank you for the presentation. I know it's a very complicated site. I think my first question would be was, was there an option of locating the theatre where the office buildings are currently proposed? I guess my, in the back of my head I'm thinking that that's gonna get the more public use and that would be the more prominent so it would be also sort of more in keeping with the use of the Hostess House, which was sort of theater kind of use initially. And, and if the theatre were located sort of closer to the circle it would sort of maintain that, you know, the historic use on that site.

Mr. Fukuji: Shall I respond to that question?

Chair Martinez: Yes, please.

Mr. Fukuji: Yes we, we looked at that. The main reason for having the theatre separate and not on University Avenue is that there's so much traffic, pedestrian, transit, and circulation movements that are happening in that space throughout the day that to try to have a public space that can be organized for different events that might be theatre related or other civic events that you have some competition around that and that in many cities they've actually looked at designing their public space separate from the transit center and the public space related to the transit center so there's sort of a protected space for how they want to manage the operations they want to have. City operations.

Board Member Lew: Then the, I think I read in the Staff report that I think you're envisioning that the theatre is sort of connected to, you know, visually connected to Quarry Road. And I was wondering how that could be connected to like the public? So say like I know that a Quarry extension, right, but it's the kind of thing that like, that intersection of Quarry is very sort of hard to, hard to navigate. Like even with extension that's being proposed I think that it's still confuse, would be confusing to people. And so I'm thinking like the, that you may see the theatre and sort of know that you need to get there, but just in the current configuration of the existing underpass and everything like that I'm not sure that I would be able to figure out where I need to go and where I need to park and how do I get to the front door. And so, anyway that was why I was thinking that maybe the theatre would be located better, you know, on the, you know, closer to the circle, but possibly if that, if the, if that plaza in front of the theater is, you know, really prominent and you know, design, you know, and has a beautiful design then maybe that creates enough of a, a, you know, enough of a space and so I think that's it. Is that the timer?

Chair Martinez: You can finish.

Board Member Lew: I'll finish. That's ok, I'm done.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: I had a follow up because I had the same concern that the highest building is next to the lowest building and that's the transit station. And if you switch positions it would give you the opportunity for more scale. And I also had shared the concern that the civic building, which is the theater and the way that I look at it is more of a, of sort of the public place. And that the plaza, the theatre, and the tower turned at 90 degrees wouldn't give the tower more opportunity to have more space for addressing the issues of scale. So my concern was obviously the placement of buildings and is there the opportunity to look at it that way?

Mr. Fukuji: I think that we can certainly look at different ways of configuring the site and seeing what the pros and cons are of those different configurations. I think the only other thought we had, and I understand the scale issue about you has the depots existing, you have the theatre it's slightly, it's less in height. Why not have that near it because then it's more compatible in height? And some ways you can orient the fly tower in order to help mitigate that.

Also we thought though that having the theatre on the park side would be a better more compatible use with the park than to have the office building adjacent to the park. So I thought that that, that's the other reason that we had in thinking about doing that. So I don't know if you had some...

Mr. Garber: Yeah, I think those are all part of the reasons. I also think there is a strong desire on behalf the Applicant to have the most prominent address be the office tower frankly, but I think the other thing that when we had initially looked at that it was prior to moving the transit center into the location it is now. Because it allowed, you know, we didn't have all of the transit activity occurring in the front. And the symmetry between having the, a theatre in the park to use the metaphor, but also adjacent to and seen from the Stanford Mall because there would be restaurants and opportunities there and synergy there and also add to the very good draw to be able to get people to be, to be able to act as a bridge between Stanford Mall and University Avenue. So ultimately we ended up pursuing this for, for those reasons. There's also the connection, the pedestrian connection that goes underneath the tracks and rather than having that, you know, that connection back to University North sort of go underneath the tracks and enter

into the offices or the office portion it would essentially enter into the intersection with the theatre there and the park, etcetera. So there's, there's some we thought there was, you know when we sort of backed out of our initial thought of it we thought that there was some synergy to placing it where, where it's ended up or where we're currently proposing it be considered. Is that fair?

5 6 7

1

2

3

4

Chair Martinez: Ok. Commissioner Keller.

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. So I'm gonna continue with this line of discussion. I will ask this question rhetorically; I don't expect you to answer. But the question is, of the uses for this district, who will take transit and when? And the answer is the transit users will be the office building users because by the time the theatre lets out at 10:00 or 10:30 or 11:00 at night transit is not a viable option to get home. People will drive. And so you really, so on that basis you want the transit to be, you want the office building to be adjacent to transit because people will get to the theatre most likely by driving to the theatre or by bicycling; relatively few people from walking. Those who live close enough, but most people will not take transit to this location.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But on the other hand you want the theatre to be located in such a way that it is safe and alive because in some sense the park at night is dark and uninviting and unsafe. And so that adjacency is a little scary in some sense; so thinking about how to make that lively if it makes interesting. I'm willing to bet dollars to doughnuts or maybe sandwiches and dinners that the, that that's the retail that will be located at the bottom of the office building will be food related. Other retail is just not really viable at that location but there's a great demand for food from the buildings unless they provide their own cafeteria as Google does. And also it's a great demand for eating from the theatre. So I think that that's the kind of thing that you need to think about in terms of that.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

I think that the office buildings are way too tall and I will talk about FAR in the next discussion about why they are too tall for various reasons. It seems to me that there's a little mistake in the design of TheatreWorks theatre. And the mistake is if you look at the, can you get back to the diagram where you show the profile of, of it? Yes. If you look on there, there's a lobby that goes up to get into the auditorium. And that seems to be a mistake. You really need to depress so that you walk into the top of the auditorium and then come down and that means that the auditorium goes down below grade and, and the stage may be above grade. So you actually dig a little bit down below. But because the parking lot entrance would be more on the University Avenue side and parking lots can sort of go around and they're not level like an elevator down unlike somebody else's elevator for cars, but the issue is that you actually go around ramps and ramps. The ramp level below the theatre would actually be slightly lower than the ramp level there so you can accommodate that depression that way.

39 40 41

Mr. Garber: May I respond briefly?

42 43

Chair Martinez: Go ahead.

44 45

46

47

48

Mr. Garber: Excellent points all Commissioner Keller. Related to the section, the section has been looked at extensively because obviously that is one of the critical things that needs to be solved with any theatre. And actually we did look at lowering the main theatre down a level such that it would be at the same level as the first level of parking. The real issue there though is

that as soon as you do that you have to get very large materials from grade down to that lower level and you end up with a service ramp, excuse me, a service elevator that's probably 10 feet by 20 feet at least. That also then has an impact in terms of operations because you are having to move then that same material from the same dock back up across from the lower level and then back up to the top and then over to the other theatre, etcetera. So we looked at it not only in terms of its geographical locations if you will, but also in terms of its operational impacts. The reality is that by the time you do that and by the time you add the additional elevator, etcetera, you've added something like half a million dollars to the actual infrastructure of the building and somewhere between \$300,000 and \$500,000 a year in operational costs.

So what you're not seeing unfortunately because the section is just two dimensions is that the theatre actually is or excuse me, the seating actually is depressed three feet. And the lobby level comes in and you enter the auditorium in the center of the auditorium so that the auditorium seating goes up six feet and goes down three feet, which is the current modern way of managing or organizing a theatre stage. That allows you to have the maximum number of people entering into the center of the theatre and shortens the exits and entranceways up and down the theatre steps. And, importantly it leaves the main stage at the ground level, which is the same level as the other theatre so you can eliminate a lot of the mechanicals that have to happen in the theatre. So, long way around, great observation. There's your explanation.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Panelli.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: So the, I want to continue on this element. In fact I took some notes and one of my questions to ask here was, was there some thought to build some of the theatre below grade. Because if you did so, I mean you could effectively lower the, the height of the entire property and perhaps (interrupted)

Mr. Garber: Believe me; the project Applicant was very interested in that solution.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: Yeah, I mean just adding up the numbers you'd actually, if you went one floor down you'd be effectively below 50 feet for everything except for the fly tower. So that was something that came up off the top of my head.

Now when I, when I look at the site and I think about what does this look like from each angle and you gave us an illustration from the park looking south. Is that? I got that right? From looking from Quarry Road (interrupted)

Mr. Garber: The rendering that was just up there?

Commissioner Panelli: Yeah.

Mr. Garber: Yeah, you are on the north looking south across Quarry. Yes.

- 44 <u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: but, but I think about it from all four sides. I'm less concerned about the El Camino side because El Camino's kind of a broad boulevard and it seemed it probably could
- handle the kind of height that's being illustrated kind of the same thing with University/Palm
- Drive. It's more of a utilitarian corridor right there. But the one that sort of I'm most sensitive

to is from Alma and a number of residences and offices on that side. In fact I sent just a quick diagram asking some questions. I know you may not have had time to address it, but...

Mr. Garber: I, Ms. French had sent me your, your sketch. I did try and come up with something, let me, but I need to bring it up on the screen. This is the section, yes? Your section diagram?

Commissioner Panelli: Well what I was trying to get at with my diagram is trying to understand if I'm standing on the sidewalk on the east side of Alma, I'm trying to compare what that viewpoint is if we had sort of a typical community commercial property with a height limit of 40 feet, 50 feet up to the edge of the parcel versus, you know, if you have buildings sort of setback closer to El Camino do we, do we have a, yeah. Exactly, exactly. So what, you know what I need time, I would need time to look at it to have some subsequent questions so I'm gonna, I'll pass along.

Mr. Garber: Ok.

17 <u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: Yeah, thank you.

19 <u>Chair Martinez</u>: Board Member Popp.

21 Mr. Garber: Do I? How do I, do I just leave it like that? Ok.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: If you wouldn't mind just leaving it up for a bit. I appreciate it. Just, is that ok?

<u>Board Member Popp</u>: Shall I begin? Shall I begin? Great, thank you very much for the presentation. Really helps me to understand some of the nuances that I was struggling with a little bit and I really appreciate the time to have this dialogue.

I will echo some of the comments that others have made tonight and just leave it at that quickly, but I really do think it's important to study flipping the site around. I'm quite concerned about the imagery of Palo Alto coming from Menlo Park on El Camino and the first object that you see that's so significant will be the backside of the theatre sort of very difficult to fenestrate and articulate. And one of the things that I might offer as a suggestion is perhaps even studying reorganizing the internal, interior of the building. I know you got this interesting concept around the centralized lobby, but perhaps there's a way to put the fly in the middle and have things around and work around it in some way. You know there may be enough site area to start to do that so you get active edges all around the building and I don't know the realities of that and whether it's even possible but sitting here in a moment it seems like that might be worth study.

I'd also like to ask to have a little bit of discussion perhaps about the vehicular entrance to the garage being centered in the site. To me that feels a little like a barrier in the middle of the site really dividing one from the other and I'm concerned about how that feels to have the site really bisected by cars where the, you know, the clear imagery that we're being shown is that you're trying to create parkland in the middle and really have that be this very pleasant park space, but with these two big holes that the cars are going in and out of seems like its detracting that, from that in a way. You know, again I don't know how to manage this and it's not my job to design it, but I'd like to ask that maybe we have some dialogue about why that choice was made and

maybe start to understand a little bit more about that. That's, that's really, I'd like to maybe just open it up to some conversation rather than using up all the time.

Mr. Fukuji: I'd like to just respond just for a second.

Chair Martinez: Go ahead.

Mr. Fukuji: Yeah we, you know, the vehicular access to the site was a bit of a conundrum for us. We had looked at a lot of different ways of doing it. We don't have the site plan. Put the site plan up? You know we looked at there's, there's kind of three things really driving our decision making around what to do. One was how do you access the theatre and what's the sequence for arrival at the theatre? We thought that if you're off Quarry Road you come off El Camino, you know drop off, from there people can walk to the plaza and find the entrance to the theatre and then people can drive around to the back of the theatre. They can drop off again if they want to in the back instead of go into parking. And that, that move I think was a good move for how to organize that. We couldn't really do it in front of the theatre. There wasn't really enough room to do that.

And then looking at how do you provide access to below grade parking for the office. Primarily people are going to be coming really along the El Camino ramp from University Avenue or Palm Drive or from El Camino and along that way that had to provide access for doing it from there. So then that set really the two main points for access. We actually thought about having more points of access to below grade parking, but in looking at parking structures of this size, 850 to 900 spaces both on the Stanford campus and other places we found that many of them only have one entrance as opposed to two. And, but the way they handle that is that they look at what to do for peak loading coming in and out and Mr. Arrillaga's a fan of having it be open when you drive into a parking structure. So he really wanted it to be, you know, four lanes. Two lanes in, two lanes out. We said that's going to be a little wide on the side by Caltrain, why don't we have it be three lanes? You have one in two out. And so we came to the conclusion that was the way to do it.

