



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 7821)

Report Type: Study Session **Meeting Date:** 3/16/2017

Summary Title: 1451 Middlefield Road: Junior Museum and Zoo

Title: 1451 Middlefield Road [16PLN-00217]: Request for Review of Updated Concept Plans for a One-Story, 14,790 Square Foot Replacement and Expansion Building for the Junior Museum and Zoo and Reconfiguration of the Adjacent Parking Lots. The ARB Previously Considered a Preliminary Review Application on January 19, 2017; Applicant Requests Initial Feedback on Design Modifications in Advance of Formal Application Review. Environmental Assessment: Pending - No Action is Taking Place at This Meeting. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF). For More Information Please Contact the Project Planner Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

From: Hillary Gitelman

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB):

1. Conduct a study session as a follow up to the January 19, 2017 Preliminary Architectural Review to view an alternative site plan and discuss project approach.

Report Summary

The City is seeking the ARB's preliminary comments on a reconfigured site plan in response to the January 19, 2017 Preliminary Architectural Review. The project is the replacement of the existing Junior Museum and Zoo (JMZ) with a new museum and education building, outdoor zoo with netted enclosures, and perimeter site improvements on the site of the current facilities. The proposed project scope was developed in coordination with the Rinconada Park Long Range Plan for the surrounding park improvements, parking lot reconfiguration and adjacent public facilities. The January 19, 2017 Preliminary Review staff report, without attachments, is provided as Attachment A; it contains background information and documents related to the project. The ARB report was forwarded to the HRB for its study session on

January 26, 2017. Meeting minutes from the 2017 ARB and Historic Resources Board (HRB) sessions are provided as Attachment B and C, respectively.

Background

Following the study sessions on January 19th with the ARB and January 26th with the HRB, the applicant team revised the site plan significantly. The goal of the study session is to confirm the new site plan concepts are heading in the right direction in response to ARB and HRB comments. In addition to providing a more civic entry from the parking lot and pedestrian entrance and building orientation toward Middlefield Road, the plans indicate the parking lot has been reconfigured. The revised site plan is provided as Attachment D. The applicant has also provided a summary (Attachment E), and images of building design concepts, and massing/elevation studies will be presented for discussion with the ARB at the study session. The ARB may be interested to learn that Page and Turnbull will be making further modifications to the historic resources evaluation provided with the January 19th report, as well as researching and preparing a report regarding the historic features of the Girl Scout House/Lou Henry Hoover House and other aspects of the Rinconada Park site.

Prior City Reviews & Action

City Council:	Study session conducted on 11/21/16; Staff Report link: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/54681
PTC:	None.
HRB:	Study session conducted on 1/26/17; Staff Report link: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/55583
ARB:	Study session conducted on 1/19/17; staff report link: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/55507 . March 19, 2015 Study Session of an 18,400 sf replacement building https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/46405 ; Action Minutes (not verbatim) are available at http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/46924
PRC:	Two Study Sessions in 2015; One session April 26, 2016; Report link: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/52063 (PRC supports reconfigured relationship with Park; Minutes: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/52999

Discussion

The purpose of this study session to provide comments to the applicant regarding the revised concept plans. No action is being taken at this meeting and further plan refinement is required prior to the ARBs formal review of the project.

Public Notification, Outreach & Comments

ARB study sessions do not require notification more than 72 hours in advance. The agenda was posted more than 72 hours in advance.

Report Author & Contact Information
Amy French, AICP, Chief Planning Official
(650) 329-2336
amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

ARB¹ Liaison & Contact Information
Jodie Gerhardt, AICP, Planning Manager
(650) 329-2575
jodie.gerhardt@cityofpaloalto.org

Attachments:

- Attachment A: January 19, 2017 ARB staff report without attachments (DOC)
- Attachment B: 1 19 17 excerpt minutes ARB meeting JMZ (DOCX)
- Attachment C: 1.26.17 HRB JMZ Excerpt Minutes (DOCX)
- Attachment D: Revised Site Plan (DOCX)
- Attachment E: March 3 2017 CAW summary(PDF)

¹ Emails may be sent directly to the ARB using the following address: arb@cityofpaloalto.org



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 7100)

Report Type: Study Session **Meeting Date:** 1/19/2017

Summary Title: 1451 Middlefield (Prelim JMZ)

Title: PUBLIC HEARING: 1451 Middlefield Road [16PLN-00217]: Preliminary Architectural Review of a One-Story, 14,790 Square Foot Replacement Building for an Expanded Junior Museum and Zoo and Reconfiguration of the Adjacent Parking Lots. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF)

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) conduct a preliminary review of the Junior Museum and Zoo (JMZ) project planned for 1451 Middlefield Road.

Report Summary

The Community Services Department is seeking the ARB's preliminary comments on the project, which is to replace the existing Junior Museum and Zoo (JMZ) with a new museum and education building, outdoor zoo with netted enclosures, and perimeter site improvements on the site of the current facilities. This review follows a recent Council session conducted November 21, 2016, and is the second ARB study session on the topic of a replacement structure for the JMZ.

The proposed project scope has been developed in coordination with the Rinconada Park Long Range Plan for the surrounding park improvements, parking lot reconfiguration and adjacent public facilities. Plans are viewable after entering the project address into the designated search box at <https://palocalto.buildingeve.com/planning>. There are multiple layers of site goals and constraints for this project. The site is shown on the location map (Attachment A).

Background

Project Information

City of Palo Alto
Planning & Community Environment
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301
(650) 329-2442

Owner:	City of Palo Alto
Architect:	Sarah Vaccaro, Cody Anderson Wasney
Representative:	John Aiken, Community Services Sr. Program Manager
Legal Counsel:	City Attorney
<u>Property Information</u>	
Address:	1451 Middlefield Road (JMZ)
Neighborhood:	Community Center
Lot Dimensions & Area:	800 feet Middlefield Rd. dimension; 795,841 square feet (sf) total area
Housing Inventory Site:	No
Located w/in a Plume:	No
Protected/Heritage Trees:	Yes
Historic Resource(s):	Lucie Stern Community Center is a Category 1 Resource (includes CSD Administrative offices, Community Center, Children's Theatre, Stern Theatre, Boy Scout facility, Children's Library); JMZ is not on National or California historic register; site includes Rinconada Park, Pool, Fire Station, Substation, and the Lou Henry Hoover House (aka Girl Scout House)
Existing Improvement(s):	JMZ: 9,000 sf, 2-stories, built in 1941
Existing Land Use:	Community Center
Adjacent Land Uses & Zoning:	North of parcel: Residential (R-1 zone) West of parcel: Residential (R-1) East of parcel: Public Elementary School (Walter Hays, PAUSD) adjacent, and Art Center and Rinconada Library across Newell Road South of parcel: Residential (R-1)
Aerial View of Property:	



Land Use Designation & Applicable Plans

Zoning Designation:	Public Facilities
Comp. Plan Designation:	Public Facilities
Context-Based Design Criteria:	Not applicable
Downtown Urban Design Guide:	Not applicable
South of Forest Avenue Coordinated Area Plan:	Not applicable
Baylands Master Plan:	Not applicable
El Camino Real Design Guidelines (1976 / 2002):	Not applicable
Proximity to Residential Uses or Districts (150'):	Yes, across from single family residences
Located w/in the Airport Influence Area:	Not applicable
Special Setback	24 feet on Middlefield Road
Utility Easement/Corridor	Water, sewer and storm drain main lines (sheet C1.1)

Prior City Reviews & Action

City Council:	Study session conducted on 11/21/16; Staff Report link: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/54681
PTC:	None.
HRB:	None.
ARB:	March 19, 2015 Study Session of an 18,400 sf replacement building https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/46405 ; Action Minutes (not verbatim) are available at http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/46924
PRC:	Two Study Sessions in 2015; One session April 26, 2016; Report link: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/52063 (PRC supports reconfigured relationship with Park; Minutes: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/52999)

Project Description

In addition to replacement of the existing Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo buildings with new buildings and outdoor environments, the project includes the reconfiguration of the existing shared parking lot(s) with improved fire access and coverage, accessible parking stalls and pathways, drainage improvements, and site lighting.

Applicant's Description

The applicant's project description is provided as Attachment B to this report. The architect's design approach to the site organization, massing, materiality, program and experience, and surrounding site improvements is described therein. Attachment B provides a complete summary of design and process efforts to address this unique and highly valued community resource that is currently constrained by the existing older (1941) facility. It highlights the goals and constraints of the project according to the applicant, including:

1. Improving the interface of the JMZ with Rinconada Park while minimizing impact thereto,
2. Protecting heritage and mature feature trees,
3. Improving wayfinding along Middlefield and visibility of the JMZ from that street, and
4. Integrating the new building within the adjacent residential context.

Project Type and Review Process

The formal entitlement application has not yet been submitted; the preliminary review application process ends with the ARB public hearing and any direction to the applicant is not binding. The Historic Resources Board (HRB) will also review the concept plans in an upcoming study session. The project plans staff reviewed for this report were submitted December 12, 2016.

The applicant plans to submit the formal AR application in early 2017; staff will review the submittal for 'completeness' prior to the first formal hearing. The ARB recommendation on the

formal application will be based upon the Architectural Review findings Council recently adopted (Attachment D), set forth in the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Chapter 18.76.

History of JMZ and Site

Constructed in 1941, the existing JMZ building has continually housed the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo. The institution of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo was founded in 1934 and belongs to a nation-wide pattern of children's museums established in the early 20th century. The Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) is attached to this report (Attachment F). The HRE concludes the JMZ is not eligible for listing the National Register or California Registers under any criteria, due to significant alterations over its history resulting in a loss of historic integrity.

The closest building to the JMZ is Walter Hays School on Palo Alto Unified School District's land to the south of the project site. The Girl Scouts' Lou Henry Hoover House is the closest building on the City's parcel; approximately 45 feet to the north. Images of Lucie Stern and Lou Henry Hoover House are shown on plan sheet A0.8.

The Lou Henry Hoover (LHH) House, designed by Birge Clark and built in 1926, is the oldest active scout meeting house today, according to the Girl Scouts of Northern California website. It predates the adjacent Birge Clark designed Lucie Stern Community Center, which includes the main theater, Boy Scout facility, children's theater, and children's library, and is listed on the City's Historic Inventory as a Category 1 historic resource (Attachment E). Staff learned that the LHH House was relocated in 1936 to the current site from its original site somewhere near the location of the Lucie Stern Center, and that the LHH House received an addition in 1945 on the northeast side of the building. The LHH House may be eligible for listing on both the California and National historic registers, but no historic resource evaluation has been performed.

Site Coverage, Floor Area, and Height

The existing buildings on the City's 795,841 sf site cover approximately 81,400 sf of the site. Project plans show the Rinconada Long Range Plan on the site and provide data regarding other buildings' coverage on this site. The existing museum and zoo buildings cover 8,500 square feet (sf) of the site. The proposed JMZ buildings would cover an additional 6,290 sf, for a total coverage of 14,790 sf by the JMZ project. The lot coverage after construction would be 11% of the site where 30% maximum lot coverage is allowed. With its small second floor of 500 sf, the existing building has 9,000 sf of gross floor area (GFA). The proposed GFA is 14,790 sf.

The height of the proposed building is 22 feet. The height of the central supportive column for the netting over the zoo is 36 feet. The fences around the zoo are proposed to be ten to 12 feet tall and the fence around the outdoor animal management area is proposed to be eight feet tall.

Building Design

The main building is a modified 'U' shaped building designed to preserve existing, mature Pecan and Dawn Redwood trees. The new, one-story building will house the museum as well as zoo

support functions. Museum components include exhibit rooms, multi-use room, entry/lobby, offices, collection hub and storage rooms, shop, mechanical rooms, conference rooms, classroom, restrooms, and other building support areas such as hallways, elevator, and staircases (2). The zoo uses would include animal control and program and storage rooms.

Outdoor Zoo Design

The outdoor zoo area includes a netted enclosure; the area is to be called “loose in the zoo” and its zoo exhibits would include meerkat, tortoise, flamingo, duck, kitten, bobcat, raccoon, turtle, cichlid, rabbit, and underwater animals. The outdoor zoo area east of the ‘loose’ zoo would include an animal management area and would be covered with low level netting (seen on plan sheet Z1.0).

