



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: February 16, 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 Members Wynne Furth, Gooyer

Absent: Peter Baltay

Chair Lew: Architectural Review Board meeting for February 16th, 2017. Can we have a roll call, please?

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Oral communications, this is the time for the public to speak on items that are not on the agenda. I don't have any cards.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: I don't believe we 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

Chair Lew: Under City official reports. I did just take – I'll take a second to mention that there are a couple projects that went to the Council. On February 6th, 429 University went to the Council and it was approved 5-3. It's going to return to the Board for minor items. 203 Forest was – the director's denial was appealed on an 8-0 vote so that project will have to come back. If it comes back to the Board, it would have to come back as a new project. Then on February 13th, the Council passed the Ground Floor Retail Protection Ordinance on a 6-3 vote and there were a lot of changes to that.

Action Items

- 2. Receive Presentation and Comment on Neighborhood Traffic Safety and Bicycle Boulevard Projects along Amarillo Avenue, Bryant Street, Carlson Court, Castilleja Avenue, Creekside Drive, Duncan Place, East Meadow Drive, Georgia Avenue, Louis Road, Mackay Drive, Maybell Avenue, McClane Street, Miller Avenue, Montrose Avenue, Moreno Avenue, Park Boulevard, Redwood Circle, Palo Alto Avenue, Ross Road, Stanford Avenue and Wilkie Way** Environmental Assessment: Not a Project Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact Christopher Corrao for Additional Information at christopher.corrao@ciytopaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: We can move on now to our first item, a study session. Receive presentation and comment on neighborhood traffic safety and bicycle boulevard projects along Amarillo Avenue, Bryant Street,

Carlson Court, Castilleja Avenue, Creekside Drive, Duncan Place, East Meadow Drive, Georgia Avenue, Louis Road, Mackay Drive, Maybell Avenue, McClane Street, Miller Avenue, Montrose Avenue, Moreno Avenue, Park Boulevard, Redwood Circle, Palo Alto Avenue, Ross Road, Stanford Avenue and Wilkie Way. The Environmental assessment is this is not a project pursuant to CEQA. We have a Staff presentation. Welcome, Christopher.

Mr. Christopher Corrao, Senior Transportation Planner: Yes, good morning. Good morning, my name is Christopher Corrao. I'm a senior transportation planner with the City and I'm pleased to present this morning the neighborhood traffic safety and bike boulevard project. This is a project that was approved by Council a year ago, and has been years in the making. As you noted in your length review of the streets that it covers, it is a very large project for the City. It covers 13 miles of roadway. The highlighted blue streets are the streets that the project touches. That does not mean that we will be excavating all of those streets. The project is largely comprised of traffic calming measures such as, speed humps, speed cushions which are speed humps that are emergency vehicles can drive of cyclists can pass through, traffic circles and other features that are intended to really slow traffic. The goals of this project really are to provide bicycle connections through Palo Alto that are safe and low stress while also having a secondary goal of calming the vehicle speeds, reducing cut-through traffic or non-local traffic. This project will be – it's at 100% design. We have one more round of revisions that were given to the design team before we break ground this summer. We expect the project to take several years to construct. Let me go ahead and – another goal – significant goal is as you can see, this provided connections between Menlo Park and Mountain View. In Mountain View, there are also plans underway to improve the bike boulevards on Nita so it really provides a regional connection too. I wanted to start with an example of what you might expect to see with this project. This is called a speed cushion so it's a speed hump with slots to bike through. This also has Chicane. During the concept planning phase of the project, residents of Ross Road felt the desire for more of a tree canopy. It's barren at the moment so with this – with the Chicane it's essentially landscaping in the street that prevents cars from circumventing the speed hump. It also gives us an opportunity to add green space. When possible, we're also able to capture storm water runoff and include green infrastructure with these types of additions. This is an example of a high visibility raised crosswalk. The intent of a raised crosswalk is to increase the visibility of pedestrians when crossing. In this example, there are Chicane, so they're essentially medians or curb extensions on each corner so that shortens the distance you have to walk across the street. It also gives us another opportunity to add landscaping and beautify the area. This is an example of a neighborhood traffic circle. The project includes approximately 30-32 traffic circles throughout Palo Alto. We already have existing examples on Bryant Street and some other locations; one on Stanford and Park. The traffic circles in this project have a been redesigned based on from feedback from those other traffic circles. This is one of those areas in particular where we're interested in getting some feedback from ARB. The new traffic circles we're designing are slightly larger and there's more concrete at the edge. They're designed to be mountable by emergency vehicles so there's more concrete and we're trying to figure out the best type of material to have in that mountable apron, as it's called. There are options such as stamped asphalt or even cobble – some of the materials can get quick expensive so that's also a consideration. This is a sketch from NACTO (National Association of City Transportation Officials) to give you an idea of what a raised intersection are. There are about 3 or 4 raised intersection in the project. Essentially, what a raised intersection does is it brings the intersection up to the sideway level. This is a location at Maybell Avenue and [Cologne], right by Briones school. This is one of the locations of our raised intersections. This gives you an idea of what the configuration is today. With the raised intersection, what we're able to do is not only ramp up so that everything at the same grade but we're also able to tighten up the radius of the sideways so that even though it's at the same grade, there's more space for pedestrians to wait as they're crossing which is a current problem. This is another area we are hoping to get feedback on, are we're struggling a little bit with what material – not the material but what color or what type of treatment to put on top of the raised intersection. It's important that there's some contrast so that motorists can see that there's a vertical deflection but at the same time, we want that to be appealing for the neighborhood and easy to maintain. This is an example of a commercially raised intersection in Burlingame. This is one that you may have seen yourself. It's a little bit different. It's a commercial application. It was also extremely expensive because these are all stone pavers. This is another region – local example on Morgan Hill. This is more of a shared street or a raised street it's sometimes called, it's

all the same grade. The only thing that separates the street from the sidewalk is (inaduable) domes, which are the little-raised bumps that are required by ADA and bollards. This is intended to create an environment where cars and pedestrians and cyclists all intermingle and it tends to make a motorist slow down and create safer conditions. The last major feature is – are really the traffic circles. This is an existing traffic circle on Bryant so as I mentioned, the new traffic circles will be slightly larger in diameter. They'll have the apron that is mountable for fire and emergency vehicles. They will also include lighting. Many of our existing traffic circles do not and they are not compliant with current standards and regulations. We will need to include lighting. We're able to try to select a type of LED light that is a bit softer in color but we are pretty much bound by the laws in terms of having lighting at traffic circles and safety is our primary goal with this project. These are some examples of stamped asphalt so these are some treatments that we are considering for the raised intersections. We have examples of this at some crosswalks throughout Palo Alto on Stanford and El Camino. There are other treatments that could be done. We also have the ability to dye essentially, the asphalt so that it's just simply a different color so more the color of concrete or something along those lines. That is my last slide for the presentation. I'm happy to take any questions and really what we're – the main purpose of why we are here is that many of these features – of course, they are in the public right of way, they're in people's backyards and neighborhoods. We want to make sure that any materials we use are most aesthetically pleasing within the parameters of not blowing the budget.

Chair Lew: Today it's a study session format so we can have it more open if the Board Members prefer? Why don't we start if there are any questions for Staff?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Could you explain what the raised intersection/raise street approach again? I understand it makes it easier to get – as a pedestrian to get from the sidewalk to the street but how do we keep it from being easier for the car to get from the street to the sidewalk?

