



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 10984)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 1/16/2020

Summary Title: Minutes of December 19, 2019

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 19, 2019.

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Draft minutes from the December 19, 2019 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

Draft and Approved Minutes are made available on the ARB webpage at bit.ly/paloaltoARB

A hard copy of the minutes of the above referenced meeting will be made available at the ARB hearing in the Council Chambers at 8:30 am.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: December 19, 2019 Draft Minutes (PDF)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: December 19, 2019
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Peter Baltay, Board Members Alexander Lew, David Hirsch and Grace Lee.

Absent: Vice Chair Osma Thompson.

Chair Baltay: Good morning. Welcome to the December 19th meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. Can we have a roll call, please?

[Roll Call]

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: All present, with Board Member Thompson absent.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Oral Communications

Chair Baltay: Next item is oral communications. Are there any members of the public who wish to address any item not on our agenda? Seeing none, and having no speaker cards.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Baltay: Next items is agenda changes, additions and deletions. Staff, can you tell us what we have, please?

Ms. Gerhardt: No changes.

Chair Baltay: For future meetings we have coming up in January, can you tell us what's going on then?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. In the packet this time, we've included both the 2019 and the 2020 schedule. You'll see, the hearing would normally be January 2nd, but that's so close to New Year's that we normally cancel that, so that's been cancelled. Our first hearing would be January 16th. You'll see on the other page that we do have four items that are likely to be at that hearing. It may go a little bit long, so, if we do really have the four items, then we will get some lunch, because we figure it will go past the noon hour.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, and 2) Tentative Future Agenda items and 3) Recent Project Decisions

Chair Baltay: Next item is city official reports. I guess we just covered the ARB meeting schedule and future items. I'd like to switch the agenda and slip in something very quickly, just a discussion that came up the

other day about a means of recording as we're discussing items, what the actual motions are that we're making, and what we're talking about, on the screen, typed up there by somebody. I thought we could establish a process whereby the vice chair is able to just write out what our actual motions are, so that we and the public can all be focused on what that is. We'll give it a try. I've been told that staff has been able to arrange some mechanism to do that. Behind us on the screen is a live Word document of some kind. Let's give it a go and see if it helps make us even better. Okay.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 702 Clara Drive [18PLN00068]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing 3,560 Square Foot, Four-Unit Apartment Building and Construction of Three Detached Single-Family Homes Totaling 5,000 Square Feet. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Zoning District: RM-20 (Residential Multi-Family). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Baltay: With that, we're going to move on to the first action item, number 2, which is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 702 Clara Drive. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of an existing 3,560 square foot, four-unit apartment building and construction of three detached single-family homes totaling 5,000 square feet. Do we have a staff report, please?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes. Good morning, Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner. Thank you for the introduction. This is the third formal hearing item for this project, so most of you have seen this project before, or at least looked at the minutes from previous meetings. I do have a PowerPoint presentation for you, and the applicant is also here with their presentation and materials board. Just a brief...

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Sheldon. Sorry to interrupt. I'd like to make sure we've disclosed anything on the board. Alex, do you have any disclosures?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site on Tuesday.

Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose I also visited the site last week. David, any disclosures?

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible]

Chair Baltay: Grace, any disclosures?

Board Member Lee: I'll disclose I did visit the site earlier this week.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Sorry for the interruption, Sheldon.

Mr. Sing: No problem, thank you. The project is located at the intersection of Sutter Avenue and Clara Drive. The site is zoned RM 20. The topography is flat, and there is a mix of single-family and multi-family residential within that neighborhood, which the project is trying to draw inspiration from. With the exception of the property behind, the adjacent properties are single-family residential in that area. A little bit of background. We did have a couple prior ARB hearings this year. The first was in February, and there were comments regarding the side yards, open space, front porches, and relationship with the street. Subsequently, there was, at the last hearing that was heard in August, the applicant presented some revisions to this Board, and there were some additional comments for the project, which are to review the circulation and the use of the side yards between the buildings. Also, to review the front yard paving, the front of Home A, showing more detail, such as the downspouts and lighting on the elevations. To review the size of the porch on Home B. That was smaller than some of the other ones. To consider revising the roof over the laundry room. Review Home A stair windows to either have more frosted or high sill preferred, as privacy concerns. The plans have been revised to include more detail about what windows are obscured

and which ones are high silled. The landscaping. The ARB wanted the plans to match the renderings that were presented, and to consider separation of the common open space along Sutter Avenue with some greenery. This is essentially the street side yard for the project. The project is maintaining all the existing mature trees, so trying to make sure there's some kind of connection there, not a separation between the units and the streets. Open space. Along with that, to review the corner of Home C for better connection to the open space in front. And then, to consider the use of operable windows. I think the applicant has looked at those options. In summary, the project is a one-lot future condominium subdivision with three two-story detached dwellings, so they kind of function like single family because they are detached. Just under 5,000 square feet total for the project. There are three different floor plans. There are some complementary styles. That's evolved since the beginning of the project. The private open spaces are at the rear of the dwellings, and there is some common space in the front along Sutter Avenue. I think one of the big things for the project has been how to use that space between the buildings because it's so narrow, and just having to service trash and AC units. So, the project has revised those, and the applicant will go through more detail on that, but it's made it so that at least one neighbor can use the side yard, and trash and AC units can be serviced in such a way that doesn't compromise the privacy of the neighbors. The zoning overview is that there is a reduction of one dwelling unit overall. The project is considered multi-family because of the number of units on the site that's consistent with the development standards, and they are paying a fee for affordable housing. With the site plan here, it's showing some of the landscaping. The street trees are the ones that they are maintaining, and the rest of the trees and landscaping would be newer. As you can see, they have reduced some impervious surfaces for Home A, which is the home on the left side in this graphic. And then, you can kind of see how the yards, the spaces between the buildings are used with the gate and the fence, and having that access to the private open space in the rear. Home C, importantly, that's the one where the entry was moved from Clara to Sutter, and then, there is that diagonal connection now from that porch in the front to that street corner. And then, an open space on the street side, it's opened up. There was a fence there, and that's been pushed back now towards the house. The porch for Home B is larger, and I think more consistent with some of the other, Home A and Home C. And the privacy between the units are met with some fencing and high sill windows. I think that's what I have this. There is still a concern about sharing the driveway. I think we believe that's a good asset to have, to try and eliminate curb cuts where we can. It's a good, efficient use of the space. These are renderings of, on the left side on the top is... Well, the top is the former rendering, and below is what's new. You can see that there's a change there. Instead of having it kind of walled off with some landscaping and fencing, it's more opened up, there's more of a connection to the corner, as well as you can see the porch has now changed the orientation of that entry. Here again, the top is the former, and the bottom is the current rendering. The applicant will describe more in detail about these, but just to show for comparison, the above is previous, and below is the current. There's more divided light windows now, so it's adding a little more variety and interest. These are the elevations. For CEQA, the environmental determination, the project is considered an infill project. The project does not create any significant impacts, and is considered categorically exempt pursuant to CEQA. The project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning ordinance, with suggested modifications. And then, we would recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and Development Services, based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval. That completes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Sheldon. Any questions of staff? Yeah?

Board Member Hirsch: Sheldon, how is the area between the houses treated? Who owns it? Is this a condominium association or a homeowner's association? Who is responsible for those areas?

Mr. Sing: I'll have the applicant, the owner of the project can explain that in more detail. There is a condominium map, as I mentioned, so the ownership will be more defined in there. The owner of the project can explain that.

Chair Baltay: We'll get to that in a second. Any other questions of staff? Grace? Alex? Okay. Then, to the applicant, you have 10 minutes to make your presentation. If you could state and spell your name for the record, we'd appreciate it.

Gilbert Fernandez: My name is Gilbert Fernandez. [spells name] Before I begin, I would like to say that, excuse my voice. I have a little issue, speaking today. As well as I do have epilepsy, so, in case I do have an episode, Tony Shi will be taking over the presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. We're looking forward to what you have to say.

Mr. Fernandez: I'm sorry?

Chair Baltay: Looking forward to hearing what you have to say.

Mr. Fernandez: Thank you. Okay, so, as Sheldon, just to kind of reiterate, we did modify the homes a bit on the exterior to kind of complement, again, the neighborhood. The right side, Home C, we changed it a bit to blend in more. We did remove the... Let's see. Let's see if I can get a before and after. For Home C, we did redesign it a bit to kind of blend in with the neighborhood, and then, also, give it a better look from both streets, Sutter and Clara. For Home A, as well as Home B, we took into consideration the porch use, so we did make it deeper so it could be used more. Home B is about five feet, to be able to use it more, as well. Before, I believe it was a little less than four feet. Home A also is deeper as well. This one, for Home A... I'm sorry. Excuse me. For Home A, we did do about 6 1/2 feet, and for Home C, on the right facing Sutter, it's five feet; in the front, it's, on average, also about five feet. With that, just to reiterate, we have all the zoning information. Sheldon already talked about that. So, just to go over the homes again. Each home has its own style of single-family, which is entry, living, dining, full kitchen, family, study room, two bedroom, laundry, bedroom. Every home has kind of its own separate living. This is existing, and what we are proposing. Again, you can just see what we're trying to do as far as blend it into the neighborhood so it doesn't stick out, as the comments we did have in the past, on the first ARB's. We did do high sills on the second floor. One is facing the neighborhood. We did do obscure glass, and also, in between the homes, we did do high sills and obscure glass, so the privacy is kind of kept between them as well. We added additional trees as well, for the privacy. Existing trees are to remain also. We did keep a lot of the landscaping to make sure privacy impacts on neighbors are not [inaudible]. This is the neighborhood around the proposed lot, which, remember, we do have the apartment complexes. The landscape architect can explain more of what we did. On the left side, we do have a single-family home, and since it is a corner lot, we do have more single families, but across the street. But we did add some landscape there, also on the street side, to kind of keep that privacy as well for Home C. Here are the materials for Home A. We did do a divided light in the windows to kind of give it more character. The porch, again, was also revised to be more of a use, and also change the look as well, to give it a better view. It will have asphalt shingles and metal windows, and more of a, kind of like a bronze, with the door being the white. It will be kind of a light gray finish with a stucco. And to go over the stucco, it's not going to be a blended color into the stucco. It will be just a standard plywood lathe with the plaster, then painted over. That will be for all the homes as well. For the material on Home B, it will be more of a darker gray, but not too dark. But again, also asphalt shingles, giving it different colors on each home just to kind of divide them, but not take away from the neighborhood. The windows would be light, again, with divided light, and the front door will keep it more of a darker, just to kind of go with the roof. Home C, we're keeping it more on the lighter side. We're going to go with a, kind of an off-white. The rendering shows more of a bright, but it will be more of an off-white, with the lighter gray shingles. Again, the windows will be divided light, and the windows and doors with a darker bronze. The Home C corner did more, kind of like a, kind of blended with a country style, but more simplified as far as the entryway, to kind of give it a... The front doors are going to be facing Sutter, so that not all the homes kind of look like tract homes in this area. But again, we also kept the depth of the porch so it would be more of a use, but also keep an architectural look to Sutter. And I don't have the floor plan here, but if... I don't have the floor plan here, but for the... If we go to page A.4, you can see the site plan here. As for the use of the area in between the homes, Home C will have the use in between Home B and C. The building for the bicycle use, and also for the trash area. We did include the fence in the rear, as you can see, to kind of keep privacy into that space, which would be a study room. The garage has high sill windows, so they don't impact the right side. The area in between A and B will be used by Home B, and again, that's for the trash and for the bicycle areas as well. They will also have access to the rear. And also, the fencing will keep the privacy for Home A, and we have high sill windows to keep the privacy. And the area on the left side of Home A will be for Home A. Other than that, I believe that's all. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions of the applicant? David, were you clear on the...?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, my same question, really. How does the ownership of the areas in between, especially for maintenance, you know, maintenance of the machinery, and just maintenance of the space? How is that handled?

Mr. Fernandez: It will be in an HOA.

Board Member Hirsch: HOA?

Mr. Fernandez: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. And it will spell out the responsibilities, then?

Mr. Fernandez: Yes.

Chair Baltay: I see you have a sample board there. Could you bring that up so we can take a look at it, please? Any other questions of the applicant? Then I would like to ask a couple myself. On your drawings, I notice, on the elevations, you're indicating that the second floor has an eight-foot plate height, height of the walls, but in the section, Drawing A.21, you're indicating it at nine feet. I'd like to be clear – What is the height of the walls on the second floor?

Mr. Fernandez: The first floor will be nine, and the second floor will be eight. That detail is just an error.

Chair Baltay: That's okay. I just want to be sure we have it for the record. That makes perfect sense. Similar question regarding the plaster finishes. On A.21 again, you're referencing a pigmented cement plaster finish, which is not painted stucco; it's a different kind of finish. And I heard you say that your intention is to have plaster, cement plaster that's painted on the exterior. Is that the finish you're proposing?

Mr. Fernandez: That's correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so this pigmented thing is not correct. Okay. But then, I noticed that the green building sheets in your application just haven't been completed yet. I'm assuming that's just a paperwork kind of thing.

Mr. Fernandez: Yes, that's right.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Lastly, could you address...? I remember some of the board members had asked strongly about having operable windows. It seems that you've opted not to propose operable windows on the side. I think it's in the spaces between the houses, the up-higher windows.

Mr. Fernandez: The windows in between...?

Chair Baltay: I wanted to know what your logic is behind that. Why wouldn't you make these windows operable? It just seems to me... What's your logic behind that? Maybe, Sheldon, are you able to help point out which windows? It was written up in your report.

Mr. Fernandez: Which windows are we speaking of?

Ms. Gerhardt: If you're talking about windows between the two houses, I can only assume that it's for privacy reasons because we have that side yard being used by one house, and the windows being, you know, for a second house.

Chair Baltay: What I'm reading in the staff report is that the side windows are high sill and fixed, rather than operable. And I'm wondering, is that a conscious decision not to make them operable as well?

Mr. Fernandez: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Why is that? Why wouldn't you have them just be awning windows that can vent a little bit?

Mr. Fernandez: Because we have operable windows towards the rear, or towards the front, and on the side, just to kind of keep that privacy, instead of opening them and being able to view into the neighbors, just to have them fixed, just for the lighting. They do have ventilation and fire escape windows on certain sides of the rooms. It's just the sides to keep them from viewing into the next neighbors.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you for the explanation. And lastly, I wonder if we could call the landscape architect up and just give us a three-minute walk-through of the corner, especially. What are you doing? What are the plants that are there now? If you don't mind. Thank you. Please state and spell your name for the record.

Dakotah Bertsch, Landscape Architect: Good morning. My name is Dakotah Bertsch. [spells name] I'm not familiar with this presentation.

Chair Baltay: Nothing formal, Dakotah. If you could just... It looks lovely, I think, but I want to know what plants are there.

