



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: June 7, 2018
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Member Alexander Lew, Robert Gooyer, Osma Thompson.

Absent: None.

Chair Furth: I call to order the June 7th meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Roll call, please.

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Oral communications? This is the time for anybody who wishes to speak on a matter not on the agenda, to let us know. Seeing nobody and having no cards.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Anything requested?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No true agenda changes. I just wanted everyone to know that on June 21st, both Board Member Thompson and Board Member Lew will be out. I believe the three other board members will be present, so we'll still have a quorum.

Chair Furth: Let's talk about that when we get to City official reports.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items.

Chair Furth: We have the transmittal of the ARB meeting schedule, attendance record, and tentative future items, which is item 1. As you say, we'll be down to three people, we'll be missing two board members, and we have the downtown parking garage, which is not a desirable situation, to have an only partial board for that. Will we all be here on July 5th or the 28th?

Board Member Lew: If we do item first, I might be able to be here before I have to get to the airport.

Chair Furth: When do you have to go to the airport?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I would probably be there by 9:30, or something. It's a big item.

Chair Furth: It's a very big item.

Board Member Lew: It's a very big item, and if there's public testimony, or whatever, it may not work.

Chair Furth: I really don't think we should be considering this with only three board members.

Board Member Thompson: I'll be present on July 5th.

Chair Furth: And I will, and Peter will. What about you two?

Board Member Lew: Did we decide to have a meeting on July 5th?

Chair Furth: We haven't decided.

Ms. Gerhardt: It did seem that everyone was going to be in town, so I believe we were going to have a meeting. We do have a couple of items.

Board Member Lew: For staff, in the past, sometimes when we've had a July 5th meeting, we've had public criticism for doing that because they think of it as a holiday weekend. I think that's kind of a stretch, to me.

Chair Furth: It's Thursday.

Board Member Lew: It's Thursday, right. I can see if it was a Friday.

Chair Furth: That's a little decadent.

Board Member Lew: Uh, yeah.

Chair Furth: What about...? Robert, would you be able to be here on the 5th?

Board Member Gooyer: I could be here for either one. It doesn't matter to me.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. I would just need to check with the director and the rest of the City. I know that they are on a time crunch.

Chair Furth: I know they are, but I think we're more likely to give you a recommendation if we have it on a 5th than if we try to do it on the 21st.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. I will bring that up to the director.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Okay. We know they're on a time schedule, we honor that, but I just think given how important this is to the City and how complex the decision is, and how much we need the wisdom of our colleagues, it would be better. All right.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3945 El Camino Real [16PLN-00374]: Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow an Exterior Remodel of an Existing Two-Story Hotel Building at 3945 El Camino Real. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt from CEQA per Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: Medium Density Multiple-Family Residence District (RM-30) and Service Commercial (CS). For more information, contact the project planner Phillip Brennan at phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org**

Chair Furth: Item 2 is a public hearing. It's quasi-judicial, so we should disclose any extramural conversations. Thirty-nine forty-five El Camino Real. I will let planner Phillip Brennan describe the project.

Phillip Brennan, Project Planner: Good morning to Chair Furth and members of the Board. A quick reminder that this is the second review of this project. This was originally heard back in April of this year. At that time, the Board provided specific feedback to the applicant and the applicant has responded to that. I just want to briefly go over how the applicant, the responses to those comments and guidance. The Board provided direction, requesting that the applicant reduce the total number of materials and enhance the street-facing side of the building. They mentioned the need to increase the street presence of the lobby; increase seating options for pedestrians; utilize alternative tree species; and explore dedicated guest registration parking space alternatives. In response to that feedback, the applicant has reduced the number of material choices and enhanced the quality, utilizing higher-grade finishes, including Ipe siding carried through from the main building and lobby to the patio area, and Trespa panels. There is a materials board being passed around. Just this morning, though, the owner of the property brought an alternative sample for the Ipe siding. It's also a Trespa-type tile that has a wood finish. According to the owner, this is a much more higher-grade material, more expensive material, and that's their preference. The Board may want to consider that alternative. The design team has increased the glazing along the second story lobby that's facing southbound El Camino to better signify the entry and lobby area of the hotel. They are also proposing a metal awning to identify the front entrance into the lobby. A new bench has been placed at the front entry of the lobby. Also, a new change that you may not see in your hard copy plans but was included in a recent updated digital submittal, the applicant is proposing a new bench to be placed under that entry, which is an ideal place. There is a loading space area directly in front of the lobby on El Camino, and this is most likely going to be the ideal place where shared-ride services and taxi services are going to be dropping off and picking up. I'm suggesting that the bench faces towards the southbound traffic so they can see the vehicles coming. As of right now, the applicant is proposing a stationary cement platform bench, but we'll leave it up to the Board to decide that detail. New native tree species have been proposed. One Pacific madrone is to be utilized, is to be the feature tree in the outdoor patio. Two Catalina Ironwood trees are to be located in the large stairwell planters, and three California Sycamore trees in each of the parking island planters. At the last hearing, a few of the board members expressed a desire to explore dedicated guest registration parking areas, and the applicant has proposed three alternatives. They just included a third option recently that's not included in their plans that I'll go over now. This first option, Option A, utilizes two existing parking spaces as guest registration spaces. Those will be marked with a placard identifying it as a guest registration space. It's located near the patio and directly adjacent to the lobby entrance. Option B is this tandem parking orientation that places the guest registration spaces closer to the lobby. I did want to bring up the fact that I did go over this with our fire department staff member, and he did confirm that fire needs a 25-foot drive aisle for this type of parking lot orientation, which features 90-degree parking spaces. This would be problematic in providing that. I think it's also an issue that the lobby is on the left side of the lot, so you have the potential of cars coming southbound on El Camino, cutting across the drive aisle to park there, or having to turn around and do a three-point turn to park in those spaces and utilize that space. Option C moves the ADA parking next to the stairwell, over. This makes a lot of sense because the two ADA ground-floor units are directly located in front of those spaces. We placed the guest registration space closer to the lobby, and one of the guest registration spaces are located directly across the lot. I did want to bring up again that just recently - six or seven months ago - a loading space, approximately 30 feet long, a white loading space, has been provided on site, and that's directly located in front of the main entry into the building. Again, this will likely be the ideal location for drop-off and pick-up for shared ride services and taxis on El Camino. I also did some field reconnaissance to look at some comparable hotels in the area to the Comfort Inn that were recently remodeled. My findings found that hotels such as Zen and Creekside Inn have provided no dedicated guest parking spaces. The Nest Hotel, which is just around the corner from the Comfort Inn, does have dedicated guest registration spaces, as you can see in the picture on the left. That's in front of the patio, and from my understanding, The Nest is actually the hotel that a lot of the design aspects have been modeled after for this hotel. It's staff's opinion that to require the applicant to move the lobby structure or reduce the structure to accommodate some guest parking spaces is a bit cumbersome to the applicant. They have no desire to reduce the lobby size. This was initially proposed as an exterior remodel. We've already asked them to provide a notched-out front entry to accommodate the entry of the hotel facing out to El Camino, and it's been expressed to me that to reduce the lobby to accommodate another guest parking space is a deal-breaker for them. Staff is recommending approval of the proposed exterior remodel of the hotel based on

findings, and as subject to conditions of approval. I'll leave it at that. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer those.

Chair Furth: Are there any questions of staff? Hearing none, would the applicant care to make a presentation? You have 10 minutes to do so, if you do.

Shawn Alexander: Good morning.

Chair Furth: Good morning. If you could spell your name for the record.