Mr. Corrao: We do have bollards that would separate...

Board Member Furth: You'd use bollards.

Mr. Corrao: We would have to have bollards for some separation.

Board Member Furth: I'm glad.

Board Member Gooyer: Now when you say bollards, are you talking 2-feet high – 3-feet high truncated domes or what...

Mr. Corrao: It would similar to what you see here...

Board Member Gooyer: That sort of thing?

Mr. Corrao: ...in Burlingame, yeah. They are about...

Board Member Gooyer: That sort of spacing?

Mr. Corrao: ... 3-feet high. Probably a bit tighter than Burlingame's spacing. If you look at our spacing here, we would – I think we have two bollards on each side of the curb ramp so there's a bit more – twice the amount of ballard...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, technically you don't need a curb cut then, right?

Mr. Corrao: It's not really a curb cut but we have an apron for truncated domes.

Board Member Gooyer: Right. Ok. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Corrao: Sure.

Chair Lew: I have a question about the truncated domes.

Mr. Corrao: Yes.

Chair Lew: I know the – they were (inaudible) by ADA and ADA does require them to be color contrasted like light to dark.

Mr. Corrao: Yep.

Chair Lew: It seems like most Cities use the yellow and then we have some on University that are grey and don't really have that much contrast but I was wondering if there's more – if there was any – beyond the stated provisions of ADA, where their interpretations about what is acceptable or is there City standards that say there's a preference for the yellow?

Mr. Corrao: We have a City standard that Public Works has been consistent with which is the gray color. Most Cities use yellow for visibility. Some Cities like in San Francisco, they even darken the curb apron with extra lamp black so that it's very – there's a high contrast. Our contrast meets ADA but with the dyes in the concrete, we are able to still create the contrast or lack of dyes.

Chair Lew: Ok and you're showing the yellow in the rendering at the moment so is that the preference or (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Mr. Corrao: No.

Chair Lew: You're just asking about – for – I know you're asking for our input.

Mr. Corrao: No, this rendering is – was something we put together for an earlier community outreach meeting. It's actually – we've given feedback that the yellow would not work so this is meant to just be sort of an artist illustration.

Chair Lew: Ok. That's fine. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me ask one question. You were talking about dyed asphalt as far as – now, how dyed is it? There's nothing worse looking than the type they just dye over the top and then after a year, where the cars are, you see the black lines because it's worn through. Is it completely dyed all the way through before they pour it or do they dye it afterward?

Mr. Corrao: That's a major consideration. With the dyed asphalt, there could be issues with patching. Another option is stamped asphalt instead, which is easier to replace. You can also use thermoplastic to do patching so that it also has the same look over the years but this is one of the comments we get internally from our facilities division. Whatever direction we head we want to make sure that it's something that's easy to maintain so we don't...

Board Member Gooyer: Or at least just deep enough so that it doesn't – ok.

Mr. Corrao: Exactly.

Chair Lew: The cross – the pilot project on Stanford Avenue and El Camino that you mentioned. My recollection is that that's stamped asphalt?

Mr. Corrao: Yeah.

Chair Lew: Red stamped asphalt?

Mr. Corrao: Yes.

Chair Lew: It seems to be holding up ok. Is that the Staff's opinion too?

Mr. Corrao: Yes. So far, it's held up quite well.

Chair Lew: Ok, any other questions? No.

Board Member Gooyer: You want a comment?

Chair Lew: Yeah, why don't we move onto the comments. Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Well, first of all, thank you for the landscaping of what had been a perfectly hideous traffic circle or a bunch of hideous traffic circles in Downtown North. I thought it was immensely clever to use succulents or semi-succulents who bloom in that international Orange, which suddenly turns the hideous high contrast paint into a design element. I thought that was really well done. I kept meaning to write a thank you letter so this is it. I think whatever you do in terms of landscaping is going to be very important. I'm really – in terms of your colors, particularly, after last year – last week's – last meeting's Maybell hearing. I think that what neighborhoods have to say about what they envision is very important. I mean, I myself would rather not have florescent yellow. I don't think it particularly fits with the suburban theme we've got going on in Palo Alto but if people want very high-visibility intersections that are (inaudible) – this is a school intersection; lots of kids pay attention, happy to defer to that. I find – Alex, what color is the – either one of you – what color is the material – the treatment at Stanford and El Camino?

Chair Lew: It's a Red – yeah.

Board Member Furth: Generally, ...

Chair Lew: There's a texture too.

Board Member Furth: Generally, I'm not a fan of Terracotta and the way it looks. On the other hand, I've not been deeply offended by an intersection so I'm interested to hear what my colleagues have to say.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: A couple of things. The traffic circles that you have, it seems like – in Europe they have a very specific reason – functioning as a calming mechanism but every traffic circle I've seen here is too small of a circle in the middle, which basically is the location to put a plant or a sign or whatever and really doesn't do what a traffic circle is supposed to do and that is to slow people down. I see the same thing with the one that you showed me, it's way too small. I mean, if you're going to put a traffic circle and then use it for what it's intended to do, which means pinching up the thing because a car could easily zip by that traffic circle with no problem at all and is not a system to slow people down. If is just for decoration or is it actually for traffic calming?

Mr. Corrao: I apologize, the illustrations are really not that great. We saved money with the project by not spending too much on the illustrations.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah but the reality is that that circle looks (crosstalk)...

Mr. Corrao: Yeah, it looks tiny.

Board Member Gooyer: ...very difficult – like all the other ones around.

Mr. Corrao: It's not very accurate. The circles will be relatively small but what we've also don't with the project is we're doing curb extensions so we're really tightening up the space for – and you will be forced to slow down at the new ones. It won't be similar to what we currently have.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok. The other thing is I'm not a big fan of raising the street up to the sidewalk because I agree that the whole concept – yes, it's easier for people to walk out onto the street but there are also easy enough for people to accidently run over onto the sidewalk. In an intersection like this I can see it but on some – the other one you showed that is the longer stretch, I'm not big fan – I'm not in favor of that. Other than that, I mean the color scheme is – yeah, just sort of a – I agree with my fellow Board Member that it – that could be a – do you go for the low-key or do you go for the really want to see it 6 blocks away type thing? That's probably something that the neighborhood should decide.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thanks for your presentation. Maybe adding onto the traffic circles, to me, I've always disliked the fact that we still have stop signs where we have the traffic circles. It almost seems like it redundant or it's – or the traffic circle is not doing their part. I know it's not necessarily part of this project per say but it would be nice to – it sounds encouraging that you're making those traffic circles larger than you have in the past so that it really does slow down the traffic. Perhaps there is an opportunity later that cars are going slow enough that you don't even need the stop signs.

Mr. Corrao: I don't mean to interrupt but we are removing stops at most of these traffic circles.

Vice Chair Kim: Great.

Mr. Corrao: They'll become a yield control.

Vice Chair Kim: Awesome.

Mr. Corrao: Not all of them but many of them.

Vice Chair Kim: Other than that, I guess I'm a little curious to see some of the concretion details. I know that different parts of town have different curb conditions. For instance, that Amarillo rendering that you have there is, I believe, a roll up curb as opposed to a hard 90-degree curb so as far as drainage – it's also an area in the flood zone. Are we still getting enough street drainage? Then the utilities – I have questions about the utilities at the traffic circles. It should like you will have some lighting and accommodations for that. What about – yeah, what about water? Will these plantings, Chicane, and other landscaping components be watered?

