



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: August 3, 2017  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

### **Call to Order/Roll Call**

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Member Peter Baltay, Robert Gooyer,

Absent: Board Member Wynne Furth

Chair Lew: Welcome to the Architectural Review Board meeting for August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2017. Can we have a roll call, please?

### **Oral Communications**

Chair Lew: Now it is the time for oral communications for items that are not on the agenda. I do have David Carnahan from the City's Clerk's Office here. Welcome, David.

Mr. David Carnahan, City's Clerk's Office: Thank you, Chair Lew and Board Members. David Carnahan with the City's Clerk's Office, I am here to speak to you about Board and Commission recruitment. You should have all receive an email last night about our current recruitment, which is for the Architectural Review Board, the Historic Resources Board, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. We are accepting applications through September 19<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 PM and we encourage each of you to reach out to at least one or two people. If you are one of the people whose term is up on this Board, we would of course, no expect you to encourage someone to compete against you but for the other Boards, we would like you to reach out to see if you have any members of the community you know who you think would be a – would get some value out of serving on one of these Boards and Commissions and could add value for the community. Applications are available on the City's website [cityofpaloalto.org\clerk](http://cityofpaloalto.org/clerk) and again, the application deadline is September 19<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 PM. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, David.

### **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Lew: We don't have any agenda changes today.

### **City Official Reports**

- 1. Transmittal of the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, and Administrative Staff-Level Architectural Review Approvals**

### **Action Items**

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL: 1451 Middlefield Road [17PLN-00147]:**  
Consideration of an Application for Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of the Junior

Museum and Zoo Building and Construction of a New 15,033 Square Foot, One-Story Museum and Education Building, Outdoor Zoo with Netted Enclosure, and Reconfiguration of and Improvements to the Existing Parking Lots including Fire Access, Accessible Parking Stalls, Multi-Modal Circulation, Storm Drainage Infrastructure, and Site Lighting. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study has been Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act. Zone District: PF (Public Facilities). For More Information Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Lew: We can move onto the first item which is number two. It's a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter for 1451 Middlefield Road. Consideration of an application for architectural review to allow the demolition of the Junior Museum and Zoo Building and construction of a new 15,033-square foot, one-story museum and education building, outdoor zoo with netted enclosure, and reconfiguration of site improvements to the existing parking lots including fire access, accessible parking stalls, multi-modal circulation, storm drainage infrastructure, and site lighting. The environmental assessment is an initial study has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA and the zone district is public facilities. Welcome, we have our Chief Planning Official Amy French here today.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, good morning. Amy French and I am here to present the project that is returning to you after several preliminary meetings. I just have some -- a couple of fun photos. This I showed to the HRB on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, when we last appeared before them and they recommended approval of this. The Lucie Stern Complex dates back to 1937 and here's an old photo that shows that along Middlefield it was pretty much a park. Then it took sometime after the original Stern Complex, in a matter of 3 or 4-years, to come in with the Junior Museum and Zoo and the library and the Girl Scout House in its current location. Here's what it looks like today with our crazy parking lot that is to be rectified with this project. The context is one to two, two-story buildings; it feels one-story but there are two-story elements on the Junior Museum and Zoo and the Lucie Stern. The Lucie Stern Center is a Category One resource and many buildings are included in that. We're interested in having the Girl Scout House become of the listed items; it is not currently today. There is an interest in moving a bird bath from the Girl Scout House over to where the Boy Scouts are located. The Lou Henry Hoover House was mentioned in the last meeting. Since the last HRB meeting, there was a study done for Rinconada Park Long Range Master – Long Range Plan Historic Resource Evaluation and that determined that this Girl Scout House is eligible for listing as a historic resource. Here are some other images of the area behind the Girl Scout House and the parking area behind the Stern Theater and seam shop there. So, back in January the ARB and the HRB reviewed in study sessions some concept plans. These concept plans were then changed and the ARB looked at that version and provided some support as far as that approach and the applicant is going to summarize what you said back in March in their presentation. The revised plans were shown to the HRB, then there's been slight revisions since then that the applicant will provide. The HRB (inaudible) on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, requested an HRB subcommittee review the roof colors in their effort to look at compatibility. They were pleased with the gable – the switch to gables roofs. They just had a question about the color and asked for alternatives to come to a HRB subcommittee. The initial study is being prepared and finalized this week and will be available on Friday. So, that will be circulated to the HRB and the ARB for any comments there. Then today, we're going to be asking you to continue this item either to a date certain or a date uncertain so that the CEQA document can run its course for public comments. We'll back before you with findings and conditions set for approval and when I say approval, its recommendation to the City Council. The HRB subcommittee has weighed in two out of three so far via email to me, they have not met as a Board, but the question came up about the taupe roof that was proposed; the charcoal roof was an alternative and red roof was another. I don't think either of the ones that I spoke with so far preferred the red roof altogether. Here is an image that one of the HRB Members Margaret Wimmer was saying that if you went with charcoal, which she thought blended better with the red as far not contrasting as much, then it's a little bit too dark in the court yard. She suggested maybe pulling down the red to make it more whimsical there. So, that's our presentation from Staff and let me introduce again, John Aiken, while I load the other presentation and then the architect will present.

Mr. John Aiken: Let me quickly review the goals of the project, which are to right size the building for our current programs and audience, to seek accreditation with the American Alliance of Museums and the

Associations of Zoos and Aquariums, as well as tailor the spaces to better suit visitors and make it safe for kids to interact with animals. With that let, me introduce Cody Anderson Wasney who has Brent McClure and Sarah Vaccaro here and I'll let them take it away.