Mr. Alexander: Yes. I am Shawn Alexander. (Spells name.) I'm with AXIS/GFA Architects, and I am the architect for the project. Thanks for having us here this morning. Phillip, thank you very much for your presentation. I think you captured the essence of our design and what we've done to respond to the ARB. We are very happy to work with the ARB to get a design that you guys are happy with, that's fitting for the community, and is something that our client, can be proud of. In regards to your questions at our last meeting back in April, you asked us to take a look at making the entry more prominent, possibly making a two-story lobby space more visible, add more glass. We've done that. We've added a canopy over the entryway to make the entry more prominent. We've added bench seating for guests to wait for Uber/Lyft ride services, and we've located that underneath so it has some degree of weather protection. We've worked very close with planning staff to come up with design responses that meet the intent of your comments from the last presentation. We've simplified materials. It's a building we're very proud of, and we hope that you are happy with our design responses to your comments. I'm here to answer any of your questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Admirably concise. Does anybody have questions of the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: I was wondering if you could go through your elevation and denote exactly where all the materials are going.

Mr. Alexander: Sure. You've got the materials board, but we had originally proposed in your drawing package that all of the brown colored materials on the lobby building and on the trash enclosure would be an Ipe material. You have the sample there. Phillip had mentioned to you that the owner is actually willing to upgrade that material to a Trespa product. It's a much more expensive material. And in the upper portion of the building, we originally presented it as cement plaster. We've upgraded that material to a Trespa, again, a much more...Yes, the white material. You have the white Trespa and the sort of warm, mahogany-colored Trespa on the bottom that work together.

Board Member Thompson: Where does Wood 2 go?

Mr. Alexander: I'm sorry...?

Board Member Thompson: It's also in the key for your elevations, but I couldn't find it on the building.

Mr. Alexander: Forgive me, I'm not really sure where that was intended. My apologies.

Board Member Thompson: Are you saying it doesn't exist in the project?

Mr. Alexander: I don't believe it exists anymore in the project.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Thompson, what page are you on? Is it 9.3?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, if you look at...

Mr. Alexander: Unless it's on the fence in the back of the property.

Mr. Brennan: It's actually identified here. If you go to A09.03, if you look at the lobby patio elevation, the bottom elevation, you'll see "WD2."

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so is that structure...

Mr. Brennan: I'll let the architect...

Board Member Thompson: ...for the roof?

Mr. Brennan: It looks like the underside of the roof.

Mr. Alexander: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Brennan: Sure.

Mr. Alexander: Yeah, my apologies. That would be the stained roof material and the stained beams.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is that...? Well, I don't know if you're going to be able to answer. It looks like it's a piece of redwood here. Is that correct? And this is fine vertical grain clear redwood?

Mr. Alexander: Yeah, you know, I'm not sure if it's going to be redwood. The hope is that it would be. The intent is to try to get the coloration to match closely to the color of the Ipe, but it's up in an eave, it's in shadows, it's not as prominent. You wouldn't build it from Ipe because you've got structural beams up there. The exposed wood there would essentially be tongue and groove decking material.

Board Member Thompson: And is the intent of the paint color PT2 to match the Ipe color?

Mr. Alexander: You're referring to the color on the cement plaster columns and fascia? Yeah. Our intent is to try to get as close to the Trespa color or the Ipe color.

Vice Chair Baltay: And the stacked stone here - ST1? Forgive me, I'm just having a hard time seeing the numbers on the elevation. They're small.

Mr. Alexander: Yeah. The intent of the stacked stone at this point was to put it on, if you look at page 903...

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Mr. Alexander: ...you can see next to the lobby entry that's back underneath the circulation, there's a solid wall.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm sorry, I...

Mr. Alexander: To the left of the stair, and to the right of the lobby glass. Back underneath the circulation from the deck above.

Vice Chair Baltay: These multiple colors of various tan on that piece of wall there is the stone?

Mr. Alexander: That's correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Are there any other renderings of what that would look like from the edges, or anything like that?

Mr. Alexander: I don't have any other renderings. Sorry.

Vice Chair Baltay: How do you end the wall when it sort of stops? You have a corner at 90 degrees. How is that treated?

Mr. Alexander: We're going to trim the edge of the stone with some Ipe wood. That was our intent.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is there a design detail of that?

Mr. Alexander: I don't have a design detail for that, sir.

Vice Chair Baltay: How about for the Trespa siding you're proposing? Is this the proper dimension of the board? Are they long tiles to look like boards, or are they...?

Mr. Alexander: No, they're actually solid boards, sir.

Vice Chair Baltay: What are the dimensions and what are the details, again, of the edges.

Mr. Alexander: My apologies.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's okay. It's clear that we have a little bit of thinking to do on the details and the finishes, still. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so the Ipe grain, there's sort of long, sort of linear slats. Are you saying the Trespa would be like that, as well?

Mr. Alexander: The Trespa grain, the intent is that the grain would run horizontal, just like the wood grain would be if it were Ipe.

Board Member Thompson: Sort of the same spacing, otherwise?

Mr. Alexander: My understanding is the owner wants to do the linear strips of Trespa as opposed to a larger solid panel.

Board Member Thompson: I see. Okay.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the applicant or staff?

Vice Chair Baltay: Phillip, can I come back for a second to that third option on the parking arrangement? Is there a drawing of that or something, aside from the slide you showed us?

Mr. Brennan: No, that's the only drawing I have for that.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's nothing that we can see except for the slide you showed us?

Chair Furth: Want to put it up again?

Mr. Brennan: Sure.

Chair Furth: Essentially, you moved over to the left.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, we did move some parking spaces over, so that's something that we would likely want to bring back to subcommittee, if that's the option. Or, you could leave that to staff to make that detail happen in the plan set, as well.

[Short pause]

Chair Furth: You moved the disability access spaces over, away from the lobby, and put the registration space next to the lobby.

Mr. Alexander: That's correct.

Chair Furth: Just slide them down.

[Short pause.]

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: I guess, to the Chair. I would like to comment that all of us spent some time going to the site, thinking about this, looking at it, and we respect that you want to come up with a last-minute change that improves it, and it seems like it does. But it really disrespects our efforts by not letting us have that drawing and have it a little bit ahead of time. When I was out at the site, it would have really been nice to think about this option, as well. And yet, here we are, at the very last minute, being shown a slide, and nothing else. It's difficult. Thank you.

Mr. Alexander: Member Baltay, I understand your concern there, and it's my apology that we weren't able to provide that drawing to you beforehand. It was an option that was thought up at a last minute. And worthy of showing the Board.

Chair Furth: All right. Okay. You may sit down, if you would like.

Mr. Alexander: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alex, would you like to start?

Board Member Lew: I think the project is looking very handsome. I can recommend approval of the project today. I think there are a couple things that need to be followed up. One is the drawing is too light and really needs to be darker for the final, the microfilming and records. Two, I like the aesthetics of the building a lot. It seems to me that you should have some details to give an indication that they're all well-resolved, and I think Peter Baltay mentioned something like the stone and wood details. I was thinking about that when I was looking through the set. Not every detail, not construction-level details, just an indication of quality. On the guest parking, I don't have a strong preference. My take on the parking is I think similar to staff's position. Most motels during the day, there's very little occupancy of the spots, so it's not an issue. I do think it is an issue late at night. Somebody checking in late often will find there aren't very many spaces, but I think that's part of the territory. I often check into motels really late when I'm on a road trip. Usually if you park in the aisle, sometimes I'll do that, it's not an issue because there isn't that much traffic at that time of day. And then, I also expect the motel to be full if I'm checking in really late. It seems to me either A or C is fine with me. It seems like your Option C may interrupt some of the landscaping that you have between the parking and the building, but I think that's pretty minor. On the findings, I think on Finding #2 on page 11 of the packet, I think I might add - for staff - I think I might add that the aesthetics of the project complement the contemporary aesthetic of the Keys School next door. You know, the contemporary design of the shed roof, fairly modern eve details, and what-not. That's all I have. I think the design is really great. I really applaud the architect and the owners for doing this project. I think it looks nice. We have a lot of other motels in the neighborhood who have done really nice things on the inside but haven't touched the outside that much.