Mr. Corrao: These will be manual –hand watered for about 90-days until they are established. That will be in the construction contract but they're all drought tolerant plantings with the intent that they would not be irrigated.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok. Then I guess if you're just asking for my opinion. I'm not against the raised intersection. I think that could work. I think the ballads would protect pedestrians and I think it's worth experimenting with it. It hasn't been done in Palo Alto so might as well try it out and see how that works. If we can get some contrasting asphalt so that it is visible and so that we don't have cars – high school students flying over those intersections. I think it looks good and I'm excited to see them in place and see how they work.

Mr. Corrao: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you for bringing this to the Board. I don't have a lot of comments for you. The – I think the biggest change is something that you haven't shown me which is the lighting that you mentioned. Could these – like 15-foot high poles or are they – what are they?

Mr. Corrao: Yes. They would be standard City street lights and they would be – we had the – our consultant does a lighting analysis of where lighting would be needed. Trying to minimize the amount of lighting. Given that many of our current neighborhoods don't meet standards for lighting, we want to make sure that it's not too much of a contrast. They identified that traffic circle – particular traffic circles – they're – not all of them will need overhead lighting so a street light, that would be a standard height street light.

Chair Lew: Those are at the corners or is it in eye – ok.

Mr. Corrao: It would be at the corners.

Chair Lew: Then on the traffic circle. The ones in my neighborhood have trees in them but there are some complications with manholes and other utilities that – what are – do you have any thoughts about what gets planted in the circle?

Mr. Corrao: Yes. We're open to different types of landscaping ideas for it. We've met with utilities and they do need to have access to the manhole cover. They do a sewer flush every 2-years so whatever is put in there, it needs to be thorn free. We've been instructed because they do need to access it. They also have a truck that needs to be able to access the very center to do the – physically do the sewer flush. Other than that, really the – as long as it's drought tolerant, the landscaping is not a huge concern.

Chair Lew: Ok. Then are you thinking about trees in there or is just smaller plantings and the trees would be out in the Chicanes?

Mr. Corrao: It would be – it would not have trees in the traffic circles. They would just be smaller plantings.

Chair Lew: Ok, that's fine. Then you'd asked about the traffic circle island and I don't – and the materials and I think that I know enough about traffic circles to make a recommendation on that. I would say though the ones in my neighborhood all have tire marks on them. They seem to get mounted a lot. I would think that a darker color would work better than maybe lighter or maybe it's better to have lighter colors so that people can see it. On the – on all the warning domes at – we've had other Board Members in the past here that really objected to the yellow. I don't – I've seen enough crazy school drop off things that I think brighter is better but generally, I think the gray – I think I prefer the gray ideally. The – it seems to me that they would blend in more with the existing infrastructure. Then I think you asked about the raised crosswalk or the raised intersection. It seems to me that I kind of actually likes the red stamped. It seems that is more typical – that's kind of what people would expect it to be, right? I mean – then I think it also makes it look like a crosswalk. I mean right now you see basically a red crosswalk. The thing in the Burlingame that you're showing, that's all pavers, it almost looks like decorative paving. It doesn't necessarily look like a crosswalk. I'm not fixed on – I mean I don't feel that set on the color and texture. I do see some of the red crosswalks like on Stevens Creek and Cupertino and they don't wear well over time. It seems like they get beat-up pretty quickly so whatever – to me, is whatever is durable and looks good over time is probably the best way to go. I think that the intersection at Stanford and El Camino is working well.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah, go ahead Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I'm a heavy user of the intersection of Bryant and Everett as – you probably are to Kyu. I'm glad to hear you're making the circles bigger. What's the traffic lane you're going to leave? How wide is it going to be?

Mr. Corrao: The lane, I believe, in most places is about 10-feet as you approach the traffic circle.

Board Member Furth: Because I avoid that intersection on a bike because the bike/car possibilities are a way to thrilling. There's a lot of events and there's also a lot of just, let me plow straight through the intersection, going on.

Mr. Corrao: There are many variations block by block and if you are interested in seeing the plans, I've saved them on the City website under the transportation division site. If you would like to take a look at the plans, you can see which intersection – exactly what's planned. If you look – just be sure to look for the layout plan because the plans are several hundred pages.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Mr. Corrao: Yes, everything.

Chair Lew: I think that's it. I had just one last comment which is I think that Staff has been – you guys have been publishing in the newspaper about the traffic circles or how to use them or maybe that's transportation. Is that transportation?

Mr. Corrao: Our safe routes team has been doing some educational pieces on how to use a traffic circle in the light that many are coming.

Chair Lew: I think it's really important – I live in another City that has traffic circles but I would just say that I see people do things that they're not supposed to do around the traffic circle so I think that – I just wanted to say that that's important because it's not typical suburban intersection. Thank you, Staff.

Mr. Corrao: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Can't wait to see these get rolled out.

3. **QUASI-JUDICIAL / PUBLIC HEARING: 855 El Camino Real [16PLN-00237]:** Request for Architectural Review of an Amendment to an existing Master Sign Program and Sign Exception for construction of a new externally illuminated post-mounted freestanding tenant sign for "Gott's Roadside" at Town & Country. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt per CEQA Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: Community Commercial (CC). For additional information contact Rebecca Atkinson at rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Lew: Now we can move onto the next item which is item #3. 855 El Camino Real. Request for Architectural Review of an amendment to an existing Master Sign Program and Sign Exception for the construction of a new externally illuminated post-mounted freestanding tenant sign for "Gott's Roadside" at Town & Country. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from CEQA. Zone District: Community Commercial (CC).

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of the Planning Department: Thanks, Chair. We just need a minute to set up here. Chair? Excuse me Chair? I just learned that the applicant for this project is not here. They are coming? They are in the lobby? Oh ok. Then I'll just go get them. Thank you.

Ms. Rebecca Atkinson: Good morning.

Chair Lew: Welcome, Rebecca.

Ms. Atkinson: Thank you very much. The project today as you stated is a new freestanding sign – installation of a new freestanding sign at Town and Country Village for Gott's Roadside. This project will require the approval of sign acceptations findings and of course, Architectural Review findings. Town and County – we rarely see on Town and Country signs here with the Board because, in the past, the Master Sign Program and the Master Façade Program were approved for the project so most of the tenant signs

and so forth get processed over the Development Center. In this case, the Master Sign Program works where if a tenant proposes a sign deviating from the approved Master Sign Program, that they have to follow the normal Architectural Review process and sign exception process if necessary. In this case, the proposed project does not conform to the revisions of the Master Sign Program regarding sign type, height, placement location and number of individual tenant signs. The proposed location is at the end of the existing plaza seating area near the corner of Embarcadero Road and El Camino Real. Here is the proposed elevation on the sign. It generally matches the character of other existing tenant signs as well as the existing Gott's Roadside wall fascia sign. For comparison, here are – here's the character of the signs elsewhere. Especially along the – this is the existing identification sign along El Camino Real. There are a couple sign exception items that are requested. The three items that are bulleted here and of course, in regard to Architectural Review, the analysis would cover the sign location, size, it's design and night time illumination. Moreover, there is a policy item here also, about the overall approach to the Master Sign Program at Town and Country. This is a request for an exception by an individual tenant and so we're interested in feedback on whether or not this would actually set a precedent for other tenants that also have existing outdoor seating areas and how that would relate to the overall Master Sign Program. How would we approach that? The recommendations are actually to just review the project and then provide direction to Staff for recommended action to the director. The alternative actions are also listed in the Staff report. The applicant has provided a project description as well as suggested sign exception findings in Attachment A. There have been no public comments on this project since it has been turned in and since the notices went out. There are color and material boards available down at the end. I'll go get that for you and I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

Chair Lew: Do we have an applicant presentation?