He proposed, we originally had you drive that, that was a street. That you can just drive through and from that you would go from that to access to the sites to the theatre or to the office. He suggested actually having it go below grade from there to more direct and then have a very wide pedestrian bridge that links the two together so you separate pedestrian and vehicular traffic through the main part of the site. We thought that was a good idea so that's how we arrived at the proposal. We said it wouldn't make sense to have driveway access where you're having bus circulation so we removed it from those areas in front along University Avenue in front of the depot. That's the thinking behind that.

Board Member Popp: Ok well I can certainly follow along with that and that's rational. I just I think in light of what you're hearing perhaps there's other organizational options that might be available even maybe taking those two and pulling them apart to corners. It certainly occurs to me that it's easy for the car to travel and more difficult for the pedestrian, bike, and others. And so having the vehicular entrances farther away and, you know, maybe some centralized element that you come up out of the garage within. You know I'm looking for a pleasant way to visualize that park area in the center and really maximize the bang we're gonna get out of that.

And so in light of the things you're hearing I think maybe that's a, that's something that's worth studying.

But I'll say that I'm not, I'm not challenged too much by the height. I think we're far enough away and these things seem workable to me. And I think that buildings that are articulated in the right way and, you know, I'm jumping into probably a can of worms here, but I think that the (interrupted)

Chair Martinez: We need to move on.

Board Member Popp: Ok. I'll let you go on. Thanks.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: I'm gonna try to follow up. No I'm gonna wait see if I can... well I'm gonna try to follow up if I can. Any of us who have traveled have used the ramp at the Palo Alto Medical Foundation know how terrible of an entry to a clinic that is and we're kind of faced with the same kind of entrance to something that should be very special.

Now I have, I'm designing a much more modest preforming arts theatre and one of the people I'm working with is singer Linda Ronstadt. And she described the best place that she liked to perform at and that was the Santa Barbara Preforming Arts Theatre I think it's called. And she described people arriving in a courtyard, in a garden, and then walking through a courtyard into the lobby and then into the seating area. And she said by the time they were there they were ready. They build up the experience of, of, of that procession really made the anticipation of the theatre that much more exciting. And I don't see that in driving down, coming out through an elevator up and into the building. You, you don't arrive walking along El Camino into the courtyard into the building. You arrive through the side or the back and I think that's a great mistake for any kind of a performance theatre. And I think the comments that especially Board Member Popp had just said really speak to the point of that experience of the theatre. I could, I'll say a little more about that in our next session, but we need to move on to Commissioner Tanaka.

<u>Commissioner Tanaka</u>: So I just wanted to ask about the theatre uses and is this only going to be used for theatre? Do you think there's convention center uses? I don't know if Dan you could speak about that?

Mr. Garber: Yeah I think the intent is for the City and TheatreWorks to come to an agreement as to how both the City and the theatre can, can utilize the space. The idea is and TheatreWorks is very much supportive to try and find ways for, for this to become a community resource and to act in a responsible way for that and to find ways to program not only the spaces that occur inside the building but outside the building as well and take responsibility for that. You know what those, you know what those programs are, what they actually can be I think is, you know, we're still a long way away from. But relative to the design of the building in terms of the concepts that we've been trying to forward here is to create opportunities for the public to enter the building and participate in it. And will not having sort of a losing TheatreWorks, you know, opportunity to have its own administrative spaces, its own storage spaces, etcetera. But to recognize that it has a very significant public function as well. I mean every theatre does, but in this case more so.

<u>Commissioner Tanaka</u>: Sure. Well I guess the reason I mention that is I, I think certainly there's a need for a theatre but also in this area there's not a lot of convention center space except if you go to (interrupted)

Mr. Garber: A lot of what? I'm sorry.

<u>Commissioner Tanaka</u>: Convention center. And so I was just trying to see a kind of prop stool use of the space.

Mr. Garber: Are you looking for a response or is that a comment?

Commissioner Tanaka: It's more of a comment, but if you can respond that's also good.

Mr. Garber: Yeah, I think the thing to keep in mind is that one of the primary reasons that TheatreWorks has been searching for a new home for, you know, more than 10 years now or 12 years is because it has programs which preclude it, you know, truly sharing. So there is a number of opportunities that were investigated back in the year 2000 as part of the feasibility study that was done with Stanford and the City and Stanford recognized that when, you know, TheatreWorks which provides over 280 days of programming every evening in addition to its educational programs, outreach programs, new works, festivals, etcetera, etcetera. You know you can't have another theatre company in there. Which isn't to say that there aren't down times for some of the spaces, and that there's obviously great utility in that. So conventions, convention center, is a completely different use that has a much different requirement for large gathering spaces. And, you know, I think there is a large opportunity for convention that would occur as a result of this project that can be pursued in other projects. I think, I suspect that it would be hard to try and do both inside this one theatre building. Is that helpful?

Chair Martinez: Thank you. Commissioner Alcheck.

Commissioner Alcheck: Thank you for your presentation tonight. This is actually my second sit through; I was present when you made this presentation to City Council as well. I in general can't imagine a more apt location for the sort of height and density you're seeking especially in the commercial context. And I think that the theatre is a very exciting opportunity and in hearing my fellow dais members speaking today about the adjustment of the positioning of these buildings I think there may be something to say for a theatre plaza being far away or far enough away from a bus depot if you will. So I do think that there is a, maybe a value to have that segregation and I identify the theatre plaza as being a public space and although the retail level of the first floor of this building is going to be privately owned I always consider retail to be semi-public in its invitation to the public and so if in fact Commissioner Keller is right that 90 percent of the space will be, you know, public, you know, restaurants available to the public to some extent I consider the transitionary area between the hub and the theatre including that retail space. And to some extent I can imagine cafés full of people and as you transition through that maybe there is sort of that element.

So in, in general I, I, I think there's some tremendous need for this space. It's not just Facebook I know that, you know, smaller companies have left. I just heard that Speck, there's a tech company called Speck, they just moved to Mountain View or Sunnyvale because the five small buildings they were looking at were not as appealing as the one larger building they could get.

City of Palo Alto October 10, 2012 Page 16 of 48

Although they did leave their retail space here, they're going to sublease the rest. So I think there's a tremendous need for commercial space and I believe that the mixed use adjacent to the transit center is important.

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1

2

My only question, and I'll finish with this is the outer loop/inner loop concept for this transit depot reminds me of the current temporarily hub, bus hub in San Francisco. It has sort of an interior out, it's probably not as large but it has an interior and exterior kind of loop thing. And I'm wondering if there are other examples in other cities of this sort of configuration? Whether it would be smart maybe to have a study of the San Francisco temporary bus depot, to see if there are issues there. One of the issues that I sort of have seen in the San Francisco temporary hub is that if you are crossing this thoroughfare of buses it's sort of scary because you look like an ant next to, you know, double length and single length buses. And so my only question is how did we come to this design and how did you study it and to what extent are we evaluating similar designs like this and whether or not they work or not?

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

Mr. Rodriguez: Thank you very much. The way we actually came to the design of the transit ring road was again through that consensus building with the various transit agencies the VTA, Marguerite, and SamTrans staff and actually one of the things that kind of helped us kind of model the concept for this was actually operations of the Mountain View Transit Center operating sort of similar, just a much smaller capacity. And in discussions we've had with the VTA, I think how their envisioning this working is for the, for the short term drop off you kind of just come in, drop off, unload the people at the bus, maybe forward some people. All that happens kind of on the outer edge of the ring road and then more layover activities begin to happen kind of in the center portion of the, of the ring where they'll be less people dropping and boarding or de-boarding from the busses. And so the activity where the pedestrians would be kind of getting off the bus happens on the outer perimeter going straight to the Caltrain station or to the other office uses or adjacent land uses. And so there's a less of an interaction for pedestrians to have to kind of [unintelligible] right across the street for lack of a better term. But it is a good point. Definitely if you're aware of some locations or if anyone else is we'd love to have some site visits. I was looking for a reason to go to San Francisco and so that sounds like a good one.

31 32 33

Chair Martinez: Ok. Vice-Chair Michael your comments.

34 35 36

37

38

39

Vice-Chair Michael: So thank you very much. This is a very interesting and provocative proposal and I've got a number of comments. One is on the plan that you've got up now the, the backside of the fly tower is both the very tall and also very wide and just very flat and its, it's not softened by any tree planting that I can see or other something just to soften that. And I just drove past the Menlo-Atherton theatre with the fly tower and I think this is a defect in the layout. So if you could plant some trees that would be fabulous.

40 41 42

43

44

45

46

47

48

Also I had a chance I was in San Francisco today and you approach the city you look at the skyline, you see the older part of the city a lot of the buildings are sort of square, rectangular, flat, right angles. You look south at Market and it gets quite a bit more interesting and what you've got here is sort of rectilinear block shapes with flat roofs on what we're seeing and I'm very curious about the option for different treatments of the, the skyline kind of qualities, more graceful, more curvilinear, which I think particularly given the sensitivity to the height impact the blocky, flat, rectangular as you being using the entry to San Francisco as an example it's

October 10, 2012 Page 17 of 48 really lovely in the new area and very dated and we're instantly going back if we keep the blocks.

So and another comment the, just to enumerate the public benefits which are substantial and significant: the theatre, the transit improvements, the intermodal transit center, all of that. I'm wondering to the extent that within the, the mixed use and the office buildings there might be an additional sort of public space dedicated in the design of one of the office buildings that might be sort of auditorium like that might be available for certain events or meetings or whatnot that could be public/private sharing which would be quite useful and balance out the, the space.

And finally to the extent that the TheatreWorks is gonna be so active but may not be here forever in terms of the design of the theatre to what extent does the design accommodate other modalities of ballet or musical performances or other activities in addition to or maybe after TheatreWorks is finished? And that's most of my three minutes but if you want to comment to any of those or just take those as observations. Thanks.

Mr. Garber: Hi, I can comment relative to the TheatreWorks or the theatre building. If you were just designing a space for ballet or concerts or something of that sort you wouldn't need frankly as much infrastructure as you have in this theatre now. Can it be used for those sorts of functions? The answer is yes frankly because they have less functional requirements. Perhaps less so for ballet in that you would have the same, you know, you can have the same amount of scenery, you have large casts, or you can have the opportunity for large casts and so you need rehearsal rooms and green rooms, etcetera.

So there's a lot of opportunity to utilize the space for a lot of different things versus for instance like the Bing Concert Hall. You would be very difficult to put on a performance there because it doesn't have a lot of the infrastructure, it does not have a fly space, it doesn't have a unintelligible, it does not have the rehearsal rooms, etcetera that you would have to have for this sort of thing. So there's a lot of flexibility for what the spaces can be, can be used for. One of the large, there are two very large rehearsal rooms that are programed one of which essentially reproduces the size of the main stage. And then there's also the second one that is also very large is a, is in fact a dance rehearsal room and those can be used actually for, you know, informal performances or a smaller scale performances as well and that works well with the lobby, the upper level lobby that's, that's there.

Chair Martinez: Acting Board Chair Lippert.

Acting Board Chair Lippert: Thank you. I think the interesting thing is that just as San Francisco's completed their review of the tallest building in San Francisco we're just beginning our review of what could be the tallest building in Palo Alto. Can you just very quickly explain what the relevance or nexus is of Urban Lane on this site? Please just be brief on it. You know.

Mr. Fukuji: I think that as Jaime mentioned earlier for existing Urban Lane the only thing we're proposing is a bus turnaround at the end by Palo Alto Medical Foundation to help support transit movements through there.

Acting Board Chair Lippert: Is it part of the site?

Mr. Fukuji: It's not part of the site. That's property that's owned by Palo Alto Medical Foundation it's also Stanford land that's been leased.

2 3 4

1

Acting Board Chair Lippert: Ok. Did you look at all the dream team scheme for the University Circle area there? University Avenue where the terminus is?

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

Mr. Fukuji: Yes, yes we did. I think that in a sense the dream team was very visionary but very difficult to implement. But the key things that came out of that were how to enhance pedestrian/bicycle connectivity and look at how to redesign transit circulation and that gave a lot of very creative thinking into how to do that. And we learned from what that could teach us and then we based most of our decision making on that and our collaboration with our transit providers.

12 13 14

Acting Board Chair Lippert: Ok that's what I was looking for exactly. Ok the connectivity and also when you're trying to piece together pieces of Salvage Park, you know, it also expanded that element as well in the dream team scheme. So I certainly take a look at that.

16 17 18

15

With regards to built heights of tall buildings in Palo Alto, 525 University in the City Council Staff report it's only given in terms of stories it's not really given as height. Where do we fit in terms of the height of this building and that?