And I like that you've actually tried to make it, tried to integrate the interior and exterior together. Thank you for that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I like the advance on the outside. I think it's helped quite a bit. I'm still not a fan of the whole entry, the way that works. I just think it's a really weak entry. It's hard to find. As far as the parking, I think Option 1 and Option 3, they are viable, but I think you're going to have a hard time finding those spaces. Option 2, I don't think is even a starter. I mean, I don't know why you threw that in. That's probably illegal the way it is, or doesn't meet code, and that was just useless. The one thing I would recommend that I thought would be a more viable one is to take your spaces - I think it's 27, 28 and 29 - that are 90-degree parking, turn those into two 60-degree parking spaces. So, you lose one, but that way you've got a readily-accessible, right when you pull in, you see the two parking spaces that are unique, which makes them unique to the entry, rather than just being one of the masses. Because once you have a half-dozen cars parked in there, nobody is going to go, "Oh, those two standing over there are for people registering." And, yes, it does lose a parking space, but I think in the long run, it's a better solution to that. At this point, like I said, it's a big step forward. I like the material uses here better than you had before, but I'm still on the fence at this point.

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Hi. Yeah, I would agree with Board Member Gooyer that this has come a nice ways since last time. Looking at the materials, aesthetically, I think the Ipe, I think has a nicer presence than the Trespa. So, if you're thinking about that, that would be my preference. At the same time, I think the other two items that you've picked for Wood 2 and PT 2 don't match the Ipe just yet in terms of their shade. While the design intent is that you'd like to match it, it doesn't seem that way at the moment. I would encourage maybe finding a shade that matches your sample a bit closer. Also, in the findings, Finding #3 in the packet still talks about corrugated metal accents and aluminum...Yeah, there's sort of bold material choices in there. That would probably need to be updated. I do think it's come a long way, it's true. The entry, I'm sort of struggling with. I think in the way that you've rendered it, it's sort of hard to see exactly what's happening in terms of the change in plane. It does seem like a compressed entry. Yeah, I think the bench that you've shown with the option, with the landscaping behind it, seems to create more of a presence, potentially, but I'd be open to discussing that more with the Board. I could come close. I could come close to recommending, but I think these material choices are really important, so maybe looking at it again in subcommittee, or something. I'd be open to that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, thank you very much, and thank you for your studies on the parking options. I know I was the one who was pushing hard to get something close to the lobby, and I do admit, it doesn't work, what's shown. Option C, I think, is preferable. I share the comments and sentiments of my colleagues, especially Alex. I think the building looks very good. It's a big improvement in design and it will be a handsome addition on El Camino. I applaud you for making the effort to improve the exterior of your building. It's really good for the City to have that. That said, I'm finding the detailing and some of the questions we've been asking are just not satisfactorily resolved. I'm going to suggest that we put this to a subcommittee to review some of the details and final material selections. I think it's a straightforward matter to make the appropriate selections, but, I'm sorry, it's just not here right now. There's just too many questions about how it is proposed. For example, if you're using Ipe siding, which we've done on many projects, you might say it's a tongue-and-groove board where you're just looking for a plainer surface with horizontal lines where the grooves are. If you're Trespa, it's typically set off a little bit. The material expands slightly. And then, you see the edge of it, where it's clearly not wood. It's a very different material even though the grain does match, and you have to treat it that way. It takes some architectural effort. They're not just a like-for-like substitution. You have to design that material differently to work, and I don't think any of us are seeing that resolution here. I'm open to either material, personally, although I do caution you that Ipe is very difficult to maintain. Within a year, every

year, it will need to be refinished. It's such a dense wood. It's not typically used for this application for that reason. It's also not inexpensive. I'm going to propose to my colleagues, though, that...Actually, first, there's two design elements that are more than materials that I find troublesome. One of them, if you look at Sheet A12.02, the upper right-hand corner perspective, this is the corner post of the new entry where you have glass all around the corner. I understand that you want a structural column there. I find it really awkward to have the two materials just sort of, the wood stopping half way up, and then the white Trespa there. On a small, narrow member like that, I would like to think there's another way to detail how that transition is made, or indeed, if you don't just have the white post come all the way down. Or, maybe you have a different post, a round column painted a different color. Some design effort, because here, it just doesn't quite work, in my opinion. We'll see if my colleagues agree, but again, that upper-right perspective on A12.02, where that column is. The second thing I've compared is, on Sheet A00.07, the trash enclosure roof eve is treated differently than it was in a previous submittal, in that it doesn't really have much of an overhang. Whereas, the previous submittal had a slightly larger overhang, which I found much more appealing. I'd like to see that resolved. I'll pass this down to my colleagues so they can see the previous submittal. Those are the two very small design issues that you might just think through once more. Then, I was going to suggest that we ask for, just to be precise, details of the Ipe and Trespa siding, details of how the stone veneer is applied, details of the trash enclosure roof, details of the soffit, the piece outside the front door. You're showing a very attractive metal finish, top-and-bottom thing, and that would look very nice if it's properly detailed that way. So, some resolution on that. I suppose a detail of the overall roof eve. Alex is correct that you want to be really responding to the building next door. It's all about the details. It's not hard to do, but draw it out, put it there so the contractors build it that way, and the staff has something. And, lastly, this entry corner post. That's some of my comments. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I'm prepared to vote to approve this and make the findings. I thank you all for your...I thank Alex and Osma for their comments on the finding changes that we should have. I like the bench under the eve, but I don't think you should eliminate the bench along the sidewalk. The south El Camino guidelines talk about seating for the public, as well as the users, tenants, occupants of this building. I'd like at least one of those benches - and I think it's up to the applicant which one - to have arms so that people who don't stand up easily can get up out of the bench. I think a back is probably not quite as important, but these should be benches that people with varying degrees of strength can use. And I feel strongly that there should be two of them. This is a pedestrian loading zone, is that right? That's been established on the street?

Mr. Brennan: Correct.

Chair Furth: Those are interesting. I didn't know they existed. That would certainly be helpful here. I'm so pleased that you're planning to redo this building in this style. I think it will look much better, much more attractive as a place to be. I, too, check into a lot of motels sort of late. I really like having a dedicated parking space by the office, so I strongly favor Option C. I don't care if there's one or two, but I think it needs to have one. I propose that we recommend approval with a referral to subcommittee to deal with the design details that you all have mentioned. That's my point of view on this. Basically, thank you very much. This is going to be a much more attractive building on the street, and I trust that it will be good for business, too. Would anybody care to make a motion?

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm gearing up to do that, if that's okay. I move that we recommend approval of this project to the director, with Option C for the parking. And then, we would like to see it come back to subcommittee, specifically to see details of the Ipe and Trespa siding. That's the material and configuration. Details of the stone veneer. That's the configuration on the sides. Details of the trash enclosure eve. Details of the soffits at the entry area. Details of the roof eve at the top of the building on El Camino. Details of the entry corner post, I'm calling it. And, lastly, details of benches, showing a minimum of two benches outside.

Chair Furth: Is there a second.

Board Member Thompson: I can...

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, go ahead.

Chair Furth: Osma, would you care to be recognized?

Board Member Thompson: Could I add to that list, I guess this would be a friendly amendment?

Ms. Gerhardt: Can we make the second, first, and then do a friendly amendment?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Furth: I think we have a second from Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: I seconded, and I will entertain an amendment.

Board Member Thompson: To add alternate shades for PT 2 and Wood 2 stain to better match either the Trespa or the Ipe.

Vice Chair Baltay: Absolutely.

Board Member Lew: I would accept that.

Chair Furth: Okay, the friendly amendment is accepted. Anything else before we vote?

Board Member Thompson: I also want to add a comment. Is it too soon? To add a comment, just on the entry post item?

Chair Furth: Go ahead.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I agree with Board Member Baltay that that entry post could use some more design refinement in terms of how it's detailed.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye? Opposed, none.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.

Chair Furth: Who would like to serve on the subcommittee? Don't all wake up at once.

Vice Chair Baltay: I would.

Board Member Thompson: I would.

Chair Furth: All right. This will be your subcommittee, Board Members Thompson and Baltay. Congratulations on getting through another step in the Palo Alto process. We look forward to seeing your project built. Thank you. We will take a five-minute break while you set up for the next item.

[The Board took a short break.]