Male: Good morning. There is an applicant presentation however, I apologize that the people who are all here to present the applicant presentation are not here right now. If needed, we would be willing to basically, bump to the next item on the agenda if that creates an issue.

Mr. Lait: I suppose alternatively, if – I think we presented in the materials and with Rebecca's presentation probably enough information about the sign and the policy statements. If the Board feels comfortable, you could probably go forward with the discussion.

Chair Lew: We can check them but I think we have more people here now. Are you may be ready to – yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: I'm not – haven't ever worked with the Town and Country Master Sign Program before and I couldn't find it on the website. Do you have a copy?

Ms. Atkinson: I do and Staff uses that at the counter regularly and things like that. Yeah, I don't think it's something that we actually published up on the website but I'd be happy to describe it for you?

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) is a first step.

Ms. Atkinson: Ok, great. In general, the original Master Sign Program that was approved in the early 2000s did have site identifications signs in the locations – basically, that have been implemented today but with the different design and then they came back in about 2007 and got approval for what we see today. The Façade Program has three options for tenant storefronts and so if you design your storefront to any of those three options, it just maintains a general consistency...

Board Member Furth: What are those three options like?

Ms. Atkinson: Just the general large store front windows, door placement and so forth like that. It's very minimal and I don't see a lot of difference between the options, in any case. Then the signs themselves, you're allowed to have a blade sign over each of your entrance doors so you get two if you have two entrances. You get a wall sign – well, on your fascia sign and that's light by a LED strip.

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry, a wall sign and a fascia sign or the wall sign is on the fascia? (Crosstalk)

Ms. Atkinson: Sorry, wall fascia sign in...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)(crosstalk) wall sign.

Ms. Atkinson: Just exactly as what that existing sign looks like for Gott's Roadside. All the tenants have those.

Board Member Furth: So, the Howie's Artisan Pizza sign which is not – which is out front in the parking lot – almost up to the parking lot, that complies?

Ms. Atkinson: That Howey's sign on that awning – that's an area of question for c-compliance. Actually, (inaudible)

Board Member Furth: It's not an awning. It's a wooden structure.

Ms. Atkinson: That whole item right there is an area in question for code enforcement.

Board Member Furth: And the eat sign, super graphic?

Ms. Atkinson: That is also something for this particular tenant, as you mentioned and in the Staff, report on the table, it said that Staff is unable to find any approval of the eat super graphics sign. That would be also – Jonathan wants to code (inaudible)...

Board Member Furth: A coded enforcement (inaudible)

Ms. Atkinson: ...that would also be a code enforcement item. The application did not – the application for the free-standing sign didn't not include retroactive approval of that eat and Staff inquired about that in and of itself. The – this particular freestanding sign can be reviewed on its merits in and of itself and the super graphic would require either the retroactive approval through a separate application or it would be a code enforcement item.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I think we're ready for the applicant presentation now and I think you have 10-minutes.

Male: Thank you, sir. Good morning members of the ARB, Chairman Gooyer. Today we have an application in front of you. I'd like to make a brief presentation. Joined here today is the Gott's Roadside applicant as well as Jim Ellis, owner of the shopping center. The application in front of you is primarily a sign to create an identity at Gott's dedicated plaza area, located in the corner of the shopping center. As mentioned by Staff, there is a Master Sign Program. That was actually created over 10-years ago, prior to the Real renovation and rejuvenation of the center. When the Master Program or the Master Plan came about the center, some key elements were made to try to attract retailers to the center. Some of these key elements included opening up of the arcades to try to create better light and visibility to us otherwise, it's a hard place to retail or (inaudible) with very low store fronts. One of the other key elements, when the center was renovated, was to create bulb-outs or plazas at strategic locations to hopefully, attach anchor tenants. These anchor tenants would then activate the plaza with intended uses or hopeful uses which include food and as you know, food attracts plaza or engages activity at plazas. Here – Wynne, I think you were asking about the sign program? This is from the Master Sign Program. This is a document that was created that most of the tenants use when they create their signs. It consists – where's the point? Ok. It consists of a long rectangular sign, mounted at the arcade fronts, so the beams. It's a fascia sign they call it and then again, as mentioned, internal arcade signs that are either hung or mounted to the walls. The signs that are used at the center are really used to express the key elements of the architecture or the (inaudible) of the center which is to express the posts and beams.

These post and beam structures are really required to be highlighted and emphasized anytime something is renovated there including any of the storefronts. The sign specific location is at the south corner of the site and it's at this entry, which is again Gott's dedicated plaza. It's approximately 45-feet from Embarcadero and 38-feet from El Camino Real. Gott's restaurant space, again, one of the larger restaurants here, is located approximately right here offset of the plaza; not directly on axis. The sign design itself is taking cues also from the Master Program that was originally created. The intent was to emphasize and create entryways into the center. These were done by looking at cues from California ranches. The vocabulary previously used also, referenced everything from low stone walls to palm trees. In this case, we're creating a portal or gateway to the entry of the plaza. The design elements again, really reference the post and beam vocabulary. The post are of (inaudible) or heavy timber posts, mounted or engaging on the existing low wall that surrounds the plaza. The engagement with – occurs with an exposed steel plates which again, is exposing the hardware that could be seen throughout the center. The beam or the fascia is a reference and a replica of the existing Gott's sign that's located slightly further away in front of the restaurant and their store front. The details of the sign as you can see are simple aluminum cut letters, then with a perimeter frame that is accented in red. I believe on the material board you see that is Gott's signature color. The size proportion of the sign are also meant to be kept very low and this low element, a beam or fascia, is to create a horizontal line (inaudible). That relates to the arcade and also happens to relate to the umbrellas when they are opened up in the plaza to create a strong gateway portal access through the plaza. Here you can see the sign off on the left as the gateway portal entry to the plaza. As well as then the Gott's existing arcade, as well as their space or their restaurant space off to the right. With that, I would like to invite Jim [Else] and Clay, if there is time left, to speak to a few points. Staff has talked about the exceptions and findings you need to make. There has been a lot of (inaudible) history on this project and we want to address some of the items if you need to discuss further, which include the number of signs of the site. Why does Gott's need so many or require this many signs? The free stand sign type. Again, it's really compliant with the Master Sign Program for the fascia but because we're mounting it between two posts, this becomes a new sign type that's not addressed in the Master Sign Program and is required for ARB approval. As well as allowing a specific tenant a type of sign (inaudible). If there is a question that if this is going to create a precedent for the center or not. Sorry, Jim.