Mr. Brent McClure: Thanks John, Brent McClure CAW Architects. Board, thank you very much for having us back again to present this exciting project. We're going to just get this – we've got a short PowerPoint. We wanted to briefly recap what we had shown you – I think, we had talked about before at the last meeting. This is the site plan, a little to nothing has changed with the horseshoe shaped building around the dawn redwood court. What we talked about a lot last time was this sort of strong pedestrian promenade that links you into the park and established a lot of these connecting points. Thinking about the context, thinking about this a civic project and having much stronger presences both within its surrounding neighbors and public use. Then we spent a lot of time with you talking about this exterior experience along the way and how do we engage a child's curiosity as we move through these spaces. If you recall, we talked about before they even – the experience starts on Middlefield or it starts at the park itself as you drawn and kind of pulled into the museum itself. With a lot of experiences that are open to the public outside the building which is along the promenade. These included – we talked about things of scale, areas where kids can play, establishing a water shed, can we illustrate wind in a creative way and also play with lights and sort of just also the elements as well. Then the massing model that we showed you at that study session was in essences – I think it was this image that you see before you now and so a lot has – we've maintained this form and this overall concept but lots has developed since then. The comments that we had heard at the meeting was to – there's a lot with this design that we heard positive feedback, which was terrific, on the focus of the site and scale and the civic context and whatnot. Comment that we had noted where can we rethink the promenade on how it intersects and connects with the Girl Scout building and how does it turn to kind of go into the park and can we shove something back 20-feet or magically figure out a way to do that? Oh, one comment that we had noted – I think it was comment from Board Member Baltay about modulation and really kind of trying to think about that elevation along Middlefield. I think all the elevations that we brought forward to you before were kind of more of a clean, modern lengthy aesthetic and there was encouragement to explore that this is a residential neighbor. Can we break the scale down in different ways and how can we animate that façade? Then another comment was really of you all wanting to see more obviously and the details and sense of scale and looking some more at the fine grade elements that we didn't have obviously with this model here. To walk your around the building, this is an overall rendering as to sort of where we are to date. I think the best way to kind of – what I would like to do is walk around the site and maybe start from the Middlefield approach and talk about the building. Not so much elevation by elevation and massing and whatnot but really how you would then experience the facility. So, what we've done is – this is a long – this perspective is along Middlefield Road. The program that is inside this wing here consists of classrooms, zoo exhibit – museum archives and storage back and other here and then office space as well; this is the elevation and then this is that entry portal. Before we just had this open slot and what we've wanted to do was really kind of punctuate that and make it fun and whimsical and actually working towards designing a rainbow kaleidoscope tunnel, if you will. So, that as you pass through, you go from light to dark and we get light in all different types of colors coming in from different skylights. We've looked to sort of break this down to kind of have more – some solid here, a punctuated window that could have some display and then classroom and office windows that are modulated back in here that you can kind of see more in this elevation. As you enter through the – one of the other things that we're looking to do is also think about thresholds and that experience. So, as you even leave the sidewalk, we're exploring ways and looking to have this read as a bridge so there would be a little bit of a watershed, if you will, kind of in and around with plants and whatnot. So, as you enter into the kaleidoscope tunnel, you would be walking along this bridge element here to enter into the building. We're looking to face the inside of this space, (inaudible) ceiling down to kind of pull the walls in. We're looking to do this economically and we'll be looking to maybe probably even do some mock ups to make sure that we can the effect that we are looking for but in essences, solar tubs would either have prisms and/or diagrammatic film within in them to get that kind of effect. So, this is a plan section and this is an elevation section through that space. As you then emerge through the tunnel, you are then on that walk way into this dawn redwood court yard and there's two different zones to this that we are having to address. One is that there is a space that the users are looking to kind of contain and have be fenced in

and then there's an area just open to the public which is the promenade along this edge. So, this is where you enter into the watershed and a bridged sidewalk with depressions and raised areas of plantings. Then we have a red fence that you can kind of see in this elevation back in here so we're looking to playfully separate and design fencing that isolates the public area from the paid experience. Then back in over here is a series of walkways around the building of natural materials and then some planter areas where – as part of the exhibit design, they will be looking to bring in really exciting and different and unique plants, have it themed as a Jurassic garden so that it becomes this educational opportunity to leverage outdoor space within this court yard. The thing is, as you might recall when we talked about this project, every square inch is precious because we're so – we're very, very budget constrained. Finishes in and around here – I'll talk about finishes in a minute and we can come back to the renderings. Then here's another section through that space looking at some of the plantings. Then the view overall from the parking is this entry piece in through here so here's the courtyard. We've kind of quit – there's the entrance tunnel as you walk along this edge but the building reads somewhat quiet so that the entrance is really played up and focused. What we've done is we've taken the end gable concept and thinking of doing it economically and so we're basically using almost like a barn like or a butler building kind of concept in construction. Then using some natural materials as far as the wood and metal and then it almost becomes this extrusion as this comes out so that you don't have this hard, sharp face. We're creating this court yard that's partially enclosed with a trellis. Then this artist wind screen that will be part of the art's or artist and residences that will be part of this project. That is to design this wind sculpture that will actually become part of the façade of the building. So, we're trying to get as much into this space as possible. Here are some sample images of what section that are would look like. Then as you move down the way and around the pecan tree, there will be some outdoor play areas and whatnot. Here's a section through the portico that I was just describing in some representative images of the aesthetic that we're looking for and it's the sort of bent steel with the zegers that extrude out. Up lighting and down lighting and then some little punctuated window view spots onto either side here. As well as a little trellis piece, over there so this is a section through that portico that's out at the front of the street or at the main entrance before you enter the building. Then a sample wall section through the building here. We're looking to get some thickness and some heft as your kind of express that main form of the dominant form of the museum itself but clean, taught eaves and detailing and whatnot. To kind of talk more about that, this kind of represents the finishes. We're using a combination – we've got a sample board that we'll hand out. A combination of wood siding and then standing seam roof, the whole building would be roofed with standing seam and then at the – to differentiate it a little bit, we were looking to kind of have this playfulness of that the museum – the main museum piece, that is a story and half, would then have that finish wrapped down. There would be those deep recesses over here that I was just talking about. Out in the trellis area there's this punctuated view window that looks out into the watershed zone with the wind screen above. So, that – we're trying to have this possessional effect as you move and kind of draw you in and then pull – and simultaneously pull you out. Site finishes is kind of echoing the same materials with a combination of concrete and wood finishes to soften the space. We talked about the view netting before and then as you move into the park, those boundaries would consist of [introgo] colors stucco plaster walls and wood fencing. We've done that for economic reasons but then having those nest in and around each other. Let's go to the next slide. There we go, so this is a rendering kind of illustrating some of that. So, as you are in the park area, this is not – this is kid flying a kite, that's not part of the building. There's a – we're looking at having that rust red color plaster wall here and then wood fencing that would kind of nest and wraps in and around. Then in some key moments like along this one section here, we're looking at having some graphics on the fencing to illustrate a sense of scale and patterning and what not to suggest that hey, this is a children's museum and there are exciting things that are happening within it. Then just a couple of footnotes, we talked I think at the last meeting about this Phase Two portion of the site. The Phase Two of this two-story building is not part of the review. The client has made a decision as to kind of differ that I think at this time so it's more of just one fine day and not part of the application at this point. The zoo, we haven't changed anything at this point with what's inside other than that there's the netting and the columns that spring off of the walls themselves. Then imagery of the Phase Two building that I just mentioned and that's it.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much, Brent.

Mr. McClure: Thank you.

Chair Lew: If there are members of the public that want to speak at this item, now would be the time. Otherwise, I'll bring it back to the Board for questions. No questions? Ok. Oh, yes, Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, for the applicant I guess. I noticed in your write up about the project that you've talked extensively about the concept of a tunnel from Middlefield and then a bridge at the dawn court yard. On the plans I see a concrete sidewalk so can you explain what's really the presentation and why?