Mr. Bertsch: Right. Well, I believe Sheldon mentioned before the issue at a previous meeting, was I think not so much that the plans didn't match the renderings, but that the renderings didn't match the plans. Because my intention all along was to have kind of a low planting along the sidewalk that created connectivity between the sidewalk and the landscape. But the previous renderings didn't really illustrate that very well. In this iteration, the planting along the sidewalk has changed from shrubs to grasses, primarily. It's a layered border planting of perennial bunch grasses and some flowering perennials. There are also no-mow lawn areas in front of each unit to create a meadow-like feeling. On the Sutter side, under the redwood trees, there's a primarily native plant, redwood understory planting, with flowering shrubs and perennials. A lot of the grasses are also native, I should mention. Another thing that has changed from previous iterations is each unit now has a separate path to the sidewalk connecting the porch to the street for pedestrians, consisting of rectangular concrete pavers. And because Mr. Fernandez changed Home C to have that wraparound front porch and relate more to the corner, the path for Unit C, as mentioned previously, diagonally connected to the corner. And, there is a stepping stone path meandering through the redwood understory garden on that side. In the back, the landings and porches have been expanded somewhat, and simplified. Each unit has a landing or porch, depending on the space available, and an area of back lawn, which is actually a lower water use ground cover. And the driveways are pavers, and the front porches will be tiled.

Chair Baltay: Is that it?

Mr. Bertsch: Yeah, I think that's it.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you very much. Any other questions from the Board? Okay, with that, I'd like to open the meeting to any public comments. Do we have anybody who wishes to address this project? Seeing no one, and having no speaker cards, I'll close the public comment period. You may sit down. We'll start with our discussion of this project. David, would you like to go first?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Just a comment about the windows, because I really don't see why you need to be quite as fixed as you have fixed the windows on the yard, especially in an area where... I think it's Home B...? Let's see...It's really Home A. You have a window on the side yard there, in the study, in the back. Is the window on the side yard operable? Can you take a look at that plan?

Mr. Fernandez: I was referring to the second floor. All the second floor side windows are fixed. The bottom are operable.

Board Member Hirsch: The first floor, the window is operable? In the study?

Mr. Fernandez: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Okay. That's fine. That's really the only area where I was concerned with that issue. Privacy seems like a good idea for the rest of those side yards. In Building B, is there any possibility of getting closer to the side yard for garbage? I noticed that Building C has access to the side yard, and I believe Building A. But Building B, the side yard is very far from the house for, kind of taking the garbage. Do you have any comment on how that would work?

Mr. Fernandez: If you're referring to...? You're referring to B?

Board Member Hirsch: It's just... How do you get from inside to the garbage from Building B? I guess you have to go out the front door, over to the side yard, and then to the back. Is that right?

Mr. Fernandez: Yeah, for this one, it would be exiting from the back to the side, or to the front, yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Either from the back or from the front.

Mr. Fernandez: Right.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, I guess we've got to live with that one, then. My major concern really is, I'm very pleased that you turned the porch, a suggestion that was made by our Chairman here. It's a major improvement in that façade, but... And I notice that the kitchen is in the rear of that building, and you really have only three windows along the side of it. It seems, I mean, they are not small windows, but there is an opportunity because you have kind of, no windows in the kitchen facing the rear yard. You have a window facing the side yard over the sink. And then, you have two windows in what's a very, a family dining area, and some beautiful trees outside, redwood garden, redwoods out there, and plantings that are nice to see. And the street distance view, I mean, some significant distance from the street. But you just have these three windows. Whereas the porch is a nice access now to the house, much improved. But I think you're missing an opportunity. Similarly in the master bedroom upstairs. You just have, just sort of divided windows where you might be able to make that a more interesting façade, and have simply better rooms facing it. I think it's not something that I would think would hold up the approval of the project, but I would see it would be an improvement if that could come to committee, if that's the way this ends up. I'm making that suggestion. I guess we got to say that this is a vast improvement from the first time you came in on this project. The three houses are very different in character and kind of fit the neighborhood pretty well. For me, it's kind of a false narrative to sort of take three houses and make them that different, but I guess I can go along with it, as if it's trying to fit into a neighborhood where different things happen on each house. It's not my personal choice, okay? But it works for this neighborhood, and for these houses, so I'm accepting that. In the same way, the exterior materials and the light fixtures. It wouldn't seem to me that if you had three houses that are basically serving the same kind of purpose, and selling them to private people, they have to be different, but okay. You did it, and let's go ahead. You know, that idea. The scale of it is pretty nice. I personally absolutely abhor false muntins in windows. Another personal issue here. I think if you have muntins, you should have divided windows and panes in each of them. I'm a traditionalist that way. But I'll go along with it because I know I'll be voted down anyhow. Because everybody will say scale is more important than the fact that you have functioning muntins and windows. But I will object to it, in any case, on the way to approval. Thanks for increasing the porch sizes. I think that was really, really significant here in the project, and it's a Palo Alto tradition to have a front porch, that I see, all around me, and I really like it. I wish people would use them more. I don't see people sitting out there very much anymore, but it probably, once upon a time, had a good use, and maybe those things will come back. I like the idea. I happen to come from Brooklyn, and I had a stoop on the front of my house, as did every other house on the block. Stoops were a place where people would sit outside, and kids would be relating to each other socially. But those things change over time, and hopefully the next generation

will use the porches, and your houses will maybe work that way. But the invitation to use a porch and relate the neighborhood, I just find to be a terrific idea. I think you've done quite a good job with that. The roof lines are pretty interesting, and I hope you don't give your carpenter too much of a headache here, but I find them to be interesting. I always liked this project from the top, down. It looked interesting to me. And I think the plantings are vastly improved now, and the kind of openness feeling of entering these houses is very nice. I don't want to belabor it anymore. I think you should get on to building it. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, David. Alex, what do you think?

Board Member Lew: I think I agree with most of David's comments. When I visited the site, I think I was most struck by the fact that I think that the project can fit into the neighborhood really well, and I didn't feel that way before. I think you've made major progress on the project. I would support David's comment about looking at the larger windows facing the street side on Unit C. I think Board Member Thompson, if she were here, she would object to the black roof on House B. I think she would look for something lighter, and something that absorbs less solar heat gain. I think that's all that I have. I think I agree with all the other comments. And I would say also, just on the landscape, I think you guys did a great job on the native plantings, and I think also the blue stone, stone walkways, are really beautiful, and a handsome addition to the project. I can recommend approval, if we get there today.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Grace? Welcome to this project.

Board Member Lee: Thank you for presenting. I understand that I've missed a couple meetings, but I see that there has been a lot of work, and I appreciate your efforts in collaborating with the Board and really responding to their comments. I don't have too many comments here, but I did want to revisit the operable window discussion, as well as just make some small comments on the landscape and exterior lighting. I am a big fan of operable windows. The only one that really sticks out to me is the... And I understand the higher sill, and perhaps why you might move in that direction. I think it's Home A, though, that still has a bathroom up high. It's window 9 that does not have an operable window. That, to me, is just a small change that you might want to revisit. I think in some of these... In homes, we also like cross-ventilation, so, although you do have the rear windows that are operable in the master bedrooms, sometimes on the side, you just want to have that diagonal air movement. I just want to bring it up. I don't know if this Board feels very strongly about that, but I would revisit that one bathroom that doesn't have an operable window in Home A. On the landscape, it's just a terrific opportunity, that common open space that's on the corner, you know, over 1,000 square feet, and I appreciate, you know, how do you plant underneath those redwoods in a way that is really, gives them ways to celebrate, and also, you think about the water. Sometimes, there is a feeling of community and a desire to sit along the corner. I've been to the site, I understand that it's single-family around there, but sometimes it's nice to acknowledge that it is a common open corner. I can think of spaces I've lived in where there is a sense that it is inviting and not closed off, like the rear open spaces. I just thought I'd mention that, that if there's an opportunity to celebrate, that that is the one piece that could create community, or that could be actually habitable, beyond decorative or just admiring from across the street. The other piece that I have is exterior lighting. Just on your board – and I think you worked with the Board on the color palette and the textures – I support the comment on the roof that Osma might bring up. A small one, but the exterior lighting, you know, it's A, B and C, and A just seems a little bit different from B and C. Very minor, but it's something that stuck out to me, so I'll bring that up. Other than that, I don't know how you all feel about the operable window. I thought since it was something that's come up previously, if we did want to talk about it as a group, that would be great. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: I think we're all acting on Osma's behalf. She feels very strongly about this.

Board Member Lee: Yes, yes.

Chair Baltay: And at least for me, I'm trying to preserve everybody's interests.

Board Member Lee: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Anything else, Grace?

Board Member Lee: No. I think that will be all.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Okay. On the operable windows, I wonder if we could understand, where is it specified which are operable and which are not? I'm sure it's in here someplace but I don't see it on a quick pass.

Board Member Lee: I'm sorry, if I may jump in, I just want to make sure the garages, you said upper story are fixed, and I can't tell from the drawings if the garage side windows are operable or not.

Mr. Fernandez: The garage are fixed. They are fixed.

Board Member Lee: May I just make a plug for potentially, in a garage, you may wish to have airflow.

Chair Baltay: Again, to the applicant, I guess. Where does it specify which windows operate and which don't?

Mr. Fernandez: Actually, it is not on the plans, no.

Chair Baltay: Okay, it seems like that's something that we may want to...

Mr. Fernandez: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: ... see revised. I do feel that operable windows on houses like this are really a benefit, even if it's just a simple awning window that only kicks out a few inches. The benefits for ventilation on a hot day are huge. Those kind of windows are very good for security and stuff. It's really tough to see that it's a privacy or security impact, and yet, the benefits to the residents are huge. I would encourage you strongly to consider adding more operable windows wherever you can on buildings like this. Nonetheless, I'm not sure we have review board findings to insist on it, but I think the consensus on the Board is that we would like to see that. I would like to address a few other things, but in general, I think this project is ready to be recommended for approval. I am concerned on a few items on the floor plans, and I want to bring them to the attention of my colleagues because I'd like to give you some latitude to consider addressing them. If you look at the floor plan for Unit C... Which page is that? A.10, yes, I'm sorry. The entrance, floor plan to Unit C, if you notice where the front door is coming in, it makes your living room awfully difficult to furnish. I just imagine putting a sofa or a TV set in there. It's really tough. And then, it seems to me it would be better to switch the door around to the other site, to more facing the side street. And I don't think that's an Architectural Review Board kind of change, but I want to put it out there, at least by my opinion, I'd be all for having you consider revising that. And maybe even some other shifting around of windows down there. As David was mentioning, you have an opportunity to be looking out at the redwoods, and little tweaks like that might really increase the benefit of that residence. But I don't want to see that hold you up. The same thing I've noticed, you have, in many of these units, the bathroom layout is such that you have a single, very small vanity for a bathroom serving two bedrooms. That's typically a very tight arrangement, and I'd encourage you to just consider tweaking your floor plan a little bit more. And I'd like to see, you have the latitude, and if that means you shift a window a little bit, I think that would be okay, with concurrence of the Board, and that would make for a better project. On Unit C, again, I noticed the master closet. It's a very large room, and it's not even accessed off of the bedroom. It's very odd to go out into the hallway to get to your closet. Again, I think that... I don't know why that is that way, but you could reconfigure that stuff. And I'd like to see you have a chance to do that without having to come back to the review board. I notice on Unit A, when you walk in, the living room and dining room are really tight together. It's not a realistic place for the dining room to be. And again, shifting the kitchen slightly to make more space, one way or the other, is something I think you'd want to think about. And I want to see that you have the latitude to work that out. I think those are mostly layout issues, which I'm just pointing out, but they are things I think you'd be wise to consider. With that, what I've heard from the Board is that we're concerned about the windows. We'd like to see perhaps more operable windows, and possibly on Unit C, more openness to the side yard there. I've heard us say that, at least one board member expressed concern

that the roof is too dark. I'll share that, what Alex mentioned, that the shingles... I think they look lovely, but I don't think they'll pass the current CALGreen standards. You're going to have to revise that anyway. I think the redder shingled one also may end up looking too bright orange, the orange and black one. There are some more muted tones that you can pick that will blend in better. And then, Grace brought up the question of the exterior lights, whether the light on Unit A was appropriate relative to the rest of the houses. And it is a bit disunite in its modern styling. The question to the board is, are we ready to put this forward completely, or do we want to have it come back on a subcommittee with those items? Does anybody have an opinion? Or would anybody like to make a motion?

Unidentified: [inaudible]

Chair Baltay: Yes, and if we make a motion, let's get it... Where did Jodie go? We were going to... I'd like us to record what our motion is, so it's written so we can see it. This is a simple one, so it's not as important. Jodie Gerhardt will go the computer screen. Alex, are you going to take a stab at this?

Board Member Lew: Well, can we do a quick poll of the Board?

Chair Baltay: Sure. Okay.

Board Member Lew: Is it subcommittee? Or do you want staff to review these items?

Chair Baltay: What do we think about that?

Board Member Hirsch: I think it's subcommittee issues.

Board Member Lee: I'd be fine with subcommittee.

Chair Baltay: I actually believe it could be handled at the staff level, but I'm happy to go along with the subcommittee. What do you think, Alex?

Board Member Lew: I was thinking staff level as well, but...

Board Member Lee: Should we weigh in for Osma, who has been involved in the past two? Do you have a feeling if she would...?

Board Member Lew: I think it's fine [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: We need to get this done.

Board Member Lee: Okay. And to be frank, I'm on the border, subcommittee or staff. I haven't been involved in the last two.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm on the border, too.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Let's take a stab at putting this to the staff level review, Alex. See if you can...

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Chair Baltay: ... make a motion of approval, then, with that in it.

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we recommend approval of the project to the Planning Director, with the following items to return to staff for review: One is to consider operable windows in the upper floor bathrooms. Reconsider the light fixtures on Unit A, exterior light fixtures on Unit A. And, reconsider the colors of the roofs on Unit A and B. For A, it would be, maybe something more brown as

opposed to reddish-tan. I can't really tell here. And then, for Unit B, something less black, with less solar heat gain.

Chair Baltay: Do you want to second that?

Board Member Hirsch: No, no, I'd like to amend it.

Chair Baltay: Let's wait. I'll second that motion. David would like to make a friendly amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Board Member Hirsch: Friendly amendment. I'd like to see some changes in Building C, the windows facing the side yard on both the bedroom level and the living room level, on the first floor.

Chair Baltay: Let's be more specific. When you say "changes," what are we after? Because staff is going to be looking at this. More openness to the side yard?

Board Member Hirsch: Larger windows in the side yard, especially on the first floor where it's being used as a living room. And there are no windows in the kitchen area facing the back yard at all. So, significantly larger windows on that elevation, on the ground floor and the proportionately larger windows in the bedroom above.

Chair Baltay: What she has written up there is: Provide larger windows on side yard. Is that too vague, David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Baltay: That's okay?

Board Member Hirsch: Uh-huh.

Chair Baltay: Alex, how do you feel about that?

Board Member Lew: I will accept that. I think I would just clarify street side.

Board Member Hirsch: Street side. Okay.

Board Member Lew: But I will accept the amendment.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I'll also go along with that. Any comments? Does anybody want to address that?

Board Member Hirsch: No, just the window, description of the smaller windows facing the inner court, inner space between the buildings, more generally could be stated in some way that it's, where feasible, create more cross-ventilation by making those operable windows.

Chair Baltay: I think what we said is "consider operable windows," so they have some latitude.

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible]. And in side yards.

Chair Baltay: Everybody see that motion? Are we all set with that? Okay, so we're ready to vote. All those in favor? Opposed? Okay, the motion carries 4-0.

MOTION PASSES 4-0.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Good luck with your project.

Mr. Fernandez: Thank you.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1700 & 1730 Embarcadero Road [19PLN-00291]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Address Specific Issues Raised by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for a Previously Approved Project that Includes Two Automobile Dealerships. The Prior Approval Through Conditions of Approval Required the Project to Come Back to the ARB to Address Issues Related to Color, Landscaping, Parapets, Lighting, Transportation Demand Management Plan, County Airport Land Use Commission Review; and Floor Area Ratio. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Adopted for the Project on June 24, 2019. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us

Chair Baltay: Okay. We're going to move on to item number 3. It's a public hearing, quasi-judicial, 1700 and 1730 Embarcadero Road. A recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to address specific issues raised by the Architectural Review Board for a previously approved project that includes two automobile dealerships. The prior approval through conditions of approval required the project to come back to the ARB to address issues related to color, landscaping, parapets, lighting, Transportation Demand Management Plan, County Airport Land Use Commission review; and floor area ratio. With that, I'd like to ask if anyone has any disclosures to make. Alex?

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: I have visited the site recently. David?

Board Member Hirsch: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: And Grace?

Board Member Lee: I also visited the site.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Do we have a staff report on this project, please?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Thank you. Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner, here with a presentation. The applicant is also here with their presentation. They also have some larger material samples that they can share, as well. Just an overview. It's an approximately five-acre site. It does include two separate parcels, one that has an existing former restaurant at 1700 Embarcadero. The other site is the existing Audi dealership, and that's at 1730 Embarcadero. This request does include an architectural review. It's a little bit unique because this project was seen before through a separate process, the site and architectural design, as well as a zoning amendment. That went through the Board, went through the Planning Commission, and also ultimately through the City Council this past June. At that time, the Council did adopt the CEQA document, and they approved the zone change. They approved a site design review with conditions of approval. Part of those conditions was to come back and file a separate architectural review application to be heard by this body. Those conditions, in general, are listed in the bullet points on the slide. The ones in bold are the ones that started off with the Board, at their last meeting, I believe it was in June. Or May. Those had to do with colors. The GL-2 parapet is a glass parapet that was inset into the top of the garage. We'll go into more details about that. Trees, street trees, as well as trees on the property. There was a curb ramp at the corner that has to do with the convergence of the multiuse path with that intersection. The green screens on the building, trying to be more compatible with the Baylands, as well as the perimeter landscaping. The focus on that was at the carwash. The Council did add some additional conditions. Those are on the right side, and that has to do with the floor area ratio. There was some inconsistencies that were brought up. Wanted to make sure that those were fleshed out. And then, there was actually more details of lighting that they wanted to see the Board look at. The submittal of a Transportation Demand Management Plan. They wanted to have in the records the County Airport Land Use Commission documentation. And then, some additional context drawings added to the plans. Just a little bit of a site context here so we understand where we are. This is in the Baylands area. The most adjacent property actually touches the Baylands proper, would be the Audi site, so you can see the site

from the rear. It is near the freeway, US 101. It's also near the golf course. It's near the airport, and that's what caused it to go to the Airport Commission. There are a number of offices in the area, as well as there is another car dealership, the Honda dealership that's adjacent to Audi. And, of course, Embarcadero and Bayshore, the two kind of major roadways in that area. From the rear of the property, from the Baylands, you can see a little bit of the Audi site. This is just kind of in the context of what you're seeing from the trail. I do want to start off a little bit about the context, just because I think sometimes we can get into the weeds of this project. It has been through many meetings in the past. But, typically for a car dealership, you see a smaller building that's kind of the showroom, then they have a service building, and sometimes those roll-up doors are open, so noise can come out. You have a large surface lot with the merchandise on site. Sometimes you have a carwash that's on the site; sometimes they have to go outside for it. I think this applicant has put together a project that internalizes those negative externalities. They have a 300-car stacker system for their merchandise. They use a parking garage as, kind of couples as also the service. So, all those things are kind of internalized, a lot of their traffic is internalized on-site instead of going off-site. The trade-off of that is we have a larger building that we have to contend with. It is in a different zoning district, so that's something to consider. I just want to throw that out there, the context as we're looking at the project. With the colors specifically – and I think the applicant will go into more detail on this – the comment was to adhere to the Baylands design guidelines, and more muted colors; use charcoal or rich brown. The applicant's colors have been revised to include a more charcoal base, so you do you have the materials board there. I'll let the applicant go more into that detail. The GL-2 parapet, the material should match the transparent quality shown in the plans and not be as opaque as the sample that was shown in the prior ARB meeting. What's proposed is to have the parapet be a frosted glass panel that will be inset into the wall. I think the renderings do show that detail. The light fixtures are located on the solid parapet segments. They're not located within the same segments as the glass parapets, so there would be some minimal light transmission through the frosted glass, and those are depicted in the photometric plans in the back of the packet. There are some down lights. They are located on the exterior, so when you look at the photometrics, you might notice that there is a light that kind of comes out, but that is actually the down light on the exterior of the building, not coming from the roof deck. Regarding the trees, there was comments to add more trees at the base of the building, to soften the Baylands roadside. Consider an alternative to the western redbuds. Along that side, there is a pretty big constraint. There is the PG&E transmission towers, so there are limitations on the vegetation that you can put in there. The limitation is 15 feet in height. That's a good 80-foot easement there, and includes underground utilities as well. What we did get was that three ornamental trees at the base of the building was changed to shade trees. On the graphic there, you can see where that's bubbled in. Those were actually smaller type of trees; now they are larger trees. The western redbuds are still shown underneath utilities. There are some alternatives that can be considered by the Board, and those are shown within the plans, and I can direct you to those if we get to that part. Also, the applicant is also proposing some off-site trees within the Baylands, adjacent to the Audi property. With the curb wrap at the corner, the comment was to work with Transportation staff regarding the transition at the intersection. The multiuse path, which is a new amenity, would confer to that intersection. There are some constraints there. This photograph shows a little bit of what's going on. There's utility poles, a manhole, other utility boxes, and some grade changes. The response from the applicant was they did identify some grading constraints. Our staff did review that and felt there could be a solution, not in time for this meeting, but we did put a condition of approval for the consideration that we would get this addressed later on. With respect to the green screen, the comment was to look at other solutions for the green screens. As you'll remember, there was more, like louvers. It was maybe something that didn't look as high-quality, or it would be hard to maintain, so what the applicant came up with for these green screens and... They're modified to be more simple panels over larger areas. In the plans themselves, they do identify maintenance plans. We can pull those into conditions of approval to make it very clear, but those are in the plans as well. With respect to the perimeter landscaping, the comment was to provide a 10-foot setback along this carwash building, and the carwash building is detached in the rear of the Audi. And I think part of the concern there was with noise, part of it was maybe just the buffer between the building and the property line. There is a five-foot setback that's there now. The applicant is proposing to add more vertical landscaping there. With respect to noise, that issue was addressed through mitigation and design. There are wing walls at either end of the carwash, as well as there will be automatic doors, so that when a car goes into the machine, doors come down, and the transmission noise is significantly reduced, to the point where it's below the thresholds for significance. Some of these things, if the five foot is maintained, then they could maintain the circulation between the carwash and the building,

and that would allow for keeping the traffic off the street, for one thing. Keeping drop-offs and loading on site. Other than that, you would have to modify the main building to make that work, and that could be something, I guess, that could be brought up. With respect to lighting, it was to provide details, specifications of lighting, including security levels. Full photometric drawings are provided. And a lot of times, we see these photometric plans, they just show it as, kind of one-dimensional, and [inaudible] does show it at multiple levels, as well as, as mentioned previously, the lighting does show what would be shown from the roof deck, the parking on there, as well as off of the exterior of the building. And at the peak, when the business is in operation, the thresholds are met. And what's proposed at nighttime security is that there will be a 50 percent drop-off in power. Therefore, it would still be compliant with the City's codes. The condition from the Council was to include and submit a TDM plan that was... There was submitted a [inaudible] report. It was not an approved document. However, just within the last day, it was approved by the Office of Transportation. That's something that's not really dealt by the ARB's purview, but something that we can follow up with staff as this project progresses. Since the project is within the influence of the Palo Alto airport, they did go to the County's Airport Land Use Commission. They did receive their approval there, and we did get the documentation, so that has been satisfied. And then, there was a condition to provide more context drawings, and I think the applicant did provide more of those. Hopefully that is more clear, about the area and how the project is compatible and complements the surroundings. With respect to the floor area ratio, there was significant comment at the start of the Council hearing about the project's floor area. As I mentioned, there is a unique component to this project. There is a 300-car automatic stacking system, and that's kind of been a point of discussion from staff from the beginning, of how to address building floor area for this portion of the project. What we kind of concluded is that this is no different than, say, like a grocery store, or a Costco. The merchandise for them is cars. It's just a larger type of merchandise than, say, a toothbrush, or something. So, you do have a high pile storage net area. We're only counting the first floor of that space. The issue is that there is a cantilevered portion, and there's about 2,000 square feet that was over the showroom space, so we had to count that portion. That's the portion that was inconsistent. The applicant came back and provided... Well, if we counted that, then where were we with the floor area? And they were approximately 887 square feet over. At the time of writing the report, they didn't have a solution. However, at this point, they do have a solution in their presentation, so they will show that to you. With respect to CEQA, the initial study, as I mentioned was adopted in June, and for its related project, it is consistent with that. There's nothing more significant. There's no new significance that would come about from this project. With that, we do recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and Development Services, based on the findings and conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. Be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Sheldon. Any questions of staff? Okay, then I do. Sheldon, could you explain, please, where are the larger trees being planted? There was quite a bit of discussion at the City Council level regarding removing the trees along Embarcadero, and then, ultimately replacing them with larger trees. Could you just walk us through, for the record, what large trees are being incorporated in this project now? Thank you.

Mr. Sing: On the graphic that's showing on the screen, there's a bubbled area that shows the trees that are in front of the building. Those are the ones that have been added to the project, and that's on sheet, in the plans, L-2.

Board Member Lew: They are olive trees.

Chair Baltay: Those are three olive trees. And how big are they expected to become when they reach maturity?

Mr. Sing: We can have the landscape architect come up and describe it.

Chair Baltay: Fair enough. Board Member Lew says 25 to 30 feet. Okay. Just wanted to get an answer on that. Any other questions of staff? Okay, if not, to the applicant, would you care to make a presentation? You will have 10 minutes to speak. If you could state and spell your name for the record, we'd really appreciate it. Thank you.

Lyle Hutson, Architect: Good morning, Chairman, Board Members. My name is Lyle Hutson. [spells name] I am the architect for this project. Just a moment while we... Okay. Again, thank you very much for having us here. I see a new face, and some old faces. Welcome.

Chair Baltay: We're all smiling.

Mr. Hutson: This project is coming to you again. We did, from the last time we met, I believe it was in May, we did go to the City Council, who... We had some very spirited discussions, and some outcomes. The fact that we're here is attributed to the City Council wanting to make sure we do the best project we can with all the means available to us. And there are items that I think the City Council felt like they would be much better handled by your Board. Regardless, we'll go through those, but I wanted to reintroduce you to the project just briefly. This is a combination. There is an existing Audi building on the corner... Excuse me, not on the corner, but next to this, that is existing. This proposed project is for Mercedes-Benz. The two are totally separate facilities. They are joined in the back, but they are owned by the same ownership group, yet they are two separate dealerships and will be treated as two separate addresses. To give a description of the site, I think Sheldon adequately indicated where this is. We don't need to belabor where that is. The Audi building is really the one that is addressed right next to the Baylands area in the rear of that. Other than that, we are fronted on Embarcadero and on Bayshore. This slide basically shows the project as it's designed, fitting into that site. There's been a lot of discussion about the relationship between the neighboring buildings and where we are. We feel like we're set back quite a ways from not only the Baylands, and from the adjacent buildings. And again, we have the 80-foot-plus easement on Bayshore that creates some other limitations, architecturally as well as from our site design, which have, for the most part, been worked through. We took very careful consideration in this with our design sensitivity. We looked at the floor area ratios as required, which we feel like we are now in compliance with the desires of city staff. The building mass, the height, is under what's allowable for the area. We're under 50 feet, which is the allowable for that zoning. Our landscape has been carefully crafted to accommodate the easement and the location. We do have a carwash that is part of this. We've been very sensitive to that, of keeping it in an area where it would not impact the Baylands. We've considered the noise requirements and the noise for adjacent neighbors with a screening wall and closing the doors, as has been described. Traffic and circulation is something that, we're keeping cars off the street and circulating around the back. We have a circulation all around the building for fire and life safety access as well. Finally, the two things that we really delved into and utilized, not only staff but the community, is our Baylands transition, and how we approach adjusting our building, four-sided, five-sided architecture, in order to accommodate our green screens in relationship to the Baylands and the wildlife as it's presented there. And, being able to begin community collaboratives, not only with the Audubon Society, as well as Parks & Recreation, regarding bicycles, bicycle rentals, paths, and things of that nature. The floor area ratio is something that we have been discussing from the very beginning of this project with staff, and we feel like we're now at an area where we're all comfortable with what we're doing. The final proposal, as Sheldon indicated, was we were about 887 square feet short of hitting our goal. There was a request by staff to provide alternative floor area, even though it's already been counted, but as an alternative to our stacking system that elevates itself over the second floor. So, our solution as proposed, and what was presented to staff, was this green area. You don't have that in your package, but we are effectively eliminating two service stalls on the end of the building to reduce the square footage of, um, very close to 1,000 square feet of floor area on that building. The upper deck would maintain, the parking, the second level, maintains its area, but effectively reduces the floor area of our building by almost 1,000 square feet. I'll let Sheldon go into the numbers if that's needed, but we feel like we've addressed that to staff. The final slide here is another one that you do not have in your package, but it just shows our elevation of what that would look like from a massing standpoint if we were to do this. It wouldn't change the elevation at all. It would just be recessed. The door would stay in the same location, the walls would stay just pushed back underneath the overhang of the building on the second level. Again, building mass. We're stepping back. I think we've talked about this a number of times previous with the Board, that we're trying to step back from Embarcadero to... excuse me... to... So that we don't have the big two-story right on the face, on Embarcadero. Steps back to the higher area, which is still under the 50-foot height limit. The next slide is basically indicating that 50-foot height limit and where we are at. We're at 20 feet at the street on Embarcadero, the lowest one, and then, that steps up to 31 feet as you go back up in our display stacking area. Landscape, you know, we are increasing our tree count from 80 trees that are on site now, to over 141 total trees on site. That also complies with the shade

coverage requirement from the City, as well as providing a Baylands buffer. We have layers of trees, not just on the property line that was requested by staff, but we increased and put other layers. And if you look at the Audi, the back of the Audi building where we have layers of trees before you actually get to the building. This project, very happily, includes a combined effort between the City and the dealership, with a multiuse path to combine, take away the sidewalk and actually have a pedestrian and bicycle path on the site, which did necessitate the removal of street trees. But I think the end result is going to be something that PG&E is going to be happier with, the height of the trees and the ability to have a multiuse path to better, again, have us be more respectful of the Baylands and the people that use this area. The multiuse path. As you can see, we have a section of what that would be. We've worked with City staff to come up with acceptable dimensions and grades in order to achieve this. The carwash has been something that we wanted to make sure that we addressed early on, and as you can see, we have a sound noise study that was done. We extended wing walls the full height of the building in order to buffer that noise, as well as landscape and trees in those areas in that five-foot setback. The request for the 10-foot setback is a bit difficult, in and of the fact that we need to have circulation, we need to provide fire truck around there, and we are still within the City setback of five feet. So, we've increased the number of trees and the shrubs on the back side, and I think that should alleviate any issues of seeing the building and hearing any noise from that. The lighting, we have an extremely exhaustive, very comprehensive lighting study that you can see, that we are very proud of, and I think we've come up with the ability to adjust lighting levels at times when the dealership is not open, to respect the Baylands and respect the neighbors. Finally, I'll go through the Baylands. You've seen some of these slides previously. One thing, I don't think...

Chair Baltay: If you could take less than a minute to wrap up.

Mr. Hutson: Yeah, I would like to go through our graphic images. I don't know, these should be in your package, but we'll walk through. This is the Audi building from Embarcadero. The Mercedes building, as you move down the street. This is with the trees in place. You'll see that some of these have the trees shown, removed, or ghosted in, so that you can see the extent of what the building is without seeing the foliage in front of it. And you can see, there's a perfect example of that. The corner, which we've shown with the trees ghosted, and with the permanent landscape as proposed. Our building as it's proposed now. The trees. The Bayshore elevation with the green screens to the right, with the trees in place. The rear of the building, in the back next to the carwash, with the green screen and the glass parapet areas. This is finishing up. That's our final context drawing with the building...

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much.

Mr. Hutson: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Do we have any questions of the applicant? Very well. I'd like to open this meeting to public comments. Do we have anyone from the public who wishes to address this project? If you could please give a speaker card to the staff. Thank you. You will have three minutes. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Gemma Lim: Yes. My name is Gemma Lim [spells name]. I'm with Embarcadero Corporate Center. We're a neighbor of 1700. And just a concern about the carwash currently. They are doing the car washing near our fence, so our tenant's vehicles are always covered with dust. So, just wanted to, you know, make everybody aware. And, of course, the noise level of putting a carwash on their site. That's it. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Do we have any other public comments? Seeing none, and having no more speaker cards, I'll close the meeting from public comment. I'd like to get the applicant to come up and explain, if you could, more carefully, what is the proposed change to comply with the FAR regulations? If we could look at, maybe the ground floor plan for the Mercedes dealer. That's Sheet ZA102, is what I'm looking at. My understanding is that you'd like to take the service bay projection of the building closest to Embarcadero and pull that back a little bit. Is that correct?

Mr. Hutson: Bayshore.

Chair Baltay: I'm sorry.

Mr. Hutson: That elevation is on Bayshore.

Chair Baltay: Yes, you're not. Not Embarcadero. Bayshore.

Mr. Hutson: Yeah. There are the last two stalls as, um, in your plan, would be removed, and the subsequent square footage removed from the overall calculation.

Chair Baltay: What I really want to understand then is, just to the right of that entire service area is this staircase, and that forms that dark vertical element that goes quite tall with the Mercedes logo on it. Is that right? That's what we're seeing in this elevation on the right here, and this one in the center.

Mr. Hutson: Yeah, the area that we're removing is far to the right of that.

Chair Baltay: And currently, the area projects beyond that and wraps onto it a little bit, and you're proposing to push it behind that. Is that correct?

Mr. Hutson: I guess I'm not understanding the question.

Chair Baltay: I'm just trying to understand the relation of the...

Mr. Sing: Maybe I could jump in a little bit. You're speaking to the ground floor. So, the top part would actually cantilever over. On the screen here, that might help you a little bit. We don't have the revised drawings, but it's just the ground floor, which is the service that would actually [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: Oh, it's just the ground level you're going to pull back.

Mr. Hutson: Just the ground level at those last two service bays would be removed.

Chair Baltay: I see. Okay. All right. That answers the question, certainly.

Mr. Hutson: I'm sorry.

Chair Baltay: You don't have any plans or drawings of that to show us at all?

Mr. Hutson: That was given to staff as an alternative for them to review as a part of our ongoing communications with staff regarding this.

Chair Baltay: Staff, do you have this drawing?

Mr. Sing: What was presented in their presentation is what we have. There is no revised elevation. It's just a... It was just, like, a green box over the area. That was it.

Chair Baltay: When did you get that? Was that recent, or...?

Mr. Sing: It was within the last couple of days.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And for the record, I understand that you've mentioned this issue about the floor area to the applicant some time ago.

Mr. Sing: Once the Council did adopt the record land use action, we were in conversations about how to address these issues, including floor area ratio. The applicant's architect did fly up to meet us in our offices, and we did talk about this issue.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. Any other questions of the applicant or staff?

Mr. Hutson: Can I add to that just briefly, that we have been working with staff on that, and there was some additional areas that they requested us to add, which put us... We were underneath our allowable for the City Council submittal and the previous ARB submittals, but staff imposed some additional area that they wanted us to count in the floor area, so we had to propose solutions to accommodate that and bring us back in compliance.

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, let's see what the rest of the Board feels about that issue. Thank you very much. Alex, why don't you start us off?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for the revision. I've got a couple comments. One is on the screening for the carwash, you know, like, the coffee berry used as a native shrub. They are, like 10 by 10. I was thinking that we maybe should consider a substitute. On a lot of our other projects in town, the landscape architects have been specifying, like, a non-native version of that, which is the Italian buckthorn, which is a *Rhamnus alaterns*. That's like five feet wide and maybe 15 feet high, and it seems to me that might be more appropriate for that space since you only have five or six feet. Also, you have a slope, you're sloping down to the neighboring property and trying to screen the carwash, so that would give you a little bit more height, provide a little bit more screening to the neighbors. I did review the alternate trees that you proposed along east Bayshore, and some of them I'm not really familiar with because they're, sort of like desert trees, and they're not really native to our area. So, I can't really say one way or the other if they are appropriate. Yeah, sure. Thank you.

Ken Pucerelli: This is the...

Board Member Lew: You need to use the microphone. Okay, so...

Mr. Pucerelli: The olive tree is the one that is evergreen, and it is adjacent to the base of the building where we said we would add. One of the comments that ARB had in the past, particularly the past chair, was increasing the number of evergreen along there, and given the PG&E easement and some of the other constraints that I know you're all well aware of, we had elected to put that non-fruit bearing olive adjacent to the base of the building as a layering effect, and having a larger tree at the base of the building. And then, the chaste tree, which you see, that has the purple flowers, that is, I call that almost like an umbrella type of a tree. Similar form to the redbud, but we've interspersed those in amongst the redbud so we would have a little plant diversity. And then, speaking with the City forester, who is also a landscape architect by happenstance, she really liked the redbud trees, but understood ARB's desire to have diversity. So, she had no issue with that.

Board Member Lew: I do support the olive tree addition to the project, and I do think you do need to have the fruitless ones because all of the olive trees here are infected with the fruit fly.

Mr. Pucerelli: Right.

Board Member Lew: It's pretty awful, actually.

Mr. Pucerelli: Yes. That's why we selected the fruitless.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. Thank you for that. And then, I do support, I think you're specifying fairly large trees, like 36-inch box shiso.

Mr. Pucerelli: That's correct.

Board Member Lew: So, even the [inaudible]. The western redbud is really small. That's probably the largest size you can get for that. I would only propose one other additional option for those accent, those small trees, the [inaudible] trees, which is local. It's a hybrid of a native plant that is local to the site, or at least to the peninsula. There's a *Ceanothus Ray Hartman*, which is a utility-friendly tree, and it's native to our costal foothills. I think the only downside of that is the *ceanothus* aren't really that long-lived. I mean, it's not a 100-year tree. It's more like a 25-year tree.

Mr. Pucerelli: Is your suggestion to substitute, or just [crosstalk]?

Board Member Lew: ...add all of those into your alternates.

Mr. Pucerelli: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Because the reality is, like, you've got a lot of this... I forgot the quantity, but it's a lot of [crosstalk].

Mr. Pucerelli: Sure.

Board Member Lew: And you may not be able to get all of those for your project in time for occupancy. So, I'm giving you flexibility to mix and match as you need to, to get the building open.

Mr. Pucerelli: We appreciate that.

Board Member Lew: Because I've been shopping. They're not all, especially with native plants, they may not be available at the time that you need them.

Mr. Pucerelli: That's true. And can you tell me the name of that again?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. There's Ceanothus Ray Hartman, and that's widely available in our native plant nurseries in the Bay area.

Mr. Pucerelli: Great.

Board Member Lew: It's local, unlike... So, on your alternate list, you've got the Texas mountain laurel, a thornless cascalote tree, a Mexican bush [inaudible] tree. I've never seen those, so I don't know if they would do well here. I don't have that level of experience.

Mr. Pucerelli: Okay.

Board Member Lew: I do support the change from green screen to the sage green life planted wall.

Mr. Pucerelli: It's actually a pretty cool technology. They integrate the drip irrigation system into the panels, and then they are fastened to the wall. It's actually quite cool. I would have brought the sample with me, but it wouldn't fit in my suitcase.

Board Member Lew: Okay. I'm not familiar with that particular one, but we do have green planted facades in the Bay area, and in Silicon Valley, too. Okay, that's all I have on the landscape. I think that's fine. Then, just on the building, on the stucco, I think I would recommend stucco color 3. I would recommend something lighter than the jet black. I did attend the Council meeting for this, and there was something that was a little confusing, which was, there seems to be the question that, there was a question put to me as: Did the ARB review the lighting? And we had reviewed the lighting several times. And it may have been that the Council didn't get the lighting in their package...? I'm not sure what that was about, but I just wanted to say that the lighting, I think it was very sophisticated photometrics and light renderings, and I do see that the drawings have been updated to remove the bollard lights that were originally along the path, I think before, they were in the renderings, but they were taken out of the plans. I know it's something that Karen Holman [phonetic] had mentioned to me. But we did review the lighting previously, and I looked at the updated plans, and it looks good to me.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Grace, do you want to take us through?

Board Member Lee: Thank you for the presentation. It's quite a set. And I apologize, I missed the other hearings, and I appreciate the care in the summary report, and just how clear that presentation was on a pretty complex project. I want to thank the applicant for working so closely with council members who

have moved on, and new council members, and new ARB members, and old ARB members. This is a site that actually came back in, between somewhere in 2006-2011 as a hotel, as a different typology, a different site, and I just want to make a few remarks about the site. I appreciate the thought behind scale, and massing, and contrast, and texture, and thoughts in terms of how the landscape and the building begin to complement one another. The scale of the site is quite large. The setbacks are significant. I don't really see any issues here in terms of some of these revisions that have been made. I do have a question regarding the floor area ratio, just because it's a little bit unclear given there wasn't a drawing in terms of this proposal, on the elevation. But like Alex, my colleague here, I do feel that the choices are all positive. I think that these are two trees on a very large horizontal plane. I appreciate the olive choice for just the wide spread. I'm a fan of the redbud. I'm not sure what that discussion was all about. I mean, I understand you want diversity, but I appreciate the chaste tree. I think that the carwash is... The program of the carwash, you know, I believe there was a community member that talked about, you know, just the neighbor. I did want to address that. It is challenging. There will be noise. The applicant here has made some efforts to mitigate. I don't see an issue with the five feet. It seems to work I think as well as you can, given the site. To go back to just this floor area ratio issue, what I understand... And there wasn't a slide, right? I did see a diagram that... Is there a chance that we could just take a look at that? And I would be interested to hear your comments. It seems that there's an effort to remove, just to address this. I wasn't sure if...? I mean, if we were going to move forward, how we might refer to this proposal. I just wanted to hear from the other Board members along those lines. Let's see. Coffee berry, to me, seems fine. Alex, you had a comment on the, I wasn't sure, when you said the choice of a shrub for that growth, you were open to the selection that has been presented here?

Board Member Lew: I think my... Yeah. This is the plant that's proposed, and it's a very desirable native plant. It's like 10 feet by 10 feet, and we're trying to squeeze it in, in between a carwash and a fence, and there's only, like, five or six feet. So, I was suggesting that they could go non-native.

Board Member Lee: Oh, I see. Okay. Well...

Board Member Lew: It's a related species that also has berries, and it's wildlife-friendly.

Board Member Lee: I see. And for me, the height is important, and, you know, I think I'd be open to what is presented, or, you know, the comments already made by Board Member Lew. Lighting plan seems also to be, the study is full, and I am comfortable on that. And green screen, which was discussed also, don't have comments. When there's a mention of the colors, I was comfortable with the board that is presented here. Happy to discuss further if other Board members have comments. I can stop there. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. David?

Board Member Hirsch: Thanks for the presentation. First, I want to just say that the building from the Mercedes symbol wall, elevator – whatever it is – that separates sort of one side of the building from the other, from that point over, everything seems just right for me. The scale steps down towards Embarcadero. The idea of the glass wall around all that mechanical car-moving thing is exciting. Will we see inside, to see actually cars moving from...? That should be really an exciting piece of work there. I wish there were some video that you could have shown us because it really will be quite the excitement of this building. And of course, the Mercedes is a beautifully designed car, so the way it's shown in the showroom I think is going to be quite an exciting corner piece.

Mr. Hutson: I'd just like to offer that there was a video – I don't know if you have that – of the stacking system. We can certainly provide that, to view that. We did for the City Council, and we did for a previous ARB meeting, for how that works.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, okay.

Mr. Hutson: I'll see if I can do that.

Board Member Hirsch: Anyhow, I think all of the pieces from that corner forward, that Mercedes black wall with the symbol up above, and I really like the landscaping, and leave it up to my cohorts here, to their comments, because I'm not as strong as they are about landscaping. But I think it looks visually, to me, like it's going to be quite beautiful at the corner. It softens the entire building appropriately. And, of course, getting all those cars inside like that is just an incredible, good thing here. It's a very, very big facility, and the one part that really kind of worries me most is really the extension beyond the staircase. I would wish somehow that the back of the building was more a back of a building. My feeling is that, one way or another, the vertical element should make a distinction, and does make a distinction, except that the part beyond it with the cantilever now set back on the first floor, it just continues to mass around the corner. And I think that if it were possible to just bring that front wall forward somehow so it was a freestanding element without adding square footage and causing problems like that, you would make a distinction between those two parts of the building. Formally, I think that would be a good idea. I can't get my hands around this, from that point on. It's just such a big building, looking at it from this frontage street, you know? I don't know if this is a bit late in the process to bring up something like that.

Mr. Sing: If I can, just to speak to that point, to the Chair. With their proposed FAR change, if you look at the screen there, that represents the ground floor.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I understand.

Mr. Sing: That would be moved inward. So, you would now have, the upper floor would be out.

Board Member Hirsch: Right.

Mr. Sing: I don't know if that helps.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: It's the upper floor that's also a problem. For me, anyhow. For me, that's a problem. The only other area where I really find a problem formally with the building is just the kind of materials on the Baylands-facing side of the building. I think you've turned to a concrete panel up at the top of the building there. Is that correct? What am I looking at here? We're not... Yeah, but that's the other building. That's not the back side. Let's see if I can find the elevation we need to look at. Well, it's part of ZA406. You know, what's happened with the planting is terrific there. You know, you've simplified that. You haven't made a special design out of it as you had previously, and I think it really works well to kind of keep that module moving like that. Every other bay is a planting bay, and it continues, and in between, and the railing up at the top works. But the panels that you're showing there are vertical concrete panels, right above the black...?

Mr. Hutson: The structure is concrete, but they are...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hutson: ... surface to match the other parts of the building. And then, again, as you can tell, the base of the building is darker. We've made it darker to bring the eye level of the building down. And then, of course, the integration of the translucent panels. And I did have a full-size sample of the glass here for you... Not a full size, but a larger size sample of the glass and the material panel, so you can really see what those materials are. I don't have a larger sample of the EFIS plaster finish, but it's a very tight sand textured finish. And then, of course, to lighten up the vertical aspect of the parapet is now full glass. That is translucent and not covered. I think that's the biggest change that we made, is that previously to the Board, we had a wall panel that was really a... You know, provides a similar look, but this actually is open to the parking deck. It's not intended to be able to see cars, or to see people, or anything like that, but there would be some movement, maybe some shadows, and certainly a bit of light transmission. That is the bird glass that we've proposed for the balance of the façade. Which, again, smaller samples are on that board, but we felt like...

Board Member Hirsch: Right.

Mr. Hutson: ... previously, you asked for larger samples, so hopefully that maybe gives a little better indication. And the proposed metal panels, we changed from the glossy black and the white to a matte finish, which will be more respectful of, certainly, like the plaster finishes, and not as reflective as you might consider for, or might think of as a metal panel.

Board Member Hirsch: I mean, I have a question for you. Why couldn't you simply use the, in the horizontal areas there on that side that faces the Baylands, why couldn't you use the ribbed metal panel? And tone down the whole look of that thing, that side?

Mr. Hutson: I think we've had... This is our fourth time in front of the Board, and I, respectfully, we've had conflicting comments in previous... Which is fine, which is our interpretation of what the Board really wants to do without participating anymore. That necessitated the darker band. Originally, we didn't have a dark band at the bottom, and we wanted... We tried not to accentuate the height of the building and bring the base down. That's kind of a standard way of doing that. And we do have **utility [phonetic]** functions back there, as well. Not that the metal panel would be an inappropriate use, but from our standpoint, it feels like we would be applying something that wasn't off... Not many people see that. We're making gestures to the Baylands with the colors and the finishes, but not trying to embellish it for the purpose of just embellishing that. Not that it wouldn't be something maybe we, is an option, but I can certainly appreciate, you know, the beautiful description of... You've described it very well, what your concern is. It's just that maybe we've attempted to achieve the same thing in a different way.

Board Member Hirsch: Huh. How to respond to you on that? I mean, I simply... I think it's a significant piece of this building because the building is just so huge.

Mr. Hutson: Can I ask a question, then?

Chair Baltay: If you could please, let David finish. Why don't you take a seat? Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: No, that's... Okay.

Chair Baltay: I want to hear what you think.

Board Member Hirsch: I really feel that from the staircase, around the corner there, the mass of the building should be played down. I'm sorry that it couldn't just be that the staircase would stay and that the rest of the building was moved back at that point, to make the turn around the corner formally and set it back. Because I think that, as I said before, I think from the staircase, forward, the building is really nicely scaled. And the stepping is excellent, and the openness, and the big glass corner, is really going to be the excitement of the building, both functionally inside, and outside. But I find a problem with a back corner, where the drive turns around that corner. And if the stair tower were pulled forward, even with a false wall, I think it would make a better relationship between the front of the building and the service area of the building. A distinction. And then, I think that minimizing the number of materials on the back wall, again, turning, because you have, facing Bayshore, I think you have a metal panel up above. Is that correct? Yeah, I think it is. In your elevation. Facing Bayshore, the upstairs portion that we were just discussing. Partially metal panel. Is it not?

Chair Baltay: Okay, please answer the question.

Mr. Hutson: Just to be clear, to the forward of the stair, or to the back of the stair? Because, yes, there is a metal panel forward of the stair towards Embarcadero on Bayshore. Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Hutson: That is correct.

Board Member Hirsch: But that doesn't turn the corner and go back around the corner...?

Mr. Hutson: From the stair, correct?

Board Member Hirsch: Around the corner, in the back where the drive is.

Mr. Hutson: No, it does not.

Board Member Hirsch: That's where I think there ought to be something that carries around that corner, and it ought to be somehow recessed, or whatever. Formally, I just find a problem with that. That's my major objection, because everything else I think has been well thought out, including the materials selection board, you know, I think is a good one. And the contrast of materials is good, especially on the front of the staircase towards Embarcadero. With that comment, I'll [crosstalk].

Mr. Sing: I'd like to interject, just to that point. On Sheet ZA203, I think that clarifies the materials that are used. To the point where they have the Mercedes symbol...

Board Member Hirsch: Hold on.

Mr. Sing: On that, yeah, on that lower drawing, it gets cut off, but then, the upper part shows what's beyond that staircase. There you see the metal panels that are used on that section. That completes the entire Bayshore elevation.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Okay.

Mr. Sing: They do wrap around, and that's where you lose that metal material.

Board Member Hirsch: Wrap around? I don't see a wrap around.

Chair Baltay: Okay, if we could... Let me chime in here, David. What I think you're saying is correct, that the building could be better on that corner. We're tasked by the City Council to address the issues on the motion they passed about this building, and in my opinion, that's just not something they asked us to keep looking at. The building is large. It could be made smaller still in appearance. The Council was satisfied with it at this mass and appearance, and I think we need to honor that. I don't think we can keep going around on that, as much as we want to, and that was our expectation. When I'm looking at the staff report on pages 113 and 114, there's A through L of items that the Council has directed us to review. And not even us; some of these are staff things. But I think we really should be checking through that list and making sure that we're satisfied with what's been done here. I'd like to address my comments then along those lines, because as I come down, the first item was D – Direct staff and the ARB to better incorporate the Baylands Master Plan guidance, etc., and I think they have done that. The colors and textures are more muted, they're not as shiny as before, and I think they look pretty good, actually. I think it's a handsome building, and it does somehow, just the muting of the materials makes a difference. More than I thought it would. I support the use of the darker black color, actually. I think it's handsome, and I think you could support that being in the Baylands. There's nothing about it all having to be a light or a single hue. The next item that I'd like to address is E., about the trees. I have significant reservations, still. I also was at the Council meeting and listened pretty hard to what Council was saying, and I think they were looking for us to keep some sort of large street trees, or some trees with a presence, and I'm afraid that I just don't see three olive trees up against the building on the far side really meeting that standard. I'm not sure what to go about it. I think a 36 box tree is big, but an olive tree somehow doesn't ever, in my mind, doesn't look like a big tree. It looks like a small tree, a garden tree, a tree along the fence kind of thing. So, I'm afraid I don't think you've met that standard with this selection of trees. I've felt all along that we should be finding a way to keep those trees under the power lines. To remove those trees is a real shame, and we're doing it just because we can't find a way to get the pathway to work as well. I understand it's complex, but in my opinion, we've never really explored that as hard as we could, to reach both. I think you have supplied the context drawings. I think the lighting is excellently done now. You've addressed our concerns about light spill-off. You've come up with a very sophisticated plan. You've documented and

shown it very well, and I really appreciate the effort you've taken to create lighting that functions for your business, but also respects the need to avoid light pollution into the Baylands. I commend you on that. Then, my biggest concern is regarding the FAR. I think that the FAR is how we measure the bulk of the building, and the Council, I believe, was clear, that yes, we'll go along with this idea that these car stackers are merchandising devices and don't count towards FAR, even though they, in this case, dramatically increase the appearance of bulk on the building. But nonetheless, I think the rational way the staff has come up to measure this is appropriate. And you're over on it. What I'm seeing is that at the very last minute, a change being thrown at us that affects the way the building looks, in my mind. Kind of a big issue. And certainly one other Board member is concerned about this area of the building, feeling that it looks too bulky. The FAR is how we assess whether the building is bulky or not, and it may be that the solution you're proposing to us is the right one. But without any more evidence or documentation of it... And it's something that's been so critical to this building. It's all about the size of it. To throw this in at what I see as the very last minute just seems too much. I don't see how we can support approval of that without a little bit more documentation, at least, and some thought. So, I don't think you've met that standard of addressing the FAR discrepancies. It's been an outstanding issue since the Council approved it, if not sooner. I just don't see that being met right now. With that said, I guess I cannot support recommending approval of this project right now because, primarily, I'd like to see the FAR issues addressed. However, I'm not sure I'm in the majority on the Board here, so I'd like to see what everybody else thinks.

Board Member Lee: Peter, just to ask the question, is there a way that we can, you know, explore how to move this application forward, given that, you know, the proposal, which we don't have documentation for, sounds very promising, and might have great potential. Unfortunately, there wasn't a drawing that was presented to the Board in our packet illustrating that proposal. I'm not sure if other Board members feel like it's just simply not having that drawing in our packet to review as a hard copy is, is the issue. And then, to go back to the trees, I just wanted to see if Board members felt like, you know, the choice of those two trees, I wonder if it's due to the slow growth and nature of that tree, knowing its full potential would go to, you know, 30, 35 feet with a spread of the same. Is it simply not having the drawing that would show that, that is compelling? It is a shade tree, it is evergreen, and I just wanted to get thoughts from the Board members, and discussion.

Chair Baltay: Okay, those are fair points. So, regarding the requirement for documentation on the FAR, and then, how the shade trees look. Alex, do you want to chime in? Well, I can throw it to you, that to me, the issue on the trees, it's more perceptual. Somehow, an olive tree is multi trunked, and it looks like a large shrub. It just doesn't somehow look like a substantial tree. And I believe a number of council members were asking for that. That's why I'm standing on that issue. It's not really a matter of it being a 24, 36 inch box, or anything like that. I don't know if that's a deal breaker for me. I'm just trying hard to respect what the Council has asked us to do.

Board Member Lee: Absolutely.

Chair Baltay: I've had bigger issues with this building all along. I think it's very large. But that's been decided.

Board Member Lee: Okay. I just, in my comments, I did refer to the multi stem actually as a positive in terms of, you know, mass and scale along the building. Also providing shade. It does take time for the tree to grow, but I did want to offer that the multi stem and the large tree canopy that essentially becomes very generous, and matches the height of the mature trees, is a plus in my mind. I don't know if others have thoughts.

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like to talk to that a little bit here.

Chair Baltay: David, go ahead.

Board Member Hirsch: Just, regarding the tree, having looked at the photograph now, you're sort of between Cilla [phonetic] and Teribdus [phonetic] here, right? You have a problem of the height of the wires. You have to do something below the wires, and it has to stay below the wires...

Mr. Pucerelli: And you have utilities be next to me, running...

Board Member Hirsch: Right. So, from what I see in the photograph here, there's a mass to the tree. It spreads nicely. I'm not the expert, but I believe you've made a good selection here, and I don't find it to be a significant problem. That it will sort of close up some of the lower area, and you can still look under it. There's a thinness to the bottom, which in this case I think is kind of nice, because I like the building. I'm okay with that, just as a personal comment.

Chair Baltay: Alex, what's your take on the trees?

Board Member Lew: Well, I think there are a couple things going on, right? Let me restate it. Wynne had an issue with the western redbuds lining East Bayshore, and it's a very small tree, it can be a very slow-growing tree, and it looks like... They look like little twigs. They're very pretty, and they are native to this area. They're very attractive. I think her comment – and maybe from Councilmember DuBois – I think they were looking for something, some evergreen component, which I think you've tried to address. And then, I gave you another suggestion which is also evergreen, and that maybe that could help address the issue of the redbuds. With regard to the olive tree, I think that was also Wynne's comment, was that she wanted something substantial against the building. And I think the olive tree does that. It's evergreen. It can be pruned as needed to fit the site. I have a 100-year-old one in front of my house, and it doesn't look like an accent tree at all. And I've seen them at the San Francisco garden show. One of the vendors comes in with a... You can buy, like, ancient, ancient ones. You can have instant landscaping of a full-size tree if you have enough money. I don't know what else we would do. Right? You want a large evergreen tree. They're typically big. They're [crosstalk].

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible].

Board Member Lew: We have a lot of magnolia grandifloras in town. You have more choices with deciduous trees than evergreen trees. And I think what would probably happen on the site, though, is that you would want the evergreen tree. You want more canopy space, typically, I would think, for a big shade tree. You might have a choice... You could have a... What is it? I'm trying to think of the name. There is an evergreen tree that we use here downtown. I'll think of the name in a minute.

Mr. Pucerelli: Okay. One thing I might point out to the Board is, from a pedestrian scale along Bayshore, is that tree is effectively a bit taller than me, and then, underneath that is ornamental grasses. So, effectively, from the pedestrian realm, you are screening that facility pretty heavily, particularly if you look at how closely spaced either the chaste tree or the redbud trees are shown on the drawings.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. I really want to keep the conversation to the Board, please.

Mr. Pucerelli: Sorry.

Chair Baltay: You've had your chance to speak already. I'll grant you guys that the trees are going to be okay. What Alex said makes sense. I believe we've given enough thoughts. To me, at least, the issue is really this FAR discrepancy and how we go forward on that. I would like to throw out that the last time we looked at this project, we came to the conclusion that we wanted to see it once more. The applicant was happy, and it didn't come back to us. I'm not quite sure why, and that's the way the process works, but I'm not sure I'm too sanguine about doing that again. I'd like to see a real concrete answer that we can vote on with confidence and give it a real stamp of approval. I don't see that here.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may, sorry. I changed locations on you. As far as coming back to a hearing, I think what happened last time is that we had had the three hearings, so we were asking for a fourth hearing, and that's where the Director has the ability to step in and decide whether to have that fourth hearing, or not.

And that's where the Director decided that the massing really was more of the Council's purview, and that's why it went forward to Council. As far as this new application, we're on our first hearing, so we do have two additional hearings. And I do, on the screen here, I've typed up the different topics. I don't know if we want to go through those, or how you'd like to move forward.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie. I feel that the FAR issue needs to be addressed concretely and absolutely for us to really look at. I'd like to see what this looks like, this change to the building, stepping it back this much. And I think given Board Member Hirsch's concerns about that corner of the building, these are quite legitimate concerns. I cannot support recommending approval right now for the project as it's proposed. Rather than make a motion to that, though, I really want to see if we have consensus here. David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, that's my concern, the corner of the building. The FAR, I suppose if you satisfied City Planning, that would satisfy me. But I'm concerned about the formal aspects of the corner and the return on the back wall.

Chair Baltay: Grace, what's your take on this issue?

Board Member Lee: I do not have significant concerns regarding what the applicant has presented. I do see the issue of the FAR. Just simply having that drawing would be appropriate to be able to approve the applicant's proposal.

Chair Baltay: Alex, we're doing sort of a straw poll here. I'm just trying to get your take on the FAR issue.

Board Member Lew: Well, it seems to me something has to come back regarding that, to the Board. I don't necessarily need to see a full set. I think that piece has to come back, somehow.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Sounds like we're all in agreement on that. Before we move forward on that issue, can I just be sure that we're all okay with the carwash? There was a request for a 10-foot setback. As best I can tell, that came from the Architectural Review Board and not the City Council. And I believe that we're satisfying the objective of the increased setback with the mechanics of the carwash, and if we can get the landscaping to really function, as Alex mentioned. Are we all in agreement on that?

Board Member Lee: I agree.

Chair Baltay: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I think the DB level is the real issue here for the neighbors, and the plantings are sufficient.

Chair Baltay: Alex, are you okay with a five-foot setback on this?

Board Member Lew: I'm okay with the five-foot setback. And I think the issue with the neighbors is really, I think, addressed with the doors on the carwash.

Chair Baltay: That's right.

Board Member Lew: For noise. And then, aesthetics, I think is the hedge.

Chair Baltay: The landscaping.

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: And you had proposed a different plant, or proposed having that taken [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: Just a related plant. Like, they're proposing a coffee berry, *Rhamnus Californica*, and I was just proposing a different version of that plant, which is the Italian version of that same plant, which is a *Rhamnus alaternis*, which is narrower and taller.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Board Member Lew: It will fit the space.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: I think we're ready for a motion to continue. Why don't I make the motion, Jodie, if we could? We'd like to continue this to a date uncertain, requesting that the design issues regarding bringing the building into compliance with the FAR regulations be addressed and presented to us. That's item number J. on the City Council list of things. And then, we'd like to see the landscaping adjusted as comments made by Board Member Lew. Alex, can you give a more clear list of what those would be?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, well, I think I've given those previously to the landscape architect, and those are only suggestions. I'm not telling you to specify those plants. You can specify alternates as well. I would just say, on principle, the carwash. I think that the plants should fit the space, because if you plant something that's bigger, then it requires pruning, constant pruning, and that creates green waste, and we're trying to reduce that. That's with regards to the carwash. And then, I think my only... I guess to clarify on the, like, say, on the East Bayshore road, I do support the alternates. And then, I think maybe what could address some of the concerns of the trees is that there's some evergreens and some of the western redbuds mixed together. I think at the moment, you've got all redbuds at the corner, and it may be too open for previous, based on previous councilmember, and also Board Member Furth's comments on the redbuds. So, maybe consider an evergreen component in there.

Chair Baltay: Okay, Alex, look on the screen there. Is that about what we're looking at?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, so, under the carwash, it's taller, it's narrower and taller. It's like a supermodel.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, that's my motion.

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Baltay: Okay, the motion is made and seconded. Do we have any discussion of that? No? Okay then, let's take a vote on it. All those in favor, aye? Opposed? Okay, the motion carries 4-0.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Let's take a five-minute break, and then we'll be onto our third item. And I believe Grace is going to...?

Board Member Lee: Yes, I will recuse myself due to my employment.

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, thank you for your presence, Grace.

[The Board took a short break.]

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 250 Hamilton Avenue [19PLN-00220]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Architectural Review Approval of Three New Bus Stops in the Public Rights-of-Way Located at 3380 Coyote Hill Road, 3223 Hanover Street and 1501 Page Mill Road and Surrounding Hardscape Improvements. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15311. Zoning District: PF (Public Facility). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at garrett.sauls@cityofpaloalto.org.

[Board Member Lee recused herself from this item.]

Chair Baltay: We're back in session. Thank you very much. We'd like to move on to item number 4, a public hearing, quasi-judicial, 250 Hamilton Avenue. It's a recommendation on applicant's request for architectural review approval of three new bus stops in the public rights-of-way located at 3380 Coyote Hill Road, 3223 Hanover Street and 1501 Page Mill Road and surrounding hardscape improvements. Do we have any disclosures to make?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site on Tuesday.

Chair Baltay: I'll disclose I also visited the site and took a bunch of photos of existing bus stops, and went around quite a bit. David?

Board Member Hirsch: I visited one of the sites today, early in the morning, and I thought I would never make it here in time if I visited all three.

Chair Baltay: Okay, that's great. Thanks, David. Do we have a staff report, please?

Garrett Sauls, Associate Planner: Good morning, Chairman Baltay. My name is Garrett, I'm an associate planner with the City. This application is brought to us by Stanford. They are proposing to do a bus shelter design for the Stanford Research Park. What they are ideally proposing in this application is to create a standard that can be replicated at bus shelters within the Stanford Research Park. As part of that, some of the improvements that they would be doing would be: Bringing each of the sites of the bus shelter up to ADA standards. They would be also providing for photovoltaic panels on top of the roof to provide for the lighting that is going to be the under-lit lighting under the roof for the shelter, as well as providing waste containers to collect any trash or any sort of other debris that comes to the sites. There are quite a number of sites in this area, which is kind of the reason why this application is coming to you now. It's comparable almost to a master sign program in the idea and concept, and if we are able to reach an approval for design, we can implement that at a staff level and not have to come back to any sort of board meeting for further sites, potentially even doing those applications as ones that are part of our new, over-the-counter architectural review process. The three sites, as were mentioned before, are at 3380 Coyote Hill Road, near 3323 Hanover Street, and near the Hanover side, the HP side, of 1501 Page Mill Road. These, as you can see in the presentation, are a couple photos of the existing sites, which have a mix of shelters or bus stops. Again, the proposal would effectively replace these stops to have full shelters that are meeting ADA and VTA standards. Again, with this new design, we have something that would possibly be, you know, providing for more consistency within at least the Stanford Research Park, and could provide guidance to help staff with making consistent designs for shelters throughout the city. The ADA and PV photovoltaic panel upgrades are something that are important, and definitely something that are needed for these sites where they don't currently have those. The materials that they provided are a steel beam for the structure. The roof is also partially made of steel. They have roof wood soffits and an IPE treated wood that they're using. They have a clear glass panel that you will also see in the drawings. All of these, staff considers as being of high quality in nature, and certainly ones that the City is supportive of towards the design. The issues that unfortunately we have are more so just the choice of color. When we look at this and look at the application, it presents to us a concern that this may be something that... This effectively brands the bus shelter towards a color that would be more recognizable to something of a Stanford color. It's been indicated to staff by the City Manager that this is something that leads to what we commonly call a slippery slope, of branding something in the public right-of-way for a private entity. It could produce other possibilities for other applications where other organizations come in and do something similar, which currently City staff is not supportive of. Outside of that, the shelter design and everything that you see in the plans is something that the City is supportive of. We definitely want to have a bus shelter in these areas where they don't currently exist, and have upgrades to these sites to make them compliant with ADA standards, and everything else. Our recommendation is to approve the project with a proposal to come back to subcommittee and discuss more in depth the color choice, or to make a recommendation to staff to approve the project with some other color choice, or leave it to staff to make that decision.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Do we have any questions of staff? No? Okay, then we have 10 minutes for the applicant to make a presentation. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Jamie Jarvis: My name is Jamie Jarvis [spells name]. Thank you for having us here today. I'm the sustainable transportation director for Stanford Research Park. I've developed and managed the commuter transportation program for the Research Park for the past four years, and would like to spend a few minutes providing context for the project you're going to see today. Stanford Research Park program is known as SRPGO, and provides comprehensive commuter services to 140 companies and approximately 29,000 employees in the Research Park. Core programs such as Guaranteed Ride Home and Points Rewards serve all commute modes and provides the framework for our program. Mode specific programs support bicycling, carpooling, van pooling, and transit. To support transit, SRP and our tenant companies purchase VTA smart passes that provide free fare on all VTA and Dumbarton express buses. We also provide free shuttles from the Palo Alto and California Avenue Caltrain stations, and we fill gaps in public transit service with SRPGO long-distance commuter buses. Our efforts have reduced solo driving by 10 percentage points over three years, and nearly doubled transit use from six percent to 11 percent. We're very proud of these accomplishments and are committed to further increasing the use of commute alternatives. However, we feel the current state of the bus shelters throughout the Research Park limit our ability to increase transit use. We currently have a mishmash of aging and unattractive shelters, and some of our most well-used transit stops have no shelter. Our transit riders bake in the summer, get wet and windblown in the winter, and generally feel unprotected and unvalued throughout the year. On a more positive note, the Research Park is relatively well served by transit with four express routes from the South Bay and three local routes, all provided by VTA: The Dumbarton express bus from Union City/Barton/Fremont; two SRPGO long distance commuter buses, one from the Santana Row area of San Jose and the other from the west side of San Francisco; two Stanford Marguerite shuttles; two SRPGO Caltrain routes to California Avenue/Caltrain; and a lunchtime shuttle to California Avenue. Over 3,000 Research Park employees currently ride public transit, and we have good potential to further increase transit use. We believe attractive, functional bus shelters are key to attracting new transit riders. For this reason, we propose to install new, high-quality bus shelters at three locations along interior roads in the Research Park. These locations are along the primary transit route through the Research Park and within walking distance to work sites with thousands of potential riders. We believe the SRP bus shelter will support and encourage transit use, improve transit rider safety and comfort, provide a visual cue to promote SRPGO transportation programs, and become the preferred option for future shelter replacements and additions in Stanford Research Park. One of the biggest challenges we face in building participation in the SRPGO transportation program is that many employees don't know they're located in Stanford Research Park, and don't realize that the buses and shuttles that they see going through the Research Park are actually available to them. Attractive, distinct and functional bus shelters will convey that the Research Park is well served by transit, and that transit riders are valued and supported. I appreciate you allowing me to provide this context for our project. At this time, I'd like to introduce Tyler Pew, who is founding principle at LMNOP Design. Tyler and his team specialize in creating eye-catching spaces that welcome users, and create a sense of place. They are the perfect partner for this project, and I'm excited to have Tyler present the site context and the design.

Chair Baltay: Welcome, Tyler. If you could please state and spell your name.

Tyler Pew: My name is Tyler Pew [spells name]. I'm the founding principle of LMNOP Design, a San Francisco-based design-build firm that focuses on a blend of public and private spaces. We are extremely excited to be a part of this project because of its lasting impact on the riders, as well as the community as a whole. Our unique experience with place-making parklets and San Francisco pavement-to-parks program made us well suited for this project. With core principles of supporting transit use, improving rider safety, providing visual codes to promote SRPGO programs, and becoming the preferred option, we have identified three initial sites. Each of these sites gives us a better understanding of the variations of existing conditions and future implementations. Site #1 is proposed to be located at Hillview Avenue, near Coyote Hill Road. This will replace an obsolete and unappealing shelter adjacent to the office building. The office building, you all reviewed last year. Site #2 is proposed to be located at Hanover Street near the Bol Park path entrance. At this site, the new shelter will replace an existing bus stop bench. It is adjacent to The Office, and The Office is a project you guys reviewed in 2017. Site #3 is proposed to be at Hanover Street, adjacent

to the HP entrance and across from Lockheed Martin's advanced technology center. With the new shelter, this will replace an existing bus stop bench, again. With each of these sites, we hope to improve safety by increased visibility, lighting, and providing shelter for weather conditions. Overall, improving the rider experience, increasing ridership, and having a positive impact on environment. Both the design and the color palette of the bus shelter were inspired by Butler buildings. Butler buildings are both attractive and functional in industrial, agricultural and community settings. Weathered steel and strong form give the sense of shelter and gathering. Inspiration has been drawn from spaces such as Palo Alto's own Junior Museum, which is currently under construction. With a glass footing, we sought to elicit the feeling of movement. The rolling mountains of Silicon Valley and the technology developed at Stanford Research Park. Through all of our conversations and precedent studies and site conditions, we sought to design a shelter that had a sense of place within the valley and the landscape. The Stanford Research Park bus shelter has been thoughtfully designed to look at homes in the three proposed locations, as well as future locations throughout the Research Park. Materials, scale and colors have been carefully selected to be appropriate within the natural, unbuilt environment. Steel structure, a key design feature, was selected to convey strength and simplicity. Wood on the ceiling as well as on the benches provide warmth and connection to nature around each of the sites. The back view highlights the glass panels, placed to provide protection from the wind and rain, and maintaining visibility for safety. The glass pattern was designed with inspiration from technology developed by Hewlett Packard, which mimics the rolling hills, yet another nod to the rich history and natural beauty of the sites. We're especially excited about the linear LED lighting which will be placed in the ceiling, aligning them with the movement of the bus, increasing safety, and supporting the visual cues. Design intention is to create a shelter that is beautiful in both day and the evening, and protecting the rider from the weather. Power for the lighting will be provided by a four-panel PV array and enclosed battery bank, and intended to work for site locations that have partial shade. The shelter has been designed to be attractive from all sides, and highly functional for the users. The design also meets the VTA bus stops and passenger facility standards. The steel beams will be [inaudible], galvanized, and finished in a copper. The smaller supports finished in an off-white that complements the Ipe selected. The wood ceiling and bench will be of Ipe, with a natural finish. Glass treatment is created by two quarter-inch tempered glass panels with three layers of footing, each ensuring longevity of the panels. Thank you for this opportunity to present the Stanford Research Park bus shelter. We look forward to your questions and comments.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions of the applicant? Alex, a question?

Board Member Lew: How is the structure attached to the foundation or sidewalk? And what happens on the slope site? I saw some of the other sites in the Research Park have, like, retaining walls around the bus shelters?

Mr. Pew: That's a great question. The site actually connects below grade with leveling concrete, basically, and gets bolted into place with plates on the steel. Steel gets put into the place, and then the ceiling and the benches, things like that, get attached. There is a concrete pad that gets put over it.

Board Member Lew: The sidewalk is after...?

Mr. Pew: Yeah, the sidewalk, we can accommodate for the elevation changes based on attaching below grade. And then, the concrete gets poured in afterwards.

Board Member Lew: Afterwards.

Mr. Pew: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Thank you. And then, on the Ipe, you said that you want a natural coat. Are you suggesting that it's maintained at this color, or you think it's going to weather to...? It naturally weathers to gray, right?

Mr. Pew: Yeah, most certainly. We'll put a coat on it to begin with, but eventually it will gray out. That's an inevitability, unless we do a very heavy coat on it, which we're not doing, basically.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Board Member Lew: One other disclosure. I couldn't read the lighting fixtures, so I actually downloaded them from the manufacturer, and I looked at the specs. I think they were proposing a 3,000 K temperature color for the LEDs.

Chair Baltay: Okay, you're just stating that for the record, then.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I did additional research because I couldn't read the drawings.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. David, you have a question?

Board Member Hirsch: The paving, sidewalk paving once you've completed your structural work, what is the intention there to distinguish it in some way at the bus stop? Or it will be just the same kind of paving as the sidewalk?

Mr. Pew: We assumed it would be the same as the rest of the sidewalk. We haven't looked at distinguishing that.

Chair Baltay: If that's all the questions, I'd like to open the meeting up to public comments. We have three speaker cards here. You'll have three minutes to speak. The first one is Kailor Gordy, to be followed by Elizabeth Hughes. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Kailor Gordy: Hello. I am Kailor Gordy. I am a transportation manager at VMware. I manage employee mobility and commute programs there at VMware. As you may know, VMware is the largest employer in Stanford Research Park, with just below 5,000 employees located at the Palo Alto site. They are at the corner of Hillview and Foothill. VMware for years has offered a comprehensive commute alternatives program that supports the uptick of transit use and getting people out of single occupant vehicles. In addition, as mentioned earlier, VMware partners with Stanford Research Park on an array of items, but specifically on a couple gaps that exist in public transit by partnering on two long-distance commuter buses right now. And then, we know that one-third of VMware solo drivers have an interest in making the switch to public transit. It's just something that we work on on a daily basis there at VMware. But, unfortunately, over half of the bus stops near the VMware campus don't have a shelter, and the three that exist are different designs, which can be confusing to potential transit riders. So, we support the update and the maintenance of bright, attractive shelters, so that we can best encourage more transit riders because we know there is the desire there for those riders.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Elizabeth Hughes, to be followed by Herb Borock.

Elizabeth Hughes: Thank you. I'm Elizabeth Hughes [spells name], and I'm the commute coordinator for Rubrik. Rubrik has moved into the Stanford Research Park in 2017 and now has two locations within the Stanford Research Park, and about 600 employees. Our commuter program is also quite robust, and we promote transit heavily as a sustainability initiative. Rubrik works diligently with SRPGO to help implement our commuter programs because it creates a value to our employees, and in the community as well. One of those key elements of our transportation program is the available transit resources and shuttle resources that SRPGO offers. Rubrik participates in the CalTrain Go Pass program and the VTA Smart Pass program, which enables our employees to ride transit services for free. In order to have a robust transit ridership, we have to have robust shuttle programs, and SRPGO provides those shuttles for our employees. Transit is actually one of the most well-used alternatives in our commuter program, with nearly 14 percent of our population on any given day who are transit riders. Our solo riders who drive alone are our candidate pool. We've got about 30 percent of those folks who say they are interested in transit, and we're working with them on a daily basis to change behaviors and become transit riders. The shuttles that Stanford Research Park provides are a vital part of our transportation program, and having shuttle stops with shelters and those visual cues become defining elements for our transit riders and help us promote the program. It's

really challenging to get people out of their cars, especially when it's hot or when it's cold and rainy and dark. Having a shelter is going to make a big difference, especially if the shelter has that visual cue with the bus and shuttle vehicles, so that they can be synergistic with the entire transit structure in Stanford Research Park. We definitely want to see this opportunity to be considered and really support it.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Herb Borock, to be followed by Evan Wakefield.

Herb Borock: My name is spelled the same as it is on the card I just submitted. [spells name].

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Borock: In the past, we had staffs that were capable of getting that card to whoever is preparing the minutes. I arrived here because I recognized the address of the previous item, and I was interested in it. I notice that the address on this one is 250 Hamilton Avenue. And I don't know how someone could figure out that something for 250 Hamilton Avenue has to do with the Stanford Research Park. It's not just the color that's important. It's essentially that a private entity is appropriating part of the public right-of-way. If, you know, a contract of someone who wants the park in the public street for itself, where there is no parking normally, or there are parking hour limits, they're supposed to pay a fee for the use of the street. But we've had the same problem with company buses as we've had with, you know, these internet-connected bicycles or scooters. People just appropriate the public way for themselves without paying for it. I think that's an important thing. And yes, it's nice to have bus shelters. I do ride the bus, other buses, and those of you who have the opportunity to ride the public buses know that while there are some bus shelters, for the most part, there are not shelters. That's my concern of, what's the real reason? Is it essentially saying that the park itself owns the right-of-way and it's not dedicated for public use and just to themselves? And I agree with the comments that have been implied, which is it's not believable that the employees don't know that they have this option, and it's not believable that the landowner and the companies that are leasing the space are not capable of telling the employees that this option exists. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Evan Wakefield. That's the last speaker card we have here.

Evan Wakefield: Hello. Evan Wakefield, [spells name].

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Wakefield: I am the environmental health and safety manager for HP. We've been there about 80 years, so we are the oldest company on the SRP lot. What is unfortunate is that the bus stop also looks like it's 80 years old. It's hard to get excited, I would say, about bus shelters, and lighting, and stuff like that, especially with my employees. We have about 2,000 there on campus. But this does excite me, and we are... I speak for the whole entire company of HP that we are in direct support of this bus shelter. We have a bench right now. I cannot convince my employees to use alternative commute methods by sitting on a bench when it's raining. It's winter season. It kind of gets warm here in the summer. But we are in direct support of this shelter. Currently, we partner with SRPGO to do free VTA passes, which is a struggle. I'm a one-man team there. I leverage SRPGO to help me with programs, with anything I can to offset cars coming into the lot. It's a great benefit to have this partnership, to have this synergy, and just to have an option to have a shelter like this, we are in great support. And not only will it benefit my company, HP, which is the direct bus stop in, I believe, proposal number three, but also Lockheed Martin is across the street, that would also benefit from it. Again, we are in direct support for this.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Okay. With that, we'll close the public hearing. To the applicant, you have an opportunity, but not a requirement, to address or to rebut anything that's been said right now. Do you have any wish to address those comments? Okay, nodding your head no. We'll bring it back to the board. Do we have any further questions? I'd like to have the staff, I guess, just fill me in a little bit on, are these just three one-off bus stops, or is this the beginning of a larger program of bus stops being done? That's one question. The second is, who's really paying for and maintaining these? What's the backstory on that? If you could address those two issues.

Mr. Sauls: Okay. Yeah, these three sites that you see are individual as part of this application, but it would be, again, like I said before that, it would create a standard that we could apply to other shelters, to answer your first question. To your second question, it is worth pointing out that Stanford is working with VTA to build the shelters and maintain them. There is a third-party agreement that Stanford has with VTA Real Estate to maintain those shelters. The design of them is intended that they would be for, the lifespan for the structures would be roughly about 20 years or so.

Chair Baltay: Who...? I missed it. Who is paying for these?

Mr. Sauls: Stanford.

Chair Baltay: Stanford University is the landowner, and they are the ones paying for these bus stops?

Mr. Sauls: Correct. Yes.

Chair Baltay: And there is some sort of maintenance agreement. They are also maintaining these bus stops.

Mr. Sauls: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. Is that the end of the questions? Thoughts? Okay, let's bring it back to the Board. Who wants to take a first stab? Alex, are you able to go ahead?

Board Member Lew: I think this is a great opportunity. When I look at a lot of the sites at the Research Park for other ARB projects, I have noticed lots of employees waiting out on the sidewalk, and it's really not very hospitable. Especially VMware, and also on, I think it's Hillview or Hanover – I forgot exactly which street it is. I think there's also more work that we need to do, like, on some of the streets that don't have sidewalks. I think we still need to keep on working on that as projects go through. There are definitely missing sidewalks in the Research Park. We've been filling them in as projects come through. On the shelter design, I think it's generally very handsome. I think I have concern, which is, with the Ipe, I think you're going to get different kinds of weathering on the trash can versus the soffit, versus the bench. And I think my thought is maybe that the soffit is probably fine, the bench may be okay. The trash I think is going to get really dirty and filthy, and I think that may be a maintenance issue, so I'm wondering if there's another option for that. The clear, like, having some sort of clear seal or oil on wood looks great initially, and it fades pretty dramatically and has a very short life span. The more clear finish that you use, the less UV resistant it is, so that's a major concern that I have with a natural finish. And that's come up before on previous ARB projects that have wanted to use a natural color wood. The staff has concerns about the color and the branding and color and stuff, and I'm not sure I agree. I think if it were, if this copper color were bright red, I guess I would agree. I'm not sure that I see it at this point. And I think, in a way, I think, from what I understand for, like, bus rapid transit, when they build a bus rapid transit station, and people know it's there, that's the station, they actually get higher usage because people understand it. And when you just put a bench out there and there's a bus stop sign, people don't really see it. I think having an identity is an important component of this. I'm okay if it's a little bit different than the existing shelters. And I think the other issue is that the existing shelters are such an eclectic mix of things. There are so many of them that I think it's okay to have something distinctive, and then, to ultimately get rid of all the existing other shelters. That's all that I have. I think my main concern will be, from looking at the other sites, is the retaining, the really sloped sites and the retaining walls, and I think the design you have, I guess I'm concerned that it may not be able to work on really steep, sloped sites. If you've already figured that out and it works, then it's okay, but I guess that's my main concern, is how, if the Board isn't going to look at this, then who is going to look at the retaining walls. I learned the hard way, working on very steep, sloped sites in Seattle, not to trust civil engineers when they do their retaining walls. Usually it's just on a little chart, it's a graphic table, and it's not done aesthetically whatsoever. That would be my main concern going forward.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. David.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I certainly don't have any questions about the idea here, is to provide shelter to a system that's hopefully going to be working better, and be able to service people who don't need to use their car. It can get them out of the car and get around without the cars. Good idea to attract them to a shelter like this. But the actual, physical shelter bothers me quite a lot. You look at your color photo here and it's a pretty dark scene of a solid roof and heavy steel members, and contrasting elements between the steel members and the whiteness of it. To me, it's not an attractive structure. This morning, I took a look at the one I could get close to, and it required me, because I got on the street the wrong way and ended up turning right, I think, on Hanover, and going into the Varian parking lot there on my way around, and I found a beautifully-shaped shelter next to the Varian building, and thought, well, why isn't that possible here? This is an area where we have fantastic engineering and capability to do things with steel in other ways. If you look at your sample that you showed us of a Butler building, the nice part of it was that it was a Butler frame, and it was all open at the top. But this doesn't give you that feeling at all. I think there's a conflict here also because you really want to provide lighting, but you then have to make a solid roof because you have a solar collector on the top of it. If you built some kind of structure, your imagination that cantilevered, so, let's say, the solar collectors in another direction, and left the roof more glassy, I think you'd have a much more beautiful structure here. I think there's an opportunity for transparency and light that you're missing in the shelter. It's just way too solid feeling. I would like to see something that you could say, "Well, this really could work all over, and it will be exciting." You know, the Stanford Park is really pretty amazing. They're building unusual buildings there that are really beautifully designed, with a lot of really incredible detailing and proportions and materials. I think that you've got a bigger opportunity here to do something that could really be extended throughout a system, and that we would all be proud of in some way. I'd like to see it different than what you're showing here.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Well, I will echo David's comments. Unfortunately, I think the design is not there yet. But, let me start by saying, I think we all support the concept of having bus stops and them being functional, and protective, and all this stuff is really important. But I'd like to suggest that, I'm concerned. These are three new bus stops going into a mélange of different styles of bus stops in the area, and it seems to me that without some sense that you really are going through a program of replacing all of them, we're just making the situation dramatically worse by having a few knockoffs that are different, and then, to be debating whether the color of these few should matter. I think we really should have a program for all the bus stops, some sort of firm... Like we would do a sign program. Just one design. This is the standard, and then, how you detail with the deviations, like the retaining wall at the back, or a slope. And not try to come to us with specific locations and say, "This is what we want to do," but rather let the architecture board help define what the overall look is, what the design is, and then make it an over-the-counter type approval so you don't have to go through the trouble of coming to a review board for each one. Right now, what I'm really afraid is that we see three, and this may be the end of this project. Unfortunately, we see that kind of thing happen a lot. And then, we've actually made the situation a lot worse because what we've heard from the public speaking is that branding and image and identity is important. And I believe that's the case. Driving around the Research Park, it's really hard to know which one is a bus stop that I'm welcome at, and having a consistent design and style is important. I can go with a variation of the color. It doesn't have to be bus stop blue. It probably shouldn't be cardinal red. But I could see it being something consistent to the Research Park being appropriate. And I could see that being a decision that's ultimately a politically level thing, perhaps made by a planning director, not by the review board. We can tell you which colors are good for the designs, and there's quite a variety of colors. I would like to see this as an application with a single design that can be used in many places, that we've now established as the standard throughout the Research Park. So, that said, I think your basic design idea is just not quite right. The concept of a Butler building just doesn't feel right to me. It doesn't look sheltering somehow, and the heavy metal frame doesn't feel right. And I think your design in particular is lacking some of the detailing of how, for example, the white vertical post meets the angled metal frame there is probably some sort of metal bracket with a few bolts. But you're in an area with exceptionally high-quality architecture. Everywhere you go, the new buildings are really beautifully done by very good architects, and a lot of effort put into them. And I find it a real lost opportunity not to make a dramatic, wonderful, new kind of bus stop. Maybe David's right; if you had a photovoltaic panel that was also transparent on the roof. A few architects have come in with designs like that, so it's not just another technical thing on top, but it's integrated into the design interestingly. That's just an idea I throw out. But I'm afraid I just see this design as a mix of little pieces, that maybe the footed glass with the hills is a nice idea, but somehow,

they're just panels bolted to a piece of steel with another aluminum or steel channel. It's not doing it for me. The design just really isn't there yet. I can see where you took a concept and wanted to run with it, and I guess I feel that the concept just isn't quite appropriate for a bus stop. I don't know. It doesn't... I guess I just don't like the look of those steel frames. Most of the bus stops out there have some sense that they're offering shelter, and I'm not sure I see that with this one. I guess what I feel is that we should be fussy on getting the design right once, and then, back out of the process. That's how I feel we should go with this. I think that the design just needs more work. Let me echo Alex's comments about the Ipe, too. I think that's really going to be a poor choice. Over time, the Ipe will turn silver, but it also, when you put your hands on it, it can splinter a little bit. It's probably not the best thing for a bench that's not being maintained. I would think you could find some modern composite product that's really bulletproof on the maintenance, that also gives you the look you're after. But as beautiful as the sample is here, which is one of the nicest materials out there like this, it won't be like this six weeks after you finish it. That's how fast the finishes fade, especially on something like a trash can. There's lots of other ideas. Just look around at what the architects have done on some of the buildings nearby and pick up those cues. I'm afraid I just don't see the design being of a high aesthetic quality, which is what we have to find. Any other comments from the Board?

Board Member Lew: I think you have to clarify what you're looking... What are you looking for if you don't like the proposed concept? I think it has to be more clear than just a translucent roof.

Chair Baltay: Fair enough. You want to take a stab at that, David?

Board Member Hirsch: No, I just want to say that I think you've stated it pretty well, and you added some elements to it that I didn't address. I agree about the comment about wood. I've used Ipe, and it isn't the same. It won't really last properly, and I don't think... Most areas where you will have extensive use of a material like that, you'd really turn to some other alternative that could be maintained permanently. And the idea of sort of a transparent voltaic, if there were something like that out there, would certainly be wonderful. I'm not sure you can technically find something like that. And I think systemwide, if you have an opportunity here, this is a chance for you to design something that really is going to be throughout the whole Research Park. And I think that could be a terrific opportunity to do more. I would think it would be an exciting challenge for you to come up with other alternatives, and shape metal differently. You know, you're living with the idea of a Butler building frame, but you have all kinds of opportunities to work with metal that you can bend and weld and make a shape out of that would be more appropriate here. These are pretty heavy structures, looking, you know? And they look like they could hold up much more than what you're really holding up here. And the contrast is really not attractive to me, between the white and the metal color here. It would be nice to do something that, color-wise, etc., graphic-wise, you can say is useful everywhere. But there are many different ways of doing this. For example, what if you were more free with the elements so you didn't have to put the sign right there on the, as part of the bus stop itself? You know, it was a free-floating element, just like the garbage container is. So that you had different elements you worked within the landscape. These are mostly on open roads next to landscaped background, so you really have an open palette to work with here. I think you really deserve it, to do something more out of this as a shape, as an element, as a transparent, solid combination. You know, you go to Google and see what else is happening out there. It seemed to me there were other opportunities that you could take advantage of here. Maybe they aren't quite as heavy in structure, but would function just fine in the environment you're living with. You know, I notice that you have some very good illustrations in the book of some of the neighboring areas and buildings that you're going to be near with these particular bus shelters. Each of those drawings shows buildings which themselves have canopies and elements on top of them that are lighter weight, and very attractive. I think those are something you could guide by in some way, that that would be more appropriate to the neighboring structures in the Research Park.

Chair Baltay: I share David's sentiments. What he's saying, I support. I'm struggling to find ways to put to words some of these concepts. I want to give you clear direction where to go, and I'm not sure if we're doing that. Maybe you can tell me what you've heard. Please come to the microphone, yes.

Mr. Pew: I deeply appreciate the comments, especially in a public setting in which there's going to be multiple context. How do you derive an architecture or a form that actually gives a sense of place and gives

a moment, right? That actually identifies it separate from the building, right? Our struggle really was a struggle between deep constraints around us, which is part of the design process itself. And constraints being around technological constraints, maintenance and future constraints. An example of that is all of the glass ceiling ones that are light, really light-feeling shelters that exist with glass or a transparent ceiling, but actually really hard to maintain, including San Francisco with the semi-translucent. They're actually really maintenance-heavy, so, working with our client to identify, okay, how do we create low-maintenance that kind of stands alone, on its own? That speaks a little bit to the translucent, the transparency. To the form itself, there is, when we researched and developed it from forms, we were looking at something that actually had, almost a nostalgic. Like, it stuck in people's head, and they knew the form of the building itself. The structure is heavy. It is. Absolutely. I agree with you 100 percent. And it's also engineered, so, this is what it would take to build it, is basically what we're saying, with the roof line, the PV's that are attached to it. With regards to darkness, I think our windows definitely show a dark, harsh line underneath of it. I think with the grain out of the material over time, that will help with lightening the space as a whole. And then, with regards to the signage, placing the sign, or different configurations of that, what we did, we looked at a configuration that had the signage completely out. And what it actually felt like, it was disjointed. It actually didn't feel like a moment, so to speak. It felt like two separate responses. Ipe, definitely interested and intrigued in other materiality with that. Ipe is something we've used and very comfortable with it. **Kevanee [phonetic]** is another interest. I know there's a lot of questions around sustainability, too, with Ipe, so I'm open to those options. I think materiality is making sure that it feels wood and natural, is going to be really important. There's a lot of composite products out there that feel like a composite product, so we have to feel like it stays within that natural feeling.

Chair Baltay: Let me try to throw out a couple of thoughts. I don't want to belabor this too much, but if you look at, page 1.6 has a recent building we worked on. I think of it as the butterfly building. There's a real lightness to the way those roofs are treated, even the ones that are solid material. Across on Hanover is another building, we don't have an image of it here, but what I'm saying is, I think if you look to the surrounding architecture in that area, I think what you'll find is your concept of a Butler building is the wrong inspiration. It's not really what's going on there. And I would encourage you instead to think of some sort of high-tech architecture more, and try to look that way for inspiration. Then I think your design skills will take you the rest of the way. I think this is not a failure of design. What we're looking at is just a concept that, it's just too heavy, and perhaps too simple at the same time. If you just drive around for half an hour, look at the other buildings, and see if something turns you on, I bet you'll...

Mr. Pew: Can I ask you a question?

Chair Baltay: Sure, please.

Mr. Pew: In response to this building on 1.6, it's a stunning building that is very high tech. The Research Park also consists of buildings that are not this, that have been here for a very long time. So, balancing, I definitely hear you. It's an interesting challenge that we've chosen to endeavor on, that everyone has an opinion on, that's for sure. So, yeah. And placing it in context of a beautiful, high-tech building, it makes sense to be high-tech and pulling inspiration from there, and placing it from some of the other buildings built in the 60's, and even 70's, throughout there. There's a diversity of architecture in there, so how diverse architecture and landscape, that's been the challenge that we've faced.

Chair Baltay: What I've heard today is how important it is to attract, encourage, to make these exciting, new. What I think that is, is, for a lot of people, this high-tech, new stuff, you kind of want to go into these buildings. I don't really want to go into the old HP buildings. No offense to whoever is here from HP, but I really want to go into this new building. I just want to see what it's like. If you make the bus stop with that attraction, you're taking us into the next century of stuff. And that's sort of... I'm trying to put a finger on it. That's sort of what I see going on.

Mr. Pew: Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: I kind of second that feeling, you know, the high-tech feeling I think would be more appropriate. After all, most of these buildings now are being built this way. Yes, you can look back and

think about wonderful things that happened in the 30's, you know, and so on, but I don't think you need to go there. This is a forward-thinking program here for this. They don't build solid buses anymore, either. More glassy. I think you should look to the future here, a bit more than you are. Accommodating the past.

Chair Baltay: Alex, do you have anything to add?

Board Member Lew: No, I just want to comment, I do support the proposed design, but I don't disagree with any of David's comments. That was in the back of my head, too, when I was looking at it. You know, the steel is heavy, the colors are contrast, you know, they're very high contrast. Anyway, if you guys come up with a motion, I very well may support it.

Chair Baltay: Let's be clear then, that the staff had concerns – and one member of the public did – about the color, whether it should match the bus stop, or if it could be closer to a Stanford color. I think I've heard that the Board is ambivalent, or if not in favor, of allowing you to choose what color you think is best. Is that a fair statement? I want to put it out there clearly, so we have that issue to rest. David, are you okay with the color?

Board Member Hirsch: With this color?

Chair Baltay: A color that's not the color of the rest of the bus stops in the community.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I mean, I think whatever it is, it should look like it belongs on every busy stop, then.

Chair Baltay: And how close to Stanford's colors are you comfortable with? Does that matter to you, even? If it were cardinal red. The color of a football helmet of a Stanford player.

Board Member Hirsch: You know, if Stanford feels strongly about that, they're paying for it... I'm not so strong about that. I think it should be a color that looks like it belongs with what you're putting there. If it turns out to be more of a high-tech kind of buildings that we're looking at, that have those kind of floating roof lines, are not that color, they're... To look at the one on page 1.6, they're all metallic-looking. I don't think that's a bad idea, to have it consistently a metallic color. A reference color to Stanford's color? Nice on a football jersey, not important here.

Chair Baltay: Alex, what's your take on that?

Board Member Lew: My main concern is if it were, like, red and white, it may look like it's exclusively for the Marguerite shuttle and not for all other options that are out there. I think also, I was looking at some of the sites, are very much in the landscape, and I think that the colors should be, should go with the landscape as well. I think the inspiration is more [inaudible], then I would support that. I realize it's a copper, like Duranar finish, and not Corten. I guess in my mind, the issue really is the contrast of the two colors. It's the copper and the off-white.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, we're in support that the color, the color should complement and integrate with the design, and the color should support the overall goal of encouraging ridership. I think that's the position of the architectural board on the colors.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: Shall I make a motion that we continue this project to a date uncertain? With revisions to the design style, per the comments we've made? I don't see how we'd write that down. Considering... What do we have?

Board Member Hirsch: You know, I just wanted to reiterate what I was saying before. You have a series of elements here – garbage collection, the shelter itself, the seating within it – and you've tried to kind of put them all together with a roof and a solar collector. I just feel that you can pull it apart as well, you

know, because it could be more free-floating, mural like. If you want to use an analogy to a, kind of an artist whose work is out there, and exciting, within the landscape. I think that it's not always a good idea to put all these things together. I think there are some very beautiful-looking, simple containers for the graphics that aren't really tied right to the shelter itself. You have the space on the sidewalk to do these things. The same is true of a garbage collection. It could be an element free-floating within the landscape. That would make it more interesting, in my opinion. And it doesn't have to be all incorporated within itself like this.

Chair Baltay: If we could add to the motion here, a change to the second one that says, "transparent roof." Can we make that less absolute, David, and say, "consider lighter roof elements?" How do you feel about that?

Board Member Hirsch: [off microphone, inaudible]

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's say consider lighter or transparent roof. How's that? That seems to meet the point. Okay. And then, I think, Jodie, if we could remove the statement, "details are important." That doesn't need to be in a motion. Lastly, can I add...? This is to staff. Can we request that this be made into some kind of a sign program type thing, where we just have a single design, and not have it be site-specific? Is that possible?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think the application as it stands right now is for these three locations, but we are proposing in the conditions of approval that as new locations come in, that staff would look at those and use the same design. Whatever is approved.

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, I guess it's up to you, how you see you need to treat and process that. Okay, with that, that's my motion. Is there a second?

Board Member Hirsch: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Any discussion of that? If not, all those in favor, aye. Opposed? Okay, the motion carries 3-0.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 3-0.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Let's take a five minute break and Board Member Lee back here.

[The Board took a short break.]

[Board Member Lee returned to the chamber.]

Chair Baltay: Okay, moving right along, we're back in session.

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 17, 2019.

Chair Baltay: Next item is approval of minutes from October 17th. Do we have any comments or feedback? I can thank the staff for including a report on the two subcommittee items. I'm happy with those.

Board Member Lew: Yes, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Any other input, feedback, comments? If not, can I collect a motion? David, are you following us?

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible, off-microphone]

Chair Baltay: Tab number 5.

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we approve minutes for October 17th and November 7th, 2019.

Chair Baltay: Oh, you're jumping ahead of me, Alex.

Board Member Lew: Okay, I'll just do one. October 17th.

Chair Baltay: One please, thank you. Okay. Motion is made. Anybody want to second?

Board Member Lee: I can second.

Chair Baltay: Okay. David, any comments on that? All those in favor, aye. Opposed? Okay, the motion carries 4-0.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for November 7, 2019.

Chair Baltay: Next one is minutes from November 7th. Any comments?

Board Member Lee: I have just one comment. First page, it says, "Board Member Lee: I will not be here on the 19th." I checked with Osma; it was Board Member Thompson who said, "I will not be here on the 19th."

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's get that corrected. I'll note that we have the subcommittee review report that we asked for, and again, that looks good. Any other comments? A motion, please?

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we approve the minutes for November 7, 2019.

Board Member Lee: I can second.

Chair Baltay: Moved and seconded. All those in favor, aye? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

7. North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP)

Chair Baltay: Our next item is board member questions, comments or announcements, and Board Member Lew is going to give us a report on the North of Ventura Coordinated Area policy, working group update. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Two things have happened recently. One was the City Council voted against approving additional services for the project. That had delayed the project for about five months last year. The additional services were to do an additional option, additional alternative that would be studied under the environmental review process, and also historic, doing the historic report, which was actually already done. There are going to be some modifications to the process that have not been decided yet. There's going to be some cutbacks to the consultants. The staff may do some more of the work. The creek naturalization study I think is, my understanding is it's funded separately. The City is also working on the Boulware Park Master Plan, and that's separate but connected, tied into the North Ventura plan. That's the Council's action. The committee met on Thursday, December 5th, to review three options that would be studied in the future. The first was to retain the building. The second option would be to just retain two or three pieces of the building, but then build around all the other parts of the site. The third option was removing all of the

building, and also looking at more of the sites in the neighborhood that aren't on the Fry's property. We did group exercises around those three, and those three studies are being refined and will be continued at the next meeting, which is Tuesday, January 21st. There was a lot of input on the three, they were all over the place. But that's the basic idea for the three schemes. We'll see if we have to cut down to two schemes, or not.

Board Member Hirsch: Just a question on the properties that they're talking about looking at, that are other properties there. Are they additional properties on Lambert and Ash, at the corner? There are two or three buildings on Ash as it turns the corner there, which were not part of the original property. Is that going to be...?

Board Member Lew: Well, okay, City Council set a boundary for the area, so Ash is included. On Lambert the City Council has only included one side of the street.

Board Member Hirsch: On Lambert, yeah.

Board Member Lew: On Lambert. Only one side.

Board Member Hirsch: The other side is the AT&T building.

Board Member Lew: Right.

Board Member Hirsch: And the guitar place at the other end, yeah.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, right. That would not be included. Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: And really, maybe you would do a little more... Alex, you're so good at the research piece here. I thought that there were several buildings along Ash, at the west end of the property, that are not part of the original. Go take a look and see.

Board Member Lew: You're saying ownership? They're always part of the study area, but they're not part of...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: There's study area, and then there's ownership, and those are different.

Board Member Hirsch: Correct. Okay, thank you.

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Any other comments, thoughts, questions of Alex? Grace, any thoughts on this?

Board Member Lee: Thanks for the update.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, thank you, Alex.

Board Member Lew: I think we'll have to pay attention to the schedule because the schedule will change for this project. The Planning staff has been setting up the meetings going forward, but it looks like it's going to be changing.

Board Member Hirsch: Does it go back to the consultant at some point, to start working up the scheme? What is the plan for the future?

Board Member Lew: Consultants are working on the schemes now. They've started, they've restarted, yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. I have another question. Does it, you know... I wrote up something, right? Did they actually present it?

Board Member Lew: They printed up your letter, so that was all part of the... It was not part of the packet, but it was all printed for all the community members. But there was actually low turnout at the last meeting, so I'm not sure everybody... I'm not sure that the whole committee read your letter.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, so, it seems to me, generally thinking about projects like this, that it's going to have to be some kind of a mix between retail or office building of some sort. Was that included? In other words, does the program involve...?

Board Member Lew: There was a lot of discussion about how much office to include and where to put it. That was a hot topic.

Board Member Hirsch: Hot topic?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: In a positive way, or...?

Board Member Lew: Good and bad, yes. I would encourage you to attend the next meeting so you can chime in on mixed use.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Okay. Will do.

Chair Baltay: Anybody else? Okay, with that, we're done with that item, and I think our meeting is adjourned. Thank you, everybody. Happy holidays.

Adjournment