Mr. Jim Ellis: Great. Good morning, Board Members. Jim [Else], I'm the owner and general partner of Town and Country Village, Palo Alto. We are – we've really appreciated your time and I don't have much time to speak but we care very much about this property as it – as we know, we are a steward for this landmark property in Palo Alto. I hope you can tell just by review – by doing a quick review of the sign program that we implemented a very carefully thought out, very minimal sign program that really caps the low-profile nature of the shopping center and what I'll just describe as a low-key vibe that the Town and Country Village has. If you – I just wanted down University Ave. I know that's probably not a good point of comparison but we very small scale signage at the center and Gott's happens to be a very important tenant to us. They are one of our anchor tenants for the center and the reality by the pictures that you've just looked at, is that it is still hard to identify Gott's to visitors to the center driving down El Camino or Embarcadero. Gott's has struggled financially to try to meet their business goals at the center and, so we are trying to help Gott's by allowing them to have a bit better identify. We understand that we're requesting this additional sign quality but given the dark store – the low-slung nature of the buildings; the very minimal fascia bands we have to do relatively small signs. We're asking that a consideration be made to add this freestanding sign. We understand that it's not defined specifically in the Master Sign Program but this is a unique circumstance. It is an outdoor seating plaza that is at a prominent location and we feel that it is a unique application. Not something that we would ever ask is repeated anywhere else in the center. Obviously, that's the reason why we're in front of you asking for your consideration to allow this minor change. That is about it for me. Then I'd like to introduce one of the managing partner or partners in Gott's Roadside.

Mr. Clay Walker: Thanks, Jim. Good morning everybody. My name is Clay Walker and I'm the president of Gott's Roadside and we're here obviously, to ask for your help because, in our opinion, we do not have enough roadside visibility and as a result, we're unable to attract enough customers and hit our sales targets. Unless something changes, our ability to remain as a tenant at Town and Country is in pareal.

When we arrived at Town and Country we combined three existing retail spaces and secured control over an outdoor patio, which is in the middle of the parking lot. It's a unique situation at Town and Country. I don't know how unique it is around the rest of Palo Alto but at least at Town and Country, it's unique. Our existing storefront fascia sign from the corner is actually behind the patio and so what we're trying to do in conjunction with our landlord is activate that corner. Not just to drive more business to Gott's but to make all of Town and Country more inviting but without signage closer to the corner, we've been unable to realize that full potential and that's why we are here today. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I will open up the public hearing to members of the public if they have any comments. I don't have any cards so I think we can move onto Board Member questions. Are there any other questions? Yes, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: If you're willing to share this information, is your shortfall in customers more towards the mid-day or the evening? Light or dark?

Mr. Walker: It's really two-fold.

Board Member Furth: So, it's even...

Mr. Walker: We're underachieving at both lunch and dinner.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? No. Why don't – Robert, would you start us off, please?

Board Member Gooyer: I've looked at this and I understand where you are coming from but it's one of these things that – what I've always liked about Town and Country is the low-key aspect of it. I've never really considered the signage that's one the buildings to be the type of thing that you would look at when you're driving at 40 MPH down El Camino. It's always been sort of a – once you pull into the shopping center, as you're driving along slowly you see the signs. To me, considering that sign is smaller than the existing one that you've got. It's going to be tough to see, as I said when you're driving on either one of those two streets. The problem is if that's – if the intent is to make it more noticeable for people on the roadway, I think maybe what needs to happen is your actual main sign needs to be modified not adding smaller signs on the buildings itself. I just cannot support it the way it is.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thanks for your presentation. I tend to look at it a little differently. I think from a larger – take a couple steps back and look at the bigger, overall picture of this. I think the current sign program probably needs to be updated. It was mentioned that it was put in place over 10-years ago. I think signs change much faster than actual building types and some of the other things that we look at as the ARB and so I think that program is set for some revisions that need to be put in place. Having said that, I think the sign that's being proposed here actually, makes sense. It's a roadside dinner. You want to be able to see if from the road. As a local, I know exactly where it is and I've been there but I've had an experience in the past where I've told a friend from out of town that's meeting at Gott's and they've had to circle around the plaza so I can understand that the visibility may be an issue. I don't think it necessarily hurts the rest of Town and Country or any of its neighbors. I think if anything that dedicated seating area can be somewhat of a mystery of whose seating area is that? I think this sign kind of suddenly says that this is for Gott's s customers and I think it's designed in a way that reflects the other signs throughout Town and Country as well as the existing fascia sign. If anything, I would question the need for the sign on both sides of the proposed sign. I think it makes sense as you're looking at it from Embarcadero and El Camino but I'm wondering if you really need that same sign lettering on the opposite side of the sign. I would also maybe question the lighting. I don't know if that is necessary but as far as a sign from a design standpoint, I think it's been thought out. It's been designed well and I think it

warrants an exception in this case. I had some other questions that I think have been answered and I would be fine with this exception.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I was telling my colleagues that I realized I've been watching the evolution of Town and Country since 1964 and it's very impressive because you've managed to change it significantly and keep what makes it particularly attractive and lovely and I have certainly spent a lot of time and money there. My principle concern is that I was looking at it again this morning. I decided to look at the drive by approach as to oppose to the walk or bike approach I usually take. What makes it – it's a relatively small site but it's so distinctive and the reason – one of the reason it's so distinctive is because of its sign program. I'm concerned that this application, which I realize is from the center, without figuring out what we're doing here, looks like a step in losing that integrity. It's interesting that Gott's red border is part of their distinctive signage and I understand both their legal and practical need and right to keep that but that alone makes that sign pop and that along with the bookstore signs and the other hamburger places and whatnot. I'm disinclined to say yes at this point without seeing the sign program because when I look at the Howie's sign, which also involves a coming forward though not coming forward as far and I look at the eat super graphic and then I also look at the very low-key Trader Joe signage. I think we'll get a better result if we look at the – I'm sorry to do this – say this but we'll get a better result if we look at the sign plan rather than trying to address this problem. This sign I think is intended for drive by traffic. I don't know if it's suitably sized for that. Obviously, the applicant thinks it would be a help and I'm not comfortable with saying yeah, we need bigger signage to sustain businesses here.

Chair Lew: Yeah. We'll have a 10-minute rebuttal period after the Board Members make their comments. What do I want to say? I would say the – I spent many, many hours on Monday at the Council meeting with regards to our Retail Protection Ordinance and there is a long – the Council is supportive of local businesses and does understand that there are issues with the local businesses and our Sign Ordinance. I'm willing to support the sign exception for this particular project. I did go to the site yesterday and it seems like your existing fascia sign works from Embarcadero entrance but it doesn't give you anything from the El Camino entrance. It seems very weak coming in from the El Camino side and I think that's just because of the corner. The landscaping, there are trees at the corner and also too, when your umbrellas are open, that also actually, makes it harder to see the fascia sign at the corner. I do think the – all the patios that were added back in 2006 or 2007, whenever, are really amazing. I mean, they are really very, very well done and I don't think that the sign that is proposed attracts from that at all. That's where I am on this one. I think I do agree with other Board Members that they want to see an update of the Sign Program just to make sure that new signs are fitting in with the program. I think that's the better way to go but if there's a time issue on this one, I'm fine with – I'd be agreeable to approving an exception today or I think the Staff is going – is just asking for direction today, is my understanding.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I can clarify that. If there's a majority support from the Board, one way or the other, I feel like we could probably draft the findings and make a decision within the 5-day time frame in the code if that was your direction.

Chair Lew: OK but at the moment, I'm seeing us more like 2-2, which is actually – a tie is a denial, at the moment.

Mr. Lait: Correct.

Chair Lew: I think that's where we are. I think – is there any more deliberation on the part of the Board?

Board Member Furth: Well, I do have a question which is, is there any reason to believe that super graphic is legal and is permitted under the Sign Program?

Ms. Atkinson: That super graphic is not permitted. It would require a retroactive approval of a sign exception for the super graphic.