20 21 22

19

Mr. Garber: You know we don't, I don't know why we don't know the height of that building. Well, it sounds like Ms. French knows. Please inform us.

23 24 25

Ms. French: That's what I found in the means that I could in our online electronic resources. Everything that I put there was what I found. I could not find the height of that building.

26 27 28

Acting Chair Lippert: Ok as far as watermark is concerned it's important I think to understand what the context is or what the height of the building is in this proposal versus the one at 525 University.

30 31 32

29

Mr. Garber: So, if you, let's make an assumption. There's 15 stories (interrupted)

33 34

35

36

37

38

Acting Chair Lippert: No, I don't want to make an assumption. I want the number, ok? I want to know whether this building is coming up to or topping 525 University. I want to know where it's coming up to or topping Palo Alto Square. I want to know where it's coming up to on, on 101 Alma. Because those are the most significant tallest buildings in Palo Alto and this is gonna be one of the tallest buildings in Palo Alto. And so we want to have an idea as to context wise where it's gonna be.

39 40 41

42

43

44

Chair Martinez: Ok. And I want to thank the Chief Planning Official for the tea. Let's see if it works overtime. When I travel I carry around with me a checklist of what makes a great city. I wanted to talk about a great civics base, but I think I'm going to take this time to talk about a great sense of history and really put it on the line why isn't the Julia Morgan included in the project? Why isn't it there? A response, please.

45 46

47 Mr. Fukuji: We're, there's a couple of things. We're looking at several different locations for it. 48 It wasn't initially proposed to be in the project. the direction that we've gotten from Council is

Page 19 of 48

to really look at how to include that in El Camino Park and in the response that we're putting together for City Council in November we're looking at how that can be done in a way that helps create a more holistic environment for that building, the park, and the project. So we can look at how that could work together.

Chair Martinez: Ok, but we all know that because of the sighting of the tower there was no place for that building and it also compromises the transit station because of it's out of scale relationship. So what I'm suggesting, move the tower, create a civics base, put the Julia Morgan back, recognize the significance of the history, not just of the building but the people who to this day continue to use that building. Place it as part of what's important, what makes Palo Alto a great city our sense of history. Our sense of who the people are that have come before us. Who the people are that are using this building. Honor the memorials that are there. It wouldn't be that hard. Perhaps you need to look at the architectural program for the site. Maybe there isn't room for a theatre that that's ambitious. Maybe the towers need to have a different relationship and be more modest. If that can be introduced into this planning process, but it has to be taken more seriously that it has been there for almost 100 years and it needs to be included in the plan. Not at the golf course, not at the other end of El Camino Park, not at the VA Center, but there where it's been for almost 100 years.

I am going to turn over the mike to the Vice-Chair Michael who has a better voice than me tonight for the next round.

<u>Vice-Chair Michael</u>: So thank you Chair Martinez. Enjoy the tea and for the second round let's go back to Board Member Lew for three minutes.

<u>Board Member Lew</u>: So I have a question about the, the office buildings. So like many of the other high tech tenants that have come to the ARB have told us that their employees require like outdoor amenity areas. Their sports, whatever recreation, terraces, patio dining, and they're all private to their employees. They are not really public at all. And so I was curious as to about this project because it's a very different kind of site. You don't really have the same kind of area and how those kinds of amenities would be provided on this site.

Mr. Fukuji: I think that we hear that. I mean I think it's not an isolated campus. It'll have a cafeteria where every need will be met. Several of the interviews that we've done major technology companies have all said that there's sort of more urban environments that have amenities that are part of a downtown are really attractive to their employees and they like to see that. That creates a lot of space for how to look at how you manage the ground floor use. I think that's the City's choice to think about how we'd like to manage the ground floor. What uses and activities should be there and to help really make sure that is enabled for that.

<u>Board Member Lew</u>: And is there anything in the proposed zoning change that would like, say restrict other office tenants? Say if it was like predominantly lawyer offices or is this really intended to be technology driven innovation district?

Mr. Fukuji: We haven't quite gotten to that place yet. We're really trying to get the big picture vision but that's gonna be a negotiation topic.

Board Member Lew: Ok. Thank you.

City of Palo Alto October 10, 2012 Page 20 of 48

Vice-Chair Michael: Commissioner Keller.

3 4

5

6

7

Commissioner Keller: So firstly let me indicate that the park appears to be in shape to be what I would refer to as gerrymandered around the space to sort of shoehorned in. And I think that the reference to Zuccotti Park is not apt because I don't think you want the Occupy Palo Alto people standing there and protesting the big industrial behemoth that happens to be in the office building adjacent. So I don't think that that's the, that's the image that we would like to continue.

8 9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

I think that what you're really doing is reducing the effective size of the park and if that's what you're doing, that's ok. That's not necessarily, not necessarily the right thing to do, but if that's what you're really doing and I think that's what you're doing then say so. And instead of trying to indicate that this certain amount of square footage goes somewhere in this weird place all around in front of the building that's really part of the setback of the building not really part of the park. So I think that, you know, while you may rationalize a little bit more of the space in front of the theatre as being part of the park this, the bridge over the roadway, the space on the other side of Urban Lane that's right it's stuck against the Caltrain depot is not a park. I'm sorry it's not.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

In terms of opportunities that you might consider you have this wonderful site opportunity this 50 or 60 or some odd feet on top of the theatre and then a tall slab of 40 feet above that and I'm wondering if there, you know, for the, for the theatre. I'm wondering if there's a use for that in some sense? A gathering space? You know some towns have outdoor movies and you can sort of show outdoor movies on top of this. You know think of, take an opportunity to use that space it's got a great view. It's sort of a wasted opportunity as unused up there and I'm not sure exactly what you'd do with it, but think of a use for it.

26 27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

Also I would hope that in the life of this project that the train tracks would be undergrounded for Caltrain or high speed rail or whatever it is. And I think that you should plan this project around the ability to accommodate undergrounding Caltrain. And although I certainly do think that it is not appropriate to have four tracks around south of say Churchill, it is quite possible that some day there will be four tracks at the Palo Alto station in an underground configuration underneath the current platform and that you'll basically have access over the train tracks to be it for pedestrian/bicycle path. And I don't know what that does to University Avenue and I don't, you know, but in some sense some consideration of that transition needs to be thought about because I think that that in the next 50 or 100 years or however long this complex is gonna be there that's hopefully gonna happen and separate the, the, the we have this sort of wall in some sense, the rolling wall of the train separating two parts of Palo Alto. That's gonna hopefully go away and with Caltrain increasing more and more it's gonna become more of a problem so think about that. Thank you.

40 41 42

Vice-Chair Michael: Commissioner Panelli.

43 44

45

46

47

48

Commissioner Panelli: I'm gonna pick up where I left off and by the way thank you for putting that slide up. I'm gonna need more time to study it so if you could send it to me that would be great. But it does, it does help coalesce my, my thought and the point I was trying to make which is if I'm standing on the sidewalk on the east side of Alma directly across the street from the depot station it's a much, the sense I think I would get is much different than if I'm standing

in the middle of theatre plaza or in the courtyard between the two office buildings. If I'm in either of those two locations there's some pretty decent sort of view plains. But if I'm standing directly across the street my, my concern is that, that both the office towers, especially with the two L's sort of interlocking and then the broad side of the theatre it's effectively, the sense is the further away I am from the site the more of a sense of a wall that there is. And I'm wondering is it, was there any consideration to, to sort of directionally sort of turning them 90 degrees and having everything sort of perpendicular to El Camino and Alma so you're sort of more preserve those sight plains?

Mr. Fukuji: I think that's been a really tough design problem to look at what to do and how to do that. I think we've had some success in doing that. I don't think it's quite completely there and we can talk about some of the things that our strategies have done to address that. One thing we did do with the theatre is that because it, and I know you want to talk about the theatre but I just want a point about it is that, you know, it's kind of a blank box. But if you have the service spaces facing the Alma side then you can have windows glazing at all kinds of articulation on the building on that side that you wouldn't have on other sides. We felt that at least when you're on the Alma side you look and you actually would see a fenestration of a building as opposed to a blank wall. We thought that would be the better of the four sides that would be an appropriate side.

We looked at how to align the streets so that you had new corridors. One of the things we did was like with Everett for example is when you look down that you now continue to see open space. We literally tried to do that with Lytton. It was a little more difficult to accomplish with doing that, but this becomes an architectural design issue. There are many streets that terminate and buildings that can be done well. This is a little more bleak in terms of how you'd be looking at it. You'd be seeing part of the building but there is a space between the theatre and the office buildings that you would partially see if you looked down the length of it. So it does some of it, it doesn't quite do everything in terms of that.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: Well, let me just quickly follow up to that. So what about a minor reconfiguration such that at least between the office buildings you have a clear shot, which right now you don't unless your actually sort of inside the courtyard.

Mr. Fukuji: I think that's a good, it's a really good idea. We're gonna see what we can do about that kind of thing.

Vice-Chair Michael: Board Member Popp.

Board Member Popp: I'm essentially gonna follow the comments that others have been saying here. It's the same tact that I'm interested in understanding as well and I really am focused on trying to find a way to enhance the connection between what is on the other side of Alma with this site. Really knit it into a feeling so that it's part of downtown and find a way to maybe not rigorously extend the grid across the street, but one of the things that I do think really is valuable is as you're moving along the streets as a pedestrian or in a vehicle that you do have this view of the hills. It's beautiful and finding a way to allow the Lytton access and maybe, you know, I don't know what the solution is and I'm not ready to start proposing things for you. It's really your job to do that.

We'll talk about it, but I think the things that I'm looking for are not taking away the view of the mountains and really trying to find a way to integrate the downtown and this new area. And maybe it is a reconfiguration of the shape of these buildings. And we've said a bunch about this now so I won't belabor that but I do also want to really encourage you to think about these buildings in a sculptural way so that when we get to the ARB, you're skilled, right? And we'll look forward to having all of that come to the table for us, but I'm, I'm intrigued by the site plan and the way the buildings are organized and shaped in a way, but I'd like to see that translated three dimensionally more. And so starting to think about how these buildings reach up to the sky and what those look like and maybe, you know, voids the pull in and out a little bit to help enhance the view might be something that would provide a good tact and a good approach. So, my two cents.

11 12 13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Vice-Chair Michael: Commissioner Tanaka.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

Commissioner Tanaka: Yeah I actually had the same line of thought as well as my, as, for my second round here which is I think this space here provides the opportunity to not just connect downtown but also the Stanford shopping mall and I think there's that kind of intent. And so thinking about how can this connect to all, you know, connect downtown with the Stanford Shopping Mall I think would be a really, really good goal to do somehow. I'm not prepared to tell you how to do it through, but if you could figure that out I think that would be a really, really powerful (interrupted)

21 22 23

Mr. Garber: Forgive me. Just spend another sentence or two telling me what you're imagining or thinking about relative to this site and Stanford again because I think is missed something there if you would just repeat that?

25 26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

24

Commissioner Tanaka: Sure. I guess what I'm thinking is, you know, we have kind of one of the premiere shopping centers, Stanford Mall, we have downtown which is also a really nice shopping area and we have this spot, which is kind of in the middle. And I think it provides an opportunity to kind of bridge the two together. Perhaps even a way where you could walk from Stanford Shopping Mall and have a meaningful experience all the way to downtown and viceversa. And I think if that could be done somehow, I was actually looking at how you were doing the pedestrian routes and still like I'm not sure if it's there yet right now. But if you could think about how that could be done I think that would be quite powerful. And I think in order to also enable this besides, you know, the right kind of routes is to also have, have the right kind of uses on the bottom to make it kind of a, a, a, you know, meaningful experience. If it's kind of dead or if it's not, you know, if there are not enough things going on when people are going in between these it doesn't really act as that bridge. So I think that's, that's something that could be thought of more of how to make this kind of strong connection because I think this is a really nice opportunity to do that where this can, I guess it also depends on what happens at the Stanford Shopping Center. So we don't know those plans yet, but I assume that's gonna also expand one day and thinking about how that all kind of comes together I think would really be nice.

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

So and just back to my other previous comment which was the theatre and I understand the need to be focused on the theatre. I guess my only concern is just it's hard to predict the future so having, you know, having a building that could serve multiple purposes is actually a good thing and I think one of the needs right now is the convention center or something like that. So it's just something which can perhaps be thought about as part of this plan. Thanks.