**3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 4115 El Camino Real (17PLN-00280):
Consideration of a Major Architectural Review of a Proposed Three-Story, 16,726**

Square Foot Mixed-Use Development Comprised of Ground Floor Retail, Second Floor Office and Residential, Third Floor Residential (Seven Residential Units in Total) and Below-Grade Parking. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Phillip Brennan at phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Furth: All right, we have a second public hearing. It's item 3 on our agenda. The address is 4115 El Camino Real, a seven residential unit mixed-use proposal on the El Camino Way island. I will let staff describe it in more detail. Could you remind me if these are condominiums or rental units?

Phillip Brennan, Project Planner: These are going to be condo units.

Chair Furth: Which is why we have a BMR unit.

Mr. Brennan: Yes.

Chair Furth: A below market rate unit. Thank you.

Mr. Brennan: Thank you. A quick reminder, again. This project had a preliminary hearing back in June of 2017, so this is the first formal hearing of this project. A quick overview. The project is a mixed-used development offering retail, office and residential, nearly 7,800 square feet of retail and office space, nearly 9,000 square feet of residential, and a 14,000 square foot subgrade parking garage. The proposal includes seven residential units, including one BMR unit. This is a housing inventory site. The realistic capacity is seven units, and that is what the applicant is providing. This mixed-use project is provided a one-to-one FAR, with 50 percent FAR for residential and 50 percent for commercial. Plus, a density bonus for the BMR unit that provides an additional 1,030 square feet for that BMR unit. The area context. This site is located in the Triangle Area in the Ventura neighborhood. This Triangle Area District Vision proposes a well-designed, compact and vital multi-neighborhood center. It's centrally located close to Gunn, Terman and Briones schools, as well as Keys, close to Briones and Robles park, and near Barron Park and Charleston Meadow, Green Acres neighborhoods. This Triangle development is comprised primarily of commercial, retail and mixed-use buildings. Some site context. This is looking at the El Camino Real frontage. These buildings...The pictures aren't necessarily to scale, but the dimensions of the adjacent buildings at 4113 and 4117 are accurate per our approved plans. The building is being proposed at 39 feet, 5 3/4 inches. The maximum height is 42 feet and six inches, as permitted to allow for the mechanical equipment. The lot abuts a vacant one-story retail space directly to the east. I believe that property belongs to Fuki Sushi and it serves as default parking space for the restaurant. And 4113 is the HoneyBaked Ham building. This is the frontage along El Camino Way. As you can see here, it primarily serves - the visual at least - parking lots to serve the two restaurants, or actually, the three existing restaurants. The subject site is, you know, it fronts East Meadow, and it is a major visual site, and is vital for development along this way. The proposed design. The feedback was provided to the applicant at the preliminary hearing. In this case, the ARB provided feedback regarding the large, screened, third-story private deck along El Camino Real, stating it visually increased the building's volume. The applicant has responded by removing some of those supporting beams and replacing it with a glass rail system. I'm hoping you can see that in the pictures and the arrows directing your eyes. The Board also mentioned that the beams and columns add unnecessary mass to the building, particularly along El Camino Way. The applicant has removed the screening features and supporting beams and replaced it, again, with the glass railing system. And, just to summarize the net effect, the profile of the building has been modified. You can see with the removal of the beams and columns and the screening that the building is now, the residential floor along the third level is more tiered, or at least gives the appearance of being more scaled back and tiered, as well as the front-facing along El Camino Real, to a lesser degree. The Board made comments regarding softening the frontage along El Camino Way. The previous design featured driveway located toward the right side and a large paved area to serve the garage spaces in the original design. The applicant is maintaining the centrally-located driveway that's currently there and provided ample open space areas for public seating close to the right-of-way, as well

as an open space area and amenity area for the tenants located on the right side of the property. There's only three service level parking spaces and those spaces are...Excuse me, there's seven service level parking spaces but only three uncovered spaces, which are screened, in large part, by the proposed landscaping. The project is generally compliant with all of the required development standards and design guidelines, but staff is requesting the Board consider how the street scape façade, if it's cohesive and consistent in terms of a base, body and roof, per South El Camino Real design guidelines; whether the primary entry signifies the location and expresses importance; and, the compatibility of the residential units with the overall building design and neighboring tenant units. No formal action is being requested. Staff is recommending the Board provide direction regarding the project's overall design and consistency with the applicable design guidelines and continue the project to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there any questions of staff? Oh, we should mention that we did have a communication from Jeff Levinsky...

Mr. Brennan: Yes, I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: ...concerning the calculation of parking ratios. I printed it out somewhere; now, I've misplaced it. And square footage. I think it was...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, there's five items in the email, two regarding TDM. It does say in the second item that the request to get a copy of the TDM was denied. It is still in the admin phases right now. That's the only reason we would have denied such a request.

Chair Furth: It's not a public record yet.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. So, number 3 is talking about limited street parking; 4 is unsecured residential parking; and 5 is the retail preservation. We haven't had a chance to go over these in quite detail yet, but we certainly will before we come back for another hearing.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Give this back. All right. Anything else before we have our public hearing? And we have a speaker card. All right. If the applicant would care to make a presentation, you have 10 minutes to do so.

Jeff Potts, SDG Architects: Thank you. Good morning, Jeff Potts, SDG Architects...

Chair Furth: Excuse me, I've got to ask you to spell your name for our transcriber.

Mr. Potts: No problem. [Spell name.]

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Potts: I want to thank Phillip and Jodie for their extensive work on this project thus far, and I'm sure we have some more to do. I'll be brief. Phillip covered most of what we were going to cover in here. The site plan orientation to El Camino Real and El Camino Way, you know, the main difficulty in the design is that El Camino Real is at an angle to El Camino Way, so our main frontage on El Camino Real is angled to that frontage. From that side, we have a connection of a breezeway that enters the main stair for the residents and the office above, and then, we have the retail openings right out onto El Camino Real, with the widened 12-foot sidewalk there. One of the main features of the design was this breezeway that maintains a connection between El Camino Way and El Camino Real for a pedestrian connection, access from the neighborhoods to schools and such. That was a strong element of the design. Based on previous comments and working with the City, the driveway location for those rear parking spaces was moved to align with the street across the way for a better visual connection and site lines in and out of the project. When we did that, knowing it was a strong view down that street, we flanked that driveway with large planting areas, one just for some trees for screening at the more northern side, ...and at the southern side we created a landscaped area with some heavy planting and some planters, but also a

seating area accessible to the public along El Camino Way. There's a significant bike path that's being updated through there, so we created a stopping point along that bike path. Then, on the more southern side is a common open space for the tenants. Based on those open spaces, we exceed the open space requirement by four times. In addition, we have very large decks on each of the units. The main vehicular access for the retail and office is off El Camino, with the residential access off El Camino Way. That will keep limited traffic on the El Camino Way side and bring most of the traffic in from El Camino. Quickly, again, the subgrade garage with 31 parking spaces. Those will be serving the retail and office and residential guest spaces. On the first floor we have a little over 4,600 square foot retail space. That's the useable retail space for the replacement. That's the existing retail minus the first-floor circulation, and that's the open, useable space. We have the four garage spaces that will be accessed off of El Camino Way. Those will have glass doors and awnings over each space. And then, we have three at-grade parking spaces, the circulation tower, and we have a large bike storage and shower space on that first floor for the employees of the retail and commercial. And then, our main circulation access is at that level. On the second level we have about a 2,300 square foot useable office space, along with the circulation for the four residential units that are located at that level. That's a combination of one- and two-bedroom units, and the affordable unit will be the two-bedroom unit located adjacent to the elevator and circulation core there. Again, each of those units has a large useable, private deck. We did reduce a lot of the screening and the spines that we had on the previous design and kept it only where it was really necessary to give us some delineation between the neighboring decks. On the third floor there are three units, the larger three-bedroom units, and then, another two-bedroom unit that is basically exactly the same as the affordable unit, just stacked on top. Again, each of those has a very large deck. And then, based on comments from the previous preliminary ARB, more of a public kind of space deck there with some landscaping that will be maintained and give that corner a nice landscaped feel on the third floor. Elevationally, we've carried the articulation and details around to all sides of this building. It is a mix of wood and stucco. The wood, as you see there, is a product called Kebony, which is a treated pine product. It weathers like it's Ipe, but it's more sustainable and more workable. You can either let it sort of patina to a kind of gray, or you can maintain it in its darker form, which would be our intention. We also added some metal awning details along the El Camino retail frontage to bring that scale down along the street a little bit, per previous comments, and stepped back that third floor and removed, again, the screening in that area. We've kept the screening between some of the decks and along the ramp access to the garage. Quickly, Phillip basically showed you these slides, but we just wanted to give you a side-by-side comparison, again, of the revisions that we've made. Along the front, again, removing that third-floor screening and that roof element that really came out proud to the street. We revised the office areas where the wood windows were. It was suggested that we bring the sills up on those, which we did, and revised that deck to have a glass railing, to make those wood elements kind of stand out a little bit more as individual elements, again, removing some of the overhanging beam features and some of the screening, creating that more landscaped area on the upper right of the building as you see it on the upper right slide. Along the rear, again, I think the statement was that it was maybe a little too industrial/commercial feeling, and it should feel a little more residential on the rear. The first biggest thing was obviously the change in the location of the access and the garages at that level, based on transportation and engineering comments, as well. Also, removing the bulk of the metal screening that was on the lower level and removing the bulk of the spines that were dividing up the building on the upper floors. What we did is tried to open those up. We kept those spines where we needed them to delineate those decks again, but then we tried to open up the corners of the building, as well. If you look at the lower two images, you can kind of feel that stepping back at that corner a little more there. And then, we added a little more wood detailing along the back and revised the window systems to be a more residential feeling portion and amount of glazing along that back element there. With that, we are here to answer any questions you have, and get your feedback. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of the applicant before we hear from the public?

Board Member Thompson: I have one.

Chair Furth: Keep them brief.

Board Member Thompson: I just have one question. Is there no access to the retail on the back side, from El Camino Way? I didn't see access. I just wanted to confirm.

Mr. Potts: The site has this large breezeway that goes right through the building, so you can walk, or walk a bike, or whatever, from El Camino Way to El Camino. The doors for the retail would then be on El Camino. The intention is that people maybe even not using the site will use that access, as the rest of the block develops and potentially becomes closed off, will use that access to get from one side to the other.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, that's the only --

Mr. Potts: You will have access. Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, got it. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Anybody else? All right, thank you. I'm sure we'll talk to you more. Robert Moss. I appreciate the use of a return address sticker, which I can read.

Mr. Moss: Thank you, Chairman Furth and Commissioners. This is a site I'm very familiar with. We've been using the restaurant for decades and we're going to be sorry to see it leave. I have three issues with the current proposal. The first one is parking. I kind of wonder if there is adequate parking. I think it's a little bit under-parked, especially when we have guests coming to the residential units, which is going to spill over parking onto El Camino Way and Meadow. There are several times a year when the store next door...

Chair Furth: HoneyBaked Ham?

Mr. Moss: Yeah, that.

Chair Furth: Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter.

Mr. Moss: It just gets loaded with people around Easter, Thanksgiving and Christmas, and the people are lined down the sidewalk, half way down El Camino Way. They're parked all over the place. If you don't have enough parking on this site, where are they going to park? That's a problem. The second is the design. I don't really care for those dark colors on the upper levels. It makes the building look top-heavy. I'd rather see those dark colors in the lower floors and have the top floors a light color. The third issue I have is landscaping along El Camino. I think we need a lot of trees along there and maybe some planters in front of the building to make the entire area look more rural and be more complied with the El Camino design guidelines, which is for a lot of planting along El Camino. There's very little in this proposal, so I'd like to see a lot more planting of trees, bushes, landscaping along the building, so that we have more of an environment that's welcoming, rather than something that's stark. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Moss. Anybody else? It's always good to have a member of the public participate. I think we feel better about the work we do when you do. All right. Questions of staff? Questions of anybody? Yes, Alex.

Board Member Lew: I wanted to follow up on Mr. Moss's comment about guest parking. For staff, my recollection is that the state...We're at 9519, the density bonus, is that if you have below-market-rate units, guest parking is not required. I was wondering if you could explain that for me.

Mr. Brennan: That's correct. Guest parking and ADA parking is inclusive of the modified parking ratio by right. That's confirmed with our city attorney.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, I didn't understand a word of what you just said. Take me through it. There are seven units. One of them is a below-market-rate unit.

Mr. Brennan: Correct.

Chair Furth: This means that the project is entitled to certain...

Mr. Brennan: Concessions and incentives.

Chair Furth: ...concessions from zoning in order to support the affordable housing.

Mr. Brennan: Right. One of...

Chair Furth: What are the base requirements, and how are they modified, and where do we end up?

Mr. Brennan: Sure. By our standard parking ratios and requirements, the project is required to provide 51 parking spaces.

Chair Furth: I just want to hear about the housing part.

Mr. Brennan: Okay. The applicant is providing a BMR unit. The BMR, by providing that, they are afforded certain concessions and incentives, one of which is a "by-right" modified parking ratio, which reduces the required parking for residential by four spaces.

Chair Furth: So, this applies not just to the parking needed for the below-market-rate unit, but for all the parking for the residential uses.

Mr. Brennan: That's correct. For all units.

Chair Furth: Because you're aren't going to require four spaces for the BMR unit.

Mr. Brennan: No.

Chair Furth: We end up with how many spaces for residential?

Mr. Brennan: Seven spaces. Excuse me, 11 spaces.

Chair Furth: That's one space per unit, plus four.

Mr. Brennan: Right.

Chair Furth: All right. These are not unbundled. Besides, they're going to be bought. Okay. And then, in addition to the parking reduction because of the below-market-rate unit, the applicant is asking for parking reductions for the non-residential portion of the building. Can you take me through that?

Mr. Brennan: Correct. Really quickly. Again, they were required 51 spaces. You reduce that number by four due to the BMR or the concession by right.

Chair Furth: That reduction also applies to the non-residential spaces?

Mr. Brennan: Well, the total parking for the site.

Chair Furth: Oh, you're not splitting it. All right.

Mr. Brennan: Yeah. So, 47 spaces are required. The applicant is providing eight. They are asking for a 20 percent parking reduction, which is effectively nine spaces. I can repeat that if you want me to.

Chair Furth: (Inaudible)

Mr. Brennan: The breakdown is on page 53, I believe, too.

Chair Furth: Right. My point is that in addition to the...Am I still right in thinking that in addition to the reduction in spaces allocable to the - the applicant is nodding - residential parts of the development, they are requesting from the City a further reduction in total number of spaces provided with respect to the non-residential property and supporting their argument with a proposed transportation demand management program, both for the retail space and the office space. Is that true? They are nodding.

Mr. Brennan: That's correct, yeah.

Chair Furth: Thanks. Alex.

Board Member Lew: For staff, just to continue that question. I understand the parking reduction is at the discretion of the director, not the board. I was wondering if you could explain the principles behind the

20 percent parking reduction. I know one element is (inaudible) transit. Sometimes I've heard the argument that there's potential for shared parking, so if you have a mixed-use building, some of those can be shared, depending on the time of day. Right? I mean, as people are at work, why have this parking spot left empty for eight hours in the middle of the day? The other is the TDM. Is there a ratio that staff is thinking about that adds up to 20 percent?

Ms. Gerhardt: There are director's adjustments, as you stated, that can be done to parking. There is the shared version, which is between office, retail and housing units, and there's also the TDM version, which is when you're offering, maybe train passes or bus passes, or something similar. I do want to make clear, though, that this request is not approved at this point. It's still under review. We're happy to take any questions that you have, but this has not been finalized in the director's mind quite yet.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for that.

Chair Furth: Any other questions before we start commenting? Okay. I had one question. When the chair and I met with staff yesterday, you mentioned that there might be some concern from the building department about the breezeway. Could you tell me about that?

Mr. Brennan: Correct. Building and Fire made mention of their concern regarding the units we proposed ingress and egress point, point of access in the circulation island. And when I say "circulation island," I mean the space that provides the elevator and stairwells to the building. That was existing out into that breezeway. They have certain parameters where they define an enclosed space. That breezeway exceeds those parameters, and therefore, they see it as an enclosed space and a hazard, so, they've requested the applicant provide the entry point along El Camino Real.

Chair Furth: They've requested that the applicant...?

Mr. Brennan: Relocate the access to that circulation island along El Camino Real.

Chair Furth: You would move the staircase and elevator from where to where? Applicant?

Mr. Potts: The slide on the screen shows the staircase and elevator were just reconfigured and the access was placed on the front...

Chair Furth: That means when you come down the staircase in the event of fire, you're exiting to open air and not the breezeway.

Mr. Potts: Correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: All right. I just wanted to thank Mr. Moss for his comments, as well. I'll echo in sort of a different way, also start from the beginning. In general, I think the project still kind of has a lot of its nicest materials on the upper side, and it seems like the party is on the upper two floors, when really it should be a pedestrian-focused design. I feel like the pedestrian-oriented part still hasn't, it still isn't successful as something that should be pedestrian oriented, mainly in that the quality of the materials is poorer. And in terms of proportionality, you have a 13-foot-one height on there. I feel like, typically, retail on the ground floor is 14 feet. Even then, in terms of the massing, you have...Typically, something that successfully pedestrian-oriented has a datum at that, sort of 14 feet. In your design, because of the pop-outs, you have these wood pop-outs, it's sort of undermining that datum and sort of crippling the pedestrian-focused part of the project, making it something that's in the background instead of something that should be in the foreground. I feel like the project suffers from that, in that sense, that it really should be more pedestrian-focused. It's not successfully doing that at the moment. In other views, for example, the wall for the garage entry, talking about particularly the street view on A-17, is kind of this blank, white wall. That could be a really nice opportunity to do something that could benefit the pedestrian experience, but it is not. Also, I'm not a fan of the signage, and I think in your renderings, it doesn't help you fight for your building. I also commend you on showing renderings that don't have trees on them because it really does expose the architecture for what it is. A lot of other applicants tend to cover up their design with trees, so I'm really glad that you're more honest about what you're

describing. At the same time, it might be worthwhile to rethink the signage because I don't know that it's helping you in terms of how you're portraying this building. The roofline is kind of all over the place. There's a lot of different lines, so the actual massing of the building is a little fuzzy. I think it's a little confusing to look at. I recommend looking at your data on the roof and your data at the pedestrian level. Those are kind of important elements for El Camino. But, in general, yeah, there's sort of this busyness, and it seems like you have this relationship between the white and the wood, and at the moment, there's a fight between the two. There's not really any hierarchy, so I would recommend having something that is a hierarchy. Maybe your white is your exoskeleton and your wood is your innards. Right now, there's sort of a fight between the two, and I think the project could benefit from further using massing and materials to highlight the parts that are important, like the pedestrian walkway part. Sorry, I wrote a lot of things. I'll start there.

Chair Furth: Would you like to keep thinking, or would you like to speak?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I'm confused. I'm noticing that there's an Option B perspective on sheet A019, which I hadn't heard any mention of. I'm wondering why that's there, how we're supposed to consider that. Is it allowable to ask the applicant to address that?

Chair Furth: Of course.

Mr. Potts: (inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah. It's a --

Mr. Potts: (inaudible) totally different. (inaudible) That is the original front elevation. Our preference actually was to keep the screen, but it felt like the consensus from the previous ARB -- and I know everybody wasn't here -- was that the screening was too dominant along the streetscape, so we did leave that in there. We didn't make any of the other adjustments to that option, so the awnings that were added and some of the beams that were removed and things, we didn't follow through and make all the adjustments to that.

Commissioner Gooyer: I had the same question. When you were going through the presentation, it was pretty obvious that was their initial design. On 19.

Vice Chair Baltay: My question of the applicant, you're putting this here because you think this is the superior design. Is that right?

Mr. Moss: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay:

Chair Furth: (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I'd like to respond to that. I wouldn't say it's a superior design, but it looks like a more designed design. It looks like you worked on this one. And I have to be honest with you, the ones we're looking at, we're not even given a rendering of the same quality, so it's hard to judge. It looks like you just sort of took a knife to it and cut it apart. At least this has the quality Osma was talking about, where there's a sense to the materials. They're trying to interplay. The white forms go back and forth in a logical way. It's inappropriate, perhaps, for its location, which I think is our initial response. But what we're looking at now is such a jumble of materials and forms. I'm just looking at the main rendering along El Camino, and I'm trying really hard to get my head around how to react to it, I guess, on a couple of levels. Let me try to be clearer. Osma alluded to the fact that you have these two materials, the dark horizontal wood and the bright white plaster. Yet, there doesn't seem to be much logic, or integrity, or design effort put into integrating them together. She suggested a couple of ideas. I can throw out another one -- that you have a mixed-used building with commercial and residential. You might let each material try to symbolize and play with that, so you have more of the wood, perhaps, in the back or on the residential upper level. Right now, I think your Option B really tells me something. You're just not trying as hard to get this one right. That's not going to get any of us closer to a real good answer because it has to be good. It's an important location. Secondly, I want to keep bringing up the fact that

we have these El Camino Real guidelines, and they're asking for buildings to be good, urban, civic citizens, which means you form a part of the public space, which is the El Camino Real corridor. The façade of your building somehow sets the stage for that civic life that takes place in front of it. I don't see anything about this building trying to do that, even. The guidelines allude to a base, a middle and a top on a building, and we're not trying to be Renaissance architects here, but at the same time, this building just doesn't seem to be cognizant of the fact that...It could be in a big grassy field, seen from 20 feet away, and it's not. It's on the edge of the busiest street in Palo Alto. Again, it just seems to miss the boat on adhering to the El Camino Real guidelines. There's been some discussion over how firmly we want to be enforcing that, but I think the Board is coalescing around the ideas that these buildings do have to follow the guidelines. While I'm talking about, I'd like to address that I think your overall site planning is to be commended. It's really quite good. It really works. The way you bring in the residential from the back, and that surface parking is out of site, but very practical. The idea of having that pedestrian pass-through through the property is fantastic. It's a very busy pedestrian area. For whatever reason, there's an enormous number of kids on bicycles, families walking through there. I know I used to live a little further down East Meadow, and it's quite true that, for some reason, people walk through here. Providing that shortcut through is fantastic and it's worth a lot to keep that there. I really commend you for that. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay. I'm going to take Chair's privilege and tell you what I think before we proceed. First of all, thank you for coming back to us. I agree with Peter. I think your site plan is really thoughtful, and to me, it does look like you've read the South El Camino design guidelines and thought about what they request. I appreciate what you've done on both the El Camino Way frontage and the El Camino frontage, and I very much appreciate the passage through. I think that will be a great amenity. In Phillip's staff report, he talked about it's a little hard to discern the architectural character of this area. I think that's undoubtedly true. When you range from Fuki Sushi to the HoneyBaked Ham, depending on which meal it is, to some of the more recent buildings. But, I think a character is emerging. I hadn't realized until we started talking about this, that this is basically the food court of south Palo Alto. This is the destination place for food, and every time something happens, people get very upset about the loss of a favorite restaurant. But, originally it was small buildings, large parking lots, terrible back frontages, open, unhidden garbage containers. It looks really tacky. And, more to the point, it makes it less pleasant to walk and bike by there. And then, you have the very heavily traveled Goodwill drop-off point -- which is always congested except when they're closed -- next to you. And then, you have an interesting collection of small offices, an increasing rare form of space in this town. And, as you've all noted, really heavy traffic from young people. I would say that that step-back building, small buildings, big parking lot, that starts to change with the redevelop projects. I spent a lot of time driving up and down and walking up and down. I guess 4131 is the Starbucks building, and the other, sort of reconfigured thing is 4073. The animal hospital, definitely not. And then, I've been trying to figure out what it is that works there. One of the things is they do have this general earth tones approach to life. Our plan says we want it to be village-y, which I think means not Disney Village, but it means that the design is driven by what the property owner wants to do, while at the same time enhancing what's already there and helping build something coherent. I was surprised that Fuki Sushi's parcels actually do have a strong street presence, because even though that's a low building, it's right up to the sidewalk, and it's a very strong design. It's eye-catching. The whole building is the sign. I mean, we talk about this in the Stanford shopping center. It's not their sign; they've got the whole façade. And in the case of this riff on Japanese architecture, it makes it a very strong statement at the curb. That's actually a pretty useful thing to have near you. I agree that having an essentially unused building to provide parking is probably more functional than consistent with the plan. Okay. That's how I see the context in which we're expected to say that you're enhancing it all. It would be very helpful, by the way, to have a photo montage of the back of El Camino Way when we see this again, though I think there's no doubt that yours is going to be the best-looking El Camino frontage that we've seen. Now, on to my more significant concerns. I'm concerned about secure residential parking in a mixed-use garage. You may know from some of our previous discussions that we think that a person should be able to come home late at night, get into their parking, and not encounter ill-intentioned strangers in their unsecured garage. I don't know how you're going to address that problem, but it needs to be addressed. One of the things...I was trying to find this finding, but generally we have - we have dozens, as you know - we generally have a philosophy that when you have residential development, it should look like residential development. A person approaching the building or driving by

the building should be able to tell, ah, that's residential upstairs. Your terraces do a great deal of that. They help with that. But, I don't think commercial signage is appropriate on that higher level. I'm very grateful to you for showing signage on your elevations because we do ask people to do that so we can visualize how it works, but I think it conflicts with the second and third story uses. I do understand that there is an office on the second floor. So, I would like that lower. Speaking about the rear-side, this is going to be run by a homeowners' association, not a landlord, but I think we should consider a covenant that requires people to keep their garage doors open when they're not accessing that space. Or closed. Sorry. This is an issue where I live, and mostly we do it with social pressure, but it makes a huge difference in what you will see, driving up East Meadow. You're talking about attractive glass doors, and I think they will look good if they're closed, and it won't if they aren't. Not that people are going to store trash in their parking, but it just doesn't generally look good. I don't find the freestanding beam elements along the El Camino frontage successful. I know that those elements are used at the corner of El Camino and California in the Carrasco Building. I went back and looked at it again and they don't even start on El Camino until you get three floors up. It gives you a really coherent building lower down. I think particularly because of the angles you're dealing with, those elements just further confuse the eye, so I do not find them an addition. They also scream - or seem to in the elevations - the view of the second floor...do I mean second floor? Yeah. The second-floor residential terrace, there's one on the second floor, and I don't see what they add. I would prefer the building without them. There's an area called Public Access Area on the third floor. Is that the common open space for the project? It's not open to the general public, is it? Staff? The area defined as Public Access Space. Is that common open space? Who has access to it?

Mr. Brennan: The public.

Chair Furth: The general public? How?

Mr. Brennan: I'm sorry, Chair Furth. Are you speaking of the open space area on the right side, along El Camino Way?

Chair Furth: No, I'm referring to the upper floors.

Mr. Brennan: The upper floors.

Chair Furth: Public space, dedicated deck, third floor. I'm looking at A0007.

Mr. Brennan: Yeah, I'm sorry, that's identified as a public space, presumably for the occupants of the building.

Chair Furth: Okay, it's not public. It might be shared, it might be accessible, but it's not public. We're the public.

Mr. Brennan: No.

Chair Furth: That's private. It's good to know, I'm glad it's there, but that's usually what we refer to as common open space for residential projects. Perhaps we could clear that. I think they do have some nice publicly-accessible spaces. I'm also concerned about the garage access. I do think it's a good site plan. I understand the difference in the lengths of the two sides, and it means that you really need to have the driveway over there. But, big driveways that go down suddenly like this are not generally pleasant to walk by. And on larger sites, we can deal with this by having a horizontal entry that then drops down. But, you need to do something cleverer here. It might be...I mean, I think one of the problems with the image that we're seeing on the cover is that it just shows it as a big dark space. That's even less attractive. We have very inexpensive-to-operate LED lighting now so that we can have very good near-daylight lighting of these spaces, which I think can make a difference. Designing those walls so that you're aware of how much pedestrian traffic will be going by there. Doing something with the wall on the Suki Fushi side, so perhaps it's more open screen, so people are clearer about what's happening there. I think all those things would help. I agree that your drawings of the first vision were more coherent. This elevation does not make sense to me. Okay.

Board Member Lew: I agree with all of the comments the other board members have made. I have very similar notes, I made very similar notes, so I'm not going to repeat any of them. The only additional things that I have to say are, one, is the El Camino Way façade. In a way, I think your previous design was better. If you think about the building on access with East Meadow, I think it had a stronger presence on there. Maybe it was a little too strong, but I think there was something there with the spines, as you called them. I do think the current design is a little too weak if you think about the building on access. I do have a concern that the balconies may be too deep on the northeast-facing façade. For the second floor, they may be too deep and shade too much from the light of the sunlight onto the second-floor units. I share Mr. Moss's comment about landscaping along El Camino. We have other buildings. We've had a whole bunch of different conditions on new projects on El Camino, and I think some of them are a little too stark. I would support more planters in there. I do understand the City has issues with, like, an eight-foot minimum width for pedestrians, and then, that clear of the street trees. I understand their issues there, but if you can consider recessed doors or planters, I think that would go a long way to making it more friendly. And consider that, like, the sycamore trees on El Camino are deciduous, so for many months of the year, it's pretty stark. On the native plants, you have a native plant finding, and I think that the number of native plants is pretty low. I think you have a lot of unusual circumstances on the site, which would prevent a high percentage of native plants. You've got *Rhaphiolepis* in the planting areas, in the planter strips along El Camino Way. I think that there are native options for that. Also, where you have the New Zealand flax along the property line with HoneyBaked Ham. I don't think there's a native substitution for that particular aesthetic, but I think that that may be an option as well for a different kind of plant that's more wildlife-beneficial. I would say that the plants that have been selected are, they're non-native, but they are drought-tolerant, and they are bulletproof. I definitely want to acknowledge that. So, I think this one still has a long way to go. I think it's a viable scheme, generally, but I think it's missing the architecture. In my mind, we have some buildings, like 1795 El Camino Real, which is a Ken Hayes building at Park Avenue. He has some other buildings at 1845 El Camino. In my mind, you're not that far away from that level of design. I think it's just proportions and materials. I think you can get there. I don't want to be too negative about your project, but I do think it has a ways to go to get to the level of our other projects on El Camino.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I also agree pretty much with most everything else that's been said. A couple of things just to emphasize a little bit. I do agree that, I think the rear needs to be more residential-looking. It's still a bit institutional-looking. It's come a long way since the first go-around, but I think it needs a little bit more there. Maybe some more of the wood on the back side rather than the front side. I also agree that when I saw the two variations, I think where you are going with the initial design is better than the second one. I think the second one is just too chopped up and not really doing it for you. I also have to agree that it's real tough to have one of these, you know, garage where you dump in. The problem is also it's being emphasized by pulling the building all the way to the property line at that point. I'm not always a big fan of setting the building back, but in that particular case, I think it will help if you lighten up the entry a little bit so it doesn't look quite as menacing right at the face of the property line. I'll leave it at that. I think you've got enough input at this point.

Chair Furth: Does anybody want to disagree with something somebody said afterwards, which would be helpful for the applicant to hear now, not later?

Board Member Lew: I have one general comment. Two of you have mentioned that residential use should look residential, and I don't necessarily disagree with that in this particular location. But, if you go to Venice...

Chair Furth: I do that so seldom these days.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: I just mention Venice because one of my friends is there at the moment. But, there isn't really a distinction between commercial and residential because they were all in the same building, and they were separated on different floors. The distinction was between religious buildings and

everything else. And it works there. And I don't know why we would necessarily need...? To me, it raises a larger question. Why do we need that distinction between the two?

Chair Furth: I don't see it as a need for distinction as much as signaling the presence of residential uses. The signaling cue is for those 12 Venetians still living in the city. I mean, this is a long-term, stable population, which understands why these buildings were built this way in the 17th or 16th or 12th centuries. I don't think we quite have that situation on El Camino Real. A couple things. I think signaling the presence of retail and residential tells pedestrians that they are in an occupied part of the city, that it's not an abandoned area, and it's not closed off. I just think it adds pleasure. We're a housing-short area, and these tend to be new forms of housing. These are generously but modestly-sized units. These are going to be a great addition to our community. I notice that we're going to generate enough office space jobs. I don't know it's going to help our jobs/housing balance, but somebody is going to get to live there. That's what I think about it. And did I make up this finding, or does it exist somewhere? Am I just thinking about SOFA 2, or something?

Board Member Lew: There used to be something in the comp plan about having residential, that residential units should have a strong presence facing the street. Some sort of entrance.

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: And it's been modified in the new comp plan. It's not quite as strong.

Chair Furth: All right. I will just tell you that that's my feeling, and I do feel fairly strongly that it shouldn't be labeled as if it were commercial.

Board Member Gooyer: I think this particular project is a little unique in the sense that there's a front and a back that are totally void of each other. I mean, you don't have...I do think, especially in this case, the back should look more residential. I don't think if you're on El Camino that the second two floors need to look more residential than the ground floor, for instance. I think that's where the distinction is. I think the rear should look more residential in the front, but I don't think you need to split it on a horizontal level.

Chair Furth: And I'm not saying that you need to have different materials or different design. I think you might be more likely to have windows that open. There are other things that cue me to tell me that people live there.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. I mean, I think that...Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Chair Furth: I don't know. It says El Camino Way frontage should be more intimately scaled to suit the mixed residential character, with highly-articulated massing, balconies and plazas. I think you got that. And they keep talking about a village setting. I have no idea what they mean on El Camino, but I think that means places you would like to walk.

Board Member Thompson: I think for me, it's really about scale. In many ways, office...I'm just like, for example, fenestration. The scale of fenestration at an office level or at a retail level is so different than what it would be at a residential level. And it's not just that detail, but there's also massing, and kind of... Yeah, there's this different...I think that's kind of what's exciting about a mixed use, is that you can sort of have all these little levels of detail in there. But, yeah, I think it kind of, it does matter, too. Yeah, just in terms of the functionality. You don't want to live in an office building necessarily.

Chair Furth: To me, it's most important that it have a design that seems more coherent to me. And you always have the problem, you know, El Camino, people go by fast, and at the same time we're saying, and it should be a nice place to walk. I'm not saying this is easy, but I think you're capable of it. Anything else? Any questions from staff?

Mr. Brennan: Yeah, I just had a clarifying question for Board Member Thompson. You were mentioning some issues with signage. Could you just clarify? Were they in line with the comments that Chair Furth was mentioning, or...?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I mean, I think the suggestion to have them lower is a good idea. I think the scale at that, at least in the renders, seemed sort of out of scale. They seemed very big. So,

lower, maybe something, something for pedestrians, something for cars. But, I think, yeah, no one is going to be reading that signage on the ground, on the sidewalk.

Mr. Brennan: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay. Staff has asked us to continue this to a date uncertain?

Mr. Brennan: Yes.

Chair Furth: I would like to say that I think I agree with Alex, that this is a perfectly possible project. We get projects that don't have site designs that work, the site design doesn't work, it becomes apparent that the proposed program for the building doesn't fit on the site. I haven't heard any of us say that. We all believe that this is a desirable program with some wonderful elements, and we're finding the design a bit incoherent. And then, you heard a lot of specific comments.

MOTION

Chair Furth: I would entertain a motion to continue this to a date uncertain.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can I have one...?

Chair Furth: You may.

Vice Chair Baltay: I want to end on a positive note because I think you're doing something that all those buildings in Venice Alex mentioned does, which is to get people living outside of your building, on the balconies and terraces. I really do commend you. You have a lot of places for people to be, both in the front and the back, and I encourage you strongly to keep that and feel good about that. That's what residential architecture is, to some degree. I commend you for the outdoor spaces you've created on the building.

Chair Furth: Okay. Is that confusing enough for you? May I have a motion, please? To continue this to a date uncertain.

Board Member Lew: I'll make a motion that we continue to a date uncertain.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: There's been a motion made to continue this project to a date uncertain. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Hearing none, it passes unanimously. Than you.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.

Chair Furth: I would just like to say that my vocabulary is improving with my participation with you all. I now know how to spell "partee" [phonetic] pronounce it and use it, (inaudible). Fortunately, the Smithsonian has a very good architectural design curriculum intended for high schools that defines all these things with illustrations. Anything else we want to talk about before we go?

Board Member Lew: We have minutes.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 3, 2018.

Chair Furth: Oh, yes. I have sent staff my corrections on the minutes. They were all clerical suggestions.

Board Member Thompson: I have to abstain. I haven't had a chance to read them.

Chair Furth: All right, then, from those who did attend that meeting, which is the meeting of...what?

Board Member Lew: May 3rd.

Chair Furth: May 3rd.

MOTION

Chair Furth: May I have a motion to approve the minutes?

Board Member Lew: I have some comments.

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Lew: Okay. On page 5, there's an area that's highlighted in yellow. That's supposed to be photovoltaic array, otherwise known as solar panels. On page 11, the previous tenant was DPIXS, and they've moved to Colorado. And then, on page 27, I think there's a reference to Jan Jacobs, and I think that should be Jane Jacobs. That's all that I have.

Chair Furth: I would now entertain a motion to approve.

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we approve the minutes for May 3rd, as amended with those three items, as well as Wynne's...

Chair Furth: They're typos. It's the three points you raised, except I didn't know how to spell DPIXS, and a few other similar items.

Board Member Lew: Got it.

Chair Furth: They're clerical errors.

Board Member Lew: I make a motion that we approve the minutes of May 3rd.

Chair Furth: Robert, did you second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: All right. All those in favor in aye? Opposed, none. It passes 4-0-1, with Board Member Thompson abstaining because she was not at that meeting.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0-1.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Furth: We have no subcommittee items today. We should indicate for the record that Vice Chair Baltay and Board Member Thompson will be the subcommittee for 3945 El Camino Real. Does that do us?

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Board Member Lew: I have a question.

Board Member Thompson: I should clarify.

Board Member Lew: Under Board Member comments and announcements, I have a question for staff. On the appeal of 620 Emerson, which I think Council was supposed to hear this week...? Meeting on Monday?

Chair Furth: What they...

Board Member Lew: We received an email about that.

Chair Furth: What they did was three members of the Council voted to pull it from the consent agenda. Their policy now is that when that happens, it's set for hearing at a future date. You remind me that I should report that at the request of staff, I attended the Council meeting in case they needed any commentary from the Architectural Review Board on the project at the corner of El Camino Real and Page Mill. They did not need any commentary from us, but I couldn't figure out a polite way to leave, so, I was there until 1:30 in the morning, as were they, working hard. The project was ultimately approved on a 7-2 vote. Most of the issues, you'll be happy to know, I think, that the issues that caused them concern were not the kind of site-specific design issues that we dealt with.

Ms. Gerhardt: On the 620 Emerson, as Chair said, it will go to public hearing because it's been pulled off of consent. I'll have to let you know what that exact date is.

Board Member Lew: And then, the Verizon sites, which had seven appeals, my understanding is that the Council did not hear any of them. They declined to pull.

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't know the outcome on that, so I will have to email you. Sorry.

Board Member Lew: And then...

Chair Furth: We'll check it. Oh, how is the progress of the...?

Board Member Lew: ...the North Ventura...

Chair Furth: ...North Ventura?

Board Member Lew: ...has been pushed back, the kick-off has been pushed back a month.

Chair Furth: To...? Which month are we talking about now?

Board Member Lew: One month. July.

Chair Furth: July. Thank you. Anything else before we adjourn? All right, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

Adjournment