Board Member Furth: I am disinclined – I mean, not having heard the arguments in favor it. I, at the moment, would be disinclined to say that that was consistent with the overall – which I agree, terrific ambiance environment that has been created.

Mr. Lait: If I could just interject there. Apologize for interrupting. I don't think that there is a – the super graphic eat sign and maybe one or two other signs that have popped up at the site. We're not finding some records for those and my thought on that was that we can focus on the one item that is here before us and we've had a conversation with the property owner about our interest in updating the Master Sign Program. I feel like we can probably address those signs that are questionable, whether they've got a permit for them and incorporate them into a Master Sign Program or as reviewed by the Board, have those be removed.

Board Member Furth: I think questionable is a bit of a ufaism in this case. I think they are illegal.

Mr. Lait: I say questionable – you think they legal or?

Board Member Furth: Illegal.

Mr. Lait: I use that term...

Board Member Furth: They appear to be non-conforming to the...

Mr. Lait: Right but I use that term because we don't have any City records but the applicant, in my conversation with them has indicated that they believe that they did get City approval. From my perspective, it is unknown.

Board Member Furth: Clearly my information is incomplete.

Chair Lew: Any other comments? Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Maybe one last comment on the text for the proposed sign. It's – I always thought there was something a little bit different and I think comparing it with the existing sign. Is there a different curning between those letters especially, Roadside? Yeah, you can come up.

Male: Yeah, in fact actually, they will be the exact identical. The graphic might be slightly off. The people that made the sign on the fascia – sign company, is the same sign vendor and they are using the same details though the portions might be slightly different but the intent would be the exact same lettering as well as the colors that you see in everything else before you on the material board. You might be looking at the line drawing and that might be what's throwing it off a little bit.

Vice Chair Kim: Do you know what curning is?

Male: I don't know (inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, no. It's fine. It's just a very minor comment but...

Male: We can ensure that it would be a replication of that sign.

Vice Chair Kim: I think if you want to maintain the existing curning, I think that the font size will actually have to get smaller but just a minor comment.

Board Member Furth: I have one more question.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Obviously, I'm trying to get to a place where I can vote yes. This is the more dramatic former parking lot seating area. There are a number of others. I'd like to feel secure that an approval of this would not lead to a whole series of additional requests in a new sign plan for additional encroachment things. Could we have your comments?

Mr. Ellis: Thank you. One of the reasons why I don't feel a revision to the sign criteria is necessary is because this is a unique circumstance. We're not interested in modifying the sign program to allow for other free standing signs. This is a unique location. It's at the corner of the property. It involves what we consider to be an anchor tenant for the shopping center and we just don't see any other relevant area or any other circumstance where we would be asking for another free-standing sign. The other thing that I would just add is that the tenants have no control over the signage that they require unless we approve it. We are the steward of this Sign Program that you have – that your predecessors have approved and we follow it very tightly. There are one or two exceptions which have been discussed here today but we're happy to answer more questions about that.

Chair Lew: I have one more question for Staff. On the existing multi-tenant signs, right, there are two. There is one Embarcadero and one on El Camino and so Gott's has – and there are two faces on each sign so Gott's is on one face of one sign, is that correct? Then the – I think they've got a photo of it. Who – how is that – how is the – do we know how the selection of tenants is placed on the sign? How do we know who gets space and why there just – why are they only on one sign – one side of one face?

Ms. Atkinson: The Staff isn't involved in that type of permitting. They were permitted to have tenants on those signs so I believe I would defer to the property owner.

Chair Lew: Great. I think they have a photo there, that they are on the right and that's the Embarcadero sign. If you could use the microphone and so I think the argument – I guess my question is could they have more placement on the multi-tenant signs instead of the patio sign? Would that do more for the business?

Mr. Ellis: As you can see they already have a position and we don't have any more room at this time to place more identity for them. I would just – I can't help myself but I've been involved in this project for so long. That is a very modest monument sign, in my opinion, compared to all the other retail centers in Palo Alto. We took really great care in making sure that it's consistent, uniform, all the same color. All the things that retailers hate. We've had to fight for it to have that type of result.

Chair Lew: Yeah, go ahead.

Male: Can I just add to that as well? When we did this, the master signs, as Chairman Gooyer pointed out. They are really not designed to the size and font that is to be really seen at a 35 MPH drive-by. It's more pedestrian friendly and some token of signage as you will and this – in fact, in the Staff report, it was hard to see where the sign was. It's on one side, it's off to the right and it's actually blocked by the palm trees when you drive into the center.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. For Staff, I just have a quick question for you. The rebuttal period, is that after we make a motion or this before?

Mr. Lait: The rebuttal is actually for the applicant to rebut any public comments. They don't have an opportunity to rebut the Boards discussion but you're certainly welcome to invite them back to respond to any comments that they heard at your discretion.

Board Member Furth: Do you want to continue this until we have a full Board?

Chair Lew: Oh, well why don't we – ok. Why don't we – do we have any motions?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Well I could propose that we continue this to till our next regular meeting so that they can be considered by a full Board which would give them direction.

Board Member Gooyer: In all fairness, the way it looks now, it's probably 2-2 so I think you're probably going to be better off – it's going to take one more time but I can't vote yes for it right now. Like I said, if there are 5 people here then there is a much better shot at getting a 3-2 or a 4-1. There isn't a whole lot of – there's no additional work that needs to be done. It's mainly the matter of the 5th Board Member is missing.

Mr. Lait: I guess to that point, if I may Chair, it would be helpful to hear from Board Member Furth about the expectations for a continuation because I heard comments about an updated Master Sign Program in order to be comfortable to move forward.

Board Member Furth: I'm suggesting that if you have 5 members present, you're going to get direction. That won't simply be a default because of a tie.

Mr. Lait: I think that – Yeah, I understand. I mean, yes, we would have a majority and we would get direction.

Board Member Furth: They might very well get an approval. Our missing member can review the tape and look at the minutes and be qualified to participate.

Chair Lew: Ok. Does Staff – We don't have Jodie Gerhardt today. Does Staff what's up on the next – at the next meeting? What's on the agenda for the next meeting?

Mr. Lait: Your next meeting is March 2nd and you've got a lot of items. You've got 3223 Hanover; the fire station is coming back on Embarcadero. You've got a new multi-family project on Alma. That's what we have slated thus far and I think there was actually another item that is pending.

Ms. Atkinson: This would be old business. We would be considered old business too, right?

Chair Lew: Right, so it would come first. Although the fire station is also old...

Mr. Lait: You've got – you would have three other items or two other items – three counting this one that would be – have heard previously.

Chair Lew: Is the applicant open to the next hearing?

Male: Can I make a point? Just to point out. Chairmen or Member Gooyer – I'm sorry, Member Baltay is not here today. He actually worked with us on some of the retail center storefronts design so he's been hired by the owners. He might have to recuse himself.

Chair Lew: Yeah, that was within a year, right?

Male: I don't know if it was a year. That was probably – I don't remember the history there but it was a little bit – some time ago, we've worked together at the center.

Chair Lew: OK, well this makes it harder. (Inaudible)

Male: To that point, we'd be glad to address some of the concerns you have and maybe come to some agreement. Just to point out, this has been a year and a half in the making. You look at the dates of this

application, last June and various – we've been working really hard with Staff and trying to come to some terms for this. Thank you.

Chair Lew: OK.