Commissioner Alcheck: Ok, so, you know, my comments are directed at you but also directed to the Council since I know that they're going to be looking at this and our input. I'm gonna just kind of quickly respond to as many things as I can. I'll start with Commissioner Keller's comments. I don't think the existing park along El Camino Real or the space that's currently designated as existing park is, is a good use of park space so to the extent that you're moving that park over here and not, you know, using it, I don't think that's an important issue. I do think to some extent if we're gonna be honest about whether or not we're decreasing park space or increasing park space we should, but in this particular instance I don't think the reduction of park space along that El Camino strip is really a significant issue. And, and I also want to highlight something, you know, I'm a huge fan of the High Line in New York and we, parks are not just places where you can run to ultimate Frisbee matches. Parks can be extremely unique spaces where we can contemplate and we can gather socially or we can even experience the outdoors individually in an extremely urban area.

So I want to just elevate or highlight the comment by Commissioner Tanaka, which is I really think that the idea of connecting Stanford to this space and, Stanford Shopping Center, to this space and maybe even Stanford to this space and this space to our downtown in a way where it feels like even if you were doing nothing related to the facilities at this site it would still be a popular walk, if you will. I think that's a very interesting idea because that would allow us to enjoy that space in a unique way and I also want to kind of comment on Commissioner Michael's note and say that I think that there is this and also Commissioner, Board Member Popp this, this sculptural opportunity here that these buildings can be gorgeous, you know, to name a preforming arts hall in L.A., the Disney Hall or whatever, that is really it's the new Bay Bridge. It's a sight that will always remain iconic.

And look I'm, I'll be very forthright with you and I hope the City Council is listening. There is no location that is closer to transit, closer to El Camino, that's more apt for the tallest building we'd ever consider. Whether it should be as tall as you like, I'm not going to venture to say that yet, but there isn't a better location for this sort of mass that we're talking about. So if we're going to do it, it ought to be, we ought to shoot for the stars here and so the, that's all the time I have but those are my comments and I encourage you to really reach for it.

<u>Vice-Chair Michael</u>: So I'll take my turn next. Just have two, two areas just to explore briefly. One is when the Planning Commission reviewed the Bicycle Pedestrian Plan one of the things I really enjoyed about that was relating my own personal experience as a cyclist and so once that came up I decided to more seducely use the Homer Tunnel when I ride my bike from my home and the community center out to the hills and so this area that you're talking about here is something I've been, been transiting quite a bit recently. And so I'm just kind of curious whether what you're proposing here is going to enhance my, you know, personal selfish experience in getting from my home out to the hills more easily or whether it's actually gonna get sort of preempted by all the, you know, the occupants of the, the space and I'll have to go back to riding past Palo Alto High School and that's not so good. But anyway I, it doesn't seem to me that it's gonna be a good sort of regional cycling kind of transit area. It's going to be more localized. So I think that'll be for me a little bit of a negative. Just put it out there.

The other thing is the concern about the, the status of the Julia Morgan building and where it might be moved to the extent that it has to be moved. I have a, an odd idea and it's perhaps, you know, not at all practical, but the primary beneficiary of this philanthropic effort by the Applicant isn't the City, it's the University. And I think that's a great thing for the University and, and I think that to the extent that there's that benefit to the University it's probably also good for the City, but I wondered if maybe there's a way that the Julia Morgan building might be moved not so far, but across El Camino into what's now sort of part of the arboretum area sort of adjacent to Quarry Road so that, you know, right now that's not utilized other than there's trees and trees are lovely and it's, you know, sort of an undisturbed block of, you know, eucalyptus forest, but you might do something quite nice with that in that space. With this it's a nice building, it's a nice area and it might also go to further Commissioner Tanaka's suggestion which I've been thinking about is there really is sort of a nexus between the shopping center and this, this development and the City. And that would be sort of on the pathway of that nexus and would, would add considerable interest and it might be utilized in a way that would promote, you know, a good experience.

Acting Board Chair Lippert: Thank you. The first thing I wanted to say is that I think probably the site for the office building there is, there is precedent for it being located close to the, the train depot. And that is that 525 is located at the other end of University Avenue. As you walk down University Avenue it's visible. It punctuates the street even though it's not centered on the street and the same thing could very well happen here as you head down University Avenue. It punctuates the other end of University Avenue. And that goes to other tall buildings that punctuate University Avenue I'm thinking University Circle in East Palo Alto. Again, you know, it's along this route.

However we can't continue the discussion of height until both the Planning and Transportation Commission and the ARB finishes their discussion regarding building height and understand what that means in Palo Alto as well as revisions to the El Camino Real Guidelines. Because we've had a retreat on that and we've talked about that as well. And those are two very important pieces that need to be completed before we can really begin to have a discussion on height for this building.

I think that, that Vice-Chair Michael raised a very important point which is the MacArthur Park building or the Julia Morgan building. And that maybe that shouldn't be moved very far. And one thought is that, you know, we do have El Camino Park there and maybe it could be located in El Camino Park in the parking area and that parking area could be incorporated with the other underground parking and therefore it could act as a secondary rec building. You know, maybe a field house for El Camino Park staying within the environs of Palo Alto.

I think the University Avenue and the Circle, the transit center that happens there is particularly important, but it does not have to happen in the Circle itself. There are lots of underutilized sites adjacent to that area and one of them is, is just right in front of the transit center across the railroad tracks. Again it's surface parking that could be incorporated into some of the underground parking or into the complex of buildings itself as well as the strip along Urban Lane. We're ignoring Urban Lane as Commissioner Keller I think indicated by not using this as an opportunity to maybe underground Caltrans, Caltrains and utilizing the land above it and perhaps since Stanford does have ownership of that land. Ownership of that land and they lease it they could not, there's no reason why they could not be renegotiated and have portions of the

tower structures happen there thereby reinforcing Alma Street and the downtown. Taking the parking that's there and incorporating it into other parking that happens. It could very well be that we, that negotiators work, negotiation is worked out with the Sheraton and there's multilevel structured parking that happens on the Sheraton lot that accommodates that. So I think there's ample opportunities but what's not happening here is we're not looking at a holistic plan in terms of how it's going to work with the other parts of the City.

Vice-Chair Michael: Chair Martinez.

Chair Martinez: Let's say I did want to talk about circulation, but I'm gonna save that for the next hour. I, I think I'm going to with the time that we have left initiate maybe a lighting round so we can continue quickly, maybe a minute each the discussion about building heights. I think Board Vice-Chair Lippert raises an important point about the future discussions, but this project also gives us the opportunity to talk about why. Why does the City want to raise its building height? Why does it want to raise it in such an extreme way or to such an extent? What, what are the factors? It's not only about or even about urban design. It's not about the location and the distance from the streets and, and what's around it. It's about other factors like what is our economic development plan, you know, is there a need for the City to grow this way? It's about our tradition. This is a fairly low density suburban city. Is new high-rise sort of fit what Palo Alto wants to be?

I think the discussion about why, why we want to build higher and I mean significantly higher. I'm not talking about 10 feet higher to allow better architecture. I think that's a discussion that this project allows us to have and I think we should continue that argument using this project as the vehicle for what is, what is good building height or why are we going in this direction or why we should not go because it's a divisive issue in the City. It's one that's going to put, you know, many of our neighbors opposing it. So we, we need to look at strongly not just yeah this is a good site, it's a great opportunity, but why should we be going in this direction? And if we can just, you know, one minute each as, as sort of our parting comments each of our members to talk about height issue from their own perspective. And we'll start with Board Member Lew.

<u>Board Member Lew</u>: so I think my question about height was how, what other options were there for massing of the office buildings? So I was thinking like is it possible to have one tower that's even taller and then you have another bar or something that's lower and more in keeping with, you know, the rest of Palo Alto. And so I think maybe going forward with other meetings and stuff I'd like to see other studies and stuff that the design team has done.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Keller.

<u>Commissioner Keller</u>: Thank you. So the first thing is the office buildings being proposed are way too high. I grew up in New York if I wanted to live there I would. I want to live in Palo Alto. Palo Alto's not New York and the people in Palo Alto made a deliberate step not to have Palo Alto be Manhattanized. So I think that that it, it's too high. Thank you.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Panelli.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: I'm probably gonna sound like a broken record here but I'm gonna say it over and over and over probably for the next several years. We need to be careful not to conflate

density and height. We have districts in fact in your Staff answers to my questions you, you mentioned, you know, the CC district which is actually the conclusion I came to independently which has a, a density a FAR that's already established in the code. So the question is do we want squat, flat, uninteresting buildings that take up a bulk of the site or do we want to increase the amount of open space on a site in exchange for more height? I think that is sort of the seminal discussion that we're gonna have on this topic.

Chair Martinez: And then Board Member Popp.

Board Member Popp: So like Commissioner Panelli I think I'll, I'll repeat some comments that I had made at the Architectural Review Board which is I, I'm concerned about the City getting full. If we just stick with the zoning that we got, we let everything fill up to the FAR that it can get to we're gonna feel like we're full. And I'd really much rather see us consider significant height in places where it feels tolerable. And I'm not sure this is the right height, I'm not sure it's the right organization of buildings yet, but I think that there are places in this City where we can tolerate significant height. And there are places where we really don't want it. And we want to make sure it stays low and comfortable and residential and calm. And I think that the, the opportunity here is interesting and I'd like to see it explored further and the height does not frighten me at all. I'd just like to see how it's going to evolve. Thank you.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Thank you. Commissioner Tanaka.

<u>Commissioner Tanaka</u>: So I'm, I'm gonna align my comments along to, along with Commissioner Panelli which I think it's kind of a trade between flat low buildings that fill up the whole lot or tall buildings. Open space versus not having open space. So I think those are interesting tradeoffs that we have to consider and think about. This site is near transit; having jobs near transit makes a lot of sense. So I think we have to think about that carefully. Thanks.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Alcheck.

<u>Commissioner Alcheck</u>: I think that this, these issues are divisive because they are issues related to individuals who don't want this happening in their backyard and there are issues related to kind of the historical record here. Frankly I need to be persuaded why we need to build only 15 feet above our two story residential homes. Our homes go up to 35 feet that means we have 15 feet above them for our commercial spaces. I need to be persuaded why that's an intelligent decision and Palo Alto is not Palo Alto. There is downtown Palo Alto, there's south, there's so many different areas and I think we have to investigate each one of them and decide which ones are more suitable for height. Downtown is more suitable for height.

I don't believe I would not call this high-rise. This is mid-rise and I, I really I'm not suggesting that I'm willing to approve or suggest approval of 200 foot or 150 foot buildings or 100 foot buildings without better review, but I believe we need to be persuaded. And if I could just quickly finish I understand that they conflict with design guidelines we have in place, but those aren't written in stone. And I, I seem, I'm under the impression that those exist because a few awful looking buildings got built in the '70's. And just because some awful looking buildings got built in the '70's doesn't mean we can't trust ourselves and this process to come up with a better, a better design aesthetic. So I'm, I'm not in charge of design but I do believe it's possible and so I think we need to be persuaded and I don't think we have been yet.

Chair Martinez: Vice-Chair Michael.

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Vice-Chair Michael: So I'm a big fan of Palo Alto and I've had a lot of, I come to the height limit with an open mind. I don't have any objection to tall architecture particularly if it's beautiful. And driving around San Francisco today I found a lot to like about tall buildings and many buildings not to like. I think suburban city is an oxymoron. It worries me. I think if this height limit sort of issue may lead to entropy and could sort of suffocate sort of the future evolution of the City in ways that would otherwise be very dynamic and interesting. I think going up as long as you have open spaces and setbacks and view corridors I think a view of the mountains is lovely. I ride my bike to the mountains, you know, three, four times a week, but having a view of beautiful architecture is also inspiring.

12 13

Chair Martinez: And Vice-Chair Lippert.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Acting Board Chair Lippert: Yeah, I, I am not in any way dissuaded from this proposal whatsoever. You know I think it's a really incredible opportunity we have here and it really needs to be treated very seriously. With regard to the height, height needs to be the solution to solving a number of problems. A number of very important problems; number one, does it really buy us something that we can't achieve by adding a little extra height to all the buildings in downtown? Number two, is it gonna create additional problems with regard to traffic impacts in the City? Will people wind up be parking, you know, parking in the neighborhoods to avoid parking in the building? And just concluding I'd say I think the, I think mixed use is also a way to reward height and density.

24 25 26

Chair Martinez: Ok. I'd like to thank Members of the Architectural Review Board for coming tonight. We're going to take a five minute break before we go on to the next round on this project. Ok, thank you. Any comments from Staff first before we part?

28 29 30

27

Ms. French: Just thank you for doing this as a joint board. It was very, very interesting to have the joint group. Thank you.

31 32 33

Chair Martinez: Ok, thank you very much.

34 35

Commission Action: No action taken

36 37

38

39

27 University Avenue: (PTC only 8:00 p.m.) Commission study session regarding general land use issues and design concepts related to the potential project presented as Item #2. This study session is being scheduled to allow the Commission and public an additional and more detailed opportunity to provide comments in advance of City Council consideration.

40 41 42

43

44

Chair Martinez: Ok let's, let's continue everyone. Excuse me again. We are continuing with agenda item number three which is a study session with the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) only regarding planning issues related to the 27 University Avenue project. And I think I'm going to ask our City Attorney to let us know what brings us here. Thank you.

45 46

47

48

Molly Stump, City Attorney: Thank you Chair Martinez. Molly Stump, City Attorney. Appreciate the Commission's opportunity to be with you this evening and to talk about this

Page 28 of 48

important project. You're here tonight for an opportunity to have input and to provide some advice and direction and counsel to the City Council as it considers the very early stages of looking at this quite substantial master plan on this site. The Council very much wanted to be informed by its Planning Commission and its Architectural Review Board (ARB) even though the project is very much at the conceptual stage and it's not the typical type of matter that you'll see. There isn't a proposed zone change before you. There's not a project application that's been filed, but it is an opportunity and an important one to have some early input into the direction on this, this major piece of planning work that may go forward.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Thank you. And in that regard I, I'm not gonna make long speeches tonight. I view this as the very best of the Palo Alto process in that here's a project that's being considered there's no sort of agreement as to that it is this. It's, you know, in a very conceptual phase being asked for the public and the Commission and our boards to have input. To talk about whether this is a good idea. And, and I think that sort of goes to the transparency that we like to see. That we like to know that we're thinking about something that we're a long ways before deciding what that is and to really put out a forum in which it can be discussed and which a wide variety of opinions can weigh into the issues. So I'm very pleased that we have this opportunity and that it really shows that this is a City that cares about public input even though I don't think there's any of us here on this panel that sort of agrees with each other. That's, that's part of the Palo Alto, that's part of the Palo Alto process.

I assume that Staff you have no additional report? Or is there something additional you want to say? Assistant Planning Director.

<u>Aaron Aknin, Assistant Director</u>: No. I think that we covered everything in the last presentation and I think you covered it in your introduction remarks that it's a somewhat wider discussion now though we touched on a number of issues during the joint commission committee meeting, but we can open it up again for discussion to see if there's any other guidance you could give the Council.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Ok. The City Attorney's not gonna want to hear this, but I forgot Oral Communications earlier. So first I'm gonna go to Oral Communications the opportunity for members of the public to speak on anything else except 27 University. I, we have no speaker cards. Yes. So I'm gonna close Oral Communications and open the public hearing. And we have one speaker card and that's Mr. Bob Moss. You'll have three minutes. Thank you.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

<u>Bob Moss</u>: Thank you Chair Martinez. It was very interesting listening to your discussion earlier with the ARB and getting some sense of how you're looking at this. I would have to agree that this has never happened before there's never been a project which isn't legally a project. You don't have an official proposal before you that you've been asked and the ARB and the Council have been asked to review and discuss. So this is unusual.

So let me just discuss some of the details of the project as it's laid out. First of all the more I look at it the more concerned I am about the location of the theatre because what you end up with is this huge wall facing park. And that's not the way parks should be configured. Another thing that puzzles me is that in the report that came out this March about what Stanford was

thinking about for a theater they said that the proscenium only had to be 70 feet, you know, 35 feet for the stage and 35 feet for the workstation and this ended up being 100 feet. And I wonder why if 35 feet is enough for a Broadway quality stage why do we need 50 feet? So I think the height of the theatre building should be reduced.

Some of the comments that you made about not, about not being appropriate to go into a garage in a tunnel and then come up through an elevator to go into a theatre rather than walking across a plaza I think are very appropriate. And so we should be reconfiguring the site so there's some surface parking. And if that means reducing the scale and the footprint of the buildings, so be it. Also the more I look at it and look at the circulation the less appealing it is. I mean you're driving down the street and the first thing you do is go into a tunnel and so your view of the site really is under, is in an underground garage as much as three levels down. And that doesn't strike me as terribly appealing.

One of the basic points that I think has been overlooked is traffic because if you look at the traffic on this, in this location the traffic we have today is not the traffic we're going to have 10 years from now because Stanford Hospital after going through years of discussion was found to have a very significant traffic impact. Impacts as far as Atherton, Middlefield, and as far down as El Camino and Page Mill. So if you combine this size project with Stanford Hospital and Lucile Packard Children's Hospital you're gonna find the traffic on El Camino and University is totally clogged. So when you look at traffic impacts you should consider what's been approved but not yet built in order to have a true evaluation of the impacts otherwise you'll be much, much underestimating what the problems are.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Thank you Mr. Moss. Commissioners you can continue our discussion about the site, the design, but this is also our opportunity to talk about the transportation circulation and traffic on El Camino and policies, implications for the downtown and really the strategy for growth for the City. In many ways it's much broader than the project itself but I would like us to try to keep it in context of this project as long as we have the consultant team here. I'm gonna start with Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. So my first comments have to do with Comprehensive Plan Policy L8. I didn't expect a two third, three quarters of a page answer; I expected the answer yes or no. And it seems to me that the spirits of the Comp Plan policy is that the answer should be definitely yes and that this should be considered part of the downtown area regardless of the actual boundaries of the downtown area. Because when the 1989 study was done it was not contemplated that anybody would be building a tall office building over here and a theatre. So the idea that this somehow falls between the cracks even though it's somewhere on the order of eight or so percent of the total citywide cap and exceeds the amount of development downtown that has occurred since 1989 means that this definitely should be considered within the spirits of Comp Plan Policy L8. And if you're gonna basically go down to the idea that it's not within the sub area I think that that's, that's not following the legislative intent and although I'm not a lawyer and I don't understand the additional, additional about originalists and whatever that's currently en vogue in the Supreme Court the issue is that it's pretty clear the legislative, what the legislative intent was. And I understand that there was an argument for the Stanford Hospital not including it in 3.25 million square feet, but I don't really see an argument for excluding this development from that 3.25, 3.26 million square feet. So I'd expect the answer to be definitively yes, not simply a repeat of what's in the Staff report.

The second issue is that Palo Alto was named after a twin tower of redwood trees and after the development of railroad trestle, a railroad trestle and widening the railroad trestle over San Francisquito Creek one of those twin trees came down and then subsequently another one of the twin trees was cut short because of lightening. And I'm wondering if it is the intent and this may be something I should've brought up at the last issue, but I'm wondering if it's the intent that these two, four, whatever number of tall buildings become the iconic tall structure for El Camino, for El, for Palo Alto instead of, instead of trees. And it seems to me that that's what'll happen. These will be the tallest buildings as proposed between San Francisco and San Joe and I'm not sure that these are the buildings that we want to be known for in terms of, of, of twin towers as opposed to twin redwood trees. Thank you.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Panelli.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: So the way I'm thinking of this is there are three predominately contentious issues here: traffic, parking, and height. I'm gonna just briefly touch on the traffic. Clearly there are some impacts here. The way I look at it though is for this project to move forward the traffic impacts will have to be mitigated and if they're not mitigated the project would not be able to move forward as planned. So it's too early to talk about that one other than it is one of the three, to me, most salient concerns, parking.

I understand that, you know, we have rules about parking. My concern if we sort of try to adapt an existing parking requirement, you know, sort of borrow it from another zoning designation and try to adapt it for this purpose I think we're gonna, we're gonna miss something because if this project truly does become a centerpiece and a beacon for the City it's going to attract incremental traffic. That's not necessarily associated with the use of this as an arts and/or innovation center. And I don't know how w accommodate that, but that is a concern is that the parking won't be sufficient and I'm, I actually would like to just touch on real quickly what Vice-Chair Lippert mentioned before, which is are there other sort of areas that we can extend this parking footprint, multilevel subterranean parking footprint beyond the boundaries of this site?

And then the last thing, you know, going back to the height. I, I think I've said my peace in the last, in the last session that we had. Now the way I'm thinking about this is the Council wants our input predominantly to help them sort of decide how and whether and when to put this on the ballot for an advisory measure, right? And so the way I'm thinking about this is what we need to do here is clearly compare what a common zoning designation would be in this case, that would likely be for this site. So if it's CC, fine. If it's something else, fine. But whatever this would likely be, what that is, what the proposed A&I characteristics are for height, Floor Area Ratio (FAR), everything else and then say, ok, here's the delta between those two. Here are the public benefits between those two. That way we can, you know, whether people are for it or against it we're all objectively, we're all using the same objective data to make our, to formulate our opinions. I think that's critical for this process. Thanks.

Chair Martinez: Thank you. Commissioner Alcheck.

<u>Dan Garber, Consultant</u>: Excuse me, Chair? Chair? May I ask a question of the Commissioner?

Chair Martinez: Sure.

Mr. Garber: I would be interested in some discussion not only from you but from the rest of you. The project being immediately adjacent to a transit both bus hub and station would normally generate, you know, it would be eligible for benefits to reduce the parking in it. And those have been in large part the Applicant in the way that the project had been conceived have sort of been ignored to be able to provide it to be parked fully. Which other communities are trying to find ways to get parking out to reduce those impacts because you're compensating with the transit. And it has been pointed out before that there's a certain irony that Palo Alto both wants to reduce its traffic and parking impacts and yet it wants all the parking which generates that. I would be interested in some discussion from the Commissioners on, you know, those two topics or that single topic and those two issues that arise.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: You care to respond? Yes, Commissioner Panelli.

Commissioner Panelli: I understand what you're saying. I have two quick comments. One is I've heard, you know, the approach where people say well if we don't build it they won't come. Doesn't work, if it's a desirable place they'll still come it'll just be messier and uglier and everything else. I would much rather see us overbuild subterranean parking and have it go somewhat unused than have the opposite problem which is not enough and we have horrible traffic impacts on surface streets in neighborhoods in Downtown North and other adjacent neighborhoods. So, that's my take.

But the point I was trying to make though is that if this truly becomes this wonderful centerpiece it's going to perhaps attract more local traffic. And I'm, you know, I live in South Palo Alto. It's pretty unlikely that I'm gonna go to the San Antonio train station or the California Avenue train station to come downtown. So that's the kind of traffic I'm talking about, not commuter traffic.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Alcheck.

Commissioner Alcheck: So again I limit my comments and viewpoints on this to the position that I hold, which is from the Planning and Transportation perspective. I've said earlier that I think on a personal level I'd love to see you guys reach for the stars here, create an aesthetic and there's design issues. I sort of want to stay away from those as a Planning Commissioner, but again I know I've said this already but this is an excellent site for the sort of development you're considering. And I think we're doing a disservice to this process to some extent by not really appreciating the notion that there is a tremendous demand for growth not just in Palo Alto, all over. I, I don't want to mention statistics because I'll probably quote them wrong, but you know, the population growth in this area is going to continue to explode. It's gonna continue to be too expensive for everyone and there's not gonna be enough office space in the places people want to work and they'll be plenty of office space off 237.

There are six or seven yogurt shops in downtown Palo Alto, which is unbelievable. It's an unbelievable thing that there are six or seven different yogurt shops. And I bet you that if you poll a number of people they'll each have a different one they'd like to choose. That, that offering exists because of the density we have here from the workforce. It is not because the residential density downtown is so high. It exists because there are young people at Stanford

City of Palo Alto October 10, 2012 Page 32 of 48

who spend a significant amount of time in downtown Palo Alto. And, and that offering is of tremendous benefit to the residents of Palo Alto because we come to downtown to eat excellent food, to shop in interesting shops, and to try out seven different kinds of yogurt.

I only mention this because I am a little worried that we are going to fail to compete space wise with our neighbors. We are going to fail to provide commercial space opportunity that, that exists at a much, much lower cost relative to downtown Palo Alto elsewhere and then it won't be the downtown that we all, it's not just we, it's everybody in the peninsula, ok? Everybody in the peninsula, every City in the peninsula wishes their downtown was as thriving as downtown Palo Alto's and I think that this notion of accommodating growth we're sort of ignoring it. If you don't build this, this won't even address probably the growth needs that we have. It's just one effort.

And I know I'm a little over if I could just have 30 more seconds. There was this notion that maybe we should just increase height on every building by a story or two. That's not the way development occurs. We need to create, you know, opportunities. Nobody's knocking down buildings or adding a story at a time. So, I just want to conclude with this idea that we have to continue to preserve this sort of economic vitality, this density. It benefits us; it benefits the public to have that. So I want to throw that, in this first round I want to throw that out there because that's really what we're trying to, you know, deal with.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Ok, but you only get a minute in the next round.

Commissioner Alcheck: Ok.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Tanaka.

enough parking for that makes a lot of sense.

Commissioner Tanaka: Yes, so I actually agree with a lot of the comments of my fellow Commissioners. So I'll just talk a bit about the parking issue first. So I think in general I agree with the concept that because this is near transit you don't need as much parking, but I think having enough parking on the site is going to be important because it is near transit and it also works the other way where maybe people want to go to use, you know, drive from home to a Caltrain station and then go to San Francisco. So it could work the other way as well and having

Also in general it does appear that Palo Alto is at a deficit for parking, especially in the downtown area, Downtown North area and this could certainly help alleviate some of that. So I think, and I'm not quite sure by looking at these diagrams if parking is already under all the buildings like the whole entire site or are the just under the footprint of the building? I don't know if, it looked from the picture it looked like it was just under the footprint of the building.

<u>Mr. Garber</u>: Well, it's, it's actually under, oh here let me use the diagram. So the parking if you follow the green light there is along this edge here. So it's underneath all the office, the plaza space. Where it's not is it's not under the theatre, which is actually a huge benefit to the theatre and the seismic and noise issues that it needs to absorb. And there are three stories.

Commissioner Tanaka: So you're saying that not having a garage underneath helps?

Mr. Garber: Tremendously so. Yeah.

Commissioner Tanaka: Ok.

<u>Mr. Garber</u>: Yeah, it allows the, the foundation of the theatre to float free of the other structure such that it can be isolated which would otherwise if you didn't do that you end up with some significant costs to try and isolate that structure not in the ground basically.

<u>Commissioner Tanaka</u>: Ok. So also just to touch on Commissioner Alcheck's comment about density and vibrancy in downtown. I agree with a lot of those comments. It makes a lot of sense so I'm not going to repeat it, but thank you.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Vice-Chair Michael.

<u>Vice-Chair Michael</u>: So three minutes isn't really enough to get into all the questions that I have. I, I was invited to give a short talk to the Venture Capital Private Equity Roundtable a couple weeks ago about risks in emerging markets, which I had to study up on to make it interesting, but I caught their attention. One of the other speakers came back from China and China he told that they were building a 4,000,000 square foot industrial park to attract a particular type of desirable arts and innovations center. And the amazing thing as an amenity they copied University Avenue. Blew me away, they copied University Avenue. So something about University Avenue is world class. Although I'm kind of proponent of thinking about change in a positive way it really is special kind of what, what there is.

One of the concerns I guess going to Commissioner Keller's concept or question about the overall development cap in the City and maybe the downtown area is to the extent that we're gonna have various impacts which will be the subject of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and other analysis to the extent that we build a large project on this site, to what extent do we sort of usurp opportunities for development elsewhere that we would otherwise see as very desirable? And I think that I tend to be very favorable towards this project, but I'm concerned about the fact that we just use up the whole nine yards right here when nothing is left that would be supported by our streets and schools and parks and whatnot. So that's one thing.

On the question about adequacy of parking I think depending on the tenant for the building you may have a lot of visitors. So you might have the issue of occupants of the building, but also how many people are coming; clients, customers, meetings, negotiations, whatnot. So I definitely would park it as close to or even in excess of 100 percent. [Unintelligible] there was, you know, whatever just max out the parking and use it because there's a shortage of parking this would be a great thing to do.

I think that the somehow anticipating what's likely to happen, best guess on the rail corridor, high speed rail, Caltrain, you know, underground trench, electrification and all that is really integral to what you're presenting in terms of concept. And I think you would really serve us all by kind of making a bet as to what you think can happen or should happen or will happen and sort of plan accordingly because that might really enhance if there's a covered trench what does this do for this property? It opens it up towards the City and might be really even quite a bit more interesting that way. I'll stop and yield my time.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Let's see how I do. I wanted to talk about circulation on the site. The, the bus loop is shared by private cars, correct?

Bruce Fukuji, Consultant: Yes.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: So cars coming out of the hotels and then cars in the perimeter road in front of the train station?

Mr. Fukuji: Yes.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Ok. So that's gonna make it a little more complicated. And then the perimeter road that goes in front of the train station other than for emergency vehicles, can you say what its purpose is?

Mr. Fukuji: You're speaking about the street that's in between the depot and the office buildings as it goes around?

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: You referred to it as a comp street or?

Mr. Fukuji: Oh right, yeah. That will have several purposes in front of the historic depot will be space for drop off, so it could be for Marguerite shuttles or kiss and ride looking at how to allocate that space and then it's gonna be for thru vehicle movement through that. But we've also been looking at how to design that street so that, you know, in that, you could actually bollard off or close this section of the street from here to here and have it be completely pedestrian oriented because the way the circulation is designed on the site it allows movement for people coming from the theatre can come directly in or from the office they can come out or they can come out through here and all the bus circulation can happen though here so you don't have to have that always be open. So you can close that for certain events. We've looked at that as a potential street, it can be designed to be more pedestrian oriented in terms of how it's paved and landscaped and treated.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Seems to me that would be preferable because the way it is now it's the, you step off of the curb and you're gonna get hit by a bus. And to make it a stronger pedestrian connection would really make it a much better use of the depot and, and of the connections to the buildings that are being placed there.

In regard to I think one of the Board Members mentioned the underground ramp access and the way it splits the site. And I think I would like you to consider moving it to the north at the edge and look at whether you can make it work and make the connection between buildings much stronger than it is now.

And then later, maybe next round I'd like to talk about sort of the some of the traffic issues on El Camino, University and elsewhere. But let's go to another round with Commissioner Keller. The same.

46 <u>Commissioner Keller</u>: So first let me say that I agree with the idea of having parking particularly 47 since there will be need for more Caltrain parking and not space to put it. Secondly, I understand 48 that one of the important reasons of isolating the theatre is so that there's not vibration when

Caltrain goes by. That's a significant source of vibration. Thirdly I think that the increased amount of density and will not only result in increased traffic, which we can talk about later, but also there'll be more pressure from the point of view of Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) for us to have housing and I think that there is a significant preference not to have a lot more housing in Palo Alto and particularly as it affects; I know that one of the Commissioners doesn't live in the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD), but most of the people who live in Palo Alto are in the Palo Alto Unified School District and don't want the Palo Alto Unified School District to continue to grow ad infinitum when there's no land for buildings. You can maybe have two story house, a two story buildings in schools, but you can't have two story playgrounds. At least not very easily.

In terms of the FAR you can't double count. You can't count parkland as part of the land for which you calculate FAR. That's just crazy. On the other hand I could imagine that if you think about the theatre sort of like Lucie Stern, which may, I'm not sure if Lucie Stern is considered dedicated parkland or not, but to the extent that Lucie Stern is considered part of dedicated parkland and that can be found out that may be justification for the theatre here being considered parkland. And that would be much better from my point of view than gerrymandering the park in a shoehorned in space around Urban Lane. So that's an issue that should be investigated. To me that makes a lot more sense to me than doing the other thing. Because in some sense it is a, it is a community amenity in that way.

Now if you took the section on, on, the calculation D, there's the calculation site plan D. that gives you about 91,000 square feet. If you took 2.0, if you calculate the office buildings as 263,000 square feet that's a 3.88 FAR. If you reduce that to 2.0 FAR that would be 182,000 square feet. It turns out that if you lop off the top four floors, floors 10, 9, 8, and 7, bring it down to 6, not sure, I'm just giving rough calculations. That reduces it by 673,000 square feet while the other one is in excess of 80,000 square feet. So, you know, if you get closer to 2.0 FAR you can actually reduce the height of the buildings and get them more manageable. And in the next round I'll talk about what, what kind of office tenants you really want.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Panelli.

Commissioner Panelli: Yeah. I, I think the heights when I take a look at some of the different angles, the 3-D views and I'm gonna want to take a look at more of these it seems to me that pushing the height closer to El Camino as much as possible is, is idea. And what that right height is, I don't, I don't know. I'm not as other Commissioners and Board Members have said, I'm not afraid of height, but I'm not, I'm not blessing it as it is today. Because the way it seems to me is that, the way that the office buildings are configured there's actually some height that's pushed closer to the depot and the railroad tracks. It just seems to me that the right place for it is as far back as possible. I should say as far west as possible closest to El Camino where it has the least impact. And maybe something that's a little bit more scaled gradually back so that it's shorter in front, and when I say in front, the view from Alma looking toward, toward the mountains.

If we are going to have this potential 10th floor that's the highest floor in the City it seems a shame that it would be in the hands of only those who could afford to pay the rents there. and I'm wondering if there was any thought given to making that top floor, which would be the highest manmade point in the City some kind of a semi-public use, whether it's a restaurant or

something of that nature that everyone in Palo Alto could enjoy. Just something to consider, as a child my parents loved to go up to the Sheraton in San Francisco and have a nice, well, I should say an average meal with a nice view at the top of the Sheraton. So, you know, maybe that if we were gonna do something like that it seems like it would be nice to have that accessible to the public. Anyway I'm gonna pass along the rest of my time to the next Commissioner.

Assistant Director Aknin: To the Chair? Can I, can I make one comment on the previous comment made by Commissioner Keller related to the jobs and housing balance and the fact that a project like this size would bring in a significant amount of jobs and ABAG may make us create more housing because of that. The Director and I looked into this somewhat and the way that ABAG does it they don't really do it on a city by city basis. What they do is project job growth on a regional basis. So if jobs aren't produced here but they're produced in Menlo Park, they're produced in Redwood City or Mountain View it would still create the same demand for housing within Palo Alto, which would, which would equate to additional housing numbers that ABAG gives us. So they don't really look at it on a city by city basis, but they look on a regional basis.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Alcheck.

Commissioner Alcheck: This is like designed by democracy, which is dangerous because, I mean, I won't speak for my fellow Commissioners. I'm not confident or comfortable with the notion that I can come up with the best ideas in three minutes every 25 minutes. If I was the Applicant, and don't take this the wrong way, but if I was the Applicant I would've, and he's a famous Applicant, I would've thrown it to like 30 architectural firms. I'd say listen, here's your chance. They have a transit hub, they've got an entry, gateway, I want this, I want to see options. Had they did that they had options and I'm not suggesting that you guys aren't the right choice, that's not what I'm suggesting, but there were and I know there's a dream team so I'm lacking some context here but I remember when they were looking at options in downtown San Francisco for their transit terminal hub whatever.

I only mention options because I think it would help your campaign. It's a campaign now. I think you should know that. I think the City Council or whoever came up with the idea to approach the public was smart because this is going to be very controversial and there's so many ideas that are floating around. Again I will say again that I think this is the right site to get developed. I think you should've, you should've designed the design that showed you exactly what you could do under the current zoning or whatever the current zoning of downtown is you should've shown us a box that's four stories tall that occupies the majority of the site with parking around it that gave, you know, just the whole thing from the theatre to the front. We should see what our current design guidelines are suggesting we do. Because I have a feeling no one would want that either, but at least they'll know. At least they'll know why you're asking for a change.

Again, I think that we've heard so many good ideas here. I'm sitting here and I'm thinking there should be an entrance to the parking lot that comes off the underpass. I mean there's a million things here and I'm not, I'm not skilled enough to know what the best way to make this site is and I can keep kind of shooting ideas and by tomorrow I'll have 15 more. I think it would make sense for there to be a few more renderings. Different mock ups because you're letting the public weigh in in a major way. You're having a meeting on a site that you're not really actually

asking to build yet. And you're gonna keep getting these comments about well I think this is important and this is important. It's our job to review projects and see how they affect our, you know, if they're meeting our goals in terms of planning and whether they're affecting our transportation and our traffic and are addressing the concerns that our citizens have. Unfortunately this is such a unique location that it's attracting, it seems to be attracting tremendous ideas and I sort of wish I had a couple sites and I could say, "Oh I like this on this one and I like this on the other," and you know.

Mr. Garber: Chair? I think it's important that I respond to a couple of things. And Bruce can mop up behind me as he needs to. It's important to recognize that we're not; the City isn't really designing these. The reason that Bruce and I are here is first of all to actually take more of a design role with the underlying master plan or a specific plan or however you want to refer to it at. And that we do take a lot of responsibly for. The design of the building themselves is ultimately in Mr. Arrillaga's hands and he does think of himself as a designer. He has actually gone out to several, 2 architects I should say, not 30, but 2 to get some ideas on how to approach the office buildings. But he has incorporated those in his own hand and ultimately has come up with the concepts, you know, that are being displayed here. We have a little more knowledge than he does on how to put together a theatre and so there's, you know, he looks to us to, you know, pull together some of those concepts to a greater degree but ultimately he is gonna be, you know, he will end up hiring the architect of record and will guide their hand as he desires. Part of our role here is to hopefully better ensure that the outcome meets the City's goals as well. Do you want to help me out here Bruce?

Mr. Fukuji: You know just two brief points. We've been in a competition already. Besides his opinions, which are pretty well developed about what he likes and doesn't like and based on his experience there's been two other architects we've had to compete with in terms of what we're doing. So that's, you know, we have done that we should talk to him about how we do that or what we do about that.

The other, the other part is, is that we if a design idea isn't a good idea we really hear about it. I mean we, we've gone through a pretty rigorous design process. I think that's based on what a market driven and a philanthropist is willing to do and I think that's been a very informative process for us. But I think you're right, I think some other alternatives to look at would be very informative for the public in terms of how to evaluate something like this and compare what would happen under current guidelines and what is or isn't beneficial about that and why this might be beneficial, for what reason would be helpful. It's a great suggestion. Thank you.

Mr. Garber: Yeah, I will simply add I did have a sidebar conversation with Steve Emslie and the number of iterations that we've gone through are probably equal to the number of weeks we've been involved. The project has taken different shapes almost weekly. And, you know, for us to walk through all those different things would take significantly more hours, but maybe I was talking with Steve and maybe there's some way that we can find a way to display them or find some way of sharing those so that people can see the amount of effort that's gone into various things that have lead us to here. Not that this is the final, this is just a snapshot in time because it continues to evolve.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: Yeah so I was actually thinking about access. I was thinking about the Chair's question about automotive access and thinking about where that might go and I think Commissioner Alcheck actually had an interesting idea if it actually came off of the under, the current underpass. That's actually kind of clever. Maybe that's a good idea. I don't know.

One other thought I had was just I was looking at the, and this is a very good picture right now. Looking at the historic depot and just how it relates to the project itself and, you know, I was just trying to think if there was a way to better integrate it. I don't quite know how but I just, maybe just cause it's a different color. I don't know. But if there's a way to incorporate into the project somehow more, more thoroughly than it is and maybe you can't because it is what it is.

And I was also thinking about one of the comments that a member of the public made about the fly space and how it's kind of a big blank wall and it's actually kind of a big blank wall on both sides and maybe on the side from the train, the station side you don't quite see it but its only from El Camino Park and I think something, something should be done about that. Maybe it's a gigantic mural of two trees. I don't know, but to have it just a big blank wall there facing the park, something should be done with it.

And then, you know, I was looking at the pedestrian network and thinking about my earlier comment about how do you integrate that with, you know, how do you kind of provide kind of like a corridor or some sort of transition from the shopping mall to the, to the downtown area? And I don't know if some sort of corridor makes sense but it looks like I guess a lot of the retail stuff would be on the bottom floor of the office buildings and so, you know, if you were making a path from the shopping center to downtown you're not really walking past any of that. It's kind of, you really have to make an effort and go some sort of circuitous route to get there. so I don't know if that can be changed somehow to kind of give it a more contiguous feel as you go shopping from let's say Stanford Shopping Mall, which, you know, walking down to downtown it's really kind of bridge both sides. But I'm sure you guys will figure it out. Thank you.

Chair Martinez: Thank you. Vice-Chair Michael. Only three minutes.

<u>Vice-Chair Michael</u>: ok, so in a, in a past life I was an executive with a large high tech company which is one of the 10 largest companies in Silicon Valley and we at the height of our glory had facilities several million square feet and I think we bought the land from Peery Arrillaga for our headquarters in Santa Clara and built something not unlike what you have on the concept plan here, which was I think about 350,000 square foot, which as we grew that was sort of a drop in the bucket of what we needed. So my sense is just in terms of what you're going to find when you stress test the market for tenants. This is not really big enough or good enough for the headquarters, the world headquarters of a top tier growth company. Just not big enough.

So what you're really going to get is you're gonna get a number of smaller tenants which may not be a bad thing. You know you're going to get a combination of some, you know, innovative type businesses, professional firms, accounting firms, financial services, venture capitalists, which might be totally ideal. But I don't think this is going to be sort of a corporate campus. It's just not big enough as far as I can tell. So I think part of the design should maybe reflect the heterogeneous nature of the occupancy and the visitors to the site rather than thinking that its going to be just taken up by one ideal, the next Facebook or something.

But when we built our corporate campus it was bought from Mr. Arrillaga in Santa Clara and we put up the 350,000 square feet in the four buildings. The orientation of the buildings was not unlike what you have here and my sense was there hadn't been a study of sort of the weather and the wind. And they wanted to use the outdoor spaces in the summer for coming to meetings and the wind would come up in the afternoon be, you know, 20 miles per hour and it was freezing cold and really, really quite unpleasant. It was amazing that that hadn't been thought through. And the Venturi effect from the having the buildings close together was nice because you could have the passageways and the, but I wonder if maybe you want to think about the year round metrological conditions and maybe space things sufficiently such that you don't amplify things like wind or whatnot and that I think would probably ameliorate some of the massing because right now with all the buildings together in one spot it's like it's a much bigger bulk. And if you spread them out then you can have your sight lines between the buildings.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Ok, I'm probably going to drive our City Attorney to drinking.

Ms. Stump: Right here at the meeting.

Chair Martinez: I want her to weigh in on something that's probably not my business and that's I'm kind of worried about TheatreWorks. I'm, here's a small theatre company that's going to grow into a massively large theatre company with a theatre that seats 650 people when there are gonna be times when they're gonna have a small audience. And nothing's worse than to preform before a small audience like this. So, so I'm worried about that. And you know usually providing a black box it's usually done in a warehouse somewhere. I've rarely seen theatres build a black box in a prominent expensive site that maybe it might be more useful to build a smaller theater and that way to be able to fulfill your promise to local theatre companies to have a place to share. Because there's not any that I can think of that would have the demand for a 650 seat theatre. They're probably looking at 200 or 225 in that range.

And then the issue that is our concern is that black box is literally a black box. There is nothing on the outside that attracts anybody in that courtyard or around it that sort of makes it sort of a inside out experience and I guess theatres are like that. I'm, I fear that the TheatreWorks is overreaching for something that may not be good for them, may not be good for us, and doesn't really be that public benefit that ultimately we're gonna be talking about. So, I don't expect Mr. Garber to respond, but I just want to put it out there as something to think about as you move towards design to really look at the program for TheatreWorks and really have a much more realistic vision for what it can be. Thank you.

Mr. Garber: I'd actually be happy to respond to a couple of those things if you'd like.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: I'm afraid. Go ahead.

42 Mr. Garber: Is that, would you like me to or?

Chair Martinez: Of course.

Mr. Garber: I'm trying to get to a plan here of the theatre. Here we go. See if we can bring this up. So the size of the theatre has been under scrutiny for about 12 years and actually the feasibility study that was done in 2000 anticipated a theatre that should be around 1,000 to 1,200

seats. The current theatre at Mountain View is 600-650 seats depending on the arrangement of them. There really is zero expectation that, the real expectation is, are there too few seats as opposed to too many? And this isn't this has been a topic that has not been just vetted with TheatreWorks but they the same theatre consultant that was used for the feasibility study has also been consulted to help confirm the programming that we've taken to Arrillaga to be satisfied in this particular case.

Regarding black box theatres, the concept of the black box theatre is that you have a flat floor such that it can be configured in any number of different ways. And I can sit here and name probably three dozen different theatres in Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New York that have black box theatres that are right downtown. In fact I'd say the most prominent one that was finished that's on top of Lincoln Center it was built because they didn't have one and that's the Claire Tow Theater that was completed about three months ago. But they are as you say they are small and that allows for, you know, much smaller audiences much more intimate sorts of things and that's much the same concept that would happen here.

I wanted to bring up the plan because you're absolutely right that you end up with, just as you do on the main stage, blank walls because you can't obviously have windows into those areas. But there is an attempt in the plan you will notice to have an interstitial space between the black box and the plaza there that would end up being occupied most likely by a small café or meeting spaces and things of that sort so that there is a sense of permeability and entry between the plaza and the building. And again these are just essentially line drawings, concepts, but we, you know, are very sensitive to trying to make sure that TheatreWorks finds ways to interact with the ground floor so that there's a sense of pedestrian participation in the activities of the theatre itself.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Yeah, that's really my point that this isn't Lincoln Center. You know it's a small community with a small theatre company and I've seen too many institutions fail because they've overbuilt. And I'm not saying I expect you to fail. I don't expect that and I know you've done your homework, but this is a real concern and the City is betting on you. So I, I'm glad you've done the study and, you know, I want it to succeed because if it doesn't it really it doesn't serve anyone. But I also want a better community usage of this. I would like to see others have a space that they can use, not just when, you know, you're out of town, but when TheatreWorks is actually sharing space and teaching and, you know, making this gift available to the community. And I don't see it in the program that's there now.

Mr. Garber: I did not spend much time going through the program which we can do. I think your points are very important. There is actually classroom space in this program in addition to the significant amount of spaces that can be leased or rented. The other important thing to recognize though is that what will happen as a result of TheatreWorks moving in here is that there's significant space in the theatre marketplace that opens up and allows for significant growth in that marketplace that cannot occur right now because there are venues that don't exist.

Interestingly, the Bay Area has something on the order of 400 theatres the largest of which the top three are ACT is the largest, Berkley Rep, and then TheatreWorks and then you jump down to San Jose Rep and then you end up with literally hundreds of theatres which are anywhere between 26 seats and, you know, 150 seats. And it's one of the densest places for theatre in the entire country. And there's a tremendous demand for space for performance. There's a lot of

Circ. (B.J. Al.

demand that TheatreWorks gets both from the City of Mountain View and the other preforming art ensembles and that utilize that space in Mountain View, you know, asking for any additional time that TheatreWorks can give up, which it can't because it has a program. But that space suddenly becomes available and there are lots of other arts organizations that would love to be able to take advantage of that space.

Same thing happens with Lucie Stern, which unlike Mountain View which has been a successful venue for TheatreWorks and is 600 seats for the last 15 years I guess or something in that sort. Lucie Stern is in the mid 300's, 360 I think, 325, 360 something of that sort. So it's a different, you know, stratus or level in the marketplace and it appeals to a different type of theatre and potentially one that's working its way up to that. But so in addition to the space that is made available new that will be used mostly presumably by TheatreWorks and yes there will be other opportunities for other organizations and not just our sort of organization but other community sorts of uses there. The, the result is that the tide if you will of theatre usage becomes greater as a result.

<u>Chair Martinez</u>: Commissioner Keller.

<u>Commissioner Keller</u>: Thank you. I noticed that Director, Artistic Director Robert Kelley has been essentially the founder of TheatreWorks. He's been there for the 40 some odd years that TheatreWorks has existed. I've been subscribing for more than half that amount of time and I hope that when you, TheatreWorks makes a commitment to move to this stage, this, this facility that there is thought about transition plan of what you do when Robert Kelley is unable to continue in that role for one reason or another and I'm not gonna go further. But just I think that's a concern that the City has to have as well. Thank you.

There was a, I want to follow up on something Vice-Chair Michael said because it's something I was gonna talk about which is what kind of tenant we want. And it seems to me that part of the reason we were told, that the City Council was told and those of us in the audience were also told that this, we want a quarter of a million square feet in this is for a headquarters building. And it seems to me that that as just as Vice-Chair Michael pointed out, this is the wrong plan. It's the wrong concept.

The right concept is that when you have a company that is distributed around downtown Palo Alto and wishes to consolidate into a space and grow out, grow into a bigger space that you need some way of doing that. And so it's really a consolidation within downtown as opposed to having to move to California Avenue area which is what Facebook did or move to Mountain View which is what Google did. In particular if you look at the history in the last 20, 30, 20 or so years we've had some big tenants in downtown Palo Alto. We've had Digital Equipment, we've had Google, we've had Facebook, we now have Palantir here and there's a wave of each one of these moving on to next space. And it seems to me that what's really needed is space for these companies to consolidate and, and be, stay downtown. And if the idea is instead to have a big office building or complex that is used by one tenant when that tenant goes away, and it will, ok. Remember how big Sun was? Remember how big SGI was? SGI is no longer anything and Sun is a mere shadow of itself and bought by Oracle, ok. Big office, big buildings they get acquired, you know, big companies they get acquired, they move, they do all kinds of other stuff. That's gonna create that bimodal distribution of small space and a big tenant is gonna create a

big problem with downtown a booming bus cycle if it goes away. When that tenant comes, that tenant goes it's gonna really destroy retail.

So instead what you really need to have is a complex of something for companies as they grow to have a place for them to move into. A smaller space, that's the kind of thing you need to do. And also in terms of that if you think about this being an activated space that is connected to downtown it means that you need to expand the footprint of retail space downtown to connect with it and in particular that means expanding the footprint of retail on Lytton and on Alma and connecting around. And in reversing the thing we did a couple of years ago about removing retail space. We really need to put it back. We really need to connect the retail space downtown or it's gonna, or it's not gonna flow to the rest of downtown.

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Panelli.

<u>Commissioner Panelli</u>: I'm gonna touch on something that Commissioner Keller just mentioned and I'm not quite certain whether you're advocating for a large tenant or, or many smaller tenants.

<u>Commissioner Keller</u>: Many smaller ones is what I'm advocating for.

Commissioner Panelli: Ok, which I think is and I agree with you then. Which I think is more consistent with what I would consider an innovation district. To me you want to have we want, we should aspire to have many tenants that have enough room to grow into reasonably sizable companies. I think one of the problems we have today is companies form they find some office space somewhere around town and then when they get to the 10 to 50 range is when they really see the growing pains. So having, having an office area where they can grow to 200 before they have to seek new digs is, is great, but building off of what Commissioner Keller was saying when you have a company of 100, 200 if they were to leave they don't leave this giant gap. What, what I've noticed in the commercial real estate market is if, if you have a single tenant who occupies a large amount of space when they do leave the vacancy, the time of vacancy is exceptionally long compared to when you have a number of smaller spaces. Those seem to turn over much more quickly so I actually like the idea of several companies occupying or sharing, sharing the space.

I wanted to touch on another thing that Commissioner Keller talked about earlier going back to the, the FAR comment. He's absolutely right and I think it's gonna require more time of study and more understanding from, from you all what that right denominator is for that FAR calculation. I can understand under all those scenarios that we documented A, B, C, D, I can understand justifications for all of them. But I think we need to figure out which one is the right one and I don't know yet, but I think that's gonna require more study.

Chair Martinez: Thank you. Commissioner Alcheck.

<u>Commissioner Alcheck</u>: I'm not gonna respond to the tenant mix because I think those are market driven. If it's an innovation district should there be some requirements? I don't know, I'm not sure that's, I'm not sure we're there yet. I'll say that I think the public will benefit if the space isn't utilized by a single company because a single company may seem put offish, you know, to the general public. They may use their, the space on the ground floor whether it's

City of Palo Alto October 10, 2012 Page 43 of 48

restaurant or not in a unique way and everybody will feel like it's somebody's space as opposed to multiple people's spaces. So I'll just throw that out there but I think yeah I don't know if I want to comment on tenant mix really.

I think my, I don't know if this is my final comment, but I think my final comment is that I don't think this plan addresses the opportunity for transit oriented development. And what I mean by transit oriented development I really mean the transit development as well as it could. In 50 years, maybe that's too long. I'll still be here in 50 years, but I don't know if everybody will still be here in 50 years so I'll scale back. In 25 years I don't know if you'll be able to tell the difference between Redwood City and Menlo Park and Palo Alto and Atherton and Los Altos, right? As it is everybody's like they're so close there's barely any division you just go from one to the next. I think what we're gonna see is tremendous growth in this area and it's just gonna be like, you know when you're in places in San Francisco did you cross into Noe? Are you in Glen Park? Is it Upper Noe? Are you in the Mission?

I mean it's a, there's a part of me that thinks we're gonna see such tremendous overlap that, that they'll almost be indistinguishable from each other and in this particular instance we're talking about a major transit center opportunity. Maybe a train pulls into a station. I'm thinking about the ferry building and how central that is to downtown Palo Alto and I think we're, personally I have a lot of issues with the plan but I really don't think that this little don't take it the wrong way, but the inner circle and outer circle and when you asked the question about whether car traffic shares that space. I don't know in 25 years if we're gonna look back and go what? Did we just create a black diamond mogul run in this area that we should've created something better? I anticipate that we will be using the train more. Tremendously more in the future.

So my last little comment I want to make is about the theatre. I want to respond a little bit. I don't think 600 is small; I don't think 600 is large. I think its small. I sort of experienced the development of the Mondavi Center in Davis. Davis is tiny. Davis is a speck and the Mondavi Center is an amazing facility. I actually happen to think it's a gorgeous building. People might differ on that opinion because it's very modern. But that place sits 1,800 in its main theatre and 250 in its side stage and this 600 seat place is supposed to have Broadway shows? So, I'd be really excited if I could go see the future Avenue Q in my local town because I think they'll be enough demand for that. But I don't think 600 is too small and I just want to throw that out there. I don't know how tall Mondavi is. I don't know if you guys know, but?

Chair Martinez: Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: I think for the most part I said a lot of my comments already so I just will comment quickly on the tenant mix. I, I think pretty much the market's gonna decide. I think probably Vice-Chair Michael and others are probably right that it's probably not gonna be one single tenant and that's ok I think smaller tenants are good too. I think it provides a good mix. But I do think it's important to kind of activate the ground floor and not just have it office. I think it needs to be some sort of retail use, shopping, restaurants, something like that that actually makes the place interesting. But I think that's kind of the intent right now anyway so, but I do, I do like the idea that you're also trying to do some of that on the theatre site as well which I think is a great idea. And that's all I had. Thank you.

Mr. Garber: Chair? It occurred to me in the previous comment that I needed to correct Mr. Moss when he was speaking. The numbers I was using when I was asked about how the height of the fly was calculated when we were making the presentation to City Council I did not use the number 35 feet. I used the number 45 feet. So the height to the proscenium is 45 feet. You double that to be able to get the, to be able to hide everything you rise up into the flight and then you have 10 feet essentially for structural space. So you get, you know, 45, 45 that's 90, 10 feet for structural you're at 100. That's where that came from.

7 8 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

Chair Martinez: Yeah, I heard that so I'll, I'll support what you just said. Vice-Chair Michael.

10 11

12

13

Vice-Chair Michael: Well after all the hours of study session on this topic my head is spinning and kind of humble about the, the quality of the feedback we give you. In this format it's, you know, the old joke about what's a camel as a horse designed by a committee. And I'm not sure how coherent these ideas are but perhaps there's a few that are useful.

14 15 16

17

18

19

20

21

In our excitement about the zoning and the height and whatnot I think the whole notion of the traffic impact has hasn't really gotten a whole lot of attention and I think that, I think that at times during the day the traffic on University Avenue is, is fully saturated and at times during the day the traffic at El Camino is fully saturated. And so this is gonna be additive to that. I'm not, so I think it's going to be very important when the traffic study is done to figure out to what extent that can be mitigated. I don't know that it's mitigated simply by giving people, you know, passes to use the buses and trains and so forth.

22 23 24

25

26

27

28

29

I think one of the conceptual difficulties I've had with trying to understand traffic and transportation issues is because in Palo Alto the main problem seems to be that people who live elsewhere kind of commute here to work for their jobs and then they commute back home, you know, at the end of the workday. But my personal situation is I'm no longer a commuter so my traffic within the City is intracity and a lot of the traffic solutions don't address intracity activities, you know, coming from my home to attend the Planning Commission meeting for example and transit, you know, doesn't really support that so I drive.

30 31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

And I think that the, the inexorable sort of rate of growth sort of in this whole region and, you know, with what's going on at Stanford and so forth is gonna put increasing capacity demands on all the existing arteries and I think that the traffic study should somehow lead the community and the Council to a better understanding of this is a big enough project that it's gonna maybe be the sort of the tipping point and if you have to get people from you know 101 and 280, you know, into their, their office and then back out at the end of the day, but all those there's a limited number of ways to, to get from there to here. So I'm looking forward to that because it was not clear to me how, it's not an easy problem. And I think that the intracity transit issue to me is, is I think shouldn't be overlooked. I think it's important particularly there's more location independent working, you know, home consulting and so on so that's part of our economic development.

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

Chair Martinez: Ok. A couple things I wanted to just finish with. One is that what this project needs a great civics base. I said that at the beginning. I want to finish with that. The civics base is really the missing piece and it should be really the connection to the City oriented to downtown not to the shopping center. But considering the shopping center I think it would be great if we had a bridge from PF Chang's, not from there, but you know, from around there

Page 45 of 48

across. I think the connection across Quarry is still fragile and I think we should be proposing a futuristic bridge as part of this arts and innovation to really build a stronger connection. So I would really like to see us explore that.

And then finally I have one other question and that is does anybody know what the final score was? Alright. We won, right? Yeah right, thank you.

Commissioners if you don't have any, yes. One minute. People want to go home. Yeah I just want to see if you agree first. Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Alright thank you. So the first thing is that the 260,000 square feet of plan is faulty that the ration off of that so if you reduce the square footage you can reduce the height. First thing. Second thing, the theatre is 800 seats not 600 seats. Third thing the last divisive thing we had in terms of land use, in terms of building structure was 800 High and people looked at the drawings for 800 High and then when they got the building they said this doesn't seem to match what the drawings were, the drawings somehow looked smaller than the building. So that's the kind, expect the divisive thing that happened with 800 High to happen here.

In terms of traffic, could you please turn to slide 28? 27, sorry, keep going, keep going, it's the one with the proposed transit routes. Ok. No, go back one, so if you see that there's a route that goes around the red route that goes around on Marguerite and then makes a left turn down there down to Quarry. That left turn is not possible. It doesn't exist and I can tell you that a lot of the cars exiting this thing will want to go that way. So, also the other red line happens to go across the bridge and fall onto the roadway in the north, in the southbound direction onto El Camino, which doesn't make any sense either.

So I think the traffic circulation is just not really feasible. I think you need to do an analysis of not just the intersection but you need to do an analysis of the capacities, various routes, especially the service road entrance ramp onto northbound El Camino from University Avenue. That is gonna be the biggest bottleneck and it'll back up and cause problems in all different directions.

In terms of transit people, the average commute length into Palo Alto is 11 miles. Somewhere in the order of over a third, somewhere 35 percent somewhere roughly of Palo Altan's, of people who work in, live in Palo Alto work in Palo Alto. A sixth of the people who work in Palo Alto work in Palo Alto. A lot of people come close and those people are gonna drive. There are some people who come from far away. The people who take transit are basically those people who live in San Francisco and take Caltrain. There is very little other transit use into Palo Alto other than Caltrain and the people who work in this office building are not gonna take the 22 bus or the 522 bus likely. They're gonna take Caltrain. That's what's going on here and that means people living in San Francisco. People living in Menlo Park are gonna drive, people living in Mountain View are gonna drive, people living in Sunnyvale are gonna drive, and people living in San Jose are gonna drive unless they live near the Caltrain station downtown. But if you're gonna live downtown you're gonna live in San Francisco not in San Jose. Ok? Seriously. So I think that that's you need to think about exactly how people will go and therefore that needs to affect your transit use.

The hospital has a completely different type of structure in terms of where people live and how dispersed they are and, and how much they make. So I wouldn't, I wouldn't think that that's comparable. And I'll close by saying that I endorse the bridge idea over El Camino to connect with Stanford Shopping Center with this arts and innovation district. I think that that's an excellent idea and it is really effective to connect them because otherwise you have people just trying to get across a essentially seven lane road, maybe it's eight or nine with left turns or whatever and that's pretty, pretty hard.

7 8 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

Mr. Garber: Chair, may I ask for just to make sure I understood what I heard?

10 11

Chair Martinez: Yeah sure of course.

12 13

14

15

Mr. Garber: Your first two comments you were saying the 268,000 square feet for the office make that less in order to reduce height and make it more appropriate for the marketplace that you're imagining should go in there? And I'm sorry did you give, did you actually specify a number of where you thought it should be?

16 17 18

19

20

21

Commissioner Keller: Well earlier I was talking about if you had a 2.0 FAR and that piece would be 180 square, 180,000 square feet. So somewhere in the range of 150,000 to 180,000 square feet is a reasonable range for appropriate buildings that would give you appropriate height. And that, and because 260,000 square feet is an artificial number for a market that doesn't make sense.

22 23 24

Mr. Garber: And then you're suggesting an 800 seat theatre instead of a 600 seat?

25 26

Commissioner Keller: It already is an 800 seat theatre. That's what the program says.

27

28 Mr. Garber: Oh that's, yes, between the two theatres.

29

30 Commissioner Keller: Oh it's between two theatres?

31

32 Mr. Garber: Yes.

33

34 Commissioner Keller: Ah. That should be explained because I didn't understand that from the 35 write up.

36

37 Mr. Garber: Ah. Ok.

38

39 Commissioner Keller: Ok, I saw it says 800 I was looking at the traffic study it said 800 seat 40 theatre. Sorry about that.

41

42 Mr. Garber: Yes, they were looking at the impact of both theatres if they were both, sorry.

43

44 Commissioner Keller: Ok, thanks for the clarification. Please explain, please put that more 45 clearly in your write up. Thank you.

Chair Martinez: Anything else? Commissioners any final comments? Ok, we shall close the public hearing and this agenda item. And thank you all very much. Thank you Bruce and Dan for a great presentation.

Commission Action: No action taken

City of Palo Alto October 10, 2012 Page 48 of 48