Mr. McClure: We've been going through in real time in the last couple of month here from the application submittal and the narratives to where we are today looking at costs. One of the things that the clients has looked at is a reduction at that spot. I think what we'll look to do is the contractor has indicated that to do something that's a complete and true bridge through there is more cost effective than to have it be more of a solid piece. What we would be looking to do is to (inaudible) some edges that cantilever out and maybe there could be some sections that could tunnel through so that we could give the implication that you're still up and above to create that same effect. That's kind of where we are at with that piece.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Why don't we have Board Member comments. Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back to the Board with this project. It's a very exciting project and overall, I'm very pleased with the direction that it's been heading in. I think the amount of work that you've put into this project in this amount of time is actually quite impressive. I have some very minor comments but overall, I'm very pleased with most everything. From the design of the site plans and the actual building itself, even down to the materials. Why don't I pick up on the materials and as far as the roof material, I can see and understand perhaps some of the concerns that the HRB has brought up but for me, I think this building wants to be as environmentally friendly as possible and in tune with the surrounding and the site. To me, I think going with that darker roof color is actually creating more of a heat on effect and that would be my primary concern with the darker color. I think the taupe here in correlation with the more red color actually looks quite handsome. I think it would work fine and I appreciate the fact that your kind of accenting the skylights with that red color as well. One of the newer changes that I'm seeing with this set of plans as it's developed from the last time that you presented to us, is that tunnel connection from Middlefield to the main entrance to the museum. I've been kind of going back and forth with this. I think that way that it was originally presented it almost looked like a transparent area or section of that gable that became the tunnel and I thought from a simplicity standpoint that actually worked very well. It looked kind of interesting in the fact that you were changing from perhaps an opaque kind of roof to a more transparent kind of roof but I see that you've presented this gable scheme and this tunnel that goes from a larger opening towards Middlefield to a smaller opening towards the main entry to the museum. I was kind of thinking back to architectural history and a lot of the Chinese, Japanese, Korean gardens actually had these smaller portals that you would enter into. Not because of any height difference but really more so that you were creating this gesture of bowing as you enter and I really like that you are making this tunnel larger on Middlefield and smaller towards the entry of the museum. It's kind of this similar experience of – even adults being kind of transformed into being a child again and I thought that was very nice. So, I think I'm ok with this new gable but the primary concern that I have is that how often is it going to be used? I think the majority of the people that are going to visit the museum are going to park in the parking lot and to have them go through the reverse process so going out to Middlefield and back in seems a little bit like a missed opportunity. I wonder if people are actually going to experience it in the desired manner. So, that was a comment on that but I think the idea and the concept of that tunnel is actually quite impressive and it's too bad that we can't maybe perhaps or perhaps we can even think about moving that somewhere to the main entry of the museum. Looking at the main entry of the museum, I'm glad that you're showing us a little bit of a different placement in the signage. I was a little disappointed in the original yellow signage that was directly in the middle of the gable. I like that you've pushed it off to the side and that the art

piece, the wind screen, becomes more of the feature there. I would just question if that wind screen has to be so rectangular and so plain as a shape? Perhaps it can follow the gable shape up and become more triangular at the top. Then I guess we'll hold off any comments on the future two-story building since it's not a part of this proposal. Looking through this set of plans, thank you for providing so much information, even these concept diagrams. Just a minor comment on the Phase One proposed floor plan, you have these very dark shadow lines I think. It took me a while to understand that they were shadow lines but they kind of obscure the drawings so much that it becomes more of a distraction but it's a very minor comment as we're just picking up on the drawings. I think that's really it for me. I like the depth and richness of the materials that are combined with a simple gable forms and I appreciate the amount of thought that's been put into it. I understand that it's a difficult challenge trying to balance out all these wonderful concepts along with the budget so I applaud your efforts. I am interested to hear what my fellow Board Members think, thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Yeah, I agree, I think it's a great step forward. I really like what you've done. The biggest concern I have and it was also in your presentation, you keep talking about the economy, trying to make it cost effective and everything else. I mean that – I understand what the reality of life is but you can also – a building like this is intended to be around for a while so I don't want to see it where you constructed to cheaply that you end up with a maintenance nightmare for the next 50-years or whatever. We all know one of these buildings is going – whether they intend to or not, seem to stick around for 50 or so years; that's just the reality of it. It's interesting that you mentioned the term butler building because that's what I had in mind. Note also that it looks like a modified butler building and I don't really want to push that too much. The biggest concern here is going to be, as with any metal building like this is you're going to probably have to spend a few bucks on making sure that the metal is covered. Meaning either a powdered coating type situation or whatever the case is and not just painting it and hoping that in 10-years the maintenance Staff at the museum will repaint it or whatever the case is. The elevation on – I think the elevation on Middlefield is a big improvement. The only thing that might be, if anything, is that possibly -- that middle section that is the darker color, possibly if you kick the roof up a couple feet just to break up that enormous continuous roof. That's the only thing that I have a bit of a problem with. To bring the...

Mr. McClure: Which section? I'm sorry.

Board Member Gooyer: This one, the top one you've got there, that very long uniform roof line. I'm saying this section in the middle where the windows are the dark red color. Possibly kick that (crosstalk) section up a couple of feet or something just to break up that very long elevation.

Mr. McClure: So, maybe the roof (crosstalk)(inaudible)...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) that kind of construction. You could just kick it up a couple of feet and it's fine so that the cost issue is not that tremendous of difference. As to the – this whole difference of opinion as far as color. I personally prefer the taupe color, I think it works better than the charcoal and I think you ought to stay with that. I do like the entry, I've been involved in a couple of projects that – over years that deal with kids. I mean, I'd love to see that entry, which I know now a day are code infested design process that wouldn't allow it but I would love to see that entry to drop down to about 5-foot 6 where the parent has to duck down. Which means it becomes sort of the haven of the children and the parent's sort of have to work at it to get into that same – but we both know that the building official would laugh at that. Anyway, be that as it may, it – I think I like or I should say I think that whole entry concept. The whole idea that this is for the kids, not for the parents. As far as the bridge, I can see it. I would have been nice and maybe it's the kind of thing that's sometime in the future you get some generous donor that you can turn it into the whatever; ABC's bridge that they donated or whatever. All and all I think it's a big improvement and I can vote for it like this with a few minor modifications.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. More or less I echo the comments of my colleagues perhaps not quite ready to completely support it but I would like to comment that I looked at your drawing A-1.3 and I don't think I've ever seen a drawing that more clearly explains an architectural concept. I was sort of thinking back over the process and I really would like to compliment that it's been a pleasure to see good architects really work to come up with a concept and push it forward. This is really nice to you grasping what a kid's museum should be like and then trying to give form to that and this notion of a tunnel and a bridge and then shelter leading to the park is really powerful. I say in that in part because I want you to feel good about it and partly because I'd like to see you push harder to keep that bridge. The idea of a bridge and of seeing water underneath you and having that explain why we have a bio-swell and retention system is really, really powerful. That's education for kids and for adults and for the community. It's a new thing that we're trying to accomplish throughout and it seems to me that's something that's worth fighting for. So, I would just like to encourage you to get it as much as a push as you can and to go on the record that it's an intricate part of your very strong concept. This is award winning stuff, this kind of concept and executing it is great. Ok, but, there's always a but, I agree that we want to make it an architecture of our time. I'd like you to encourage thinking about making it of our place as well. I am troubled by this – what's essentially what's an agricultural building. You've used the term butler building but it really is a metal shed and I think you're not quite getting away from that enough. This is the heart of Palo Alto is a very important civil building and I think has the risk of looking like a farm shed. Especially the main part where you choose to run the metal roofing down as siding, right down the edge. That's exactly what a farmer does out in Stockton and that's not where we are and that's not really appropriate. I don't – I think that we've missed that takes away from the Birge Clark design where you have a distinct roof and a wall that are very different. Different textures, colors, materials and I don't want to tell you what the architecture should be but I'd almost prefer to see it all be the same with just a wood siding and a roof than having that metal roll down the side. I think that would look just to industrial, to agricultural and then Robert's concerns about the painting it very real with that metal siding. The paint will eventually start to flake off no matter what you do and you'll never have enough money to maintain that. It's an expensive kind of thing to paint and you set them up for a long-term failure with that very, very inexpensive idea to begin with so again, I think it needs just a little bit more there. I keep saying that it may be of our time but it's not yet of our place, which is equally important. Another concern that I have is the Middlefield elevation. I've expressed this before and I think you're making steps towards doing things. It's really nice to see the gable end picking up the motif of the building coming out on Middlefield but overall, it's one long straightforward low building on a street that's quite long. So, I did go out there again just to check and it is about the only place where you have this long of the building that is this continuous and I think Robert is absolutely correct. That changing the roof is probably the way to break it up but I'd really like to see you get some more modulation on that façade if you could, and in and out or a breakup or some sense of another utility entrance. I was hoping that the trees and the fact that you're driving by quickly would break it up but at least in my judgment when you go out there, that's really not the case. It's quite visible and it really will be the frontage, the face of the building, to most of the public as we drive by it every day and it's not quite there. It's come a long way with your first concept but if you could put half of the energy that you put into the creativity on figuring out how to make this for a kid and figure out how to make it for Palo Alto as well. How do we build next to Birge Clark? Where we see both of these in the same space of 30-seconds as we drive by. That would really be appreciated so I don't think it's quite there yet on those two factors. The façade along Middlefield is still too uniform and I'm concerned about the overall gable form where the siding drops down the side giving it too much of an agricultural look. On a detail, I do share Kyu's sense that the metal screen over the entry would be better served if it followed the gable on the inside. I'm just putting that out there in detail but Middlefield elevation and rethink the agricultural look. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Peter. I don't have a lot to add to this particular – to the other Board Member's comments. I think the project to me, looks great. It seems to me that I could meet the findings for this project. In my notes, I just have some nitpicky details. One is like the wood slats at your – at the entry porch. I guess I was curious about the finish of those if it was like a stain that would be applied to the wood and the maintenance – long term maintenance of them. It's a high maintenance item and it's a City project so that's a concern. If you have a transparent stain that's only going to last maybe 2-years before it would need to be touched up so that's a concern. That's a concern that the Board has had on

other City project's as well and on the other projects they've been changed too – like on Mitchell Park Library, I think the architect changed it to metal. I think they considered EPAY so I would – I'd like to see more information on that. On the – also on the building you're showing – I guess it's like an 8-foot wood and stucco fence along the park side, along that and I did see that in the perspective and I think I understand the details. I would like to just have a detail in the set. It seems to me – whenever I've done those wood slats, it – the size of the boards and the spacing of the boards is really important and it was an issue at the –with the Board on the Art Center project. Also, just the species of the wood and the grade of the wood. On your landscaping plan, I think you're showing small cape rush along the Middlefield Road planter strips and so those are like 2-3-feet high and I guess I would ask to consider having something within the door zone that's lower. I mean typically you're in a car – if there's – there are typically lots of cars parked along that section of Middlefield so when they open the door usually they will damage – if a plant is a 3-feet high, it will get damaged by somebody opening the door. I would ask – consider something smaller along the curb. I think the plant is fine otherwise, outside of the door opening zone. On the colors, I did want to sort of echo the comments about the maintenance of it and I would just say like an example of what went wrong was there's the CVS store on Middlefield Road which has the metal – red metal kind of like a (inaudible) and it looked terrible when it was faded. People were complaining and they weren't repainting it and stuff and I don't want that to happen on this particular project. It seems like the – I'll differ to the other Board Members but it seems like you were mentioning that it could have a coating or the Kynar finishes that are much more durable than the painted finish. I don't know how long those last but it seems like the Kynar lasts longer than powdered coating, I would think.

Board Member Gooyer: But that lasts longer than painting so that's what I was basically – something over and above painting.

Chair Lew: Yeah and I guess it could but I don't know how long and then we have to factor in – this is like a City – yeah, a City project and let's say it should last, ideally, last 50-years?

Board Member Baltay: We have Kynar 500 coated roofs and after about 20-years they look faded. That's the honest truth.

Chair Lew: So, then that gets to my next point, is if you have the red – I really do actually like the red color but it seems to me like faded red looks pretty terrible. It looks pink after a while and it seems to – if it's a taupe or charcoal and it fades, nobody is going to notice the difference.

Board Member Gooyer: Well the other thing is like a Core 10, something like that.

Board Member Baltay: The guys on the firehouse went to, wasn't it Zinc (inaudible) or something?

Board Member Gooyer: That's very cost prohibited.

Chair Lew: It's expensive.

Board Member Baltay: Well, it's cost prohibited now but over 50-years, it's probably the most cost-effective solution. Well, (crosstalk)(inaudible)...

Board Member Gooyer: The Board on something like that isn't going to say yes but it's going to save our maintenance for the next 50-years.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah but if we get a pink looking building 20-years from now.

Chair Lew: Ok, so I think that's where we are at. I think we want to see some more information and I wasn't quite sure – actually, could I ask a clarification maybe from the architect or maybe Amy. Is the HRB's concern about the – it was mentioned that they were concerned about the roof color. Are we



saying that their recommendation is that the roof be one color and the siding – the metal siding be a different color?

Ms. French: No, I think what one Member on the subcommittee thought that if you were going to go with the darker, she liked the darker charcoal I guess, but didn't – thought it was too somber for that court yard. So, she suggested that you could pull the red down and have that provided some whimsy but the other Member liked the taupe.

Chair Lew: Ok, I think I get it. I think my other comment then would be if there where – if anybody ever foresees photovoltaics on the roof, I think charcoal is a better fit for that. Also, if – you've got skylights showing on there and again, I think generally a charcoal color works better with all of those aluminum skylights and the frame and the dark glass and what not. Then for all of the roof penetrations like plumbing vents and all the fans and all of that stuff, generally taupe looks better. I mean red could work but generally, a dark color is a little bit more forgiving and so that's all that I have. We don't have – I think we're – the recommendation is to continue it. We don't have...

Board Member Gooyer: Can I just...

Chair Lew: Yeah, yeah. Just one more thought is that we don't have draft findings that we're not going to comment on that yet.

Vice Chair Kim: It's the CEQA that we're waiting for (inaudible).

Chair Lew: Right.

Board Member Gooyer: I just have one concern and you can see that I think more than one of us has that concern that the whole thing about the whole concept of it being metal. That there may need – that you may need to look at doing something other than metal or at least if it is metal, main framing metal but either cover it or something that – to get away from the whole butler – not even so much appearance but the concept. I don't have a problem with the shape but it's just I have a fear that, like you said, it's going to turn into a pink building with rust all over the place. So, I think you need to at least possibly address the concept of using something other than that or a different framing system or something.

Board Member Baltay: Are we as a Board willing to give them more clear direction on that? I really think it's often really helpful if we come out and say it. To me, the concept of the Kynar 500 coating or any kind of painted standing seam metal, as I listen to our comments, probably is just not the right solution. If you're going to use metal, it really should be something like the zinc aluminum which is really expensive. So, maybe metal is the wrong choice for a civic building that we expect to last a long time.

Chair Lew: Can we clarify maybe – could we differentiate or separate this – your comment into the roof and the siding because I think – because, in my mind, the siding needs to last longer than the roof. The roof isn't going to last forever anyway, right? In theory, the siding should last longer than the roof. I mean normally we think the roof is going to last 25...

Board Member Baltay: The roof takes more abuse.

Chair Lew: Right, (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible) you don't typically paint a roof. You don't typically paint metal roofing, siding, the standing seam. Once it's manufactured, you don't repaint it typically. It's very hard to do that.

Chair Lew: So, then you have another issue is that say the roof – typically the roof would be replaced before the siding and so if it's all the same, then there's the potential problem of matching the colors; you're going to have to replace everything.

Board Member Baltay: Do you think Birge Clark built Lucie Stern thinking the roof would be replaced after 25-years? We're building to make timeless architecture, this is a civic –this is a public museum.

Chair Lew: Yes, you know but they had the – I don't know what the right word is. They built during the depression and they were under very different circumstances and they also built all of those buildings one at a time because she couldn't solve her (inaudible) stock. I mean that was coming out of her income fund.

Board Member Baltay: There's fascinating history behind it all but when we're creating civic architecture...

Chair Lew: Right, we want it to last...

Board Member Baltay: ... (inaudible) corporate building and we know full well that maintenance is a real issue over time. It's really hard to find the budget to keep these things up so now is the time to encourage to push – for the Architecture Board just to come out and say, standing seam metal on siding certainly and roofing is really not appropriate for a building like this when it's painted or when its...

Chair Lew: Ok, I think my take on this is just slightly different in that I think it's fine for the roof and then I think the siding I think I'm more in agreement.

Board Member Gooyer: At least if that's the case then, unfortunately, if you do it for the roof you need to do a color that even if it fades, it really doesn't change that drastically as compared to a pink or a red that's goes to a pink. A beige is going to be – say a beige, not that I'm saying that it needs to be beige but something like that. That you end up with that sort of criteria.

Chair Lew: I am in agreement with you about – on that. Any other – Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Just another minor comment, I thought the scale of the elevations was much too small for us to read. I just they would show up a little bit larger on a full-size set but for us, on the half size sets, they're a little bit small. Then on sheet A-4.2, drawing number four, the elevation A, maybe it was a slightly – previously reiteration but to me, I think that gable should be shown on the right side of the building toward Middlefield and I don't see that there so just a minor comment.

Chair Lew: I have one last question for Staff. On our favorite topic of parking, it seems like there's no – there's not a requirement – generally, there's a net reduction in maybe two spaces but there are loading zones. I was wondering just how the City was thinking about the parking requirement and the reason why I am asking today is that the – I was just at the site yesterday and it's the peak of the summer and the park was in maximum use yesterday and the parking lot was pretty full. It wasn't completely full but I was just wondering if the City had any thoughts about adding parking or are we trying not – are we trying to just keep everything as is?

Ms. French: Yeah, I think conceptually with the bicycle circulation, the bus drops off, providing bike racks when they aren't as many today, that's key. We want to encourage people to drive less and we know that in the Rinconada Park plan, there is going to be some changes down the road over a long Hopkins. There's a lot of street parking too. I know for a commercial business we don't consider that but this is a Civic Center/Community Center and street parking is something that is also on public property. I think there's a little bit of different thinking for this type of a use. Again, there's an increase in zoo area, the animals will have a better experience and more place to reside. I don't think that necessarily results in more cars. Again, we're – and John can weigh in on programmatic aspects of this but we're looking at – and you'll – when you do get the CEQA document, you can see a description of this. We had opened to have that in your packet last week but it did get pushed a week so we can have more conversation about that in the next report.

Chair Lew: Ok, thanks.

Vice Chair Kim: Just a quick comment on the zoo area. I saw that in the central tree stump you have this glow in the dark type of thing, right? Could you explain that perhaps a little bit and if it's a reasonable thing considering how early public facilities in Palo Alto and the effect – possible detrimentally effect towards the environment and animals in that area.

Ms. Sarah Vaccaro: That's the tree fort and that's actually part of the future Phase Two.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, so that's not technically a part of this project? Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I have a question for Staff, Jodie? So, if we can continue this to date certain, is there a date in particular?

Ms. French: September 21<sup>st</sup> would be preferable. Yeah, I think September 21<sup>st</sup>, we'll stick with that and if they are able to beat that, we can always advertise it for earlier. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, that's – so...

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to move that we continue this project to September 21<sup>st</sup> subject to the comments that we've made.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Great, so we have a motion to continue it by Baltay and seconded by Gooyer. All in favor? Opposed? None and Board Member Furth is absent. Great, thank you. The project is looking good and we'll look to see this back in September.

## **MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT**

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2747 Park Boulevard [17PLN-00122]:**

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow a Master Sign Program. The Master Sign Program is for a Previously Approved 33,323 Square Foot Office Building Currently Under Construction. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15311 (Accessory Structures). Zoning District: Gm (General Manufacturing). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at [graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org)

Chair Lew: The next item is number three. It's a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter, 2747 Park Boulevard. Recommendation on applicant's request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow a Master Sign Program. The Master Sign Program is for a previously approved 33,323-square foot office building currently under construction. The environmental assessment is exempt from the provisions of the CEQA in accordance with guideline section 15311 for accessory structures. The zone district is general manufacturing and our project planner today is Graham Owen, welcome.

Mr. Graham Owen, Project Planner: Thank you, Chairmen Lew. So, yes, I'm Graham Owen and I'm a planner with the City. I've been working with the applicant on the application that is here before you today. So, as you said this is a Master Sign Program for the new R&D building which is currently under construction at 2747 Park Boulevard. This Master Sign Program is essentially a – it's a way of providing a framework for feature tenant signage. So, no tenants have been selected at this time for the building which is under construction but the applicant has expressed an interest and the developer has expressed an interest in providing feature tenants with basically a framework document that has basic design parameters for feature tenants. The benefit for a Master Sign Programs is that once that framework document – once the Master Sign Program has been approved, no further architecture review is required

as long as signage is consistent with the Master Sign Program. So, this – the plans that are before you today do show logos and companies but those are just examples as no tenants have been selected at this time. This is a site plan showing the build outs of the 27247 Park Boulevard project. The building is located at the apex, right at the corner of Park Boulevard and Sheridan Avenue in the Ventura neighborhood and there are ten total signs that are being requested with this application. Two are free standing tenant monument signs which would be located at the vehicle entrances. Those would be 9-feet in total height and 54-square feet. There are two that would be two free standing monument signs which would be located at the building entrances, right at the apex and then also facing the parking lot. Three wall signs, one of which would be at the pedestrian level directly facing Park Boulevard and another that would be or two, excuse me, that would be located closer to the parapets of the building at the top. One facing the apex at the corner and then one facing the Caltrain right of way. Then there would also be two signs which would essentially be addressed so 2747 numbers. This is an example of the freestanding monuments signs which would be located at the vehicle entrances. So, as I mentioned, 9-feet in total height, 54-square feet in total sign area. These signs would be made out of aluminum, as well as a clear plastic material to go on the cabinet. The signs would be externally illumination from below shining onto the sign. This is another example showing a different cabinet which shows three tenants instead of just one. This is an example of the type of sign which would be proposed at the building entrances, slightly smaller at 5-feet in total height and smaller sign area of course. These – the two that are proposed at the building entrances are not proposed to be illuminated. Then this is an example of the wall sign which would be located -- as I call them skyline signs but signs that would be located near the parapets of the building. This is proposed in two locations and this example is slightly different from the iteration that you saw in the earlier plans that we provided in the packet. This shows an example of a total sign area of 120-square feet for the sign – total sign area and 2 ½-feet in total height for the letters; which is what is requested with this application. The signs – the two signs that are mounted at the top of the building would be channel lite so internally illuminated signs. So, Staff is recommending approval of this application at this time. We would want to highlight two conditions of approval that are significant for the project. The freestanding monument sign, as I mentioned a couple times, is 9-feet in total height as proposed. We felt that along the Park Boulevard corridor, you don't actually see that many monument signs to begin with so we felt that a 9-foot high sign might be inappropriate for the neighborhood. We are requesting through the conditions of approval that total height is lowered to 6-feet. The other is to ensure that the walls signs are compatible with the area. We're just reiterating that the letters for the wall signs be no more than 2 ½-feet in total height, which is consistent with what it is in the plans. I believe that the applicant has a presentation as well but I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Graham. So, let's do the applicant presentation and you have 5-minutes.

Ms. Julie Vogel: Is this on? That's good, thanks, Graham. My name is Julie Vogel and I'm from Kate Keating Associates and this is Shawn Reese. I am president and Shawn is project manager for this particular project. Graham did a really great describing that there are only ten signs. There's not really an elaborate presentation that we can expand on a great deal more. I think that one – a couple of things that we just want to highlight on an overview and that one is that the signs have been designed to the best of our abilities to be compatible with the site and with the architecture. The goal is to have the opportunity for the tenants to display their brand in a way that will give them the identity and still have a really nice site and experience on the street and that's been the goal of the project all along. We've kept the setbacks that are required and one of the things about making – from our perspective is the potential of making the sign a lot shorter means that the footprint would expand considerably instead. Then we're trying to keep the sign out of the sightlines for the vision triangle and a very safe distance for viewing for people who are turning in and out of the parking lot. If you see, this sign is the one that Staff is suggesting that we lower the size and one of the reasons that we're concerned is that right now, if this was to be reduced by 6-feet – to 6-feet. That's a thirty percent reduction and right now, things like – these all make belief companies and we just make these – load these us ourselves but for example, the Techglow logo, the Techglow is only presently 5-inches tall and the smaller the sign becomes, the more – the smaller the font has to become. Ideally, what we're trying to achieve here is a clear area that allows for these logos not to be kind of smashed on top of each other and if the building were to lease one tenant per floor, that they all have enough clear space so it doesn't look kind of junky out there. That's

the goal is that the font of the logo is large enough, the logos are not on top of each other and they all have clear space and that each of the three tenants potentially has the opportunity to be identified on the street. That's the goal and kind of how we got to where we are. Again, the sign itself is of the same coloration and materiality of the building. Then also the one at the door here is we're planning to co-locate the card reader into it to kind of clarify the elevation as you enter the building. Those are really the only things that I wanted to add to Graham's presentation so if you guys have any questions, we would be happy.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. I do want to open it up to public comments. I don't have any speaker cards and I think we also do need to do disclosures with this item.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I'd like to disclose that I had an email exchange with Tom Gilman, the architect of the project, just asking questions about the wall sign.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board?

Vice Chair Kim: I have a quick question. I am wondering if this is maybe more comment oriented but you're showing a multi-tenant monument sign on the street but the free-standing door tenant monument, you're only showing a single tenant. So, what are your plans if you're going to have multi-tenants for that door tenant monument?

Ms. Vogel: That's a good question. The idea of both of those signs is if the whole building goes with one tenant...

Vice Chair Kim: Then it's easy.

Ms. Vogel: ...that – they would – it would either look like that Elogic or the Techglow but if the building went with three tenants, both of the signs would have a similar layout where you would have the (inaudible).

Vice Chair Kim: Where you would divide the door tenant signage into three as well?

Ms. Vogel: Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: You're confident that you can get your desired height for lettering?

Ms. Vogel: Well, at that point the sign is basically a greeting for the front door. It's more of a pedestrian scale and the goal is not really to have a vehicular experience with that sign.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Two questions please and I don't if it's for the Staff or the applicant but down the street from this is the Groupon building. It's sort of brick building and how tall are the letters of the Groupon logo?

Mr. Owen: We looked at that up and they are 2-feet 3-inches.

Board Member Baltay: The second question for the applicant, I dug up a perspective rendering of this project as we approved it and I'm wondering if on this rendering can you say where the large Techglow, as you've put it, the logo would be as the building curves around. Your elevation on sheet 3.02 doesn't really specify where in the curve it would be if you've decided that but there seems to be a roof overhang that varies in thickness and depth; I think that would matter.

Ms. Vogel: The intention is to have it at the apex of the corner. The plan kind of describes that a little bit better.

Board Member Baltay: So, right in the middle, sort of half way around the curve. Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Board Member comments? Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, thank you. I share Staff's concern that the monument sign is just too tall, in fact, I think 6-feet is even too tall. As I go around that neighborhood there really are no monument signs and that's the size sign you would have for when you're traveling down El Camino or even a larger street moving 30 MPH. Nobody drives that fast, this is a pedestrian dominated area and it will become much more pedestrian dominated. Signs that are 1 ½ times the height of a person as you're drawing so aptly demonstrates is really inappropriate. I can share your concern about the height of your fonts and stuff but your talented sign makers. I'm sure you can come around making signs that are pedestrian scaled. I've said this about many buildings and projects in this area. This Park Avenue, south of Oregon is a rapidly changing area in our community and it is astonishing how many people are walking around on foot in that community. I think we all need to really consider that as a pedestrian area and the signage has to reflect that. These are signs made for high vehicles passing by, that's your intent, that's your objective. You are doing it and it works for that but that's not the right place for it. I think of a minimum; the signs have to go down to 6-feet and I'd like to see it less than that. My second concern is with the large logo on the wall of the building. As I just pointed out, I pulled up the architectural rendering of it and I just don't understand how you put a channel mounted a big sign on a glazed curtain wall. I don't see how that's integrated into the building when the faced is curving one way and the roof overhang is a little bit different. It just seems to me that it's sort of stuck on as a logo and that's not integrated into the building. So, I'm eager to hear what my fellow Board Member's think and I'm happy to pass around this rendering but I don't think that a large sign on the wall of the building is integrated into the architecture. Other than that, I think the materials are fine.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree that the monument sign probably is too big for what it is based on the comments you've already said so I'll just leave it at that. The problem with a lot of these signs that go in front of curtain walls is either they secure them from the roof down so you see the support system behind to make it somewhat free standing. I find it a strange place to put it right at the curve. I think it ought to either go – if you're going to put the sign it ought to be on either this end or that end if it has to be at that front end. I – but I don't want to see it – I wouldn't really want to see it right at the bend. First of all, I think it's going to be a situation that if you've got something that's free standing letters but if you end up having something that is some sort of different configuration, it might even be difficult to make it on a bend like that. Other than -- like I said, it's not rocket science so I'm not too upset – most of it is ok other than the sign, I think needs to be smaller and I'm not a big fan of the larger sign right at the bend.

Chair Lew: Ok and Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, thank you for presenting the Master Sign Program package here. I will agree that I think the free-standing monument signs at the parking entrances are a little too large. I don't think that they're – they would be too large if these signs were on a busier street but I think considering the pace of traffic along these two minor streets off of Park and the dominance of pedestrian traffic. I do think that they will begin to dwarf the people and almost give the building a sense of a standoffish feeling, almost. I think it would be better if they could be reduced in size and maybe present the building as a little bit more welcoming and pedestrian scale. The concern there, of course, with the area and the size of it are not so much the actual area of the logos. I think there are ways you could keep the logos and their areas the same while reducing the sign in overall size so I think there's something that can be done there. I disagree with the previous comment that the materials are ok. For me, these tenant monument signs that are freestanding, to me they actually lack a little bit of depth. I think it's a little bit too plain and I'm almost curious to see what these look like in 3-D with the shape of the curve and the plastic.

How much reflection we get? I think there needs to be a little bit more thought into the depth of the materials and I was looking at the materials board and the materials that were used on the building itself. I don't know if there is another material that can be picked off from the building and incorporated into the signage. I do share concerns about the wall mounted sign, less so about the one facing the train tracks but more so about the one facing Park and Sheridan. I'm also curious to know how that's going to work on a curved surface but more so than that, just the fact that we're kind of slapping that on to the glass surface. I don't know if that's the best way to go about that. I also have questions and concerns regarding the raceway connecting the letters in that case. Somebody brought up previously that often these are not just directly mounted onto the glass but hung off the roof. That was something that I was going to possibly suggest but I realized that the roof changes in depth there, the (inaudible), so I don't know if that's possible. Yeah, I guess I'll leave it at that, thank you.

Chair Lew: We're going back to Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I have one comment and this is probably just being totally anal on my part but on 2.05 where the actual building address is. I have a real problem with the relationship of the letters to the material in the back of it. In other words, the seam right in between the 4 and the 7. It – I know – like I said, that is – either it gets shifted so that the address is completely centered on one tile or something like that. Like I said, it's an anal comment and maybe by the time they get done and depending on the size of the joint, it may not be an issue but like this, it just really rubbed me the wrong way. So, if nothing else, it's on the record.

Chair Lew: I think my comment is that the – it seems like we higher standards for signs in the City and in particular in the adjacent Research Park. So, for example, Stanford – on Stanford land, they don't allow any wall signs. So (inaudible) down Page Mill Road, you won't see any walls signs and all of their monument signs, most of them are all very, very low. I – from my point of view, I think they are too small. I think I understand that – your sign makers point of view that you want them to be readable and I think what I found in – at least in the Research Park, is that when they have a multi-tenant building and they required the monument signs to be really low. They put them side by side in these really small fonts and I don't think they look very good and to me, they are hard to read. That's Stanford, that's their rules for signs there but it creates a really beautiful landscape environment. Then I think the hard thing that I've been struggling with on your site is I think it's – I think I agree with Board Member comments that it's the – there's a lot of pedestrian activity like at lunch time. I find the intersection on this particular site to be very confusing. If I was a visitor I wouldn't really know exactly where I was supposed to go and where to park. I would think that if I were the building owner, I wouldn't want Caltrain people to park in the lot because it looks – it's right adjacent to the parking – Caltrain parking lot. I think I understand the desire for the placement of the monument signs for the parking lot. I think I would just – not – I don't have a smaller proposal – the 6-foot proposal but at the moment I would just say that I would concur with the Staff condition of approval. I think it would be a question – I guess a question for the Board would be, do you want to see this again or do you want to just let the Staff recommendation or the Staff's condition of approval to make it smaller to just let it stand and we have – without having seen it. If we continue it, it would allow them to make another case for something in between. I think that's an open question from me. On the...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I mean if you want an answer to that. I have actually a more problem with the wall sign than I do the monument sign.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I was going to get – you're right, I was going to get to that.

Board Member Gooyer: If I was going – I mean I would trust the judgment of either proportionally going from 9-feet down to 7 ½-feet or something like that. Even if it doesn't go all the way down to six because I can understand where the applicant is coming from. The wall sign is what I have more of a problem with.

Chair Lew: Ok, then on the wall sign, I would say the – previously the Board had a lot of issues with the Survey Monkey sign, which was hung with a structure – you know if it was hung from the cornice of the tower and that was an issue. It's still got – well, it did -- they left pretty quickly.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: But the sign did go up and the armature to hold the sign up was not beautiful but I think we made it better. I just want to remind the Board that for us to – when buildings come through, to ask for placeholder locations for signs on the other projects because it's an issue. Then I guess at the same time is the – I think we have to sort of acknowledge that the desire for signs on buildings is changing. At one time really, we really didn't have any office tenants putting wall signs up on the cornice of buildings but it is an issue and we do want them; even here in the downtown district. I just want to sort of put that out there that things change. I think I'm in agreement with the placement of the wall sign on the curve; it seems strange. I think I would rather have it on one end or the other. I'm ok with the one on the back, the one on the back seems a little strange to me in terms of placement. I think what my take on it is that I think you guys want them to come back to the Board, is that where...

Board Member Baltay: Well, I'm certainly not ready to approve it with the wall sign and I'm skeptical that they will be able to find a place on that curved façade to make it work. A sign of the size that they are talking about, you just don't have a chunk of a building that supports that. Maybe the question really to ask is that they are asking for a Master Sign Program so there's not even really any firm proposal of where...

Chair Lew: Right, it would depend on the tenant.

Board Member Baltay: In my email exchange with Tom Gilman, he made that very clear that this is still very dependent. Maybe what we can do is approve the sign program with the change to the monument but just don't approve the wall sign and that has to come back as an ARB project when they figure out what they want to do exactly. So, we can see the mounting details and the exact specific sign. I think it's important on a building like this with a fairly dramatic appearance that the sign should not just be stuck on the glass wall.

Board Member Gooyer: But that's the – why you do a Master Sign Program so that you don't have to come back and we can't yes, we'll approve the Master Sign but you have to come back anyway. Then you sort of defeat the purpose of.

Board Member Baltay: Well, then maybe a Master Sign Program is inappropriate for this situation.

Board Member Gooyer: That could be but I mean that maybe that is why they are doing it. (crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: I hear you but I am not able to approve the wall sign.

Chair Lew: Right, I mean I think the Board...

Board Member Baltay: Maybe Staff can chime in (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: I think the Board could recommend no and then the Staff could come back with a response on how to proceed.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I'm open to whatever mechanism is appropriate. I have a big issue with that wall sign the way it's presented.

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: I think it's up to the Board how you'd like to proceed. I mean we can certainly bring it back. If we were to bring it back, it would need to be probably September



21<sup>st</sup> though. We – I mean you also have the subcommittee option if you felt like there were some smaller refinements that needed to be made.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, let me suggest that if you're ok with the sign on the back. Is that basically because it's facing the railroad tracks or is it because it looks better or works better on that portion of the building?

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, for me it was that it works better on that side of the building but I am still curious to see the actual mounting details.

Board Member Gooyer: What I was going to suggest, if that's the case, then maybe on the front we don't allow the sign to go on the curve portion and put it on the far end of the building, on the south end of the building at the corner.

Chair Lew: Which is actually a better – in my mind is a better location because it would give you (crosstalk) (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) basically a sign that – or I should say a mounting situation that basically mirrors the two and they could be the same and then there isn't a difference. I mean that's (inaudible)...

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I'd be ok with that.

Ms. Vogel: Hi, can we comment on that?

Chair Lew: Yes, please.

Ms. Vogel: The thinking of the location on the curve and the apex is that this is capturing specifically Oregon Express Way and the traffic that's moving through the neighborhood. To put it further to kind of mirror what's facing the Caltrain is – and put it towards the corner of Park and Page Mill, there's a lot of trees and there's an adjacent development. You would actually never see that sign from the sight lines so the locations are chosen by sight lines of what's actually visible. If I can speak a little bit to how it's attached. The way we would detail these – we've done a lot of these with DES, is that the (inaudible) system itself gets brackets and it has support and nothing comes over the roof. Then all of the raceway is generally as minimal as it can be to handle the LED equipment which is much smaller than it use to be and it's painted to black out. This is on glass but it's spandrel glass so it's not visual glass so it's basically a solid surface anyway. The goal is to have these letters be up there kind of floating and you just don't have a lot of perception by the location. Even though it's on glass, it has the framework and the raceways are all painted to kind of black out.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, part of that is that let's say that spandrel glass was stucco. It's not even so much what that is, I just don't really like the thing right on the curved corner of the building. It's not so much that it – I mean it is – I mean you've got two things there working against it but like I said, even if that was a solid band I would have a problem with it right on the apex of the curve.

Board Member Baltay: As I look at it more I find even the sign on the back, just seems to me haphazardly across the moulin and the windows and then the solid wall and it's not – it's just not integrated with the architecture.

Board Member Gooyer: That (inaudible) what I said with the sign – the address sign. It's put on but it doesn't relate to the wall behind it.

Board Member Baltay: I mean I think you're – with all respect, your renderings even to us, show us a sign in a 2-dimensional rendering on a curved façade, the letters are all the same dimension. There is no sense of graphic curving to it. You're not even thinking about the curve in your signage. I guess I'm just

having trouble with the big wall sign on this building. Questioning whether we even really show have a wall sign here at all honestly. Somehow the Groupon sign is some much more subdued. You see that from a distance and it's just a big brick building. This – we have to make a finding that it's integrated with the architecture and I'm unable to do that the way it's presented. So, the only solution is to say no or to continue it.

Chair Lew: Ok, well I think my recommendation to the Board would be to continue it because they are allowed – the sign code allows them a certain amount of (crosstalk)(inaudible)...

Board Member Gooyer: Absolutely.

Chair Lew: ...so I would say let them have another stab at this...

Board Member Gooyer: That's fine.

Chair Lew: ...and continue it to – I think the Staff was saying September 21<sup>st</sup>.

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Kim: So, I will move that we continue this item so that it comes back to the Board for September 21<sup>st</sup> and have the applicant reconsider the wall signs and how they relate to the building so they do better relate to the actual architecture of the building. Also, to reduce the free standing tenant monument signs at the parking lot entry to be a maximum of 6-feet tall.

Board Member Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Lew: We have a motion by Board Member Kim, seconded by Baltay. All in favor? Opposed? None, so that passes 4-0 with Board Member Furth absent. Ok, thank you. We'll see you in September.

## **MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT**

### **Approval of Minutes:**

- 4.** Draft Architectural Review Board and Historic Resources Board Meeting Minutes for July 13, 2017, Joint meeting and July 13, 2017, Architectural Review Board Meeting.

Chair Lew: Ok, we have one last item which is the approval of the minutes for July 13<sup>th</sup> and that was ARB meeting, as well as a HRB/ARB meeting. Are there any comments from the Board? I have one comment on the minutes. This is on page 16 and there was just a -- Board Member Furth was dissenting from the vote.

Vice Chair Kim: Which set of minutes is this? The joint or the ARB only?

## **MOTION**

Chair Lew: I think it was the ARB only. This was the – I think it was the Alma – Peter's project, Alma. The three houses on Alma Street. Anyway, it's just the word in the minutes is decent, it's dissent and I think that's nitpicky but I think that one is important for the meaning of her comment. I'll move that approve both sets of minutes for July 13<sup>th</sup>. I think Peter, you have to recuse yourself on part of it, right?

Board Member Baltay: I wasn't at the meeting so I won't...

Chair Lew: Right. Oh yeah, that's right.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second the motion.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor?

Board Member Baltay: I abstain.

Chair Lew: Great, so that passes 3-0-1-1. Ok, we are adjourned.

**MOTION PASSES 3-0-1-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSTAINING AND BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT**

**Subcommittee Item**

**Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements**

**Adjournment**