Board Member Furth: I would certainly appreciate having the additional time. (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Would the – and then would we be – the Staff could provide the existing Master Sign Program so that you could review that? ok. Why don't we – I think that we still need to make a motion.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: I move that we continue the hearing in this matter to our next regular meeting where it will be heard as old business, at the front of the agenda.

Chair Lew: Great.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, I'll second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

Chair Lew, Vice Chair Kim, Board Member Furth, Board Member Gooyer: Aye.

Chair Lew: Opposed? None. We will continue it to the next ARB meeting.

MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH ONE MEMBER ABSENT

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2600 El Camino Real [16PLN-00022]:**
Consideration of an Architectural Review Application to Allow the Demolition of an Existing Six-Story Commercial Building and Construction of a New Four-Story, 62,616 Square Foot Commercial Building; no new Floor Area is Being Requested. The Project Includes Retention of an Existing Subterranean Garage and Proposes a new Parking Structure at the Rear of the Proposed Building. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From CEQA per Guideline Section 15302 (Replacement and Reconstruction) Zoning District: CS. For additional information contact Sheldon Ah Sing at SAhsing@m-group.us

Chair Lew: We move on to item number 4 which is a PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL item. 2600 El Camino Real. Consideration of an Architectural Review Application to allow the demolition of an existing six-story commercial building and construction of a new four-story, 62,616-square foot commercial building; no new floor area is being requested. The project includes retention of an existing subterranean garage and proposes a new parking structure at the rear of the proposed building. Environmental Assessment is the project is exempt from CEQA per guideline section 15302 and the Zone District is CS. Welcome, Sheldon. You have the Staff report?

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing: Yes, good morning. Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner. The applicant is also here with a presentation. Just a brief project overview because you did see the project a couple months ago. The project does propose a demolition of an existing non-conforming office – commercial building and construction of a new 4-story commercial building with no new net square footage. So, there is some amenity space that's being added but that's not considered as gross (inaudible) under the Palo Alto code. The request does include Architectural Review. The key issues would be architectural design and context and we will go over some of the things that were discussed at the last meeting. There was some discussion about privacy as well as some hardscape in the front of El Camino Real. There was a lot of discussion about the garage in the rear of the building and how that should be functional. It wasn't

perceived as a lot of detail was given to that parking structure and how that parking structure would complement the architecture of the building as well as having pedestrian connections from that structure to the building. Then there was also some discussion regarding the project's preservation of 4 mature trees, 2 of those, in particular, are along El Camino Real. The applicant did come back with a response to the garage. Some real detailed drawings about how the garage circulation would work and the layout and these would meet the Cities criteria for a design. They also included areas for pedestrian circulation on the first floor – the ground level with some different (inaudible) pavement styles so that people would know that that's an area to walk in. Including in that was a particular attention to the design. This is an upgraded design that was previously presented to the Board. You can see in the upper picture that that is the garage and the lower picture shows a slight silhouette of the garage but the main building is in front of it. There you can see that the two have some mirroring types of architectural design and materials that are being used; same themes. This is a close up of the first floor of the garage showing the circulation and you can see the dashed arrows where the pedestrian would be on the ground level and lead to the pedestrian plaza at the rear of the building. This just demonstrates the site plan just to remind the Board that there is an existing basement below that is going to remain. The surface parking is being upgraded with a garage deck in the back so the project now will meet the code with respect to parking. There is a loading space that is being added in the back. The two elm trees along El Camino Real and this new current plan are being removed so that freed up some flexibility for some landscaping. There is some public art that is being proposed out in the front and that is working its way through the Commission. As I mentioned, the site does include the amenity space within the building. These are just some images that we've shown before. These have not changed. There was a lot of comments regarding, I think, the architecture of the building the last time but the applicant will have in their presentation some pictures regarding the privacy with the adjacent mixed used building. As discussed before, the Environmental Review, this is a replacement project. There are not impacts of cultural resources as well as any hazards. We did receive some public comment, you should have that before you, from the adjacent developer of the new mixed-use building stating that they did consider the privacy in their design and landscaping so they don't perceive any issues happening there. With that, the motion is to recommend the approval of the project based on the findings and subject to the Commission's approval. That concludes our presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Why don't we do the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Cliff Chang, Change Architecture: Thank you. Cliff Chang, Chang Architecture, Burlingame, California. If we go to the next slide just to review – Oh, thanks. The four major items that were brought up that we responded to was removing the two Chinese elms that were in the existing planters. Second was providing more detail on the hardscape integration with the housing on the side walk and the trees. Third was provide more detail on the circulation around the parking garage, the upper garage in the back and how that integrates with the architecture of the office building. Then lastly, addressing the privacy between the office building on the west elevations with the housing. This view and the – mainly shows the access – just to clarify, the access to the lower garage shown by the red arrows so those are coming in from both sides into the upper garage. They go down – it's the same as it works right now currently on site. The blue arrows are the new entrance to the upper garage. We had them, as you recall, at the corners. We had one-way entries – one-way entry up and a one-way exit down. We've solidified that and clarified that into one single two-way ramp at the bottom of the sites so it's further away from the other entries. This is a blow up of the Landscape Plan and in the left corner you can see the adjacent housing hardscape. You've actually a picture of it in your 11x17 showing the sidewalk scoring. We've – we're matching the 13-foot sidewalk exactly. The tree grates that they have, we're mirroring that with our trees. You can see that the spacing of the trees is similar and this plan also shows the – we're going to have new walkways along the left and right of the garage in those will be planted with addition of 10 new trees. I think you asked about the relationship between the office building and upper parking garage. This is a diagram showing the relationship between the two with the green space right in between. Just to clarify the ways that the ramps work. The top diagram is showing the red ramp going down to the lower garage that's below the office and then then the lower diagram shows the ramps going up to the upper garage. Just to clarify how that circulation works. The circulation on the upper garage is now one-way and it has no dead ends so you simply come up this central ramp. You circulate clockwise. One-way