Building Materials, Signage, Landscaping, and Trees

Plan sheets A4.0, 4.1, 4.2 and 5.0 provide images and the building locations for application of proposed materials and signage concepts, which reflect a contemporary style. The zoo site plans, located on Plan Sheets Z01 and Z11, show materials proposed in the ‘loose in the zoo’ area and landscape concepts are shown on sheets C2.1 and PH-2. The applicants’ project description indicates uses of materials are intended to show nature is an educational tool. Plans indicate that 31 trees would be removed and approximately 40 trees would be added for a net increase of approximately nine trees. Many of the new trees would be located within the parking lot(s). The attached Arborist Reports provides information about existing tree conditions and removals.

Parking, Circulation and Lighting

The existing main parking lot (between the JMZ and Lucie Stern center) features diagonal parking spaces and is inefficient. The secondary parking lot between the Lou Henry Hoover House and theater has a 90-degree parking layout. The landscaped area in front of the Girl Scout House would be converted to parking spaces to increase the supply of spaces on site.

The proposed parking lot reconfiguration features 90-degree parking spaces throughout, primarily two-way vehicle circulation and some one-way circulation. The December 12, 2016 plans indicate the proposed parking lot(s) revisions would result in approximately 13 additional on-site automobile parking spaces.

The design includes new sidewalks, striped crosswalks, and parking lot trees. The electrical plan indicates 12-foot tall light fixtures around the perimeter of the parking lots, and 25-foot tall light fixtures in the center of the parking lots. Storm water treatment areas are proposed within both lots shown on plan sheet C2.1.

One driveway to the parking lot on Middlefield Road would be eliminated. The long-range plan includes an increase in on-street parking by approximately 21 spaces. The project includes an expansion of the number of bicycle rack spaces, located at each end of the new JMZ building. 25 short term bike parking spaces and five long-term bike parking spaces are proposed.

2015 ARB Study Session

The ARB conducted a study session to receive an overview of a replacement building containing 18,400 sf of floor area. Board members Gooyer, Kim and Lew provided non-binding comments at that time, and a former member also provided comments. The board members:

- Wanted the JMZ to retain the kid friendly environment/atmosphere;
- Noted the proposed building is similar to an office building/structure;
- Stated the proposed green roof is not used as a teaching opportunity;
- Declared the proposed elevation is “a let-down”;
- Questioned the need for total demolition of the existing building;
- Asked whether the existing building could accommodate visitor increase;
- Asked how the Rinconada Park Long Range Plan fits into the project;
- Questioned whether the area along Middlefield Road belongs to the Rinconada Park;
- Questioned if the Plan for expansion of the Rinconada Pool was included in this project;
- Asked whether the proposed building could have a basement to lower down the mass of the proposed structure;
- Inquired about the use of backside of the Walter Hayes school property and back end of the zoo property line, noted that the existing fence was not engaging and suggested a better use of the space between Walter Hayes School and JMZ;
- Suggested improved signage and graphic art qualities of the building to bring back “childlike” qualities;
- Noted the existing parking lot and wayfinding should be improved;
- Stated that the entrance building resembles an office building, that the difference between the two buildings needed to be bridged, tied together;
- Stated that the building had bulky massing, and asked that it be toned down;
- Noted the scale and texture were okay and fit in with the neighborhood;
- Said landscaping fronting Middlefield Road is important and that neighbors should weigh in on this;
- Asked whether the Zoo support in the building could be embedded in the basement, noted a preference for smaller massing, and suggested that two stories may be too tall and that the applicant provide a 3D model for proper understanding;
- Suggested that more robust neighborhood outreach would be necessary, as not everyone in the community is aware of this project;
- Noted the goals of the project are exciting and interesting, and the scale are okay but the architecture needs improvement;
- Asked for a contextual section of Middlefield Road with foliage and screening;
- Felt the proposed project is consistent with city’s Comprehensive Plan vision;
- Warned about the utility easement running through the site;
- Supported the increased setback from the school building;
- Wanted more color, playful inventive motifs as long as these were respectful to the neighborhood; and
- Noted several other suggestions having to do with parking, bus standing area, and a need for more community involvement.

Analysis¹

Neighborhood Setting and Character

The ARB considers the context of the project. The context includes the adjacency of Walter Hays School, the Lou Henry Hoover House, Rinconada Park, and the Lucie Stern Community Center, as well as the proximity of the residential neighborhoods across Middlefield Road and Hopkins Avenue. The existing context includes both one story and two story buildings.

School and Residential Neighborhoods

The southeasterly wall of the existing JMZ building is located on the property line shared with the Palo Alto School District's Walter Hayes Elementary School. The proposed JMZ building would have a ten foot setback from that shared property line, and follow the existing setback from Middlefield Road. The proposed building improves the building separation from a Walter Hays classroom building. The building component facing Middlefield homes would be longer than the existing building end by about 30 feet.

Historic Site and Nearby Historic Buildings

The project has a contemporary design on a site that contains older and registered historic buildings. The Lucie Stern Community Center, designed by Birge Clark and built from 1932 to 1940, reflects the Spanish Colonial Revival style featuring a stucco exterior and clay tile roofing. It is locally significant and listed on the City's inventory as a historic category 1 building as noted on the attached inventory form prepared in 1978 and updated in 1981 (Attachment E).

As noted, the Lou Henry Hoover House, circa 1926, relocated from the current Boy Scout wing of the Stern Center to its current address at 1120 Hopkins, was named after the former First Lady, Lou Henry Hoover, who established the first west coast troop in Palo Alto and served as president of Girl Scout USA. The Lou Henry Hoover House is finished with vertical wood siding and shingle roofing material. There are shrubs in front of the building and several mature trees, including a protected coast live oak (tree #284 on arborist map), and several ruby horse chestnut trees (#283 and #289). A old bird bath or fountain, dedicated to a former boy scout master, is also found in the front yard of the and would likely be relocated to the vicinity of the Boy Scout facility at the Lucie Stern Center. Staff is reviewing the setting to determine which features of the landscaping, if any, may have been installed during the period of significance.

¹ The information provided in this section is based on analysis prepared by the report author prior to the public hearing. The Architectural Review Board in its review of the administrative record and based on public testimony may reach a different conclusion from that presented in this report and may choose to make alternative findings. A change to the findings may result in a final action that is different from the staff recommended action in this report.



The historic buildings on the site are primarily one-story with some two story components.



The Historic Resources Board (HRB) will have the opportunity to see and comment on the conceptual plans for the new building with respect to compatibility with the existing older buildings on the site, and compliance of the modifications of this Category 1 site with the Secretary of Interiors' Standards for Rehabilitation. The HRB can also provide assistance to staff regarding the AR Findings, and comment on the Historic Resource Evaluation and environmental review document, once published.

Transportation Demand Management and Parking Lot Improvements

The site is on shuttle, bus and bike routes, and the applicant is preparing a transportation demand management (TDM) plan for submittal with the formal application for Architectural Review. The TDM plan will address pedestrian wayfinding and accessibility enhancements on and off-site, the provision of pedestrian scale lighting, bus drop-off along Middlefield, shuttle stop enhancements, a passenger drop off area at the new JMZ entry, and other improvements for safety related to the Rinconada Plan. The TDM plan is intended to not only reduce parking demand, but also to provide clear transportation options to residents and visitors. Transportation Division staff provided comments regarding the need for coverage over bike parking, secured parking provisions, and the disadvantages of wall-mounted bike parking.

There is a requirement for 50% shading of parking lots and a requirement for one parking lot tree-island for every ten parking spaces in a row. The project architect is working with the City's landscape architect to balance the requirements for shade and tree numbers with pedestrian wayfinding and storm water drainage needs.

Utilities, Public Works Review

The project architect has received comments from Utilities and Public Works Engineering staff about the City's requirements. There is a utility corridor crossing the project site and there appears to be a gas line along Middlefield Road. The applicant is aware that building foundations are not allowed to extend into a utilities easement, and major construction projects include upgrades of existing utilities lines. The project architect is aware that a Utility Plan is required with building permits to show water line and meter upgrades, backflow preventers, transformers and the like, and aware of requirements for plans submitted with the formal AR application and additional requirements for building permits.

Plans prepared for formal AR review must include a site plan indicating storm water system connections and treatment requirements, standards for driveways, curbs and sidewalks, meters and transformers, backflow prevention, work in the right of way, notes about pavement resurfacing and storm water pollution prevention. The formal AR submittal plans also must address trash and recycling requirements.

Logistics Plan

Building permit applications would involve further disclosures, including submittal of a logistics plan(s). Logistics plans include pedestrian and vehicle traffic controls, truck routes and deliveries, contractor parking, on site staging and storage areas, concrete pours, crane lifts, noise and dust control. Conditions of approval and other measures can be designed to minimize adverse, temporary impacts of construction on residential neighborhoods.

Zoning Compliance²

This project is subject to meeting the AR findings; it is not subject to Context Based Design Criteria, nor to any interim ordinances or moratoriums. The project plans indicate conformance with lot coverage, floor area ratio, setbacks and height development standards within the Public Facilities Zone District. The additional floor area proposed for the JMZ requires that additional parking spaces be provided. The proposal is to add 13 spaces to the supply on site. However, the number of parking spaces for all uses on the site is not met with the revised parking lot design. A request for a Director's adjustment for the parking facilities is anticipated; this will be reviewed with the formal application in connection with proposed parking lot reconfiguration and transportation and parking alternatives (TDM plan).

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan³

With 150,000 annual visits, JMZ provides a strong start for children; JMZ is integral to Rinconada Park and the park is integral to the JMZ. The Palo Alto Junior Museum & Zoo (JMZ) works closely with researchers and professionals to provide a rich environment that stimulates children's natural curiosity and creativity. The proposed project is consistent with Policy C-26 of the Community Services element of the Comprehensive Plan that encourages maintaining park facilities as safe and healthy community assets; and Policy C-22 that encourages new community facilities to ensure adaptability to the changing needs of the community.

Multi-Modal Access & Parking

The applicant is preparing a draft traffic study and TDM plan which will be submitted with, or in advance of, the formal application. The formal application will be reviewed with respect to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan and Safe Routes to School. The traffic study and TDM plan will be reviewed by the City's CEQA consultant, and included as source documents for the CEQA document. The Parks and Recreation Commission will review the TDM plan as well as the Initial

² The Palo Alto Zoning Code is available online: http://www.amlegal.com/codes/client/palo-alto_ca

³ The Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan is available online:
<http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/topics/projects/landuse/compplan.asp>

Study following publication of those documents. The Planning and Transportation staff will review the parking lot plan to ensure efficient and safe circulation and minimization of conflicts.

Greenbuilding

The City's long-time policy, established in 2007 before the City established green building requirements for private development, requires City buildings to obtain LEED Silver certification or equivalent (Attachment C). If the City Council adopts the new Green Building and Energy Reach Code being proposed by staff, it is likely that compliance with the 2016 more stringent green building code requirements will satisfy the City's LEED Silver equivalent alternative.

Consistency with Application Findings

The Council approved Ordinance containing updated AR findings is attached to this report (Attachment D).

Environmental Review

Environmental review of the proposal under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by the City's consultant (Powers) is underway. Following submittal of a formal application for Architectural Review (AR), anticipated in early 2017, the Initial Study will be published for public review and comment prior to the formal ARB review hearings. The ARB will have a role in commenting on the Aesthetics section of the CEQA document. The HRB will have a role in commenting on the Aesthetics and Cultural Resources sections of the CEQA document.

In January 2015, staff had launched a joint environmental study for the Rinconada Park Long Range Master Plan and the Junior Museum and Zoo Project with the help of consultants David J Powers and Associates. The CEQA review includes preparation of technical studies to analyze existing conditions and identify potential impacts, as well as preparation of an Initial Study. Completed reports to date are Air Quality, Arborist Assessment, and Noise Assessment.

Public Notification, Outreach & Comments

The Palo Alto Municipal Code requires notice of this public hearing be published in a local paper and mailed to owners and occupants of property within 600 feet of the subject property at least ten day in advance. Notice of a public hearing for this project was published in the *Palo Alto Weekly* on January 6, 2016, which is at least 12 days in advance of the meeting. Postcard mailing occurred on January 9, 2017, which is 10 days in advance of the ARB meeting. A Council study session is under consideration for early 2017, and the Parks and Recreation Commission is tentatively scheduled to review and recommend a Park Improvement Ordinance along with reviewing the Initial Study and Transportation Demand Management plan.

Public Comments

As of the writing of this report, no project-related, public comments were received regarding the current set of concept plans. Public comments have been provided in public hearings of the City's Parks and Recreation Commission.

Report Author & Contact Information
Amy French, AICP, Chief Planning Official
(650) 329-2336
amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

ARB⁴ Liaison & Contact Information
Jodie Gerhardt, AICP, Planning Manager
(650) 329-2575
jodie.gerhardt@cityofpaloalto.org

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Location Map (PDF)
- Attachment B: Applicant Project Description 12-12-16 (PDF)
- Attachment C: City Buildings LEED Silver 2007 Policy (DOC)
- Attachment D: Council Approved Ordinance AR Findings 12-12-16 (PDF)
- Attachment E: Community Center Historic Inventory Sheet(PDF)
- Attachment F: Historic Resource Evaluation (PDF)
- Attachment G: Arborist Report - Rinconada LRP (PDF)
- Attachment H: Project Plans (DOCX)

⁴ Emails may be sent directly to the ARB using the following address: arb@cityofpaloalto.org



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
EXCERPT MINUTES: January 19, 2016
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Members Wynne Furth, Robert Gooyer, Peter Baltay

Study Session:

PUBLIC HEARING: 1451 Middlefield Road [16PLN-00217]: Preliminary Architectural Review of a One-Story, 14,790 Square Foot Replacement Building for an Expanded Junior Museum and Zoo and Reconfiguration of the Adjacent Parking Lots. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review. Zoning District: Public Facilities

Chair Lew: Ok, I think we can move onto the first item, which is number 2, Study Session, 1451 Middlefield Road: A Preliminary Architectural Review of a one-story, 14,790 square foot replacement building for an expanded junior museum and zoo and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lots. Environmental assessment: Not a project, yet. A formal application will be subject to CEQA review. Staff?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, good morning, Chair and Vice Chair and Board Members. This is Amy French, Chief planning official. I'm here to present the project. To my left is John Aikin, the zoo director. I knew there was a title there. I'll just quickly provide some context and then we'll move onto the rest of the presentation. That last the ARB – a former member ARB was March 19th of 2015. There was a study session for a replacement building. So, that was provided with some background in your packet as well as some bulleted items comments to say what the ARB felt was critical, in terms of what to look at for the next round. Here we are at the next round, preliminary review. The Junior Museum and Zoo has a circa date of 1941 and it is a two-story building; a small second story as you see here on the screen. I provide some views here of the aerial of the site which includes the two parking lots and the zoo. Then, you know, there's an image there from Middlefield. Middlefield is a critical elevation as it faces residential houses across the street. Here's an aerial of the border site that includes the various Lucie Stern buildings, which is quite a complex and includes the Boy Scout facility here, and the library over here. The adult theater, the Community Services Department buildings, and some other related shops for the theater and such. Over here, the Girl Scout House; this is the Lou Henry Hoover House that was talked about in the report. Here is a list of addresses on this large parcel, include the fire station that's in red here, you'll see as the next item today. I should say the Walter Hays School is abutting the project as well and is the closest building to the existing zoo, here. Here are some images of the Lucie Stern Center. It is a Category 1 historic resource on the City's historic resources inventory. Here's the Boy Scout facility here. I show this to you because what's interesting is there use to be at this site – there was a street that went through, a city street and it was abandoned – Melville, it was - and it kind of became this driveway and the building that was here was the Girl Scout House, that was also a Birge Clark building, that was relocated to its current location, and the Boy Scouts took its place. Here's an image of the Children's Library – I'm showing this to you to make sure that we're all on the visual page with what's existing at the site, architecturally and placement, etc. Here's the Lou Henry Hoover House. This is, again, a Birge Clark building, but it wasn't specifically mentioned in the historic inventory. We think of it as historic but it has never been analyzed with a historic evaluation per say. A couple of things that they require is continued access to the garage here and this just shows the limits of the lease in which goes slightly beyond the building. Then, in the report, I mentioned there's a fountain dedicated to a scout master that

passed away early, I guess, and I think that's somewhere about here, outside of the lease area. This shows a few more images; the playground, where you could see thru here to the existing zoo, behind the Girl Scout House. This is from Hopkins Street here, and then the parking lot; that will be a part of this project. This is the adult Theater here; Theater Works and others use this, and here's this current driveway. One of the things about the current project is – there are two driveways to get into that first parking lot off of Middlefield, and there are diagonal spaces here and there's a blockage here and some 90-degree parking back here. It's really badly, configured. So, one of the things is to redo the parking lot and make it more functional and adding spaces in the process. Here's the footprint of the existing building; the building for the zoo and the outdoorsy area, and here's the proposed, which shows kind of an 'L' shaped or a 'U' shaped, rather, that turns the corner around a key tree; the Dawn Redwood Tree. There's also a Pecan Tree over here and then, here's the Loose in the Zoo proposal. I'll let John talk to that, and then there's some outdoor animal management area. I'll let John speak a little bit to the – I'll just say one more thing, which is the parking redesign. Again, here is the new alignment coming off of this main street and that's the only driveway then into this whole parking lot and then, exit or – it goes both ways onto Hopkins. It circulates so, you know, it's likely to discourage cut-through but certainly much better aligned, and with trees in wells, this kind of thing, and wayfinding. I'll let the architect go more into all of that. So, here's the Loose in the Zoo, if John wants to...

Mr. John Aikin: Sure, John Aikin, Director of the Junior Museum and Zoo. Our big ideas here are really to rebuild the building for our existing audience. We have about 160,000 guests a year visit and take better care of our animals and better care of our collections. I mean, we take great care of them now but this building and the zoo are sufficiently old. The technology has moved forward and it is really time to recapitalize the facility. The Loose in the Zoo concept is one where we're netting over the entire Zoo. It's a relatively small footprint and this does a couple of things, it keeps vandalized and predators out but it also keeps the animals in and so, it solves some problems but it will also present a wonderful opportunity to have animals, where kids can go and look for them where they'd go to look for them in nature; underground, underwater, up in the trees and find animals that are loose in the zoo. We can also facilitate the connection between children and those animals because these animals, of course, are all cared for by caretakers and they know them and such. The other big change here is that we're going from a free admission policy to a ticketed admission policy proposed. This building needs to be able to help with queuing and ticketing and all of those other kinds of guest services that are required for today's facilities. Let's get into the architecture. Why don't I introduce Cody Anderson Wasney Architects, Brent McClure to speak about – he's got a presentation to bring up. Brent, I'll let you take it away.

Mr. Brent McClure: Thanks John.

Mr. Aikin: Oh, wait. Amy has got a comment?

Ms. French: We just have a few more slides here. I'm just going to show -- I think one more thing as where the driveway is eliminated, we do have some landscaping going across. The building is not the only thing, of course, there is some landscaping to buffer the extended facade there. Then, I just wanted to say that the next steps in our process are – we're going to the HRB next week, on Thursday. They're just receiving the same report you are and with some requests to provide some input. There's not been a formal application submitted, it will be submitted. There is a consultant working on a draft Environmental Review document. That will be modified as needed; following the completion of the formal plan set. Then, you will be seeing this, of course as a formal design. There's also a mention on Phase 2 and that of course, the architect will cover. So, let's upload the other presentation.

Mr. Aikin: While we are loading that up, I'll also mention that the project has been constrained by a budget. The Junior Museum was originally built with private dollars and this re-capitalization is occurring with private dollars and escalation in the current marketplace in the last couple of years has consumed about 1/3rd of our project budget. This is a reduced footprint from what you saw when we were here 2-years ago. Alright Brent, if you are ready, take it away.

Mr. McClure: Thank you. We're really glad to be here before you today. I'm Brent McClure with Cody Anderson Wasney Architects. As was mentioned, we presented a couple – I think it's almost 2-years ago, now – a very different project. This has been a labor of love since 2011 as [John] mentioned. This is 100% donor funded the project so, a lot of the challenges have been really trying to eek out every bit of program within this high constrained site. I'm going to go through just some site plans really quickly. Some of the things, Amy talked about how the existing lot and the configuration of the existing building – here is the existing Zoo. This green line represents the park boundary. We've got a Dawn Redwood tree and a Pecan Tree that are out here; very large and significant, which we are working the design around. Here's the current site plan – ends – what we've done is completely reconfigured the parking lot with a single entrance over on one side, improved driveway drop off, visitor parking, bike parking over on one side and then, the main entrance will then sit right off where the Dawn Redwood is and then the Pecan Tree – so, we're – we pulled the building completely out of the park because the last time we had some structures that were in the park and we're kind of threading the needle by allowing the edge of the expanded parking, these trees and the park boundary to almost define the shape and size of the space. The Zoo still lives within the park with some outdoor Zoo support over into this area here. Just some analysis and illustration to all of the constraints we have been working around. Living within the setbacks, we aligned the building to comply with the side yard setback; the outdoor space is here. The Zoo is completely outdoor within the park boundary and then enhanced and sort of widened entrances into the park over here. This has been in conjunction and coordination with sort of the Park Master Plan. Another illustration to show circulation through the site; we're going to have a modest, sort of loading and service that's fully screened out over here on Middlefield with exterior access that links the zoo support with this sort of service corridor along the side over here; to allow the zoo support to not have to go through the museum or the entrance spots. With the building – the floor plan as I mentioned, you enter in through a gateway over here. This is an exterior courtyard. The program consists of classroom and education spaces, museum space and then, zoo support space. Presently, the zoo does not have enough support space to then – for the animals and what not to become fully accredited so, a lot of this project is to really enhance and improve those functions. All of those are aligned along this back edge over here. The blue signifies the classroom and academic space, the yellow is the exhibit space. As you enter in, ticketing is right over on this edge. You then come into the exhibit space and then one of the other main big ideas that, you know, that [John] was talking about was this immersive experience. We're kind of taking the zoo, and kind of pulling it inside and outside with the exhibit space. There are views that you can then see into the zoo. We have the science courtyard, that's outdoor space over here and this outdoor education zone. These areas – this is the site of that future Phase 2 and then the zoo support which is sort of screened back in over this area here. We've tried to take the intersections of the grids of the overall site. You've got the grid of Middlefield and then you're got the access that comes off of – I think it's – you know, the opposing street here. We've tried to take some simple massing forms with the education wing back and over here and then popping up and having this museum and sort of the public's sphere back in over on this edge to have this higher mass. Then this main piece of the museum that bumps out and creates this sort of viewing window and whatnot so, that as you walk up to the museum and zoo, you can sort of see into the museum to have this featured ball machine, is what they're looking to have. It's a really big exhibit space and then, this outdoor, sort of canopy frames the portal of sort of the entrance into this courtyard over into here. Some of the materials that we're considering for the project, we're trying – we're working with some modest means, given our budget constraints but using a combination of wood, some Lithocrete. Lithocrete is like a concrete material that allows this to almost replicate sandstone and what not to kind of give this rich, dense, textural feel. Pops of color and some playful windows and signage to kind of accentuate and signify where we have – and kind of echoing that this a children's museum and zoo. The one spot over here where we have the feature window, we're looking at using a flatlock seamed metal cladding, is one of the types of materials that we're looking at to kind of accentuate and showcase that piece right there. To walk around some of the views; here are the entry perspective and elevation. We're seeing that the front of this building really is focused primarily on the parking and that area that kind of looks out towards – more towards Lucie Stern. You can kind of see here with the wood siding and then, this low wall here in the front would then be the Lithocrete with the signage. Then, we've got some round, playful windows that pop back into the museum here. Then, some windows over here onto the – that look into the museum itself so, you really, kind of get this indoor/outdoor connection with the netting over here back and above. The view from the street, we're

worked to sort of almost play this down so that as you're coming along Middlefield, you begin to have this experience and so, we're trying to be respectful of the neighborhood and the context of the 1 and 2-story homes that are directly across the street. Light Earth tones, cement plaster, this Lithocrete wall would be this solid wall that kind of comes and turns and wraps around so, you start to begin to see that material. Then, some wood siding around where the windows pop. Then, if you come back towards Walter Hays, we're continuing to fully screen that service area so, you don't get any views into that as well. Adding some trees and landscaping; I don't know if you have been by that portion of the site; it's a little sparse, back in that corner. We're kind of just trying to have this be a sensible elevation because we do understand that the Walter Hayes view is somewhat prominent as you're coming down Middlefield Road. Section views; this kind of tells the story as to how the homes across the street are at 21-feet and we've got the low one-story mass, which is the education wing and then it pops up into here for this 22-foot high – the yellow signifying the museum space. You get some of the context in this other section of the netting of the zoo space itself and some of the trees and how we're kind of – the different heights of the different spaces. Then lastly, the zoo – I think it was already kind of touched on. You exit out over into the science courtyard. You can also then, pull off into the museum where this really – this immersive up, down, over and under experience with this tree fort that's in the middle. Meerkat exhibit is over here with some connections and views between these exhibits into the museum space itself as well as views – some select views that we will have thru the science courtyard over into here. As the wall continues around, it will also be that Lithocrete wall with the netting then above. Here's a shot of an early sketch of looking at how the zoo itself in section and whatnot would come together. Then lastly, just to touch on – this was already mentioned is that there's a – not as part of this project before us today but just as a – there's a future Master Plan to – if funding permits, is to then expand and create some additional classroom and exhibit space that would then link up with the tree fort over back in this corner here. That concludes our overview.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much, Brent. I don't have any speaker cards from the public on this one so we can move onto Board Member questions and comments. Are there any – ok Wynne.

Board Member Furth: In terms of the Environmental Review, this is going to be coordinated with the Rinconada Master Plan Environmental Review? Is that, right?

Ms. French: That's correct. There is currently an effort underway, regarding that project.

Board Member Furth: What sort of document are we going to have, do you think? Are you talking about EIR? Are we talking about a Negative Dep.?

Ms. French: It's probably a Mitigated Negative Declaration, currently as it stands.

Board Member Furth: So, we don't have the same freedom of operation that we would have with an EIR? Where can you decide where an adverse impact is acceptable given the project?

Ms. French: Correct. If that's the – you know, the end up result.

Board Member Furth: I'm thinking about two things. I'm thinking about Lou Henry Hoover House as a historic structure. I think they're going to find that it's a historic resource given its importance in women history which is American History. Also, freedom to decide that trees perhaps should be replaced if they constrain the design too much. I should also say, just for the benefit of – I did – I know this isn't quasi-judicial hearing but I did talk to the Girl Scout council because I was unfamiliar with the use that they made of that building. They basically informed me that they use it intensively and Amy provided me with a copy of the lease agreement that they've leased it for the last 90 years. They're now on a month to month tenancy and basically, they use it intensively for programs for both girls and adults and lease it back to the City essentially, for the City to operate summer camps there. So, it's from about 10 in the morning till late at night, most days. Thanks.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I have a question for the architect. On the circulation slide, you have shown some arrows as far as how the cars would circulate. Could you confirm whether all of the drive aisles will be two-way traffic flow or if there are some that are just one-way?

Mr. McClure: All of the drive aisles will be two-way. It's – I guess bi-directional or multi-directional.

Vice Chair Kim: Also, can a school bus navigate that hard right turn as you enter from Middlefield?

Ms. McClure: Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Ms. McClure: I'm sorry. We've got drop off for smaller buses over into here but we have a full bus drop off over here at the street... (Crosstalk)

Vice Chair Kim: So, the larger school bus would not be able to make that turn? They would have to drop them off at the street?

Ms. McClure: Presently, the way that it's designed.

Vice Chair Kim: Understood. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I have just a couple of quick questions. You mentioned accreditation, is that AZA, is what you're talking about?

Mr. Aikin: It's both AZA (Association of Zoos and Aquariums) as well as (Crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: Are you currently...(Crosstalk)

Mr. Aikin: ...the American (Inaudible).

Board Member Gooyer: ... Do you currently have the accreditation or...

Mr. Aikin: We currently do not have accreditation from either.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok. Also, for the architect I guess, the netting, is that going to be a metal mesh or something else?

Mr. McClure: It's a stainless-steel mesh.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Good Morning. This is a question for Staff regarding the Historical Classification of the site, is what I read in the report; that the entire site is considered a Category 1 Resource in town because of the Lucie Stern Center but the entire site. Are we expected to be treating it that way?

Ms. French: Well, it's one of these things. I mean, it's 27-acres. The fire station is on the site and it's not – it's been considered and studies as not historic so there are building – many buildings on the site – I had the list earlier – only two of those basically, were called out. I think the Lucie Stern Complex which is a number of buildings really and that would be—the library – the children's library. The Girl Scout House,

I'm assuming it is historic because it's – so, we're treating it as if we need to look at Secretary of Interior Standards with respect to the project and its relationship with the existing building there, the Girl Scout House. Even though there has not been a historic resource evaluation prepared on that building.

Board Member Baltay: This brings up something that I'd like us as a Board to be thinking about more which is how we're interacting with the Historic Resources Board, who should be I would think, giving us important input as to be treating a new building on a Category 1 historic site, even when we all agree that the building itself is not. How is staff going to help us facilitate that?

Ms. French: We are going to the HRB next week. They are also going to see this project and weigh in and give us their thoughts. Then, of course, when the formal project comes back, you will see a report of minutes of their discussion. Staff can also help with that. As far as the environmental document goes, there'll be a discussion in the cultural resources section of that report. It's a tricky thing. It's a very large site—City site. You know, this happened with Avenidas site as well, as you remember. It's on a City parcel that includes a park and a parking lot and an older building; it's a very large parcel because the City doesn't have separate lines – between the different uses.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, so, I think we can move onto Board Member comments. Peter, why don't you just continue?

Board Member Baltay: Sure, thank you. I've quite a few things. I've tried to break them up into four general categories. First of all, it is a very exciting project and I'm delighted to see that the zoo is going to be able to upgrade their building. I did go on a tour through the inside and it's been a few years since I've taken my own children to that zoo and it's just a wonderful thing to see the kids so excited, consistently over the past 25-years, in my experience. I think the Loose in the Zoo concept is wonderful. It's really nicely put together. It seems like it's going to be great. Ok, that said, I have some concerns about the site planning. I think that the building doesn't really have a front. There's no entrance, there's no presence. The way you drive through the parking lot conceals it even more. Even now, the zoo is a little bit hidden away unless you know what's there. You have to sort of rely on signage but now, at least, there's some sort of an entrance off of Middlefield; a large stroller pathway in. In my experience, just the other day, watching quite a few parents are pushing their children up that path from Middlefield. To me, that points out that the building really needs to have some presence on the main street, not just on a parking lot and the way it's been designed now, even removing one of the entrances so, it's farther from the museum; feels to me it's more like intended to be a traffic engineers attempt at mitigating cut through traffic rather than an architectural or civic attempt to create a building that's going to be for the next 100-years a presence on Middlefield Avenue. I just really had an issue with how the parking lot has been reconfigured and how it sorts of forces you not to have an entrance to the building and I think that could be thought through more. I'm also concerned about how you have service drop off and a bus drop-off that was pointed out, on Middlefield Road. Anybody in town knows that that stretch of Middlefield is about the worst for traffic especially, late in the afternoon; especially, when Walter Hayes is letting out. The idea of a service bus delivering some – I mean a service truck deliver something to the museum, taking up a lane of traffic right there, right next to the entrance to the school with the parents frantically trying to get their kids, just doesn't work for me. I can fully appreciate how complex the site is. It's devilishly difficult to find a way to accommodate those needs, but block a very narrow road right next to a busy school doesn't strike me as a good way to do it. The same things I think applies to Kyu's question regarding the school bus drop off. Again, that's so much better done somehow on the site. As a matter of fact, I can imagine a bus just going all the way around the back side of this and try to come in that way, just to be able to stop so they're not blocking the traffic. It's a really busy, tight street right there and I just don't think that works very well. My second set of comments have to do with the overall context of the site and I think the building is really not respecting or looking to the Lucie Stern Center or the Girl Scout building, in a very respectful way. I can fully understand that we don't want to replicate one of those old buildings but it seems to me that it is a historic site, I think, not just the Lucie Stern Center but the whole place and I'll come back to that in the design but that's why I think that it will be important.

The context of this site is a historic site in town and the building needs to go back to that. That said, I think that the basic design of the building – my third, sort of approach here – is one of perhaps you should consider having an entrance of some kind off of Middlefield, sort of into the dawn courtyard as well as an entrance off the parking area; sort of what you have now. Rather than having just service functions along Middlefield Avenue. I think that decision to put the service functions there, sort of dooms the building not to have civic presents on Middlefield Avenue; which is unfortunate. It may well be that the only way to accomplish that would be to put some service facilities on the second floor or since that would be difficult, underground but we're trying to build buildings to last – I've said this before – you know looking for 100-year life span here for town and this doesn't quite feel like we've taken that broadened approach. I question when I look at the floor plan of the building that there is an official lot of space that seems to be given up services offices; the classrooms. Very few spaces to exhibits and I grant that we're not making plans for the program for the museum and you guys know full well what you need. That said, it just seems to me to be a shame to have offices and classrooms along Middlefield Avenue rather than something more civic, more of a presence. Again, just the fundamental floor plan of it and the way it's laid out, I find problematic and that's driving some unfortunate things. Then lastly, I don't know how to put this nicely but the character of this building is one of a corporate office center. I'd like to read from the Staff report the historic report written by Page and Turnbull. The ideology behind Children's museum was not just to educate children but to inspire them with an institute that they felt was created for them. A building for children; I don't think anyone can look at this and say this looks like a building for children. It looks like a modern, contemporary, tech start-up building. Some interesting lines and heavy mass along the street but boy, it doesn't look like it's for kids. It doesn't have any of the whimsical sense about it, anything about a scale that the old building has. When I look at the Lucie Stern Center, because I think that we should be looking back at historical context there, that has a very strong roof form. It also has very simple, imaginative angled forms like the chimney that you see as you drive by. It also has a very consistent unified architectural theme. I don't see any of those characteristics on this building and I think it really needs to have things like that. It needs to have a roof. It needs to have some consistency throughout its architecture. Ok, so, I think the site planning needs some work. I think the context needs to be respected. The interior floor plan layout is just not working and then, the overall character of the building is not appropriate. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree completely with my fellow Board Member. I was here when we went through this the first time and the sort of, common denominator at that point, looks like any small, tilt up office space that you could find in the peninsula. I mean, the most child-friendly or imaginative thing is the sign outside. Once you get past the sign, it's a bland box. I mean, it – and I agree, somewhere in the paperwork it says we don't have to – what's the term? Basically, fit the context of the site or whatever but this is just placing – basically, ignores the entire buildings around it and the buildings around it are also something that has been there for a while; their historic. I mean, it doesn't seem like any interest was taken to even come up with a – I don't know, a modern version of that or something. Again, I agree with Peter that it doesn't need to be a copy with a stucco sides and a tile roof but still, something needs to be done to at least make somebody think that this thing wasn't designed somewhere in a vacuum and then placed on the site. Looking through the elevations, they're just not very exciting. I agree also that the dropping off on Middlefield in that location is a horrible idea. I mean, that's always busy, that section and so, I don't think that's a very good idea. Other than that, I mean I love the children's area and what you're proposing. I was very involved with doing a lot of work up at Coyote Point, also the children's museum up there and so, I understand the concept. It's just that this is not a children friendly environment. I mean, usually, an architect, when they do a museum. It's sort of the one chance they get to get out of the box – work out of the box a little bit and come up with something playful or whatever and this is even designed to be children's museum and you're not taking advantage of it. I think that's it for me.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back with the revised project. I think some of the concerns with the previous presentation was that the scale of the building, it being two-stories was perhaps something to be rethought but I think this one-story design and especially, this section that you've shown showing the single story, massing the museum towards Middlefield and across the street to the residences does show that you're trying to keep those things in mind. Having said that, I think that the building – part of the beauty of the existing museum and zoo is that from Middlefield, you can't even tell that the building is there. You almost think that it's another house that you're passing and I think that's well shown in some of the existing site pictures. I think more of that has to come back into the proposed project so that, you know, it's not simple a box. There are some roof forms or there are some other things that you're doing to break up the building and to make it feel much more of a pedestrian scale and even from an auto scale. I think currently as you pass the proposed building down Middlefield but I don't think it's really going to catch your eye at all. It's just a long mass and I think that also leads into some of the previous comments that there needs to be a child's scale to this building and currently, I don't see that. I think if you were to take off the sign that you have proposed on the building and replace it with, indoor golf course and batting cage, you might think that that's what the building is. Right now, the building doesn't really say anything from an architectural standpoint that it's a children's zoo and museum. I think that there have been some attempts at trying to make the building more playful. Whether it's the circular windows and some of the other circular elements that you've attached to the building but I think more of that has to come into play. I have some concerns about the proposed parking plan. While I do agree that it provides a much better flow than what's currently there. I think the lack of buffer against the Girl Scout building is something that will possibly come back up after an analysis by the Historic Resources Board and I fear that that's going to change the parking layout in a way that's detrimental. I also wanted to make a comment about the – I guess just to reiterate the entry. Maybe – I understand that this – a lot of this is problematic based and it's pretty evident to me that that was kind of the design approach but I think, even if we have to keep some of those things and keeping in mind that cost has been a driving force to reduce the scale of the structure. I think the entry is really the focal point at which there has to be some kind of scale showing that this is a welcoming environment. That this is a child's museum and zoo and I think a start has been made but there needs to be some refinement to that. Overall, I'm very excited about the project moving forward and having a small child myself and having gone to the junior museum and zoo, even as a child myself. I think it's long overdue that this facility gets an upgrade and I look forward to the progression of the design and I'm very excited overall. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for the presentation and thank you for Staff for the helpful slides at the beginning of the presentation. I wasn't able to look, to download or stream the ARB review in 2015. I was able to listen to and watch the City Council hearing and I am distressed that we didn't get a visit from the Eagle but maybe at a later date. Unlike my colleagues up here, I did not either take my child to the zoo – this particular museum and zoo or go there as a child myself but I certainly have been there in the last 18-years since I moved here and it's a fascinating place and thank you for the very – thank you to Page and Turnbull for the really interesting discussion of the history of the children's museums and zoos. Clearly, you're proposing quite a different project then it's current use. I was there yesterday when the bad weather was really making it a drop-in child care resource. Where you bring your own child care person with you and that kind of casual use may cease with your new model. I'm not sure. Let me say first, that one of the things that make this complicated is that we really have two projects and two funders. You know, this is heroic fundraising for the Junior Museum and Zoo itself. I think that Council Member Kniss mentioned that this is probably – since the era of Lucie Stern who was a – Levi Strauss eras, we haven't seen this level of Community and highly focused generosity towards the City's cultural resources; almost all of which depended on private resources. Having said that, in addition to the zoo and museum, we've got this parking lot reconfiguration; I share my colleague's belief that this is not adequate. We don't have adequate circulation for buses. We don't have adequate accommodation for loading. I think it's sort of ingenious to run the equipment back along the side, over to the zoo support building but I don't – having been stuck on Middlefield this morning which I realize is not an hour for deliveries or that the zoo is open. I'm reminded again that there isn't room for us to do this. I also know that you've got a transportation demand management program under way and I don't think -- this

is a case where I think we really need to see that when we're reviewing the document, not to hear that it will happen later. This is a tight site. It's a public site. It's much loved and much used. It's right in the middle of a residential development and we need to see that now. One of the things that concerns me is as it's presented to us, this design still seems to privilege those few cars that actually can get on site. I don't see sufficient encouragement of enticement really, to arrive by shuttle, to arrive by bus, to arrive on foot, to arrive in my stroller. I think that needs much more – putting that first. That's one issue. The second one is that I think we need a better study of the Lou Henry Hoover House. You can't decide whether you're adequately treating a historic resource unless you know what makes it historic and what the key features are. You need a study of that building. We know we have an important local architect. We know it's been moved, which certainly wasn't unusual in the history of such buildings. We know it's been expanded but we need to know, where it's from? What's it for? How does it work? There's a long tradition – I mean, Lou Henry Hoover was a friend of Juliette Gordon Low, you know, a name sacred to all ex-girl scouts and troop leaders and the tradition of scout houses goes back to the British. Baden-Powell, his British movement originally, for boys and a lot of it was sort of modest buildings and sort of slightly wooded spots. Now, apparently, we didn't have that. Apparently, we were right up front on Meville, was it? Then, displace for the Boy Scouts, not that I have a chip on my shoulder but I do. I need to know a lot more about this building and how it's used and how it's evolved to know whether we are doing justice to it as both -- I think our values and the law requires. Secondly, -- oh, and so it concerns me that we've got asphalt laying at their front door now and it may be that when I see what it really looks like, that won't be the impression. That their focus is all on the back, that it's fine but I don't have the evidence that would let me come to that conclusion. Circulation, Lou Henry Hoover House and then, my other – I can hardly wait to go to the zoo. It looks fabulous and I think it will be a great amenity for the park as well. As you see things fluttering by and the question of – we don't have to make the decision on park improvement ordinances and their possible subjection to referenda but it certainly seems to me that zoo users are park users so, at least we don't have that problem. Lou Henry Hoover House is not in the park, right? It's excluded. Not that the Girl Scouts ever engaged in behavior that would have gotten them thrown off public land. This – I don't think we need to think about the entire parcel of land. I don't think the parcel of land – it's what's relevant to our Committee, our Commission. What our Board is looking at is this building in context and we have to make a series of findings and one of them is, is that it preserves and respects the historic character including resources of the area when relevant. It provides harmonious transitions to adjacent land uses and land use designations. Basically, this building is not only wonderful in itself but it doesn't diminish the other buildings around there and I can't make that finding at the moment via the Lucie Stern Center or the residential uses across the street. I may be persuaded on the residential uses when I understand better what faces Middlefield, how it works with landscaping and the bus drop off is moved but it's going to take design changes, I believe, to properly respect and resonate with the Lucie Stern Complex, which has a very clear design philosophy and execution. I had a hard time, as a late person understanding the choice of materials and colors. As it happens, we have two projects today which are rebuilds in the Stanford Research Park and they use those materials and colors but I do not find them on the existing site and I do not find them in the neighborhood which has an oddly strong and unified character for Palo Alto. I couldn't make those findings at present. I agree with my colleagues that this building should look like it's built in the 21st century. It should look like it's for children, which it does not to me and it's respectful of them, their scale and their interests and that it acknowledges that a previous great philanthropist gave us buildings that come across this shared parking thing. I would also think that in looking at the redesign of this circulation plan, we should consider seriously whether if we are in some cases – and I have no idea – moving around trees that could be removed or replaced. Some trees are definitely sacred but not all are. I just think in order to do what you need to do on this site, you may need to cast a colder eye on them than we sometimes do. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I think I had more – I think my take on the project had a more positive reaction to all of the layout, and all the exhibit designs that have been shown. I think that all looks like well thought out. Then, really, what I was struggling with on my take on it was that the architecture on the outside was sort of missing a big idea that sort of holds everything together. It seems like there were some key constraints that you had to deal with like the existing trees and everything and I think that was all well resolved but I still think there's an architectural idea that's beyond that. That's missing and so,

whether – I guess the question is in what – where do you go from here? It seems like there are two – there are a fair bit of concerns with the existing context, the (Inaudible) buildings and I think there's also concern that there's – that it's actually not really that child-friendly and I think I agree with those two comments. I really don't know where you go and how you put that all together but I think that's the architects – that is the architect's challenge and I think you guys – I've seen your work. You guys are up to it. I think there've been a number of projects, recently, I think more than just the Avenidas center but also 429 University, where ARB and HRB are not in agreement about what is a new – what is a comparable new building in a historic context. It's an unusual topic. I think I will try to find some other examples that other Cities have done or possibly – maybe tap Page and Turnbull and also there are a couple other historic – really good historic consultants in San Francisco, who might have better ideas for us since we seem to be struggling at this and maybe we can do a – if we have a retreat, maybe we can do something with the HRB so that we can sort of be in more agreement about how to put a new building in a historic context. So, that's all I have to say on this. I don't disagree with the comments that have been made by other Board Members. I was wondering, Brent, do you have any follow-ups for us? No? Yes, Peter.

Board Member Baltay: If I could, through the Chair, the question Wynne Furth brought up about the trees, I think is important. It seems to me that the building has been designed about the Dawn Redwood, a large Poplar and I can see in the parking lot that there is a cluster of trees that might be limiting the parking. We have Dave Docker, the City's arborist in the audience. Is it permissible to get an opinion from the City on that stuff? The validity of the importance of the trees; I'm just seeing a...

Chair Lew: I think we talked about this a little bit at the first hearing but yes. Ok, excellent. Dave?

Board Member Baltay: The idea is that if for example, the Dawn Redwood were not so critically important, I should think as the architect, that would free you up to make a lot of other changes that might affect what we're doing and it's a tight site.

Chair Lew: Welcome, Dave.

Mr. Dave Docker: Thank you very much for asking. The specific question was again? If you could repeat, thank you.

Board Member Baltay: It seems to me that the building has been designed around preserving the Dawn Redwood in the entry courtyard. To a lesser extent, a large Poplar tree next to the Loose in the Zoo area and then I can see in the parking area where you drive in, there is a cluster of current trees, existing. I guess the question is really, is it something that the architect could consider removing; some, one, all of those trees, if it greatly enhanced the overall project?

Ms. French: I'm just going to jump in while Dave has a chance to look at the plan again. He has seen them but just to correct the species, it's a Pecan tree, not a Poplar...

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Ms. French: ... that second – the largest tree and then the Dawn Redwood and I'll just say, from a CEQA standpoint, to Member Furth's earlier comment, this is not a CEQA impact because Pecan trees and Dawn Redwood trees are not listed as protected trees in the City's ordinances. Oaks and Redwoods are the protected trees so, to the extent that they provide a visual resource in CEQA terms that, we can address in various ways including removal of the trees and replacement with large trees. So, I'll just give that caveat and then Dave can weigh in from an arborist standpoint.

Mr. Docker: Thank you, Ms. French; that was an excellent tear off into my answer here. It's well within the Architectural Review Board to purview – to direct anything that relates to aesthetic resources, which would be any non-protected trees as far as the ordinance goes, is under your purview and discretion to remove or not at your – applying your values. We have personally identified several elements on this site

as pretty darn historic and important that are not protected by the tree ordinance and that is the Pecan, the whole Oak Grove area that is probably this area of discussion, is very, very important and (Inaudible) to the whole Lucie Stern experience area. The Pecan, the Dawn Redwood and some of the existing frontage trees are very, very important to the character, I think, of the whole streetscape and Lucie Stern experience there. Having said that, there's several on the tree inventory, several smaller things in the planting areas. I think the parking can be reconfigured maybe and still maintain some of the really critical large tree elements that are really defining the whole building as we know it but I think unless the whole parcel was really relooked at with inclusive and comprehensive way, I think this is a pretty good direction that they've got it going personally and maintaining some of these other resources that are kind of in a grey area, a discretionary – we call them designated trees. They're designated for a reason because they're so prominent, so visual, so historic or have some reason to be unusually important. The Pecan is probably the largest Pecan we have in all of Palo Alto. Who planted it and when I have no idea but it's one of the biggest and best. Hope that answers your question. Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, any follow-ups? Yes, thank you.

Mr. Aikin: I just wanted to also point out the utility corridor -- the Pecan Tree sits on top of a utility corridor that prevents us from building on that site anyway. We need to respect about a 25-foot wide easement through there.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. I think that wraps up this item. We'll move on and we look forward to seeing it come to us as an application.

Board Member Furth: I just had one more comment which is, we're also looking at two funding sources here because the reconfigured parking lot is basically a City project and I certainly wasn't intending to tangle with either the Dawn Redwood or the Pecan Tree.



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING EXCERPT MINUTES: January 26th, 2016

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

Present: Chair Martin Bernstein; Vice Chair Margaret Wimmer; Board Members David Bower, Beth Bunnenberg, Patricia Di Cicco, Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen

Study Session

- 3. 1451 Middlefield Road [16PLN-00217]: Request for Preliminary Review of a 14,790 sf replacement building for an expanded Children's Museum and Zoo and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lots. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is being prepared. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF)**

Chair Bernstein: Alright, that brings us then to our next item on our agenda which is a study session. I'll read it: 1451 Middlefield Road. Request for Preliminary Review of a 14,790 sf – Oh. You are correct.

Ms. French: The CLG report.

Chair Bernstein: Yes, thank you Board Member Bower for reminding me of that.

[Move back up to City Official Reports]

[Continued Study Session]

Chair Bernstein: Ok, next, study session. 1451 Middlefield Road, Request for preliminary review of a 14,790 sf replacement building for an expanded Children's Museum and Zoo and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lots. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is being prepared. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF). Shall the Chief Planning Official have a report for us?

Ms. French: Yes. First of all, I just this morning sent to you the Architectural Review Board minutes transcript from last Thursday's meeting. I don't expect that anyone has opened that email up. I just got them this morning; do, apologies for that. I do have a summary of what transpired last week. Also, I had last week – or maybe it was Saturday, sent you a Power Point – this PowerPoint but I have some additional photos that will be fun for you, I think. I'll just give a general overview of the context and then I'll let John Aikin, who is the Director of the Zoo and Children's Museum to go more into detail and of course, the architect is here. Also, I believe in the audience we have John Rusch of Page and Turnbull, who will be supporting us in our efforts on this project. With no further ado, there is – on the screen, the context aerial for the site, which includes the museum and zoo and the parking lots that go between the zoo and the Lucie Stern Center and the Girl Scout House; also, known as the Lou Henry Hoover House. Here is the present facade, currently on Middlefield, of a residential kind of quality and it's facing residential homes across the street. This is a larger context map showing the Girl Scout House here, the Hayes School – elementary school. Here's the neighborhood all along here and the Lucie Stern Center. Ok. Here I found a photo, an aerial, from 1937. It's fun because it's showing the Lucie Stern Center. This might be under construction over here, I'm not sure. With the theater – the adult theater, the Children's

Theater and you can see, just at the tip of this, the Girl Scout House -- which was originally, potentially -- maybe -- you know, this is to be explored but first placed in alignment this way or perhaps, this was prior to an add-on. All of this research has not been done. A summary search has been done to see what the qualities were of that potential historic resource. It's not listed on a -- specifically, with the Lucie Stern Center. It has a different address. Here we have just a listing of all of the addresses on the property. This is the Hayes school, this is the fire station that recently -- you all saw and the pool over here on this side. Really, the immediate site area is the Lucie Stern Center, the parking lot, the zoo and the Girl Scout House. This is kind of the area we're focused on. Here are some images of the Lucie Stern Center and here's an image of the library that came after the Lucie Stern Center; Children's Library. Here's an image of the Girl Scout House and Lou Henry Hoover was the first lady of course, who was very much involved in the Girl Scouts and so, this has a quality of interested, culturally, that seems like it would rise to the level of National but you know, it hasn't been studied in an evaluation to date. There's a little fountain outside here that is dedicated to a former Boy Scout Master so, maybe it belongs on the other side of the campus here. The playground behind the Scout House is shown here. Then, here's the parking lot that would be a part of this project. So, the parking lot is actually a City capital project; the parking lot improvements. The Junior Museum and Zoo project is a collaboration between the friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo and the City. Again, here is the existing footprint with the existing parking lot layout. Diagonal spaces here and then kind of a barrier here and then, here is the proposed footprint as in the current plans; sort of a 'U' with this whole Loose in the Zoo and it's -- key to this project was, you know, preservation of the Dawn Redwood which is here and the Pecan which is very large. They are not protected trees in the sense of species that is called out in the ordinance but they've been there a while and they're of esthetic value. The proposal is to delete the driveway here and put landscaping and have just the one driveway that aligns with this street here or circulation through the property. The ARB discussed this last week and had some comments. They were concerned about the context and the missed opportunity for more child-friendly architecture and a child's scale. The fact that the materials and colors seemed to be more Research Park looking than, you know, borrowing from the materials found on the site. There was some concern about how transportation would be handled. There's a bus parking area that has been considered here and so, this is a busy street and there was some concern about that. Of course, the Girl Scout House was called out because of the proximity of the pavement that was proposed here, coming into what is now, kind of a landscaped area in front of the Girl Scout house. Those are the main points. I'll just now turn this over to [John Akin] to discuss the excitement about the proposal.

Mr. John Aikin: Good morning Chairman, Vice Chair and Board Members. [John Akin] Junior Museum and Zoo. The plan is to rebuild the facility to right size it for our current audience and that includes replacing the building with a larger building, replacing the zoo with a larger zoo but also, rebuilding the components so that we're accreditable by the American Alliance of Museums and the Associations of Zoos and Aquariums. The -- let me click to it -- I've got a button. The Zoo will be completely netted and the netting will be viewable from Rinconada Park especially, perhaps the parking lot too; although the building and the Pecan Tree will hide most of that view. The idea here is to not only, keep vandals and predators out but to be able to have some of the animals Loose in the Zoo so that children can explore the zoo and find animals where ever they might encounter them in nature. We are replacing many of the exhibits that we have for our animal collection today which are mostly rescued animals, pets, and wildlife that's been rescued but we are adding a Meerkat Exhibit and a substantial area for management of animals to make the Zoo really endure for the next 100-years; a long-term investment. Roll it? There we go. It's a very tight site. One of our goals is to enhance parking because parking seems to be an issue everywhere and thereby enlarging the parking lot but also, connecting all of the other pieces of the park to the Junior Museum and Zoo. So, pathways will connect the Girl Scout House and Rinconada Park and to Lucie Stern Center, bicycle pathways to Middlefield and through the park as well. There are a number of constraints on the site but I think I'll let the architects talk about that as they laid this out. Let me introduce Bret McClure of Cody Anderson Wasney.

Ms. French: Let me just finalize that by saying the next steps would be -- because we do not have a formal application for architectural review and of the course the HRB would be involved in the next stage as well; providing recommendations to the Director, who's the decision maker in this process. The ARB is

not actually the decision maker. Then, we have an initial study that would be prepared, is being studied right now and final action, there's a Phase 2 that the architect will describe. Let me get out of this now.

Chair Bernstein: Welcome.

Mr. Bret McClure: Thanks. One second. How do I go full screen? I can't read it. There we go. Hi, there, Brent McClure with Cody Anderson Wasney Architects. I want to reiterate – follow on some of the things and the key points that Amy and [John] both highlighted about the project and the site. She's alright kind of touched on some of the things. First is the existing site plan. You know, we've got the two existing driveways that enter in; one closer to Lucie Stern and one imminently adjacent to the Museum with diagonal parking that kind of rounds about and there's this separate parking area that's over here; the landscape buffer zone in front of the Girl Scout Building. This is the outline of the existing Museum and then the zone that is – encloses the existing Zoo right now and the little circles representing of the variety of trees. The green line represents the park boundary. As Amy mentioned, what is part of our design, is we are looking at having a building that stays completely out of the park. Part of our charge was to maintain the same number of parking stalls and ideally, increase the number of parking. Build around the Dawn Redwood, which is a species of tree that dates back to the Jurassic Era so, there is a tremendous amount of rich science opportunities with this tree. This species of this tree it's self doesn't go back to the Jurassic era. There's the Pecan Tree up in the front as well and so, as part of the design, we are connection off of Middlefield. Having some pathways that link up and around and then kind of having a gateway into Rinconada Park. Part of the City's Master Plan for the park is to have connecting pathways that then link Lucie Stern complex and then into the park. We're trying to fit this building in and around sort of a variety of contextual issues. The – part of the parking also allows for drop-off. It was – there is drop-off along the front however, there's dedicated bus drop-off as well that kind of comes in so, that was something that was an oversight at last week's ARB session. The Zoo zone is all outdoors space, enclosed by the netting along with the Zoo support. The blue represents really, what the new structure is. As I mentioned, we're kind of threading the needle with the area that we have to work with. It's probably one of the most complicated sites I've worked on in my career. As far as the amount of space and all of the things that we're trying to fit and preserve – you can see the boundary of the parking, the park boundary and then the other piece that we're working about is that there's an existing utility corridor that runs through. So, we've got City utilities that we're having to not build around. We didn't investigate relocating those but it was infeasible from a budget stand point. This project is also 100% donor funded by the friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo so, there's been – it's really been a labor of love over the last 4-years as they looked to raise close to 25 million dollars to solely fund this project. The parking lot, as – I just want to highlight too, is that there's a landscape zone that's in front of the Girl Scout building and then as part of the City's design that we were working with them on was to expand parking and then now, the parking edge in this current state – which I'm sure you'll want to talk about a little bit – is approximately 15-feet off of the edge of the Girl Scout building. Jumping ahead to the plan. This is a diagram – we can show plans if you have questions about it but really, I think, this kind of sums up how the building is assembled. There's the Dawn Redwood tree here. We're using that outdoor space as the entrance court yard for ticketing and then that front piece is the exhibit hall that links up into the Loose in the Zoo space. The building zones the front of Walter Hayes and Middlefield is sort of the back of the house support. There's such a shortage of Zoo support rooms for animal care and whatnot that [John] mentioned that we need to put into this project to get accreditation. Then, another piece that most people don't know about is the educational component of this program. They do huge amounts of classroom and outreach to the school so that would be the blue spaces off the sides of the building. Here's an image of an Ariel perspective kind of showing our design concepts as it stands. We've tried to design this as somewhat of a court yard building with the Dawn Redwood sort of being this focus and center pieces. A portico and gateway that allows you then to enter into this court yard and then, using the building to try and resolve the intersecting geometries of the two City grids. This mass over here – this low-slung mass is the education and Zoo support building, that then links and wraps around the back and then this taller mass at the front with this bump out piece, forms sort of the public display and the exhibit space. Some of the finishes that we're proposing today is – we're mindful of budget and trying to use splash and different things in mindful ways. The low building would be sort of a cement plaster. There are some Lithocrete walls, which is like an exposed sand stone looking concrete and then,

intersecting this kind of low, climbable walls and little pops of color with this blue at the entrance portico and then this blue canopy that's part of the enclosed zone back around the Pecan Tree. With this being a new building on existing site, I think the one Standard from the Secretary of Interior Standards to do of – discussion would be #9 about differentiation and compatibility. How does that fit with a new building on existing site that is adjacent to other historic structures? In our – you know, we've kind of gone back and forth with this at some degree – we kind of welcome the Boards input as well. Is that we're kind of looking at finish, at some degree as far as the color of the Stucco and the texture as it relates to the Lucie Stern complex. We're using some wood elements kind of to echo some of the Girl Scout building and then different – and then also, trying to kind of look as a court yard configuration and arrangements to start to echo a little bit of it. We don't have gabled roofs. We're proposing some parapet forms and some flat roofs to kind of echo and suggest, you know, more modern construction of this time as well as having some fun elements and some pops of color. Here's a quick section that shows, sort of the heights as it relates to the Girl Scout building and I think this gives you a sense to the aspect ratio of where that outdoor space in the Zoo stops and how it relates to the Girl Scout building. Then some of the heights as it relates to the neighborhood. To kind of quickly go through some of the elevations; there's a perspective of the top and then a rendered elevation at the bottom. This would be the view off of Walter Hayes. Trying to take a quite approach just to how it's seen from the street and then along the street, kind of having the landscape blend in so that what you really see is when you come around the corner and into the complex, you know, you've got this gate way window display so that you can see some of the exhibits from the outside; a wall for kids to climb on and other areas of exploration and then an entrance into the court yard. [John] already kind of touched on the Zoo but it's interactive and connects with the museum. There're pathways that wrap around, you know, things to climb on, animals are on display and then the Zoo support space in the back, which is more for service and kind of out of view and whatnot. Here's an enlarged section and view of an early concept and illustration of what it might look like in the Zoo itself. Just a diagram we highlight – probably some discussion on how the parking – you might want to adjust around the Girl Scout building and as well as, you know, the street approach off of Middlefield. That was really, I think, a key point from the ARB. I think that kind of concludes the points I wanted to touch and turn it back over to the Board.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. At this point – thank you so much. Does anyone have questions for the applicant or Staff? Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: Amy and [John], can you clarify who's developing the parking lot? That's not going to be the Junior Museum, correct?

Mr. Aikin: We're in the process right now. The friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo have committed to raising the funds and building the Museum itself. The parking lot needs to be reconfigured and they presented a design for that and the City and the friends of the Junior Museum are in negotiation right now about who's going to pay for the remodel of the parking lot.

Board Member Bower: I notice in the plans that there is a proposal – I think is the best way to put it – that the barrier now between – I guess Hopkins or no, that's Rinconada, that runs on the backside of the park?

Ms. French: Hopkins.

Board Member Bower: Hopkins and Middlefield, which is current – which was installed to keep cut through traffic from moving from Middlefield into the neighborhoods. I think that's being removed – the barrier would be removed. Is that, right?

Mr. Aikin: True. It's being removed but it's being replaced with a large hump, like the one in front of the Art Center. Between the Rinconada Library and the Art Center, to provide a broad pedestrian walkway that connects Rinconada Park to the Lucie Stern Center. It's also relatively – the mains pathway is circuitous so, we're hoping to try and cut down on cut-throughs.

Board Member Bower: Right, ok. I wonder also if the age of the Girl Scout House is known. Do you know when that was built?

Ms. French: It was in the report but it pre-dates the – the original home was relocated to the current site and it was built – designed by Birge Clark and built prior to Lucie Stern Center. It was – the research we had done, just by Staff at the Cubberley Center, was that it was relocated from near Melville over to Hopkins and kind of the Boy Scout House area replaced – came to that...

Board Member Bower: Right

Ms. French: ...former location.

Board Member Bower: Prior to Lucie Stern?

Ms. French: (Crosstalk) Prior to the design and build of Lucie Stern.

Board Member Bower: So, it's the oldest building in that ...

Ms. French: Yes, in the whole area.

Board Member Bower: Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: Any other questions for the Staff? Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I was wondering because the site is so small and so limiting, what's your flexibility on height? Do you have to stay at a single-story level? I mean, is there possibility – I know you're right on Middlefield but is there's a possibility of you having some of those facilities offices may be on an upper level so you can have public space on the lower level?

Mr. McClure: This project has been a labor of love for the last – I think we're going on 5-years now and we're still at entitlements and we've – the design that is before you are one that their confident and I think our team is confident that it can be constructed to meet their program for their budget. We explored – we've had an earlier version that is prior to this that had two-story designs. We've explored basements. We've kind of exhausted, I think all possible aspects of this and so, really, it's sort of pushing up against either park boundary or parking edge and determining kind of what can give and not at this point. Yes, we've explored it but I think the one-story solution is sort of the direction of the client at this point.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Yes. Strictly by reason of history not by financial, I should disclose that some 40-years ago, I was hired to teach outreach classes for the Junior Museum and then at times, did substitute for [Dale Bruce] in teaching art right there in the Junior Museum. That this -- and of course my children attended many classes there. I was concerned to hear that you had discarded a gable roof as a possibility and would like to suggest thinking about the very steep gable roof which would repeat gabled roof that is across the street. You show boxes, they're gabled rooves across the street. Lucie Stern is gabled roof but a gabled roof or a very steep pitch could be used as a teaching tool to say that Palo Alto is very unusual in that it goes all the way from sea level up through different climate zones, to the hills that are in Foothill Park. That – to say that for instance, the indigenous people right up to now have enjoyed this span and the shells down on the beach where – had many uses to the people and food support and the acorns up in Foothills park where used on grinding stones. So, that – it would sad to miss a chance to have this kind of thing and a gable roof –steep gable would not be that – in fact, would call attention to the building from Middlefield. You have your wonderful sign and you have your fanciful playground that does respond to children. What about one more item?

Chair Bernstein: Ok, thank you. Any other questions for the applicant or Staff? Board Member Makinen.
Board Member Makinen: I think read in the report that the decision or the preparation was that the site was not historic, it had lost integrity. Is that correct?

Ms. French: There was a Historic Resources Evaluation actually, two. One back in 2004 and another one more recently to respond to the current proposal and yes, it was determined by that study that it was – while culturally significant, the building itself had gone through many variations...

Board Member Makinen: That was never brought before the HRB for concurrence or?

Ms. French: It's before you today. It's in your packet.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, it's in the packet but was it actually brought before the HRB?

Ms. French: It's before you today so no, it has not been brought before you. There's been no determination on this project because it's not a formal application.

Board Member Makinen: Ok.

Ms. French: It's all right for your comments.

Board Member Makinen: I will take that as an opinion right now. Is that correct? That's an opinion.

Ms. French: It's a historical – qualified professional opinion that was prepared after significant research and the preparer is here today. At least a representative of Page and Turnbull is here if you had a question.

Board Member Makinen: The point is I think it should be subject to a review by HRB; that decision. Maybe we don't concur with it.

Chair Bernstein: We'll discuss when it comes time for the HRB to discuss. We'll discuss all the things you're bringing up. That would be great. Board Member Di Cicco.

Board Member Di Cicco: I have a question. I'm kind of – the report was rather lengthy and I'm getting a little bit confused, shall I say. The original building is going to be demolished. Are any parts of that being retained or you're starting from scratch?

Mr. McClure: At the current state, no. That's correct.

Board Member Di Cicco: Pardon.

Mr. McClure: We're not preserving any aspects of the building.

Board Member Di Cicco: The original building as it stands right now, part of that building has the gabled roof and in part, two-stories so, that would be a consideration or not?

Mr. McClure: I think we could consider gable roofs. We're not opposed to it.

Board Member Di Cicco: It's hard – from the plans and such – it does look kind of industrial with just flat roofs and I would agree with – as Beth mentioned that it would be a – it might fit into the neighborhood a little better with the massing and the appearance of the building. That would be a possibility and it's going from – what is it? How many square feet are being – increased by 5,000-square feet?

Mr. McClure: We're adding approximately 5,000 – 6,000-square feet.

Board Member Di Cicco: Ok. Well, thank you. I just wanted to clarify it to myself.

Chair Bernstein: Before we go to members of the public, any other questions for the applicant or Staff? Yeah, we'll go to the public and then we can discuss. Do any Board Members have any other questions for applicant or Staff before we move to the public? Seeing none. I don't have any cards on this. If there are any members of the public that would like to speak on this, you can let yourself be known. I see none. OK, we can bring it back to the Board. Board Member Kohler, where you prepared to continue with your train of thought?

Board Member Kohler: I – looking at this, it's – I moved here in '54 and started 4th grade at Fairmeadow from New Jersey and I remember vaguely, going with my mom and dad to the Children's Museum there and being kind of overwhelmed. Vaguely, remembering thinking, you know, what a great place and then my kids went there; went there for classes. I have to admit, I haven't been in there for a little while. I think there was something – did the Historic Board Members – did we have to do something in there? They were doing an improvement or something?

Chair Bernstein: It was for the Lucie Stern Center. We looked at putting the utility box on the opposite side.

Board Member Kohler: Well, but I meant before that there was a – but I was – it was interesting the comments about why is the roof flat and that was sort of one of the things I was wondering about it. I kind of agree that it's – you look around, there are all the homes with – and it's felt a little out of place, on a park scene. It was more – just feels more industrial. So, we're just making comments or are we asking questions or what are we doing today?

Chair Bernstein: (Inaudible)

Board Member Kohler: No, I just was tending to agree with the comments about that maybe the roof shouldn't be flat because it kind of reminds me of the Industrial Park – Stanford Industrial Park. Because there are so many – even the school next door and it's – I sort of feel like – other than that, I mean it's an amazing layout and the access to the Zoo and everything is quite incredible. It's just the building seems to fall short of the rest of the result.

Chair Bernstein: I'm reading the ARB preliminary review comments and it seems to be addressing a similar kind of thing where it says, the architecture needs to address the context and purpose of the building and the building materials and colors should reflect the site, the neighborhood – your name again? I'm sorry.

Mr. McClure: Bret McClure.

Chair Bernstein: Bret, mentioned already about the – at least the color and some materials. For example, the Lucie Stern Center is white colored Stucco and they're proposing Stucco on some of the buildings. At least – you know, we're heading in that direction. Yeah, the roof forms, I agree with what Board Members have said so far is that the houses across the street and then also, the Lucie Stern Center itself. There's a gable roof system there so, that could add to more of the compatibility regarding the Secretary of Interior Standards. Other Board Members? Board Member Bower, you have your light on.

Board Member Bower: I'd like to say that – to start by saying, I think the – all of the site layout here, is an improvement. I should disclose, I went to the Junior Museum first, about 63-years ago, and I took my children there and I was there last month with my grandson and I was astounded at the number of people that use the facility. This is way overdue this remodel. I also noted that when I was there that the building, as it exists today, has no resemblance to what was built; at least from my memory. I think the analysis that this building has no historic fabric that we should be saving, it accurate. We can have that conversation again or at a different time but I was – so, let me move on to the design. I thought the use of the materials on the outside of the building is appropriately clever because it's picking up the wood from the Girl Scout House and the Stucco but I share with my other colleagues on the Board, a concern

about the fact that it looks like we have an industrial box and the gable – the tile roof on the Lucie Stern Center, for instance, has a softening effect. Even though tile is not soft but the appearance is softening and the fact that it does work with the neighborhood, which has gabled or sloped roofs and practically, every building surrounding this; I think is important. I like the entrance to the building because of that – it's very important having little kids running around, that there's a way to contain them and I thought that that archway was quite clever and it does a feature that Redwood Tree. I think this is a really nice compromise in a very hard design situation. My only other concern is the cut-through traffic on the parking lots. Which I have to say -- I'm guilty of -- when it was open because I live not too many blocks away from here and in our current traffic situation, it will only occur again, at the Art Center parking reconfiguration; that was done when the main library was remodeled. There is a kind of circuitous route from one parking area to the other and there are also ballads that can be raised and lowered. It's – that cut-off is very effective when there's a big group of people at the Art Center and it doesn't seem to be a problem on most other days but I would think, that if we're going to open that up, we ought to have some barrier that can be erected most permanently or raised and lowered so that on the really heavy traffic days, like the weekends, people can get in and out but I think weekdays, absolutely, do not want cars cutting through there. Those are my general comments.

Chair Bernstein: Bret, the drawing on page A1.1 says it's a fire access line so, can there be ballads in that or does that have to be accessible for a fire truck cut-through? Do you know?

Mr. McClure: Yes, it would have to be accessible for a fire truck to go through but there's a way to get around that. You can have a ballad that has a padlock on it that the fire truck could then, you know – it's like opening a gate.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, thanks for that. Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: In listening to the ARB – the tape of the ARB, I was interested and concerned that the bus parking appears to be out on Middlefield and there was real concern about what about both that congestion on Middlefield and letting children out so close to a major artery in our City. I was wondering whether you had considered any kind of possible tunnel or semi-tunnel to get kids in, without having them (Inaudible)...

Mr. McClure: One of the – I'm sorry if I can clarify. I don't think we had fully and properly clarified that comment with the ARB in the short time that we had to present the project. What we have is -- it's kind of a multi-layered aspect to this job. As part of the Master Plan for the park, I think the City is looking at establishing and reinforcing a bus stop zone on Middlefield, however, the way the parking lot is designed with the turning radiuses, if a school bus wants to pull into the site, they can do that and then drop off right in front of the Museum and Zoo.

Board Member Bunnenberg: That's very important. I also, very much feel that that modern Museum techniques do involve some things like time tunnels and this sort of thing and they seem to be fascinating to kids. Keep that as a possibility.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: Yeah, I was wondering if you could change the slide back to one of the exteriors front elevation so we can kind of take a second look at that. In my – I mean, I – my comments are very in kind of keeping with what the Board has already mentioned is that – I mean, I just feel like this is part of the Community Center. It's a part of – it's an extension of Lucie Stern and I would like to see some kind of a nod or response to the architecture of Lucie Stern but still make it of today. Which now things are becoming very modern, very sleek, very boxy. I think if you could balance that, it could be very exciting. It could be very interesting because this is – it's almost a little to streamline, to square, too boxy and you have this – the building that's closest to Middlefield, the one – and on your materials page, it's a cement plaster exterior which is kind of similar to what Lucie Stern has. I mean, maybe you could take a look at putting a gable roof over that and maybe put some Spanish roof tiles and maybe that's your

opportunity to pull a little bit of Lucie Stern over to this but still make it modern. Still, make it of today and exciting in that sense. I think about what – where that just has recently been done, is Palo Alto High School. I mean, Palo Alto High School has that Spanish/Colonial original buildings and then now, they have a new theater and gyms that's – I don't think that that's like a wow. I can see how they are trying to pull that – those elements into those new buildings and yes, they succeeded in doing that but it's that – I think you have an opportunity to pull those elements over and make those elements more correct but mix it with some modern lines. I think it's a great opportunity to do something really cool but I really do think that it needs to respond to Lucie Stern. It needs to feel like it's a part of that and this feels like it's trying to be something totally different and deny the fact that it's part of the Community Center. I think that would be my strongest opinion.

Chair Bernstein: I would share those comments too about the – if there was a way to introduce a gable or gables but still that – using the genius of the architect to keep it contemporary and also keep it subordinate to the dominant Category 1 Lucie Stern. I know your office is very capable of that. When I first saw the renderings, I was actually quite excited to see something very fresh. I'm there about once a week on that property and yeah, the existing building – it looks tired and it's time to do something different. I think something in the modern direction and a very contemporary direction as your illustrating and again, as other Board Members have mentioned, a nod to the gable. Keep it – not a replication of historicism but I think – yeah, I see that you agree. The other comment I had and thank you for bringing it up, on page A-1.1 site plan, shows new parking stalls within a few feet or inches to the existing Girl Scout building. Page A-1.1 – yeah. If there can be a – when you – as you proceed with your review process and refinements, to see if there's a proposal that doesn't have a car right next to that building there because again, it's not listed on the Historic Register yet but if it does go through a review, it's – because of its age and architect, its use in history, you'll probably get some level of historic designation I would imagine. Then – don't let those cars come so close. That would be my suggestion. Any other discussion. Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: I was looking at page Z-21 and I really like that, the mesh that goes over the top of it. We were in Hong Kong a few years ago, and there's an Avery in downtown Hong Kong that as a similar treatment and it's really quite effective. You can walk along little catwalks and walkways. I don't know if you're familiar with that but this kind of reminds me of it. I think that will be a very strong point but I do concern with the other comments about the form of the building. It would probably be more compatible if it was – did have some similarities to the Lucie Stern Center. It's kind of a boxy type look right now when you look at it. That's it.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Di Cicco.

Board Member Di Cicco: The Zoo looks like it's going to be amazing. Oh, I thought I had done that, sorry. The Zoo does look amazing. Is – how – is that being enlarged by in what size compared to the original?

Mr. McClure: It's increased in size by – I don't have my cheat sheet in front of me but by 5,000-square feet.

Board Member Di Cicco: It looks like it's going to be an amazing place for children. I know it's Phase 2 and Phase 1 hasn't actually occurred but the fact of putting in a tree house and – sounds also very amazing and I don't know anything children don't like better than tree houses. Where would that be in respect to the Zoo and what's in place and what tree has that been designated?

Mr. McClure: The Phase 2 – I'm going to jump – so, if we – I think the diagram is probably will help illustrate it best. If this is the building shape here, this 'U' shape that then rotates and then this is the Pecan Tree. You know this is an enclosed open air courtyard, that we're calling a Science Court Yard. This is internal to the complex and then opens up and you can go into the Zoo. The netting goes around this green zone. There will be a tree like structure out in the Zoo as part of Phase 1 but with Phase 2, what the plan is, is that there would be at the ground floor. We would add a small modest building – not part of this application today but to just sort of show, the sort of long-term plan is that there would be an

education classroom on the ground floor. Then, a Zoo exhibit space – initially there's been talk about a butterfly room, lots of really fun and you know, interesting ideas. That then could link up with a catwalk bridge -- such as Mr. Makinen was talking about from Hong Kong – it could then link up and connect with the tree fort. You know, one of the goals was to get this over and under experience so, when you're out with the animals, you know, you're up in the trees, you're down below and as we've looked at the constraints of the modern finances of this project. You know, some of those things have been moved to this Phase 2.

Board Member Di Cicco: Well, thank you.

Mr. McClure: Sure.

Board Member Di Cicco: Sounds amazing.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Kohler. Ok. Yeah, Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: One comment that I'd like to make about the exterior materials is I think about how this new building will relate to the buildings on the site. I think that this building really relates to the Lucie Stern Center more than the Girl Scout House. Girl Scout House is kind of screened by the trees and it's off in its corner. Obviously, extending the parking lot makes a difference but I think that really, the face of the Museum should reflect the materials and the style of Lucie Stern and maybe the wall that faces the Girl Scout House is the wood material that you've used. I'm not being critical of your architecture. Just suggesting that you might explore that.

Board Member Kohler: I have one final question. How is former Historic Resources Board Member [Monty Anderson] doing since he started his company and everything?

Mr. McClure: Monty Anderson is enjoying retirement or his next phase immensely up in – full time up in Cedar Ranch as the moment.

Board Member Kohler: At Cedar Ranch, I didn't know (Crosstalk)

Mr. McClure: Yeah. Well, pass it along.

Chair Bernstein: Alright, so this was a Study Session and does the applicant – do you have any questions for us? Good. (Inaudible) Ok, good. Alright. Any other items on this subject? Amy, anything else or [Mr. Akin], any comments?

Mr. Akin: One thing I wanted to point out about the parking lot challenge with the Girl Scout House. One of the reasons the parking lot was sort of shifted towards the Girl Scout is to actually give Lucie Stern a little bit more breath and put some landscape on that side. We kind of recognized that there was a little bit of a dilemma here, to respect one side of the lot or the other but we'll look at – take these comments and look at it again.

Chair Bernstein: Is there – Amy, is it appropriate for the HRB to request that a Historic Restructure Report be done on the Lou Henry Hoover Girl Scout building or does the Board even think that's necessary to do at this point?

Vice Chair Wimmer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Bunnberg: I would certainly favor that kind of thing. If we have to wait till our retreat to suggest it but I think that it is very overdue and one of these structures that are so easy to overlook when you're doing a City-wide survey as the Dames and Moore. I would strongly agree that this was a major step in women's rights movement, to bring in the Girl Scouts.

Chair Bernstein: The reason why I am asking this question if it's appropriate that this is done and soon, is that when we get the formal application for this project and if that parking structure – I mean if the parking spots are like very close to the historic building. The HRB may have a little stronger voice in its comment about not allowing parking to be – new parking to be so close to it. If we could have that – our position backed up by saying, hey, this is a significant historic structure. I think that could give a little bit more emphasis for the HRB's comment about the parking. Yeah, please, Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I'm mindful of the expense of a Historic Structure Report and since the applicant would probably have to bear that expense, that just takes money away from the project. If we want to have a Historic Report on the Hoover building, it seems to me, we don't need it for this project. We ought to have it – the City ought to have it but I don't want to burden the applicant with this. I mean, they don't have enough money probably, to do what they want to do and that just takes more away. I think we can make our determination about the appropriateness of the space between the Hoover House and the parking lot without that. I'm not discouraging the report to be done. I just don't want to – I don't think we have to have it for this application.

Board Member Kohler: I agree with David.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, right. No action on that. Ok. Right, anything else before we move onto the next agenda item? Alright, thank you very much. Yes, thank you. Thank you Mr. Aikin.

Project Site Plan

Hardcopies of project plans are provided to ARB Members.

The preliminary review plans presented to the ARB on January 19, 2017 are available to the public by visiting the Planning and Community Environmental Department on the 5th floor of City Hall at 250 Hamilton Avenue. The conceptual site plan for this study session will be available on the below webpage

Directions to review Project plans online:

1. Go to: <https://palalto.buildingeye.com/planning>
2. Search for "1451 Middlefield Road" and open record by clicking on the green dot
3. Review the record details and open the "more details" option
4. Use the "Records Info" drop down menu and select "Attachments"
5. Open the attachment named "Revised Site Plan JMZ"

DATE	March 3, 2017
PROJECT NAME	Palo Alto Junior Museum & Zoo
CAW PROJECT NO.	11011
SUBJECT	Project Summary and Update for ARB Study Session on March 16, 2017
DISTRIBUTION	Amy French, Architectural Review Board, City Staff
PREPARED BY	Sarah Vaccaro

Palo Alto Junior Museum & Zoo Project Update and Summary

CAW Architects and the Friends of the JMZ presented the Palo Alto Junior Museum & Zoo project for Preliminary Review at the January 19th ARB Meeting. The main comments we noted during this preliminary review were:

- The design character of the new JMZ should be more compatible with Lucie Stern Community Center and Lou Henry Hoover (Girl Scout) Building.
- The design should better integrate into the overall Rinconada Park / Lucie Stern city site. The design should read as one of several civic buildings within the larger site.
- The design should reflect a child-like whimsy, and include a “big-idea” that could reflect the mission of JMZ into the architecture.
- The design should better integrate bicycle and pedestrian access to the site from Middlefield and not solely focus on vehicle access to the site. The design should have a stronger presence along Middlefield.
- Create a safe parking lot with bus drop off and adequate landscape buffers between the buildings on the site and vehicles.

We are developing a revised design, which is still in progress, that attempts to balance the program, budget, and incorporate these comments from the ARB. Some of the key points are described below:

Site Organization and Circulation:

Our revised site plan, which is still in development with JMZ and City Staff, creates an axis connecting Middlefield to the JMZ entrance plaza to the Park. This pedestrian and bicycle path connects with other major axis from Lucie Stern, the Children’s Library, and Girl Scout building into Rinconada Park to improve the overall site circulation.

Since our last ARB review, the City has clarified their goals for the parking lot, which include pedestrian and bicycle safety, clear organization, and maintaining the current parking count. The City is no longer requiring the design increase the parking count. Our revised site plan re-oriens park of the parking lot to align with the city grid along Middlefield and the grid of the proposed JMZ building. The revised site plan results in a larger outdoor plaza space to enhance the presence of the building in the surrounding site.

The plan has been simplified to align with Middlefield grid and to reinforce the courtyard design with a larger entrance plaza. Each of these site organization moves allows for a more civic entrance and presence for the JMZ Museum & Zoo.

Creating the character of a children’s museum and zoo

The mission and vision of the JMZ is to engage a child’s curiosity in science and nature. The promenade connecting Middlefield to the JMZ entrance plaza to the Park becomes **a journey of discovering natural phenomena – water, light/color, wind, earth** – through child-scaled experiences:

A bridge over and rock maze through a bio-retention swale.

A trellis defined by sunlight shining through a variety of colored and transparent planes.

Kinetic wind sculptures ushering visitors to the JMZ entrance.

A stump maze encircling the Pecan Tree and a geological wall rising from the ground to create the zoo enclosure.

These experiences, sculptures, site features are the child-like whimsy and allow the architectural design of the building to be a clean, quiet background. We are working with the arts commission to establish areas within this area of the site to further capture these design concepts into the project.

Architectural Design:

The revised floor plan and massing, which are still in development, reflect a traditional courtyard building with end gabled roofs, echoing the character of the Lucie Stern complex. However, the JMZ building forms will utilize clean contemporary lines and material. The simple form of the building allows for playful interventions – sculptural skylight forms, colorful entrance awnings, playful window patterns – along the Middlefield and main entrance facades and roofs.

We would like to present the development of the revised design in response to the Preliminary ARB comments at a working study session on March 16th. Our goal is to present the in-progress design concepts articulated above through diagrams, site plan, building massing and case studies and discuss further input in preparation for Formal Planning and ARB review.