parking – diagonal parking is much easier to navigate and then you just circulate either up or down. We have added the new lights – before I get to that. We actually designed this in tandem with [Watchry] Design, a garage specialist and this just shows that the turning diagrams indeed work very well and so we're both comfortable with the design. Just some sections. The bottom one showing how the lower garage access works. These diagrams show that – the lower diagram elevation shows the mechanical vent from the lower garage which is that tall spire with the egress stair and then that's all metal panel facing the office building and this is what it would look like. What we've done here is if you look at the lower elevation of the office building on both sides, they have a very geometric square with the large punch out in it and its metal panel on the right side and its stone on the left side. What we've done on the garage facing the office building is mimic that same architectural move so that they can coordinate very well together so that's all white metal panels just like the office building. Then we've come on the exhaust shaft with a similar element with the wood – simulated wood soffit coming over. Just like what appears on the office building. The white panel actually extends on the edges all the way around the edges of the slab and then we've come in with some cable rails so that we increase the light and safety of the garage which was another comment. Moving on to – oh, this just shows a diagram of how the pathways work around the garage. We've coming in with special paving that's consistent with the rest of the special paving around – that's at the front of El Camino so that shows how pedestrians get there. Again, this is a similar – this is the same view inside the court yard showing the limestone lower planter coordinating with the limestone piers on the office building and then you see the garage structure above. Moving onto the residential and the privacy issue. This diagram shows that there's actually a layer of trees that's being proposed – actually, they are being planted right now, on that housing site. It's a row of red maples and then in addition, on our property, we've got a number of either existing Chinese elms – the existing Chinese elm and new trees on top of the garage. I did forget to mention that we got rid of the Chinese elms along El Camino, thankfully, so that's going to avoid a huge liability issue. Sorry for forgetting to mentioning that in the beginning. We're actually planting a brand-new tree right in the soil. It won't be in a planter so it's going to grow very well. The left plan shows the first floor – I just want to remind everybody that there's no housing on the first floor. It's all amenity spaces. The diagram on the right shows that there are 4 units; there are 3 two bedrooms and there's 1 three bedrooms but you can see the row of red maples that are being installed now. Then we have the elm in the lower left corner of our site and then we have the new trees being planted along our property. It's really a layered system. In section, it's 86-feet between the units. What helps – also helps out is the fact that we do have some decks on this left side so it actually obscures the view from inside the building and we're we have – we either have solid rails, opaque on the second and fourth floor and then were we have glass rails, we're actually going to frost that so that you can't see through it. This is a view that you can see the white portion on the right. Really small windows that go into a hallway of those 2-3 bedroom units. Then you can see actually, the balconies have very small windows so those windows look like that little slot window from the interior – the one in the middle with the fan. We're not talking about incredibly large windows here. They all have shades just like our office building is going to have shades but that kind of depicts what those are and those are the heights of the window heads. This is just a very reasonable 6-year view of what that will look like from the office building. We have the existing Chinese elm that is right now at 60-70-feet. We've got the red maples, which will conceal the entire second floor up to the head of those windows. As you can see, only after 6-years, we just have really, three units plus the fourth unit with a very small window on the right. At the end of 10-years, those maples actually, with the red spires and the Hungarian Oak will conceal all the windows. We feel pretty comfortable that this whole privacy issue is resolved and that we've got plenty of planting – we've got blinds in our office building and we've actually have got a letter from the developer of the housing, indicating that their very comfortable with the situation. That's it. If anybody has any questions?

Chair Lew: Thank you. I will open up the hearing to the public. I don't have any cards so I will close the public hearing and move onto Board Member questions. Any questions? Why don't we do comments? Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back. Thank you for addressing – a thorough address of our comments from the last round. I just want to touch on a couple of the points that you've replied too. I think the added details and the revisions of the parking deck behind the building are much better than

what we've been shown before. I do still – I think the turning diagrams work from a navigation standpoint but I still think that it seems to me that there are at least 3 or 4 parking spots that would be terribly difficult to actually pull into when I'm looking at this diagram. I don't know if there's maybe an opportunity to remove those from the parking deck and either add them to the ground floor or what we can do to accommodate those spots but that's something that I found on the parking. Then my only other comment was really – I think I made a comment about the locker rooms and the privacy and the amenity space. My comment was actually more towards views as you're walking to the men's or the women's locker room, that when the door is open, that you may have a privacy issue potentially as you're walking by so that was my concern. It wasn't necessarily that going to the lockers was the privacy. I do have a quick question on the lockers, it looks like there are some rectangles in the spaces that I couldn't understand what they were necessary. I'm looking at sheet A-2.1. There ...

Chair Lew: Can I chime in for a second? We don't have purview over the inside of the buildings but I think if...

Vice Chair Kim: But those...

Chair Lew: ... you just want to know the answer, I think that's fine to ask the question.

Mr. Chang: Those rectangles, those are lockers. The small ones?

Vice Chair Kim: The longer rectangles like in front of the sinks? Are those benches?

Mr. Chang: Oh, those are benches, yeah.

Vice Chair Kim: Actually, in the plan that we received. One of the benches is much too close to the sink but I understand that is not our purview, it's just a comment that I had. From an overall standpoint, I think the revisions have addressed the overall arching concerns that we've or that I've had at least and I would be more than comfortable recommending approval of the project and I thank you for sticking with the process. Again, addressing the comments as thoroughly as you have. Thank you.

Mr. Chang: Thanks.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I was very impressed. I think you answered all the questions that I had so I am fine with it the way it is.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I agree. I really appreciate the care and thoroughness in which you addressed our concerns. I am willing to except the analysis by both you and your neighbors that you've got great privacy and not only great privacy but addressing treatments and landscaping and whatnot, but that you're going to create a very nice, green outlook for people in both buildings. I will say you raised another question for me which is not significant but just – I see the statement that you have been revised to native Palo Alto plantings as reflected on sheet L-2.1 and that 5 out of the first 7 are not. I presume that's because those are a tree for which you don't think there are reasonable local substitutes or we've decided already that our traditional local trees are not going to survive in a warming climate but I just note that as something that confused me a bit. I think you've addressed my concerns.

Mr. Chang: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you for addressing all of our comments. I think you guys did more than I was anticipating. I think – thank you very much for that. I just wanted to follow up on Wynne's comment about the trees. I think I do appreciate all the new native plants that have been added to the plant list. I

think those all look good. There are non-native oak trees but those are still considered beneficial because they are producing acorns

Board Member Furth: I'm not arguing that they aren't beneficial. I'm just saying it doesn't match the description in the letter. I'm just reading the text.

Chair Lew: I know and then I would just say that the – it seems like, from what I can tell – I think the Landscape Architect is here who can maybe answer it but it seems like they have been selecting oak trees that are more vertical proportioned than some of our native ones that have a wider canopy. I don't know. Paul, if you – I don't think we need to delve into that too much. I can support the project. I think I do agree with Board Member – Kyu's comment about the parking. Some of the parking in the above grade deck don't – they seem to be difficult to access. I would say it seems like you do have more parking than what is required so I don't – now? No? I thought you added – I was looking at the tables...

Mr. Chang: We're right at the limit and we discussed the maneuvering with [Watchery] and they are very comfortable and I can get them to write you a letter that because this garage is not handling that many cars. They are very comfortable with a 2-point move to get into some of those that are some of the first spots.

Chair Lew: Yeah. Is it – I think maybe – it's just that maybe we would have the Staff double check it. I think another option would be to back into those spaces. I see that – I've seen that in other garages. It's not common but in a low trafficked garage, that's not a big deal. We're only talking about a couple...

Mr. Chang: Right.

Chair Lew: ... we're only talking about a couple spaces. That's where – I'm good with the project and then I think I have some comments on findings. I think for Staff – we're going to the findings on page 38 of the packet. Under finding #3 which is about aesthetics. I think the very first part of the paragraph is talking about the lockers and the showers and the bicycle parking standards and I think that goes into another – into a different finding. It would go into either 4 or 2.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah. Then under – so that's one comment. Then the second comment is on page 39 about the landscape and we have our new regional indigenous finding for plants, is that I would add that the revised Landscape Plan has over a dozen California – locally native California plants and there are non-native plants that are producing – yeah, that are beneficial; they are producing acorns. Then there are also native places that are producing berries which are also desirable for birds and other wildlife. That's all that I have. Do we have a motion?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: I move approval based on the findings and conditions proposed by Staff after illuminating the first three sentences in finding #3, which don't pertain to that finding.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

Chair Lew, Vice Chair Kim, Board Member Furth, Board Member Gooyer: Aye.

Chair Lew: Opposed? None. Congratulations. It's been a long road. You've been in process for over 2 or 3 years.

MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH ONE BOARD MEMBER ABSENT

Mr. Chang: Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you very much.

Approval of Minutes:

Chair Lew: We don't have any minutes or subcommittee items. I think we are adjourned. Thank you.

Subcommittee Item

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment