



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: January 19, 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, Robert Gooyer, Peter Baltay

Absent:

Chair Lew: Welcome to the Architectural Review Board meeting for January 19th, 2017. Roll call, please.

Jodie Gerhardt: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to welcome our new Chair and Vice Chair.

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Are there any – Oh, we have oral communications for items that are not on the agenda. I do have one speaker. David Carnahan from the City of Palo Alto.

Mr. David Carnahan: Thank you and good morning Chair and Board Members. David Carnahan, Deputy City Clerk. I am here for two reasons today. One is to again, express Council's appreciation to you for your service last year and to present Council's appreciation gift and proclamation to Board Member Furth, who wasn't able to stay for the whole event last year. So, I'll bring that up to you for a moment and then for all of you, for the members of the Community that here and watching from home. I wanted to announce the City is recruiting for the Historic Resources Board, the Parks and Recreation Commission, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. The reason we come to Commissions and Boards is because you are great representatives out in the Community and I'm hoping that each of you will talk to a couple people about these various Boards and Commissions. Again, three terms on the Historic Resources Board, five on the Parks and Recreation Commission and one on the Planning and Transportation Commission. Applications are available on the City's clerk's website and the deadline to apply is January 27 at 4:30 PM. Again, hoping that you can all reach out to one or two members of the Community for a couple of these Commissions and then, if members of the Community are watching or are here today are interested, I have some flyers here and I'll give you each a copy of this. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you, David.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Are there any agenda changes or deletions? No.

City Official Reports

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

[Moved to Study session first]

Study Session

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

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

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, good morning, Chair and Vice Chair and Board Members. This is Amy French, Chief planning official. I'm here to present the project. To my left is [John Akin], the zoo director. I knew there was a title there. I'll just quickly provide some context and then we'll move onto the rest of the presentation. That last the ARB – a former member ARB was March 19th of 2015. There was a study session for a replacement building. So, that was provided with some background in your packet as well as some bulleted items comments to say what the ARB felt was critical, in terms of what to look at for the next round. Here we are, next round, preliminary review. The Junior Museum and Zoo has a circa date of 1941 and it is a two-story building; a small second story as you see here on the screen. I provide some views here of the Ariel of the site which includes the two parking lots and the zoo. Then, you know, there's an image therefrom Middlefield. Middlefield is a critical elevation as it faces residential houses across the street. Here's an Ariel of the border site that includes the various Lucie Stern buildings, which is quite a complex and includes the Boy Scout facility here and the library over here. The adult theater, the Community Services Department buildings and some other related shops for the theater and such. Over here the Girl Scout House. This is the Lou Henry Hoover House that was talked about in the report. Here is a list of addresses on this large parcel, include the fire station that's in red here, you'll see as the next item today. I should say the Walter Hays School is butting the project as well and is the closest building to the existing zoo here. Here are some images of the Lucie Stern Center. It is a Category 1 historic resources on the City's historic resources inventory. Here's the Boy Scout facility here. I show this to you because what's interesting is there use to be at this site – there was a street that went through, a city street and it was abandoned – Melville, it was and it kind of became this driveway and the building that was here was the Girl Scout House, that was also a Birge Clark building, that was relocated to its current location and the Boy Scouts took its place. Here's an image of the Children's Library – I'm showing this to you to make sure that we're all on the visual page with what's existing at the site architecturally and placement etc. Here's the Lou Henry Hoover House. This is again a Birge Clark building but it wasn't specifically mentioned in the historic inventory. We think of it as historic but it has never been analyzed with a historic evaluation per say. A couple of things that they require is continued access to the garage here and this just shows the limits of the lease in which goes slightly beyond the building. Then, in the report, I mentioned there's a fountain dedicated to a scout master that passed away early, I guess, and I think that's somewhere about here, outside of the lease area. This shows a few more images. The playground, where you could see thru here to the existing zoo, behind the Girl Scout House. This is from Hopkins Street here and then the parking lot, that will be a part of this project. This is the Adult Theater here; Theater Works and others use this and here's this current driveway. One of the things about the current project is there is two current site – there are two driveways to get into that first parking lot off of Middlefield and there are diagonal spaces here and there's a blockage here and some 90-degree parking back here. It's really, badly, configured. So, one of the things is to redo the parking lots and make it more functional and adding spaces in the process. Here's the footprint of the existing building. The building for the zoo and the outdoorsy area and here's the proposed which shows kind of an 'L' shaped or a 'U' shaped rather, that turns the corner around a key tree; the Dawn Redwood Tree. There's also a Pecan Tree over here and then, here's the Loose in the Zoo proposal. I'll let [John] talk to that and then there's some outdoor animal management area. I'll let [John] speak a little bit to the – I'll just say one more thing which is the parking redesign. Again, here is the new alignment coming off of this main street and that's the only driveway then into this whole parking lot and then, exit or – it goes

both ways onto Hopkins. It circulates so, you know, it's likely to discourage cut throughs but certainly much better aligned and with trees in swells, this kind of thing and wayfinding. I'll let the architect go more into all of that. So, here's the Loose in the Zoo, if [John] wants to...

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

[Mr. Brent McClure:] Thanks [John].

[Mr. Akin:] Oh, wait. Amy has got a comment?

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

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

[Mr. McClure:] Thank you. We're really glad to be here before you today. I'm Brent [McClure] with Cody Anderson Wasney Architects. As was mentioned, we presented a couple – I think it's almost 2-years ago, now – a very different project. This has been a labor of love since 2011 as [John] mentioned. This is 100% donor funded the project so, a lot of the challenges have been really trying to eek out every bit of program within this high constrained site. I'm going to go through just some site plans really quickly. Some of the things, Amy talked about how the existing lot and the configuration of the existing building – here is the existing Zoo. This green line represents the park boundary. We've got a Dawn Redwood tree and a Pecan Tree that are out here; very large and significant, which we are working the design around. Here's the current site plan – ends – what we've done is completely reconfigured the parking lot with a single entrance over on one side, improved driveway drop off, visitor parking, bike parking over on one side and then, the main entrance will then sit right off where the Dawn Redwood is and then the Pecan Tree – so, we're – we pulled the building completely out of the park because the last time we had some structures that were in the park and we're kind of threading the needle by allowing the edge of the expanded parking, these trees and the park boundary to almost define the shape and size of the space.

The Zoo still lives within the park with some outdoor Zoo support over into this area here. Just some analysis and illustration to all of the constraints we have been working around. Living within the setbacks, we aligned the building to comply with the side yard setback; the outdoor space is here. The Zoo is completely outdoor within the park boundary and then enhanced and sort of widened entrances into the park over here. This has been in conjunction and coordination with sort of the Park Master Plan. Another illustration to show circulation through the site. We're going to have a modest, sort of loading and service that's fully screened out over here on Middlefield with exterior access that links the zoo support with this sort of service corridor along the side over here; to allow the zoo support to not have to go through the museum or the entrance spots. With the building – the floor plan as I mentioned, you enter in through a gateway over here. This is an exterior courtyard. The program consists of classroom and education spaces, museum space and then, zoo support space. Presently, the zoo does not have enough support space to then – for the animals and what not to become fully accredited so, a lot of this project is to really enhance and improve those functions. All of those are aligned along this back edge over here. The blue signifies the classroom and academic space, the yellow is the exhibit space. As you enter in, ticketing is right over on this edge. You then come into the exhibit space and then one of the other main big ideas that, you know, that [John] was talking about was this immersive experience. We're kind of taking the zoo and kind of pulling it inside and outside with the exhibit space. There are views that you can then see into the zoo. We have the science courtyard, that's outdoor space over here and this outdoor education zone. These areas – this is the site of that future Phase 2 and then the zoo support which is sort of screened back in over this area here. We've tried to take the intersections of the grids of the overall site. You've got the grid of Middlefield and then you're got the access that comes off of – I think it's – you know, the opposing street here. We've tried to take some simple massing forms with the education wing back and over here and then popping up and having this museum and sort of the public's sphere back in over on this edge to have this higher mass. Then this main piece of the museum that bumps out and creates this sort of viewing window and whatnot so, that as you walk up to the museum and zoo, you can sort of see into the museum to have this featured ball machine, is what they're looking to have. It's a really big exhibit space and then, this outdoor, sort of canopy frames the portal of sort of the entrance into this courtyard over into here. Some of the materials that we're considering for the project, we're trying – we're working with some modest means, given our budget constraints but using a combination of wood, some Lithocrete. Lithocrete is like a concrete material that allows this to almost replicate sandstone and what not to kind of give this rich, dense, textural feel. Pops of color and some playful windows and signage to kind of accentuate and signify where we have – and kind of echoing that this a children's museum and zoo. The one spot over here where we have the feature window, we're looking at using a flatlock seamed metal cladding, is one of the types of materials that we're looking at to kind of accentuate and showcase that piece right there. To walk around some of the views. Here are the entry perspective and elevation. We're seeing that the front of this building really is focused primarily on the parking and that area that kind of looks out towards – more towards Lucie Stern. You can kind of see here with the wood siding and then, this low wall here in the front would then be the Lithocrete with the signage. Then, we've got some round, playful windows that pop back into the museum here. Then, some windows over here onto the – that look into the museum itself so, you really, kind of get this indoor/outdoor connection with the netting over here back and above. The view from the street, we're worked to sort of almost play this down so that as you're coming along Middlefield, you begin to have this experience and so, we're trying to be respectful of the neighborhood and the context of the 1 and 2-story homes that are directly across the street. Light Earth tones, cement plaster, this Lithocrete wall would be this solid wall that kind of comes and turns and wraps around so, you start to begin to see that material. Then, some wood siding around where the windows pop. Then, if you come back towards Walter Hays, we're continuing to fully screen that service area so, you don't get any views into that as well. Adding some trees and landscaping; I don't know if you have been by that portion of the site; it's a little sparse, back in that corner. We're kind of just trying to have this be a sensible elevation because we do understand that the Walter Hayes view is somewhat prominent as you're coming down Middlefield Road. Section views. This kind of tells the story as to how the homes across the street are at 21-feet and we've got the low one-story mass, which is the education wing and then it pops up into here for this 22-foot high – the yellow signifying the museum space. You get some of the context in this other section of the netting of the zoo space itself and some of the trees and how we're kind of – the different heights of the different spaces. Then lastly, the zoo – I think it was already kind of touched on. You exit out over

into the science courtyard. You can also then, pull off into the museum where this really – this immersive up, down, over and under experience with this tree fort that's in the middle. Meerkat exhibit is over here with some connections and views between these exhibits into the museum space itself as well as views – some select views that we will have thru the science courtyard over into here. As the wall continues around, it will also be that Lithocrete wall with the netting then above. Here's a shot of an early sketch of looking at how the zoo itself in section and whatnot would come together. Then lastly, just to touch on – this was already mentioned is that there's a – not as part of this project before us today but just as a – there's a future Master Plan to – if funding permits, is to then expand and create some additional classroom and exhibit space that would then link up with the tree fort over back in this corner here. That concludes our overview.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Lew: Kyu.

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

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

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

[Ms. McClure:] Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

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

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

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

Vice Chair Kim: Understood. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

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

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

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

[Mr. Akin:] ...the American (Inaudible).

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

[Mr. Akin:] We currently do not have accreditation from either.

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

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

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter.

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

Ms. French: Well, it's one of these things. I mean, it's 27-acres. The fire station is on the site and it's not – it's been considered and studies as not historic so there are building – many buildings on the site – I had the list earlier – only two of those basically, were called out. I think the Lucie Stern Complex which is a number of buildings really and that would be—the library – the children's library. The Girl Scout House, I'm assuming it is historic because it's – so, we're treating it as if we need to look at Secretary of Interior Standards with respect to the project and its relationship with the existing building there, the Girl Scout House. Even though there has not been a historic resource evaluation prepared on that building.

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

Ms. French: We are going to the HRB next week. They are also going to see this project and weigh in and give us their thoughts. Then, of course, when the formal project comes back, you will see a report of minutes of their discussion. Staff can also help with that. As far as the environmental document goes, there'll be a discussion in the cultural resources section of that report. It's a tricky thing. It's a very large

site—City sites. You know, this happened with Avenidas site as well as you remember. It's on a City parcel that includes a park and a parking lot and an older building; it's a very large parcel because the City doesn't have separate lines to – between the different uses.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

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

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

the way it's laid out, I find problematic and that's driving some unfortunate things. Then lastly, I don't know how to put this nicely but the character of this building is one of a corporate office center. I'd like to read from the Staff report the historic report written by Page and Turnbull. The ideology behind Children's museum was not just to educate children but to inspire them with an institute that they felt was created for them. A building for children. I don't think anyone can look at this and say this looks like a building for children. It looks like a modern, contemporary, tech start-up building. Some interesting lines and heavy mass along the street but boy, it doesn't look like it's for kids. It doesn't have any of the whimsical sense about it. Anything about a scale that the old building has. When I look at the Lucie Stern Center because I think that we should be looking back at historical context there. That has a very strong roof form. It also has very simple, imaginative angled forms like the chimney that you see as you drive by. It also has a very consistent unified architectural theme. I don't see any of those characteristics on this building and I think it really needs to have things like that. It needs to have a roof. It needs to have some consistency throughout its architecture. Ok, so, I think the site planning needs some work. I think the context needs to be respected. The interior floor plan layout is just not working and then, the overall character of the building is not appropriate. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

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

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back with the revised project. I think some of the concerns with the previous presentation was that the scale of the building, it being two-stories was perhaps something to be rethought but I think this one-story design and especially, this section that you've shown showing the single story, massing the museum towards Middlefield and across the street to the residences does show that you're trying to keep those things in mind. Having said that, I think that the building – part of the beauty of the existing museum and zoo is that from Middlefield, you can't even tell that the building is there. You almost think that it's another house that you're passing and I think that's well shown in some of the existing site pictures. I think more of that has to come back into the proposed project so that, you know, it's not simple a box. There are some roof forms or there are some other things that you're doing to break up the building and to make it feel much more of a pedestrian scale and even from an auto scale. I think currently as you pass the proposed building down Middlefield but I don't think it's really going to catch your eye at all. It's just a long mass and I think that also leads into some of the previous comments that there needs to be a child's scale to this building and currently, I don't see that. I think if you were to take off the sign that you have proposed on the building and replace it with, indoor golf course and batting cage, you might think that that's what the building is. Right now, the building

doesn't really say anything from an architectural standpoint that it's a children's zoo and museum. I think that there have been some attempts at trying to make the building more playful. Whether it's the circular windows and some of the other circular elements that you've attached to the building but I think more of that has to come into play. I have some concerns about the proposed parking plan. While I do agree that it provides a much better flow than what's currently there. I think the lack of buffer against the Girl Scout building is something that will possibly come back up after an analysis by the Historic Resources Board and I fear that that's going to change the parking layout in a way that's detrimental. I also wanted to make a comment about the – I guess just to reiterate the entry. Maybe – I understand that this – a lot of this is problematic based and it's pretty evident to me that that was kind of the design approach but I think, even if we have to keep some of those things and keeping in mind that cost has been a driving force to reduce the scale of the structure. I think the entry is really the focal point at which there has to be some kind of scale showing that this is a welcoming environment. That this is a child's museum and zoo and I think a start has been made but there needs to be some refinement to that. Overall, I'm very excited about the project moving forward and having a small child myself and having gone to the junior museum and zoo, even as a child myself. I think it's long overdue that this facility gets an upgrade and I look forward to the progression of the design and I'm very excited overall. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for the presentation and thank you for Staff for the helpful slides at the beginning of the presentation. I wasn't able to look, to download or stream the ARB review in 2015. I was able to listen to and watch the City Council hearing and I am distressed that we didn't get a visit from the Eagle but maybe at a later date. Unlike my colleagues up here, I did not either take my child to the zoo – this particular museum and zoo or go there as a child myself but I certainly have been there in the last 18-years since I moved here and it's a fascinating place and thank you for the very – thank you to Page and Turnbull for the really interesting discussion of the history of the children's museums and zoos. Clearly, you're proposing quite a different project than its current use. I was there yesterday when the bad weather was really making it a drop-in child care resource. Where you bring your own child care person with you and that kind of casual use may cease with your new model. I'm not sure. Let me say first, that one of the things that make this complicated is that we really have two projects and two funders. You know, this is heroic fundraising for the Junior Museum and Zoo itself. I think that Council Member Kniss mentioned that this is probably – since the era of Lucie Stern who was a – Levi Strauss eras, we haven't seen this level of Community and highly focused generosity towards the City's cultural resources. Almost, all of which depended on private resources. Having said that, in addition to the zoo and museum, we've got this parking lot reconfiguration. I share my colleague's belief that this is not adequate. We don't have adequate circulation for buses. We don't have adequate accommodation for loading. I think it's sort of ingenious to run the equipment back along the side, over to the zoo support building but I don't – having been stuck on Middlefield this morning which I realize is not an hour for deliveries or that the zoo is open. I'm reminded again that there isn't room for us to do this. I also know that you've got a transportation demand management program under way and I don't think -- this is a case where I think we really need to see that when we're reviewing the document, not to hear that it will happen later. This is a tight site. It's a public site. It's much loved and much used. It's right in the middle of a residential development and we need to see that now. One of the things that concerns me is as it's presented to us, this design still seems to privilege those few cars that actually can get on site. I don't see sufficient encouragement of enticement really, to arrive by shuttle, to arrive by bus, to arrive on foot, to arrive in my stroller. I think that needs much more – putting that first. That's one issue. The second one is that I think we need a better study of the Lou Henry Hoover House. You can't decide whether you're adequately treating a historic resource unless you know what makes it historic and what the key features are. You need a study of that building. We know we have an important local architect. We know it's been moved, which certainly wasn't unusual in the history of such buildings. We know it's been expanded but we need to know, where it's from? What's it for? How does it work? There's a long tradition – I mean, Lou Henry Hoover was a friend of Juliette Gordon Low, you know, a name sacred to all ex-girl scouts and troop leaders and the tradition of scout houses goes back to the British. Baden-Powell, his British movement originally, for boys and a lot of it was sort of modest buildings and sort of slightly wooded spots. Now, apparently, we didn't have that. Apparently, we were right up front on

Meville, was it? Then, displace for the Boy Scouts, not that I have a chip on my shoulder but I do. I need to know a lot more about this building and how it's used and how it's evolved to know whether we are doing justice to it as both -- I think our values and the law requires. Secondly, -- oh, and so it concerns me that we've got asphalt laying at their front door now and it may be that when I see what it really looks like, that won't be the impression. That their focus is all on the back, that it's fine but I don't have the evidence that would let me come to that conclusion. Circulation, Lou Henry Hoover House and then, my other -- I can hardly wait to go to the zoo. It looks fabulous and I think it will be a great amenity for the park as well. As you see things fluttering by and the question of -- we don't have to make the decision on park improvement ordinances and their possible subjection to referenda but it certainly seems to me that zoo users are park users so, at least we don't have that problem. Lou Henry Hoover House is not in the park, right? It's excluded. Not that the Girl Scouts ever engaged in behavior that would have gotten them thrown off public land. This -- I don't think we need to think about the entire parcel of land. I don't think the parcel of land -- it's what's relevant to our Committee, our Commission. What our Board is looking at is this building in context and we have to make a series of findings and one of them is, is that it preserves and respects the historic character including resources of the area when relevant. It provides harmonious transitions to adjacent land uses and land use designations. Basically, this building is not only wonderful in itself but it doesn't diminish the other buildings around there and I can't make that finding at the moment via the Lucie Stern Center or the residential uses across the street. I may be persuaded on the residential uses when I understand better what faces Middlefield, how it works with landscaping and the bus drop off is moved but it's going to take design changes, I believe, to properly respect and resonate with the Lucie Stern Complex, which has a very clear design philosophy and execution. I had a hard time, as a late person understanding the choice of materials and colors. As it happens, we have two projects today which are rebuilds in the Stanford Research Park and they use those materials and colors but I do not find them on the existing site and I do not find them in the neighborhood which has an oddly strong and unified character for Palo Alto. I couldn't make those findings at present. I agree with my colleagues that this building should look like it's built in the 21st century. It should look like it's for children, which it does not to me and it's respectful of them, their scale and their interests and that it acknowledges that a previous great philamprothist gave us buildings that come across this shared parking thing. I would also think that in looking at the redesign of this circulation plan, we should consider seriously whether if we are in some cases -- and I have no idea -- moving around trees that could be removed or replaced. Some trees are definitely sacred but not all are. I just think in order to do what you need to do on this site, you may need to cast a colder eye on them than we sometimes do. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I think I had more -- I think my intake on the project had a more positive reaction to all of the layout and all the exhibit designs that have been shown. I think that all looks like well thought out. Then, really, what I was struggling with on my take on it was that the architecture on the outside was sort of missing a big idea that sort of holds everything together. It seems like there were some key constraints that you had to deal with like the existing trees and everything and I think that was all well resolved but I still think there's an architectural idea that's beyond that. That's missing and so, whether -- I guess the question is in what -- where do you go from here? It seems like there are two -- there are a fair bit of concerns with the existing context, the (Inaudible) buildings and I think there's also concern that there's -- that it's actually not really that child-friendly and I think I agree with those two comments. I really don't know where you go and how you put that all together but I think that's the architects -- that is the architect's challenge and I think you guys -- I've seen your work. You guys are up to it. I think there's been a number of projects recently, I think more than just the Avenidas center but also like 429 University, where ARB and HRB are not in agreement about what is a new -- what is a comparable new building in a historic context. It's an unusual topic. I think I will try to find some other examples that other Cities have done or possibly -- maybe tap Page and Turnbull and also there are a couple other historic -- really good historic consultants in San Francisco, who might have better ideas for us since we seem to be struggling at this and maybe we can do a -- if we have a retreat, maybe we can do something with the HRB so that we can sort of be in more agreement about how to put a new building in a historic context. So, that's all I have to say on this. I don't disagree with the comments that have been made by other Board Members. I was wondering, Brent, do you have any follow-ups for us? No? Yes, Peter.

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

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

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

Chair Lew: Welcome, Dave.

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

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

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

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

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

Mr. Docker: Thank you, Ms. French, that was an excellent tear off into my answer here. It's well within the Architectural Review Board to purview – to direct anything that relates to aesthetic resources, which would be any non-protected trees as far as the ordinance goes, is under your purview and discretion to remove or not at your – applying your values. We have personally identified several elements on this site as pretty darn historic and important that are not protected by the tree ordinance and that is the Pecan, the whole Oak Grove area that is probably this area of discussion, is very, very important and (Inaudible) to the whole Lucie Stern experience area. The Pecan, the Dawn Redwood and some of the existing frontage trees are very, very important to the character, I think, of the whole streetscape and Lucie Stern experience there. Having said that, there's a ton of – several on the tree inventory, several smaller things in the planting areas. I think the parking can be reconfigured maybe and still maintain some of the really critical large tree elements that are really defining the whole building as we know it but I think unless the whole parcel was really relooked at with inclusive and comprehensive way, I think this is a pretty good direction that they've got it going personally and maintaining some of these other resources that are kind of in a grey area, a discretionary – we call them designated trees. They're designated for a reason because they're so prominent, so visual, so historic or have some reason to be unusually important. The Pecan is probably the largest Pecan we have in all of Palo Alto. Who planted it and when I have no idea but it's one of the biggest and best. Hope that answers your question. Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

Action Items

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 799 Embarcadero Road (file PLN16-00123): Applicant's Request for Architectural Review Approval of a Two-Story, 6,663 Square Foot Replacement Fire Station Building Located on the Northwest Corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads Adjacent to the Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction of Existing Structures). Zoning District: Public Facility (PF)**

Chair Lew: Ok, so the next item is item 3. It's a public hearing/quasi-judicial for 799 Embarcadero Road. Applicant's request for architectural review approval of a new two-story, 6,663 square foot replacement fire station located on the Northwest corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads which is adjacent to the southeasterly edge of Rinconada Park; which is an 18.27-acre property. An Environmental Assessment is that the project is exempt from CEQA, pursuant to section 15302 and the zoning is public facility. So, Staff?

Ms. French: Yes, thank you. Amy French again. I wanted to just start off by reminding the Board that this was last before you on December 1st and we did try to capture in the Staff report the various comments that were made and how the applicant has returned. The applicant did provide an updated chart that's attached to the plans that were sent out. We got them the day of the packet so, they -- it's just slightly different. It has a few more statements there. Again, here is the existing first station. You saw these images last time. The one change here, I just wanted to let you know, over the weekend I had a chat with the former firefighter who said that the firefighters are interested in that original sign because some of them, including the one that I spoke to, started work at that station and it has some sentimental attachment to this old original sign. He said, you know, even if it was salvaged and placed inside in the lounge where they hang out, that would be nice so, I just thought I would bring that up. Again, the HRB had seen this before and had asked for consideration for a pitched roof. The ARB, some members brought that up last time as well and then, also there was a suggestion for outreach to the Community and I'll have to say, they really knocked it out of the park. The fire Chief and the Staff here and Public Works met -- (Inaudible) to my left and [Bridget] back there and the architects held an event over at the Art Center in the form City Council Chambers there and we did have one attendee but it was very interesting because she -- her father had been the one to design the Terra Cotta wall over at the Rinconada Park -- I'm sorry, over at the Rinconada Library. So, it was very interesting having a conversation with her. The revised plans, just to get to it. Zinc panels here and I'll let the architect go a bit more into the choices there but there was a concern by the ARB about the life span of those. Then, the park facing the wall, there was another concern there so, there have been changes there. The other

note was about the corner, you're noticing that there can be a bit more generous paved area for the bicyclist that come to that corner. I have the revised materials here, just quickly. Again, the architect will cover these in more detail but CMU wall with recurring slates and openings facing the park with some additional vegetation. The wood soffit going into the inside to supplement the wood door. Then, of course, these are two images that you have in your plans that have the see thru fence option and then the CMU wall with the breaks and the additional vine plantings. Then here, on one of your later pages in the packet shows a study for a pitched roof. So, this would be increasing the massing and that's the architect looked at. Again, here's the existing and proposed layout and so, that's it. I'll just leave – get this out. Again, we're asking for the Architectural Review Board to – here? Oops, how do I do this? There we go. Is it this one? Oops. Here? There. Technical difficulties. So, we're asking for architectural review recommendation to the director today. We've teed it up that way with the findings and conditions so we're hopeful that the ARB can come to a recommendation today and Matt, did you want to add anything as the project manager?

Mr. Matt Raschke: No, I would just like to introduce Alan Kawasaki from (Inaudible) Architects and have him present the latest design.

Chair Lew: Well, welcome back and you have 10 minutes.

Mr. Alan Kawasaki: Yes. Thank you for seeing us again and we also joined by the Fire Department with your questions as well as our landscape architect if there are any questions in that direction. Just to summarize, I think we all have recognized that the surrounding has a mid-century modern vocabulary and we've been trying to respect that and as we know, modernism is not necessarily fixed in time but it's about reflecting our own time but being respectful of course to existing conditions. As we talked about previously, you know, our constraint is that we're essentially trying to put twice as much program into the same footprint in the same sight so, that's a challenge. We're trying to get more in and how do we do that has generally been through a two-story, rather than a one-story building. I'm going to show a little bit of backtrack only to show the progression because I know that not all of us have attended every single one of the past – this is the third meeting so -- Board Member Furth?

Board Member Furth: I should say that I was unable to attend it but I have read the minutes carefully and they're practically revamped.

Mr. Kawasaki: Right. So, this was actually where we were in November and I think we first talked to you in June but November we were here and we were – actually, we had also talked to HRB; had a presentation. This reflects where we were with them and also with some preliminary with you and I think what we've been seeking to do is get more articulation and scale to the building. So, as we've progressed, we've added more window openings, more variations to the facades but it has remained --in our recommendation, it has been for a flat two-story building rather than sloped. Just to recall also, part of the reason was of course, if we sloped it, we believe that many of the elements will exceed the 35-foot height limit, if we had sloped elements. The other is that our belief is that we are now required – as architects, we know that we have CALGreen and we know that we have PV requirements and so, we also know that technology changes over time so, we felt that rather than having PVs on a sloped roof, that having on our high section – as you know, we increased that center bay above the apparatus and made the saddle bags lower but we made the center part taller. That center part is where being PV panels are and are ballasted so they could be changed out over time. This was the first iteration. More articulation and I know this was not necessarily what we came for today to talk about, really, we came about this slide. Same thing though, rather boxy to begin with, more articulation and I think the last comments we had on this slide or questions that we had to address, where the materials. The question was on our specified materials which is a fluoropolymer or Kynar aluminum finish. Is there something that could be designed to have a longer durability? One question was asked, what is the durability of Kynar or fluoropolymer and as we all know, it is the material, state of the art, high risers are clad in it so it is the best in terms of finished materials. What we said was, how about we said natural materials? What we are coming to you today is to say, as an option or recommendation, we like – we're recommending Rheinzink, which is a Zinc material so there is no paint on it. It weathers to this color. Actually, we're

having it pre-weathered and the panels are a little different, it's more of a thinner panel as you see and vertical which we think is fine because we'll have the metal panels vertical. We'll have the Terra Cotta horizontal just to sort of keep them different, keep them broken up. The other thing we did was – I think there was a comment on the elevation. You liked the wood door as we do and just to note, our interiors of our front entry, the ceilings are wood and so we thought, let's bring more of this wood. So, what we're proposing to do is on the soffits, the underside – I hope this works – yeah -- so the undersides, we're actually putting a wood slate and we like that idea because you know, weathering wood is also an issue over time and so this becomes protected. As we're entering the building, we have a nice human scale and pick up on the door which is wood and then the wood panels that are in the ceilings beyond. The other comment was on this elevation in particular, but I think in general it was the idea of a sloped roof. We did look at that again but we still feel that – essentially, what we've done is our saddle bag portion or the metal portion of the building are pretty much – the roof is just at or slightly above – the parapet is almost a gravel stop and so anything that we add in terms of sloping to that, will increase the height of the building. Then, if we did that, this shows at the high point 35-foot and at the low point right down to the lowest portion of the gravel stop so technically, we can slope and if we were to slope, we like the idea of Asymmetry in the building rather than symmetry but still, our recommendation is not to go this direction. As you can imagine as I have already stated – and we were just looking at this element so, if we were to make this low and make this high at 35-feet – but imagine taking this from the low point and raising at the same slope to that point, we would exceed significantly the height limits. Again, we think that the idea of having a flat zone here with interchangeable PV panels is probably the best. We have a tree here of course so, this location also gets us mostly the best orientation – southern exposure, probably this is not a great location but we think this as a flat roof predominantly over the main bay is the way to go. We think that by bringing more articulation to the building, we've accomplished many of the concerns I think that we heard about massing and scale. This is our recommendation. I think some of the other points that were concerned about last time where the concrete wall along the park and there were concerns about both the massing but also is there a way to kind of have a little bit transparency. Rather than – well, what we did was photographed the building as it exists. We take relatively the same angle -- I think you pointed out that there is a picnic bench of course, which exists there and then there's a little barbeque place there. Right now, you cannot see or see it just a tiny bit of the existing building right here and yes, a two-story building will be seen from here but is obscured by the current trees and as we know, when we rebuild a wall, a lot of these existing trees will be affected. Our proposal – this is the first one which is the idea of transparency. This proposal is one where I think as suggested that some sort of gate that we have at the – sliding entry gate to the parking would be replicated on this side and yes, you would see through but I think -- just bear in mind what you're going to be seeing is parked firefighter vehicles. There are storage vehicles back there also for emergency and of course we have the generator and other things. We can do it, it's not our favorite solution so we're thinking if the transparency was desired maybe an idea of slots in the wall makes a bit more sense. So, we would have these – yes, these sort of metal pickets as where shown here but really in kind of isolated places and that's what's shown here. You wouldn't really see until you got up and if you really wanted to look in there, you could look in there but not so much. This is sort of at construction and you can see some smaller indications of 15-gallon trees being placed back here. The other thing that we did – I know it's not what you asked for but what we did was we said let's replant all those bushes and trees and vegetation that's there that is actually screening the existing building. We think in sort of 15-years, it's going to look like this. We think in 20-years, maybe you won't see any of the building on that side so, a combination of what do we have in the beginning which is sort of a peek a boo – I think someone said peek a boo look into parking and then over time, all that would grow through. The vines would cover probably those fences and the trees would probably obscure that elevation in its entirety. Then, the following are just simply our resubmitted boards. Our previous board or previous elevation, the Rheinzink boards also with the bird glass, right? Safety glass and – we can take that over there. This is also -- Board Member Lew, this is the block so rather than poured in place concrete, we have to be mindful of our budget also so what we did was we offset – you know concrete block is less than poured in place. We thought, well ok, we get some scale but we made a nice block which is machined faced block and that's what we're proposing. We think that works well with the metal panels. Again, concrete walls changing to block walls, Rheinzink, the new glass. These are just for record, right? The concrete with slits and a site plan with more vegetation along that edge. We did widen out along – as much as we could.

The problem that we had was that right here, there is telephone pole with guild wires going out so we weren't able to actually put the paving in here. We were worried about people hitting the guild wires but we did increase as much as we could the paving area. That's our response to your thoughts. Thanks very much.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you very much for your presentation. I don't have any speaker cards. We can move onto the Board Member questions. Anybody? No. Comments? Then why don't we start with Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Alright, thank you for coming back with the refinements that you've made. I guess I do have a couple quick questions, just to start perhaps. I was not so much against the previous metal panel but I think the Rheinzink is also a fine choice. Is that the only proportion that it comes in? Could you find a wider panel perhaps or is that just the natural dimension of that panel?

Mr. Kawasaki: We're actually trying to look and see. This is what we've found thus far. We're actually – we're going to talk to our manufacturers of our prior panel which is currently only available in, to see if fluoropolymer they could do this but we don't have an answer.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok and then also, I wanted to get a clarification then, what is your preference for the fencing? Is it to go with (Inaudible) or is it...

Mr. Kawasaki: I think the Fire Department can best explain this but you know, we've done 24 fire stations and every single one of those, there is this balance that you have to take between what the public sees and what is kept private. In general, from a functional standpoint, you don't have those back aprons visible. Then the question usually is, do we make that sliding gate opaque or picketed? In this case, we said picketed. We've never had a comment before to open up the backsides of an apron. It usually can be pretty messy back there and if you – the Fire Department is here, they can explain that I'm sure.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, understood. I mean, I think for me, the project was near approvable last time and I think the further refinements that you've made – I stand very comfortable in recommending approval of the project. Thank you for staying with us and addressing our comments. I was perhaps just slightly a little disappointed that that water fountain never got moved to the corner but it's not a deal breaker by any means. I think the choice in materials, again, is very handsome and very thought out. I appreciate the section details of some of those material corners of the building. I think my preference for the fence – my question was actually not so much whether to go picketed or CMU but I think the original fence that was presented in the poured in place concrete was perhaps a little bit nicer but I do understand the cost implication and I would be fine with a CMU fence as well. The comment that I have is really regarding the park facing elevation. It does seem like you've tried to make an attempt at changing one of the dormitory windows. It looks like it's been set further back than the other window and goes to the roof. To me, it seems a little bit like a one off. I can see how at the fire station entrance way, you have a similar window condition where it does go up to the roof but I don't know if it's necessarily worth doing that change but in either case, I think over all the fire station has come out very well and I'm appreciative of the process that you've undertaken to get here and thank you very much for your presentation.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, first of all just a couple of things. I always frown a little bit when an architect sits here and says, don't worry, in 20-years we'll put trees there and it will hide the whole things. It just really – that bothers me a little bit but I do like the improvements that you – definitely like the improvements you've done with the materials and everything else. I'm still not a big fan of the big cubes. I mean, I do appreciate also the Staff report that says, note that with the proposed installation of solar voltaic – photovoltaic panels will provide a visibly sloped element to serve as a reference to a sloped roof residential oriented civic architecture. If we have to use the solar voltaic panels to get the sloping roof I want, I think we're really pushing the envelope. This thing has a 5-foot parapet on it and I still don't see why we can't get some – and I agree with you, I'm not a big fan of the symmetry; I agree with that. I would prefer an A-symmetrical but I would have liked to see something more of the slope to represent

that. I like the change in materials that you've done, definitely. The only thing I fear a little bit is the new metal may end up on a not so sunny day, end up being a very, huge black cube sitting there and that bothers me a little bit. That may detract from the rest of the building. I guess that's all I have – I'd like to hear what the rest of my fellow Board Members say before I give you a sort of up or down on it.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Thank you for working through the design process. I think the building has indeed gotten better, gotten closer to something that we can approve every step of the way. Contrary to what Robert said, I liked the elevation, the cube from Newell. I think it's a handsome building of our time and support that part of it quite well. I also think the use of the natural Zinc panels is a very good change and I want to be clear that we want to – I will want to see that definitely put on the building. I do agree with Roberts comment that your choice of finish might be a little bit dark and I would support having perhaps you take one more look at whether that is the right color. You don't want it to just be a black box and I have worked with this material and it does on a cold wet day, have a very dampening effect. It's very non-reflective, very natural looking and you want it to look sort of interesting and crispy and the dark color may not do that. I'd like to bring my comments though back to the Board that I remain quite concerned about the height of the building against the park. I've struggled with this quite a bit. I went out yet again, to the park and took a long walk through the whole park from the Lucie Stern Center through the trees and I'm sorry but I think that that part of the park is not just a tucked away piece of one picnic table but rather sort of the end of Rinconada Park, which is heavily used. Those Redwood groves back near this building are, I think, quite heavily used with people sitting, recreating in there. I think your renderings taking it off from one angle doesn't fully get the way that this will appear through the trees, I grant you. I was unable to convince myself that it didn't matter, that it was ok. So, back to my Board Members then, this building is 7-feet closer to the property line. It is twice as tall. Literally, 30-feet against the boundary. No place else in town do we let a development go that close. What they're really proposing to do is take another 10-foot buffer zone of the park and let that become the landscape zone. Well, that's what a setback is and why do we let this building of all buildings push another 10-feet into the park, which is really what they're doing in order to properly mitigate the impact of the height of this building and the mass of it. Again, 7-feet closer to the property line, twice as tall...

Chair Lew: Can I make a correct, that it is not a property line. There's a park boundary line but it is one parcel.

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely. I'd like to be clear. I understand that this is one parcel. What I'm referring to is what the public perceives as a boundary line and I think that's important to see. Anybody else developing in town would think of this as a boundary, a termination and setbacks are designed for purposes to mitigate the effect on the neighboring – I won't use the work property but the neighboring use. When I look at the design of the building, then I say to myself, what can be down about it because I understand it's a complex program, it's on a tight site but if I could pull our attention to section A3.12. I wonder if it's possible to even pull that up on the screen?

Mr. Kawasaki: I don't have that on...

Board Member Baltay: Is that possible to...

Mr. Kawasaki: I don't have it here. No, this is from last time probably or from the hard copy that you...

Board Member Baltay: Well, I'm just looking at the drawing that was given to me. If I get my Board Members to even take a look at section A3.12.

Mr. Kawasaki: If you could just go – show me what that is because we'll know which one you're talking about.

Board Member Baltay: It's a building section through the residential – through the firemen dormitories...

Mr. Kawasaki: Right.

Board Member Baltay: ... what I'm looking at is a 10 ½-foot plate to roof area for the dormitories. It's about a 9 ½ -foot ceiling for the firemen's dormitories. Then, I'm looking at – it's not dimensioned here – several feet of mechanical space over some other functional space – this is the part of the building that is against the park and I just don't understand why you can't do something to lower the height of that piece of the building. So, in my opinion, for me to feel that I can make a finding that this is contextually appropriate, I think it needs to come down at least 4 or 5-feet against the park somehow, just to mitigate the apparent height. So, that's my push to my fellow Board Members that we seriously consider what's otherwise a very handsome building but seen from this angle of Rinconada Park less so. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Could we go back to the image of the view from the park now upon competition? The photo simulation.

Mr. Kawasaki: Yes. This one or this one?

Board Member Furth: That one. Thank you and just – so, I understand that this is a single parcel of land but we're not here to decide whether something is compliant with the quantitative aspects of the code. We're thinking about does it meet the design standards of the City? Treating the use line, the park boundary as a property line, what the setback of this building from that property line?

Mr. Kawasaki: If it were a property line, it's against the property line.

Board Member Furth: From that line, there is zero setback?

Mr. Kawasaki: Right.

Board Member Furth: I think it's our responsibility to look at this not as if where a computing device that can't think about a larger context and is calculating literal compliance with the quantitative code but to understand the intention of these rules. It comes up in the research part to and applies them accordingly. First of all, I think it's great to have a new building. I like the way the building looks from Newell. I like the way it looks from both those street frontages. I think it will be lovely to have a building that looks new, adequately fun and update, solid, unlikely to come down in an earthquake and also is civically inviting on those frontages. I think that is all terrific. I'm very struck by the adverse impact on the park. It does two things. One is, you see it from quite a distance and it's a handsome building but what's special and delightful about Rinconada Park is that it's a wood. Particularly, in the vicinity of this building but not unfortunately in front of it and with this building, we lose two things. We lose the sense of being away from urban hardscape and we lose any sense of privacy. This becomes an overlooked – not in the sense of the neglected but prevailed site. I've got two questions for Staff here because this is a project of course. I'd like to approve – I recommended approval for – one is, are we confident that the shadow line that this building will throw in the park will not adversely affect having plantings there, heavy plantings? I know we have shade diagrams but I don't know what that means in terms of the health of growing plants.

Ms. French: Well, I'll try to answer that. I guess the existing plants are mature vegetation and when we say growing plants – I mean, all plants grow but...

Board Member Furth: Well, no, in my garden, a lot of them die because of inadequate light.

Ms. French: Well, plants tend to continue to grow as long as the circumstances allow for it. The brand-new planting that is proposed in this project include vine plantings along this walls as shown on the

screen image and I guess potentially transplants of trees. Looking at sheet A108, which is basically, December at 9 AM, you know, there's not going to be much growing going on at that time.

Board Member Furth: I'm basically asking you if it's going to become all mossy? The answer I'm getting is we don't know but we think it will work.

Ms. French: I think if you consider where the – where South is, we will have sun coming into it just not at the times – not at 9 AM, you know, in the winter. I think yes, they'll have enough – Oh, is he? Oh, the landscape architect is here.

Board Member Furth: Great.

Mr. Kawasaki: Would you like –ok. This is Bob...

Board Member Furth: Cool. That's wonderful.

Mr. Kawasaki: ...Norbutious?

[Mr. Bob Norbutious:] [Norbutious]. Hi. Maybe I can help a little bit with that. So, in this situation with the very large trees, regardless of orientation, we're looking at understory planting design. Along the walls, with the use of vines, we will be able to create that green screen and the interface with the park setting. The planting material is going to be low water use plants that will tolerate the shade, part shade.

Board Member Furth: For example?

[Mr. Norbutious:] We have Celosia and Salvia on the edges that will still grow thin but will still be a nice rich color. It won't be a deciduous look so, it will always have that nice green interface with the park itself. Final selection definitely has to consider the shade value of the tree that are above it.

Board Member Furth: If one of the concerns is higher landscaping so that the overlooking of this area by the deck, for example, on the second story is through tree filtered –is through foliage rather than as it presently is, is that possible and how many years would that take? Do we have funding for that part of the design?

[Mr. Norbutious:] One of the problems of bringing in trees to an existing situation, other than looking at the arborist report and the health of the trees today, you're looking at a generational planting. That if you were to put in more Redwoods or more groves of trees for future growth as these starts to die, that would be one approach to take. That has been taken before but right now we're in a situation where it's understory trees that will be able to grow to their maximum 15 to 20-foot height and not grow irregularly based on what's above them.

Board Member Furth: So, you couldn't get a 25-foot tree in there or 30-foot?

[Mr. Norbutious:] No, that would be with the expectation...

Board Member Furth: I'm not expecting you to do violence to the park design.

[Mr. Norbutious:] Right. What it would expect is that these trees have a life span that those Redwoods and Oak would eventually come out which generally, looks like they don't have that ability. If you bring in Redwoods, they're going to be thin. They would fill in but they would fight with the existing trees.

Board Member Furth: Even though it looks like that there is a fairly large open space here actually, roots are busily occupying that land?

[Mr. Norbutious:] Right, right.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Well, I find myself in a dilemma here because I think the building is – partly is because I'm mindful that Palo Alto population has residents that have often felt that the City has not adequately protected its park land. That's why we have a park improvement ordinance that lets them reframe any park improvement. That's why we have a park dedication chart provision that says that the City can't undedicated used parkland for non-park uses without the consent of the voters. Looking at these photo simulations, which are not looking at the real building, it seems to me that this does have an adverse impact on that park and I would love to hear from my colleagues that I'm wrong and it will be fine.

Board Member Gooyer: Can I make one thing – what made me think about this is that one of the big issues, when we talked about the University property, is the whole concept of an eyebrow makes it even look bigger than – and that is a terrace. I mean, would there be some consideration of getting rid of that eyebrow which would make that corner a lot smaller?

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely. That would be an improvement in my opinion.

Board Member Gooyer: That's a fairly simple...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: ...right, exactly. That seems to be the biggest concern that we have is the impact on the park. If possibly, as you said, you take that back second-story area, get rid of the eyebrow. Possibly drop the – just in that area, the ceiling height to 8-feet instead of 9, that would begin to – do a big chunk -- I mean I understand, in the central area you don't want to lose 4-feet out of your space but that would go a long way towards making it seem smaller and also just the whole concept of the shadow study.

Board Member Furth: Somehow, when you take that eyebrow off. It seems like this engages with the park instead of looming over it.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) Ok, excellent. I think that is a very interesting suggestion and I – maybe I have a question for the applicant. Board Member Baltay was talking about lowering the height of the building but if you could maybe just refresh our memory about the – you went through the height – I think the first hearing of why the ceiling heights went up and maybe if you just review – you have a cross section through the whole building that shows how the different cubes align with each other.

Mr. Kawasaki: So, the governing elevation setting for the second floor is obviously over the top of the apparatus bay and so, we would want that to be continuous. We would not want to have a staircase going down to the saddle bag so, we take those across. If there some room on that second floor to take it down a bit? Yeah, I would say currently they are set at 17 if I'm not mistaken. We have, under circumstances, for instances, when the ARB has said we need to take it down, we can push it down a bit. I can't – I'd have to work with the construction engineer and see what we can do. See what happens is you got that fire apparatus that has to come out a 14-foot door and then above that, you have coiling doors on the backside so that there's height. There's also, I think we talked about the (Inaudible), these are the vents – there are hoses that go from the back of the truck. They are on a slider so, those also take the room. The front of the building has the 4-fold doors. They do not have such a requirement however, they have greater depth. If we – we can't really push the building back because of the turning diameter. We can take another look to see if we can get 4-fold doors back in the back. There is a higher cost. They are about 35k per door versus 5-10; they're pretty expensive. They're great doors but that will add considerable cost to the project. I think that we can push the engineering to see if we can drop the floor down somehow if – I think I hear what you're saying. Now, as far as the dormitories, 9-feet. That is a standard firehouse – let's call it program requirement. I will say there are also, similarly, when we have concerns with height. We took down (Inaudible) Fire Department down to 8-foot, which is a residential

level in the dorms. Many of our house are at 8-feet, right? Again, that can be done. We're maybe talking 8-foot on the dorm, maybe a foot on the At. Bay, that's 2-feet. I think what I'm hearing from you is do everything you can to bring that elevation down and so, that would be something that you could direct us to do. We would need to see if our department can accept that because it is a programmatic requirement at this point. Typical fire station, 9-foot ceiling. Typical 17-foot floor to floor. I could, with some additional engineering see if we can pull that down so, yes, you could direct us to take another look at that and talk back with our department and see if we can pull that elevation along that side down slightly. I don't think we're talking 4-feet but maybe a couple feet and I think the suggestion about the terrace there is a good one. Yeah, we can pull that back and see what we can do there to reduce the massing. All good comments and things that we can come back to you with.

Chair Lew: OK, thank you.

Board Member Furth: One more question.

Chair Lew: Sure. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Trying to remember back to our previous discussions. Remind again why this building couldn't be back 10-feet from the changed use from the parking boundary? Was it to do with the turning radius?

Mr. Kawasaki: From the park boundary, it has to do just with getting things to fit. Maybe...

Board Member Furth: Because we're not built all the way up to the street setback line.

Mr. Kawasaki: No. We can't be because what happens is if you look at – maybe – let me see if I can get to the site plan. It was way up front, right? All the way up.

Board Member Furth: C2?

Mr. Kawasaki: I don't – here. Going back to some of the other diagrams. We are pushing the turning diameter for a truck to get into these back doors right now.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Mr. Kawasaki: So, that's at that door. Then we have constraints regarding the historic or the cultural assets which are the Oaks and the Redwoods. We cannot get into those areas – stay clear of the canopy because we know the roots are at least that far. Pretty much, if you looked at this footprint, it is pretty much the same as the existing building footprint with the exception of, as you stated, this area – I think it's about 7-feet or so. So, we are now encroaching into this area and that is both on the ground floor and the second floor. That has to do with putting in support and putting in stairs. By support I mean, (Inaudible) when we do a fire station, there's more cleaning and safety things that we do. There's more stuff that we have to do to support an apparatus. The other thing that happens on the upper floor as you notice is that – you know, we have private bathrooms, private dorm rooms...

Board Member Furth: I know, the introduction of women just made it so much harder.

Mr. Kawasaki: It made it better for everyone. So, yes, we have those issues as well.

Chair Lew: Is that it Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Yes.

Chair Lew: Ok. Kyu? Sure.

Vice Chair Kim: I have one more question. Looking at the perspective that you had on the screen before and even the west elevation. If the building is up against that park dedication line, currently it's showing the CMU fence wall with the Rheinzink above. Is that what you're planning? It almost looks like there is a double wall there but it's really on the same plane, is it not?

Mr. Kawasaki: This is currently on the same plane so, as you said if this was a property line – that zero-lot line – block wall on the property line and then the face of the Rheinzink is also directly in alignment with the concrete block wall.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok. I have a couple of over comments that are different than the other Board Members. Part of this relates towards a revised finding and I think that some of these are issues that we haven't really discussed in previous hearings. One is that we have a – in our landscape finding, we're trying to create habitat and so, we are trying to encourage more native plantings. We have that in – I think the Staff has put in some draft findings for that, which is finding number 5. I think I did want to sort of revise that to say – let me get the exact wording. I think the Staff has written it as the existing protected trees on and off site will be retained and protected and I think we just want it to say something more positive which is that the existing Oak trees are wildlife beneficial and are considered an anchor species for habitat. Then, there are other native, smaller shrubs, right? Like the Salvia, Spothesea, and the Manzanita are also very attractive to birds, bees, and butterflies. I think the idea is that in creating a habitat, you actually want trees and shrubs together. You don't want an Oak tree and a lawn because the wildlife actually wants both in proximity to each other; is my understanding on it. Then, I guess a question for the landscape architect, is that the Manzanita that you're specifying for the ground cover. I think you had a lot of it. My understanding was that that was used along Palm Drive at Stanford when they reconstructed the road in the 90's. Then, they took it all out because it wasn't performing well and they replaced it with a non-native plant. I was just – I don't know all the details about it but I was just wondering your thoughts on how you selected this and then if you're aware of any issues with that variety of Manzanita?

[Mr. Norbutious:] Do you know the actual variety of Manzanita?

Chair Lew: It was that Pacific Mist... (Crosstalk)

[Mr. Norbutious:] It was the Pacific Mist? (Crosstalk)

Chair Lew: ...Yeah, and they've used it elsewhere but in this particular one, it was sort of a high-profile failure. It just didn't really fill in – it was along the curb, right? You know on the planting strips.

[Mr. Norbutious:] Ok. So, as far as plant material, we do like to use it but we have found lately that working with nurseries and different varieties, we've done some work at the Bay Lands and El Camino Park. Same kind of situations where it's hit or miss that they do very well and then we've also had some situations where whether it's recycled water or the orientation that they aren't doing as well. I think we need to look at some more of the different varieties we could choose from if we want to still stick with the Arcaste and keep that kind of ground plane or bring in a secondary ground covers so that we do have the benefit of variety. Not too busy up the landscape but to look at different massing especially, for health and quality. The healthy plant will dominate the areas. The Arcaste may not thrive as well.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. Then, I think my second item is on finding or new findings which are 2E which is on – that the project enhancing living conditions on the site and in residential areas. I think the Staff; your draft says the temporary living facilities for firefighters in the new building would provide much-improved living conditions on the site and the proposed building would not adversely impact the nearby residential neighborhoods located at the south of Embarcadero Road and north of Hopkins Avenue. I think that those are fine and I think I was thinking about adding an additional comment which is that the existing fire station is very low key and very inwardly oriented and that the new stations is actually fairly outwardly...

Board Member Gooyer: In your face.

Chair Lew: ... well, in your face. I would say – well, I would say it's welcoming but the plaza, the porch, the entrances, the balconies are all – and the glass doors and the wood pedestrian entrance doors is all very desirable and attractive to the neighbors. On the fence options, I want to thank you for this sample. I was a little worried that this was going to be to gray. I think you picked it to go with the Zinc. You know, I was worried it was too gray – to dark compared to the pool house or the pool facility. So, we'll see. I don't know. If there was a way to use a warmer color I would welcome it. I realize that it's – you're proposing to cover with Creeping Fig, which will sort of – yeah, it will (Inaudible). Yeah, and the Creeping Fig will pretty quickly cover up all the block. Regarding the fencing, I think I had a preference for the CMU over the metal. I have seen metal fences or at least metal gates that have more privacy than I think the way you've detailed it. It seems to me that the block is a safer design choice at this point than going with the open gate and primary fencing around the back. Especially, because you have the garbage and the generator and potentially a cell tower – station in the corner. So, it seems like the block is a safer design choice. Regard to the comments about the sloped roof and the massing – the three-story massing on the park. I think my take on it was that the building is only 40-feet long facing the park; horizontally. It's not like some of our buildings in town. We have 300-foot long, three-story facades without windows so, this is not anywhere near close to that. We do have other parks. I think there's a Heritage Park downtown that has three-story condominiums facing the park with no buffer at all. My take on it, I think it's – My take on it is I was thinking that's it's approvable today but – yes.

Board Member Furth: That park actually followed and was created by that same development so that's an Ab Initio arrangement.

Chair Lew: I know you worked on the (Inaudible). Thank you, Wynne. It seems to me – I think Robert's idea of cutting off the eyebrow could be a huge – possibly be a huge improvement so I am – I think that's worth studying. Then, my question is for Staff. I think we're on our third hearing. I think we have to – No? Because you're not counting the preliminary?

Ms. French: This is the second formal hearing.

Chair Lew: But we normally count the – what is (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

Ms. French: (Inaudible) You have three hearings...

Chair Lew: So, you're not considering...

Ms. French: Yeah, so if you felt you needed to continue it to see something additional, that is your right to do so or privileges as a Board to do so.

Chair Lew: Ok. Why don't we – do anybody wants to take a stab at a motion?

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: Sure. I'll move that we continue this project to a date uncertain with the request that...

Male: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Let him try the motion and we'll see where... (Crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible) I just wanted to put it out there – with the request of the applicant to the lower the height of the saddle bag – to use the term of the architect – between 2 and 4-feet adjacent to the park boundary. With all other findings as set forth in the Staff report and with – oh, on the last

thing would be to have the actual finish on the Zinc panels come back to us for consent review – subcommittee review. I don't think – was there any other? (Crosstalk) I would leave it to the architect's discretion how to reduce the apparent mass. I think the suggestion is a good one but I'm very uncomfortable with us actually designing from the podium here. I think these architects especially – was there any other landscaping questions Alex that you were concerned about, though? I can't remember.

Chair Lew: I think they're aware that there is an issue so, I think that that's...

Board Member Baltay: Ok, well, that's my motion.

Chair Lew: Anybody going to second?

Board Member Gooyer: Second.

Chair Lew: Ok, seconded by Robert.

Mr. Raschke: Can I just make a point of clarification? So, the motion is to continue it to a date uncertain but then you asked for the Zinc panels to come back on consent. Would those be coming back for consideration with everything else?

Board Member Baltay: Very good. Let's just take that off altogether at the moment.

Mr. Raschke: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Kawasaki: I think – can I add one other point? We asked – we presented two options in terms of the block wall versus the picket fence and if there's a preference that you have, we would like to continue on your preference or if the Fire Department has any issues then, they would want to weigh in.

Board Member Baltay: I would like to then add to the motion that we keep the concrete block wall preference if that's ok with the secondary?

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Furth: Is there a date certain that the applicant would like and Staff would agree to?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt: If you wanted to talk about a date certain for a March 2nd hearing, we would need to have revised plans at the beginning of February. For a March 16th hearing, we would need to have revised plans in the middle of February.

Mr. Kawasaki: We can make the beginning. Staff may shoot me but we'll make the beginning.

Ms. Gerhardt: The beginning of February would be a – for revised plans would then be a March 2nd hearing.

Board Member Baltay: Very well. Let's change the motion to a date certain of March 2nd.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll keep my second on that.

Chair Lew: Ok. So, all in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Ok, so that's 5-0. We will see you back in March. We are going to take a 5-minute break before we hear item #4.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL MATTER. 3223 Hanover Street [16PLN-00190]: Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of two Existing Office / R&D Buildings and the Construction of a new two-story 110,000 Square Foot Office / R&D Building. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: RP**

Chair Lew: Welcome back to the meeting. We're going to start with item number 4. 3223 Hanover Street:]: Major architectural review to allow the demolition of two existing office and R&D buildings and the construction of a new two-story 110,000 square foot office/ R&D building. Environmental assessment is an initial study is being prepared pursuant of CEQA and the zone district is the Research Park. Staff, welcome.

[Mr. Graham Owen:] Thank you very much. My name is [Graham Owen], I'm a Staff Planner with the City of Palo Alto and I've been working with the applicant on the project that's before you today. This is an Architectural Review Application for a new two-story office building in the Research Park Zoning District. It's also an application for a design enhancement exception to allow for an elevator and a stair enclosure to exceed the maximum permitted height in the Research Park Zoning District which is 35-feet. The request would be to allow these enclosures up to 46-feet in total height to allow for a roof deck. Here's an Ariel photograph of the site. The site is a 10.17-acre lease area in Stanford Research Park on the eastern edge of the Research Park. For context, the HP Campus is across Hanover Street from the subject site and you also have other offices/ R&D buildings to the north and to the southwest. To the east and to the south are some residential – it's a residential district, the RE District and you have several single-family homes that are directly adjacent to the site along the rear. The topography of the site is – it's kind of interesting, Hanover Street to the southwest sloped uphill and so this site is actually terraced into two distinct levels. The existing building is situated on the upper terrace and then the surface parking lot that you see there in the photograph is on a lower terrace. They're put together by a drive aisle that's along – situated along the rear of the site as well as an existing staircase that goes up the terraces. There's about a 15-foot grade difference between the two terraces. The new building would be situated in approximately the same location as I believe, building 204, which is on the upper terrace and it would have a boomerang plan – as I've heard it termed, which is a kind of modified 'L' shaped plan. With the primary frontage being a relatively reduced section along Hanover Street. Access to the site would remain the same as it currently is. We have a modified drive aisle configuration that would essentially, bring the drive aisle up to current codes but the location would remain the same. The existing surface parking lot would be replaced with landscaping and the new parking would be in a subterranean structure that's located in the upper terrace. There would also be a small surface parking lot in the upper terrace as well. Vehicles would access the garage via two different approaches. It's a two-level parking deck and so they're not – there's no drive between the two levels so you would have to go in either entrance to access this specific level. On top of the parking structure, you would have a courtyard. This area is shown to have benches and tables. It's kind of an area for the future tenants and workers in the office to use outdoor space. Here are the building elevations from a couple of different angles. The first one is as you would see it from Hanover Street. Primarily, the materials consist of a curtain glass wall – glass curtain wall -- excuse me -- as well as primarily, a blue theme on the canopy fascia and there are other elements that would-be wood, including the soffits beneath the canopies. The third elevation down shows on the roof, a mechanical enclosure, which is permitted to exceed the maximum height in the Research Park Zoning District and it also shows two of the proposed stair enclosures at the front of the building which is subject to the Design Enhancement Exception Request. Those elements I am pointing out right here. There's also – I don't believe it's shown in this elevation but, there would be with this application an elevator shaft that would be located at about the crux of the boomerang which would also be subject to the Design Enhancement Exception Request. Here area additional views of the elevation. This would be from the other (Inaudible) site which is – that use to be a part of the subject site but now its own distinct lease area. Then this would be the view from the rear so, along the – for the neighbors

for example, along Matadero Avenue. There are a couple of key issues that were identified during the review of this application that we wanted to highlight for you today and why we're bringing this forward as a project with a recommendation of continuance. The first is the Design Enhancement Exception findings. When Staff was reviewing the findings, and studying the findings, we felt that we weren't quite seeing the request for the stair enclosures and the elevator enclosures weren't really meet the intent of the Design Enhancement Exception provision of the code, which is to allow for an enhanced site and an enhanced building of an exceptional character and it's more of use question and it allows for an enhanced use of the building rather than an enhancement of the architecture. Having said that, it would be certainly nice to have a roof deck but we didn't feel as though the request was meeting the intent of that provision of the code. Other key issues, the – as I've said, the site is adjacent to several single-family homes along Matadero Avenue and so, we've actually heard from a couple of the neighbors in that area and I believe that at least one of them will be speaking today but there are some questions about screening. I know that the architect will also go over some of the provisions that they have and mitigation that they have for screening the use from those residential areas but I believe that there are additional design changes that could be implemented to further screen the use. To also balance the need for privacy for those neighbors and for – the mitigate potential nuisances. A couple of other things. There are a number of trees that are going to be removed in the existing surface parking lot. With the current application that we have, there's no plan to use that site for anything in particular. We don't have another application on file but it's understood that the site is – does have additional FAR potential and so, the idea as it was presented with the preliminary review of this application in April was that there may be future development at a later date. However, we don't have anything on file at this point. With that said, we were wondering if there were ways to preserve the trees with this development, with the understanding that there's no building plan for that area at this time. Lastly, there is – let me go back to the site plan. There is a proposed bicycle connection to the Ball Park bicycle path, which runs adjacent to the north of the subject site. We believe, you know, a good connection. It enhances the connectivity of the site with the adjacent Barron Park neighborhood but we believe there are additional connections and considerations from a design perspective that could enhance the use and the connectivity from a bicycle and pedestrian orientation; not only here as it terminates – basically at the drive aisle. Our request would be to extend it along this drive isle section so that it connects up with the building. As well as featuring additional connections to Hanover Street. The applicant has proposed to revise the location of two VTA bus stops that are along Hanover Street, which is a design feature that we certainly supported but we believe additional modifications are needed to further enhance the connectivity of the site with those relocated bus stops. Do you have any questions for me? I'm happy to answer them now but I believe the architect also has a presentation.

Chair Lew: Why don't we do the applicant presentation. Welcome, Bob.

Mr. Bob Giannini: Good morning.

Chair Lew: You know the drill. You have 10 minutes.

Mr. Giannini: Yes.

Chair Lew: So, talk quickly.

Mr. Giannini: Good morning all. I'll let my slide show come up but morning everyone. I'm Bob Giannini from Form4 Architecture. Thank you. Well, thanks very much. It's been great working with everybody. We were actually at our preliminary in April of last year and got great comments. We were able to address those we think. Also, had a lot of time to meet with our neighbors and work on the neighbors screening concerns that we have. Actually, the way we organized this presentation is to really try and hit on some of the key issues that we just brought up. The issues of how do the site work, circulation? How does it tie into the bigger neighborhood? How do we work with the neighbors and be compatible with that? Then, environmental concerns and finally, the building architecture. Again, this is the vicinity plan. You can see that we're not that far actually from the Cal-Train Station. This is where the site is located and the existing buildings that you've already seen across the street from HP. This is a little bit closer so,

we're actually very fortunate. We have two bus stops right at our site. We're putting in a new crosswalk. We have the Bol Bike Trail that runs back through here and in just a second, I'll show a larger view that shows how we've tied into all of these features into the site. First, just talking about the site a little bit and why the site was developed the way it was. One thing we did is we did want to maintain the basic topography to the site so that we matched up with all the edges around us because there is quite a bit going on and resculpting the site in a big way would kind of mess up those relationships so, we worked with that. We also wanted to make sure that we planned for the future and a car-free environment. We're actually working with many companies to – planning for our car-free environment is their primary concern so, we're really familiar with that; as you'll see in just a second what we've done there. Part of that is burying all the parking in the hill. We could have easily surface parked the site but to preserve space, we wanted to just get the cars out of the way. We wanted to accommodate (Inaudible) bus by pedestrian access and again, buffer the neighbors. This is an axon looking down on the site so that you can see the basic pieces. The first things to maybe point out here as we kind of get into it is that this is Barron Park behind us and our neighbors. We've actually had the chance to meet with many of our neighbors and go into their houses and take pictures from the windows so, that will come up in just a second so, that you can see what you would see from those sites. This is the lower area that was discussed that will be landscaping in the inner rim. The berm that goes up the parking garage is buried into the hill and – let me flip actually to this one. This gives a little bit more an image where – when you first come in, you'll enter the first level of the garage at the lower entrance. The upper garage at the second level and then primarily, it would be emergency vehicles or what have you that would actually go up to the top level. This is the way the circulation works. The site levels out with the street at only one spot; right here. That's where it works now and that's where we're using is also. Fortunately, there's also a large Heritage Oak Tree right at that spot too so, that becomes a bit of a focal when you first come in walking off Hanover. This is one bus stop; the other bus stop is here. This is the new crosswalk that we're putting in. This gives us the opportunity to enter the site at the lower so – actually, let me take you thru the bike – the way bikes would work. So, bikes – coming down Hanover, could either enter the site at the low driveway, go into the garage and then you'll see how we get bikes through the garage and then up into this pavilion, right into the center courtyard. Bikes can also go up to the main entrance and drive right into the upper courtyard at that point. If you come in from Bol Bike Trail, as [Graham] mentioned, you can take a short cut off and now we've extended this all the way up to the courtyard of the building. Then, of course, we talked about how cars get into the site. The garages look like this. This is the lower level of the garage. We would create a sidewalk that brings you in and goes alongside the drive aisle. To get you back to this point which is where the pavilion brings you up into the center of the site. So, this is a blow up of that area. One thing we did was open that stair up so, light will spill down and into the garage at that point. When you come into the garage, you'll see the light at the other side and know that that's kind of the center of activity to get you up to the top. That's also where we located the long-term bike parking. We made it large enough so there's room in there for a little workshop. The elevator is right there. This becomes a kind of whole node down in the garage, that brings you up right into the center of the courtyard. Then, I wanted to walk through some pictures that show the arrival sequence but this one is actually, probably a good one for me to talk about the roof deck also. The building was designed with a roof deck. A roof deck is actually a fairly innovative thing to do. It's creating a park in the air. It's a – it just brings activity – when you first see the building from the street, you'll see some activity up there which I think add to sort of the life of the project. We use to have a butterfly kind of solar canopy – shade canopy on top but that was certainly above the height limit and we eliminated it so now the only thing we really are asking for – all of this is under 35-feet. We're only asking for the stair and elevator to get you up to that roof deck but we think it actually is quite an enhancement to the site because creating that sort of outdoor park space is something that seems like a good thing to do. This is the view you would see when you first come up Hanover and look at the project and you can see the little pavilion that brings you up from the garage. The way that would look as your driving in, you come in the existing entrance and you would see these little butterfly canopies that poke out of the side of the hill. The first one brings you to the lower level, the second one to the second level and then once you arrived at the top, you get the pavilion that would be the stair and elevation from the garage below. When you arrive at the courtyard, this would be the experience. You – most people would come out of the pavilion and walk right across to the lobby of the building. By the way, the landscape in these images is not completely accurate but we have the Landscape Architect here and we have landscape plans and

would love to talk about all of that. This is a lustrative plan – landscape plan of the site. This shows where we're kind of preserving space for future use that we don't know yet. The garage is below here and it's designed to handle a building above it if that becomes the case. You could also put parking or a building down here. It all depends on what parking – how parking changes in the future. An important feature of the site is we did rework the road that comes into the sites so, right now it's flat and when you get to the end there's about a 15% grade – a hard right turn, 15% grade that brings you up to the upper level. Now, we sloped this and eased the edge and it's only about a 3 1/2% grade there. The reason we did that was one, to make sure the garage worked and take advantage of the topography but also to cut down the noise of any truck that might come up there; a delivery truck or what have you; make the turn and then go up that grade. A transformer is located right at this position and this is the Heritage Oak Tree that we talked about. This is the character of the meadow that would be a sort of temporary use for the existing parking lot that is down at the bottom but it would be that kind of character. As I mentioned, we do have out Landscape Architect here, Rich Sharp, who would be happy to talk about the landscape in depth. Then, jumping into this screening strategies. We've done several things – I mean, the input we got from the neighbors was very good. As I said, we were able to go out there. The yellow dots show all the houses that impact us or that we impact them and again, we were very fortunate to be able to go out and take photographs from people's houses second-story windows to see the impacts. This is what you see right now today. The existing building is right behind here. It is 35-feet high at one point so, it gives a fairly good impression of what you actually see. This is the kind of landscaping that happens at this house, that looks right in at this point of the project. We already have a fairly good buffer but it's not good enough because the problem with trees is you do get little holes in them and you can see through; there is headlights, there's sound. There's lots of reasons to kind of improve the screening. So, what we've done is we have done Spandrel glass on the bottom 30-inches of the windows and it's actually this dotted frit here. The most important thing we did was add side walls and earth berms and we have some sections coming up in a section but the best way to control both light and – well, especially sound, would be mass of earth and walls. So, we've included those and we've done a study actually to show how those could work.

Chair Lew: You can wrap up. If you have more to finish – yeah, finish your thought.

Mr. Giannini: I'll maybe just wrap up this. We'll be beefing up the mature landscaping with additional landscaping. Actually, when you get to the next step we can show these but we're filling in with hedges that would be in the back of the property to block out any light. So, if you can see in the diagrams, we've taken into account the light from headlights, the sound from cars; everything that might impact to try and completely make it invisible to the neighbors. Certainly, a much better condition than what's there now which is the truck dock in the corner. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: We have speakers for this particular item. I have four. Each person has 5-minutes. The first is Michael Palmer, followed by [Sheroud] – I can't read the last name – [Lapavole], Jessica Palmer and Jeff [Lavinski].

Chair Lew: Welcome.

Mr. Michael Palmer: Thank you. I'm Michael Palmer. I live at 922 Matadero Ave., which is behind the site here. I'm here representing several of us here from Matadero Ave and Matadero Court area. We talk often about this project so, I'm grateful for the opportunity to come here and speak before you to this forum where concerns residents can voice their concerns about the impact of these large developments on our neighborhoods. Back in April, I spoke about some of the impacts of the driveway to the residences. Today I want to talk more about the impacts of light pollution from the all glass design. Placed – you know this large, all glass building placed next to bucolic Barron Park neighborhood so, I did a – recently I did a little drive – oh, ok so, just for context, here's the elevation from Sand Hill Property slides. You can see it's almost translucent; the building so, almost 100% glass façade and there will be significant light spilling out. I did a drive around the neighborhood. This is a property that we're discussing today is here at this 'X'. This is Hansen Way. I just drove through taking pictures of some of these office buildings. I want to show you the kind of character of the neighboring buildings. This is

Hanover here, this Porter Drive and then Hillview so, here's the subject property and here's Matadero Ave and Matadero Court. There's a bunch of neighbors here up the hill and then here's all of Barron Park and Bol Park. I just wanted to compare the character of a lot of the neighboring buildings to show that this all glass building is really out of character. On Hansen Way, you can see most of these buildings are mostly concrete with some office windows so, I don't know how you would eyeball that – say maybe it's less than 20% glass. I'll just quickly go through these and just trying to eyeball them. This is 25% glass on the facade, I don't know. Maybe this is 30% glass, that kind of thing. This is maybe 25% glass on Hansen Way. This is crossing across through to Hanover – let's see. This is crossing, though – so, you'll see mostly cement – concrete façade and maybe 25% glass windows. Ok, this is crossing through Hanover. Again, not a lot of glass on the facades. This is on Hanover, HP. Kind of the one pattern is that the front of these buildings, they do have a kind of glitzy entrance, right? The entrance of HP does have a lot of glass and the two-story kind of glass façade but then the other part of HP, where the actual office buildings are being much less glass. It's mostly concrete facades. This is Cooley, the law firm on Hanover. It's next to the subject property. This is also developed by Sand Hill Property Company so you can see that this is – I don't know – what is that, maybe 30% glass and these kinds of overhangs which would shade glare from going up in the sky from those buildings. That's an attractive modern building. We don't have to do all glass to make a nice-looking office building. This is the current building at 3223 Hanover. The old building definitely does not have much glass on that building. This is the view from high up the hill, up above, just kind of low office windows. Compared, you know, again, too – this is what they are planning to replace the building with almost 100% façade with light spilling out. So, continuing up the hill, this the next building up the hill. I'm concerned that if we set the president at the subject property with this big glitzy glass building, this property slightly up the hill will be the next to go. There will be another very large, all glass building up the hill. We're not just talking about this property today, we're talking about the neighborhood – kind of president in the neighborhood. At the top of the hill is a new Lockheed building. It does have a lot of glass here on the front and it looks kind of imposing looking up the hill from the parking lot but then around the side – this is the same building on the side facing Hanover, it a much more modest amount of glass. You can have kind of mixed facades and make it an attractive building. You don't have to go 100% glass and the new building is doing that. I'll just quickly (Inaudible) through. This is some – most of the buildings in the neighborhood are smaller, they are further from residential and a lot less glass and unfortunately, this is a big building right next to residential with 100% glass. That's kind of the main – This is new construction. It doesn't have to be glass to have kind of modern appearance. So, just (Inaudible) through. I wrote a letter to the Board last with these pictures in there if you want to refer to them. Just to sum up, -- I'll get back to the – these are more – just to sum up – here's the view again. This all glass construction is maybe more appropriate on Page Mill on a big, busy street. Kind of a glitzy office building but I don't think it's appropriate right next to residential Barron Park, which is quiet and dark at night. It's kind of in congress and it's obtrusive to that neighborhood. It's ironic because the people who are working here will use the bike path, will use Barron Park – go walk in Bull Park during their lunch break. That will improve the rents for Sand Hill Property Company but then they are kind of spoiling the character of Barron Park by putting this building there. Finally, in April I spoke about the impact of this driveway. Today I talked about the light impact. In April I spoke about the impact of the driveway and I wrote a letter to Sand Hill Property Company in March, which if you look in your Staff report, that letter is reproduced with a bunch of suggestions of alternate driveway/pathways. I suggested that there were other ways to move this driveway up instead of – this is basically the closest point to residential. They bring all the cars back to residential and then bring them up and in my letter, I suggested several alternative approaches but we haven't gotten a response or study of those alternative approaches so I just wanted to point that out here. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you very much. The next speaker is [Sherrod].

[Mr. Sherrod Lapavole:] (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. Jessica Palmer, you're going to yield? Excellent, thank you, and Jeff [Lavinski]. You have 5-minutes.

[Mr. Lavinski:] Thank you. Good morning Board and Staff. When you heard this project last April I raised three major points. We wanted full transparency on the parcel split and the compliance on that. That the project didn't qualify for a DEE for the roof deck and we wondered what the – what's going to happen when the site is fully developed and what the impact will be on residents, not just this phase of the project. I can't say that there's really been much progress on any of these three points but let me go through that. On the first point, although the Staff report now claims that the parcel was split between May. The City parcel map that I checked yesterday, still doesn't show that so, there's a question about that. The footnote on page 4 of the Staff report says that the Subdivision Map Act does not subject commercial lease lines to City review. I believe that's incorrect and let me try to explain. Subdivision Map Act is a State law and it does require that commercial lease lines be reviewed when you split or move them around. There's an exception and that exception – I can read you the actual law if you wish – says, that if the split is part of another project that you're reviewing, there's part of that, then you don't have to have an additional review of the split itself. Instead, you can combine it and review the split and the project at the same time. Don't take my word for it but here's what a local land use expert said just last year. The Subdivision Map Act by its expressed terms does not add another layer of review to this process when commercial or industrial buildings are concerned. Who is that expert? That is Stanford University's own lawyer, who pointed that out on a Sand Hill Property matter. What she was saying was, you don't have to have a separate review but you do still need a review and the City never did that review and the footnote, in fact, admits that the City never the review. This is a serious law. It's up to a \$10,000 penalty per incident and up to 1-year in prison for violating this law. I believe this project is not illegal as it stands and the City needs to follow the proper process and this point also applies to this next project that you're about to hear, which has the same issue I believe, associated with it. On point two, I agree with the Staff's position that the roof – that the new proposal for just a DE for the elevators and stairs does not meet the City criteria for that. Obviously, if you were to approve that, they could umbrella tables or temporary canvas cover out on the roof anyway so, they'd get what they originally wanted if you were to approve that. On point three, last year, I think the Board agreed that it made sense to see the full layout for the sights so, you could understand how it's all going to play out on the residences and I believe we heard that they're just not presenting that; it would be good to have that in a future review. One final point that I'd like to touch on. The company behind this project is Sand Hill Properties and as you probably know, they're also responsible for the Edgewood Plaza Grocery Center in my neighborhood. They came and they promised many things, public benefits including that they would revitalize the center by operating a grocery store at the site. All good, the neighborhood was for that but just in the last few months, Sandhill has filed a legal motion with the City, saying it is not obligated to provide an operating grocery store there. Instead – they said the City doesn't even have a – the City never had a right to require them to do that and so, their position is the City can't do anything about it; the City has no option. It's a little troubling when a company comes forward and makes this kind of argument because it means that when they stand right here and say to you, we're going to do this or we're going to do that. You don't know what's actually going to happen. Down the road, you may find that they'll say, that's not operable. The City can't enforce that, the residents aren't going to be protected, the City isn't going to be protected so, please be forewarned. I wouldn't have to say this about any other company but Sand Hill is the company that has done this. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you, Mr. Lavinski. We'll close the – Yes? The Staff. Welcome.

Ms. Gerhardt: If you – I can respond to the parcel issue if you'd like. Just to confirm that we have spoken with our attorney's and that commercial lease lines are not subject to maps. As we have and when we review these projects, we're certainly looking at how the lease lines are changings to ensure that each lease area meets its FAR requirements as if it were a real property – meets its setbacks and things of that nature. We are treating these lease lines like property lines even though they are not. Secondly, those changes in lease lines are also captured in the Mayfield Annual Report that is given to the City Council.

Mr. Raschke: Chair, for me?

Chair Lew: Yes, thank you.

Mr. Raschke: Maybe you're going there. Your rules provide that the applicant has up to 10-minutes of rebuttal time after the public comment.

Chair Lew: Does the applicant want to make a statement?

Mr. Giannini: Actually, just a couple. Absolutely correct on the lot line coverage at FAR. We – with the split, this parcel works but more importantly, on the neighbor items. It's always hard to put one use next to another use. We took the approach of making sure that we absolutely, screen it so, there could be no view of light or sound from the other side. Actually, we increase the setback on the back of the property; I didn't mention those but there's a 50-foot buffer back there now, which the City provided just for this purpose. We increased that to 90-feet and the 90-feet actually, only happens at the point of the building. Then, we angled the building also so the building wouldn't be broadside to the neighbors. The nice that that did was that it added that 90-feet of the buffer that we provided on the back of the property allowed us to do the berms, you know, change the grades and put in solid masonry walls to make sure that we ensure that we screened it. Even if there were floodlights coming out of the building, you wouldn't be able to see it. Also, I don't want to pull up the other drawings but one of the images in the slideshow also shows the neighbor building, which is the big, glassy front Lockheed building and the quality of the light that comes from that building – which actually, isn't as it appeared in the washed-out rendering, it actually is a much more subtle, glowing kind of light that comes from these buildings and all the lights are kept down low. I just wanted to point out that we did pull out every stop that we could think of to make sure that you will never see our building from the neighboring sites.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Bob. If there are no other speakers, I will close the public portion of the hearing.

Mr. Giannini: Great, thank you. I just wanted to remind the Commission about the disclosures if you have any to report.

Chair Lew: Yes, I think we do have disclosures today. Did you? Oh, you didn't? I thought you had – ok, any other disclosures? Ok. No disclosures.

Board Member Furth: I've toured the site but I have spoken to no one.

Chair Lew: Excellent. I will disclose that I was emailed – maybe with Bob about the meeting but we did not meet. Are there any questions from Board Members?

Board Member Furth: Could we have some more information about the landscaping? I would like to hear more about the upper-level landscaping and the lower level landscaping. I particularly – you know, we're required to make a finding that you're providing good habitat and I'd like to understand how you've approached that. Also, just sort of just what the scale of this is? I mean, how many acres of what do you have on this site?

Mr. Rich Sharp: Good morning, I am Rich Sharp with Studio 5 Design and Landscape Architect on the project. I put the lustrative up just so we can see what's green and what's hardscape and what's softscape, basically. I have a planting plan in front of me and we also have a planting plan if we need to go to it. It's just a little hard to read the black and white plans on the screen. What?

Board Member Furth: I found it hard to read in real life.

Mr. Sharp: Well, 11 x 17 for sure. It's a 10-acre site and we're trying to squeeze a lot of planting information onto a small 11 x 17 plan for your review. Conceptually, I guess I can walk around the project. Is there a particular area you want me to start at or just maybe sort of an overview?

Board Member Furth: The upper terrace.

Mr. Sharp: The upper terrace, ok. The upper terrace is, essentially a podium condition, right? It's over the rooftop garage. So, we have soil depth restrictions on that type of a landscape so, our approach given that it is a 10-acre site, heavy lid canopied on the perimeter was to infill on that upper terrace where we were off the structure, which you'll see along the north side of the building. I guess I can move the mouse here – yeah, so all in here we have, as Bob mentioned, the Heritage Oak that sits kind of right at the – sort of the gateway coming in at grade to the project and then as you move through this front terrace, we're trying to create some sense of – kind of reduce the appearance of suburban office park and have sort of a hard patio space that sits up against a very modern, glass building instead of foundation planting around the perimeter of the project which you get in a lot of the light industrial areas. With that said, Heritage Tree, urban sort of plaza coming into the project with a large tree cut-away; these are Anglemens Oaks. You know the perimeter of the project has a lot Quercus Agrifolia, Coast Live Oak; has some Cedars in the mix, Hungarian Oaks along the street. We're trying to play to this Oak wooden canopy if you will. We're on this escarpment -- basically, this upper level before the project drops away. With that, we brought that Oak canopy into the project. It's a large leaf, deciduous Oak that moves into here. We have Crape Myrtle along this edge of the building and along the back as a flowering accent as you move into the project. The tree canopy gives way to the butterfly pavilion that comes up from the garage and then as you – you get an entry sequence along the curving path coming in. We have a series – sort of this parterre on the roof, that we're calling it, where we have diagonal lines that move out through the garden and then we have horizontals that pick up on the geometry of the building that moves through the garden this way. Those all create this sort of panelized gardens, which we're trying to do...

Board Member Furth: Excuse me. What are the materials and the planting in that area?

Mr. Sharp: I'll go into that. We're trying to – you spoke to habitat, this is where we're trying to introduce habitat. This is – in the spirit of the project being sort of inspired by butterflies, we're looking at Monarch gardens, we're looking at multiple Salvias in here, the Greggii, the white Salvias, the Greggii Red Salvias, Bees Bliss which is a low spreading Salvia. Those sit along the edges that run at these diagonals that form these garden walks and then as you move out along these garden walks we have little Holly Hedge which is what we call an adaptive plant. It sits well with the native material, low water use, well behaved Evergreen, non-fruiting and those hedges define some garden corridors here that have seating so that we can provide breakout spaces for Staff. We've done this on a number of projects. On the Hanover Street project, Paige Mount Hanover. We've done it at Netflix, we're doing it at Apple. There's a handful of projects where tenants want Wi-Fi out in the garden and the ability to sit down and work on laptops. So, that's what these areas are accommodating and then these large panels become native and adaptive grasses. We're using Sesleria Autumnalis, Muhlenbergia Rigens which is a Muhly grass, Gamma Grass. We bring Verbena up in that, Liatris perennial. They are kind of wispy, airy perennials that kind of come up. These become sort of meadow like qualities. (Crosstalk)(Inaudible) Yes. Just to in terms of a illustrative, we're showing that sort of as a straw because grasses are seasonal. We have four season grasses in there and three season grasses in there so that we don't have a project that looks ravaged in February when you have to cut the grass... (Crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: So, these are mostly pre-European grasses or?

Mr. Sharp: The Gamma Grass is a native. The Solera is a native. We have Stipa in there which is a native and an adaptive – varies Cultivars are Stipa. The little Holly hedge is an adaptive Mediterranean but not a native.

Board Member Furth: How high is that hedge?

Mr. Sharp: That can vary. We typically keep it at 3-foot high so that when you're sitting down, you have a sense of enclosure in these seating areas but we're not trying to wall off one chamber from another in the garden.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Sharp: We've introduced a Bocce court into the project. Again, we have limited depth so something like Bocce works well. We don't have a lot of footings. It's not like a basketball hoop, where we need to have a massive footing into a roof top which would compromise waterproofing systems etc. Those types of uses are the lower noise level. We've tried to keep the seating areas here and up in this garden so that we are as far away from the residential as possible. As you move around the project, we have a little, kind of art – potential art location here. It's a little court with a bosque of trees that we could drop in an art piece. Most of this area here is just – it's circulation to get around to the back lobby. It's all mounded with infill Oaks. All of this canopy back here is Evergreen Oak for the most part. Our infill in the pockets that we have available would be the same Quercus Agrifolia. We have some Red Buds in there for accent. We've introduced a few Anglewood Oaks along the drive here to pick up on the Oak drift that's moving through the project. I could go to the section that Bob had up that shows where – beyond the canopy, we've introduced a berm that rolls up and back down to a...

Board Member Furth: I'm pretty much focused on the habitat aspect of it right now.

Mr. Sharp: Sure.

Board Member Furth: Then, you've got a Hydro seeded...

Mr. Sharp: The meadow.

Board Member Furth: ...over there?

Mr. Sharp: Yeah. That's a native California mix hydroseed.

Board Member Furth: That's what, acre and ½? 2-acres?

Mr. Sharp: That's probably 2-acres, yeah. We've kept – we have an updated rendering. We have 9 trees in here that we've kept. The trees that were mentioned by Staff in here, given that this is a parking lot, there is probably two dozen very small caliper Crepe Myrtles.

Board Member Furth: I just have one more question. What – how did Crepe Myrtles function as habitat in California, in this area?

Mr. Sharp: They don't and we're not – that's why we have them limited to just the building face here and that's why we're taking them out of the meadow here. If you put a meadow in and left those trees, it'd look like a ghost of a parking lot sitting there because you'd see three trees every 50-feet, you know, marching through there and it would be pretty obvious. So, what we did was we kept – again, this doesn't represent – we have an updated rendering in the slide show that we had three more trees in here. We kept the Sycamores because we felt even though they're (Inaudible) they resemble [Arasamosa] which is in California so it would play well with the meadow as a look. We mounted – we're taking some of the spoils and we're trying to do contouring here so it's not a big, flat, use to be a parking lot. Now it's a big flat meadow. It has a contour to it so there's some value from the bike path etc.

Chair Lew: I had just a follow-up. I have a question on the landscape.

Mr. Sharp: Sure.

Chair Lew: Which is, what is happening along the sideways edge and along the...

Mr. Sharp: The streetscape.

Chair Lew: ... there's a slope – yeah, the streetscape.

Mr. Sharp: Sure. Good question, thank you. If you walk the site, the existing condition has a fairly steep embankment. It's not quite that tall here, up to the parking lot but it's still, what we would call an

engineered slope. Not super attractive but densely planted with existing vegetation. As you come past the driveway entrance here, it's much higher because it's trying to reach up to the upper pad and then as Bob indicated, when you get up to this point, it levels off and comes in. We're fairly restricted in here. We have a lot of mature vegetation that we're keeping as part of the tree distribution plan. We're keeping a lot of the Oaks in here. The Hungarian Oaks along the street but in this area, we have an opportunity because there's a handful of existing Oaks that we're keeping at the entrance. As you move north, it's fairly tree free here so, what we've done is we've laid the grades back to a much gentler slope; 3 to 1. We've actually introduced a bio-swell here to pick up being a low spot on the project and actually, as a gateway to the bike path. What we've found was that the bike path is very abrupt to just sort of come off the sidewalk and go in so, we're opening up that corner for slight lines for the bicyclists. The bio-swell sits there so, that introduces habitat. The *Juncus Patens* that we'll put in there as a – we're trying to create a variety of habitat opportunities. Bio-swell at the street becomes a feature. We have Cedars to help shut views. This is where the view looking up to the building might be the most exposed so we introduced Cedars here. We've actually walked the site with Dave Docker and looked at all these opportunities with the project arborist and the City arborist to develop some of these strategies.

Chair Lew: Sort of midway ...(Crosstalk)

Mr. Sharp: So, mid-way...

Chair Lew: ...in the front where there's all the Juniper, what happens there?

Mr. Sharp: Some of that is coming out. There's three Cedars that were in poor shape here that in walking the site with the City Arborist, we got approval to remove those. Obviously, there's mitigation for replacement. We're introducing some new Oaks in here. We're keeping some existing Oaks at the top of the rise. This entrance into the project here becomes sort of a gateway of Hungarian Oaks, picking up on the cues that have been established with the street trees and bringing them down the drive aisle here. This entrance is – we have as a foreground, we have *Carex*, which is a low water use, low growing grass like material. We have *Ceanothus* layered in there which, by the way, needs a lot of sun so it should be in a sunny area which this is. Then, we have layered behind that *Baccharis Coyote Bush* – again, habitat plant material. Performers – I mean, they do well. We've used them on lots of projects. They're native but they show well, they present well as a front entrance. We're not trying to sort of flower up the entrance. We're trying, to be honest with the native plant material even at the entry statement.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you...

Mr. Sharp: Artwork also sits right here. Gordon, who is doing the art piece there. That's part of that sequence.

Chair Lew: Ok. Thank you, for the moment. Are there any other questions? Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I have two questions, please; not for the landscaping. One question is for the architect, the other is for the neighbor, Mr. Palmer. Why don't we start with the architect? I'm looking at your drawing A4.3, where you seem to be claiming that the building is entirely shaded from solar heat gain because of Fritted glass fins. Is this the glass fin you're talking about and could you explain how I'm supposed to believe this drawing please, A4.3?

Mr. Giannini: So, sustainability is one of the things I enjoy and actually, I'm on two of the City Committees; on the Green Building Committee and the Electrification Committee. We have a net-zero building just down the street and so, we've had – the only reason I mentioned that is that we've got a lot of opportunities to talk about what works and what doesn't work on shading strategies and is the most effective. The most effective thing that you can do as the architect is shade the building. Then, what that means is the mechanical (Inaudible) can get smaller and you can get to net-zero and all those kinds of things. We're not pursuing net-zero on this project yet. What we wanted to do was give this building the best chance. The big butterfly roofs as well as being this theme that we've kind of used throughout the

projects, shade the building in the most important times. Those particular shades were taken at 3 o'clock in the summer. It's mid-afternoon in the summer when the sun is relatively high but it's a little lower than if it was at noon. In the actual package, we have sun – you know, we show – I believe we show the other times of the year or whatever but the goal with this project was to shade the project from above. On the west elevation, even though it actually doesn't make a whole lot of sense because we're actually shaded by the hill. We did put glass sun shades there, just because we do have the west sun coming in and if it should happen to get through the hill, that would be an appropriate thing to do. We've done buildings where we've changed each elevation and each exposure -- which is actually, 1400 Page Mill right down the street – can be problematic because when the users actually come in, there's a lot of complaints about why is my window much smaller than the others? Well, it's on the west side. So, what we try and do is rather than kind of modifying each window side and shading each window down at the low level. On this project, we're exploring shading the building from above.

Board Member Baltay: Again, if I could just get clarification on my question.

Mr. Giannini: Oh, the glass? I actually don't have a sample of the fin. What we would use would be – I actually have it in the box (Crosstalk)...

Board Member Baltay: What is this sample then?

Mr. Giannini: That is the sun shade that works on the top of the building. Hang on a second.

Board Member Baltay: I don't want to belabored too much. We've been doing a lot of questions but I would just like come confirmation from you. You believe the building is entirely shaded from solar heat gain?

Mr. Giannini: It's not entirely shaded from solar heat gain. That would...

Board Member Baltay: Your diagram and your argument here seems to say that and I want to be really clear because I'm very skeptical obviously.

Mr. Giannini: The diagram – which I can pull up.

Board Member Baltay: If you could just answer that it (Inaudible)

Mr. Giannini: The building is not 100% shaded. It would be – there are the diagrams right there. You can see, there's still little spots of sun that hit the building at that particular time of the year. What we do, is rather than taking an approach of trying to get 100% shade on the building, we do as best we can. It's kind of balance between aesthetics, architecture, and sustainability. This is doing a pretty good job of shading the building at the most critical times but it is not 100% shaded. The glass sunshades on the west side of the building would just be etched glass.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Giannini: That particular glass is the glass that floats along the top edge of the building.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you very much. If I could direct one last questions, if my colleagues will indulge me, to the neighbor Mr. Palmer. Mr. Palmer, you've pointed out that this building has considerably more glass than other buildings in the Research Park area. I'm wondering if you're concerned about the glass is one of the architectural style overall or if it's one that your building will be visible from your property? Secondly, are you aware of this berm feature that they are proposing which seems to me makes this building invisible from the neighbors?

Mr. Palmer: Yeah. It's not a particular architectural concern. It's whether – it's the questions of light pollution through any screening. It's hard – if you have 100% glass building with kind of open offices, it will be basically impossible to screen that.

Board Member Baltay: Have you see the berming and proposals they've made about screening the building and do you agree with those? That they would work?

Mr. Palmer: The berming is basically around the driveway approach. It's not on the upper area and it definitely won't screen glare up in the sky, on a hazy evening. That will be visible throughout Barron Park.

Board Member Baltay: Do you feel that the building will be visible from your property?

Mr. Palmer: Yes, definitely.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Peter, would you like to start?

Board Member Baltay: Sure. I still have a couple of fairly serious concerns about this project. I'll start from the overall site planning and layout of it. I'm just confused as to the rationale behind the layout. As I understand it, any vehicular approach to the building comes in along the side of the driveway and turns into one of the two parking levels with no internal connection between the two. Somehow, you're supposed to know that's how you get into it. Then, if you continue further to the very end of the site and come back around, you are sort of left at a parking lot at the side of the building. You're never really close to the front so if I'm taking a taxi from the airport for a business meeting, where does the driver drop me off? Where is the approach? How does it work? It feels to me more like your trying really hard to get a clever two-stacked parking arrangement with internal ramps and take advantage of that topography feature without really having a main entrance to the building; a front; a sort of face. The center of the building – the main entrance I believe from the plans is at the nucleus, the knock of where the building bends and yet, it's a pretty long walk on a day like today and weather, for somebody to get close to that. It just doesn't quite work. When I pair that then to how it works relating to bike riding approaching the building, things like that. I'm left with a similar sort of concern. A bicyclist is supposed to somehow know where to go into that lower level and somehow navigate between all those parked cars to get to that long-term parking lot. I'm left thinking that if you were to make a much larger opening through the parking area – so, from that big public plaza on the top, it wasn't just a staircase that's open but rather a large round thing all of us are familiar with. The coffee shop over on El Camino and Menlo Park, where they have these large openings down into the parking area. It makes the parking area much more used and visible. That kind of design thought might really take you a long way. I think also that having the cars go back to what's left of the parking lot at the back is sort of a sore spot with the neighbors. I agree that a 3% grade is not likely to make a lot of noise but nonetheless, I wonder if there's not just a way you couldn't bring all this internal through the parking garage and just not have that roadway all the way to the back. I find that I don't believe that this building is going to be visible from the neighbor's properties and I think with the landscaping and the berming, I find myself convinced that you've done a good job of screening from the neighbors and I would appreciate if you could really make an effort to explain to them and understand. If this berm is not where they're saying it is or what – if you're not really accomplishing that goal, you'd want to make those adjustments but I – seems to me that you're trying to do that. Regarding the Design Enhancement Exception, I find myself pursued by the Staff report that it's not appropriate here. I'm concerned about all the glass on the building from a sustainable point of view. If you caught the drift in my questions there, I really find it hard to believe that this glass is even 50% shaded and the building seems to be 100% glass. I don't have an issue with that aesthetically but I do think it's important for it to be a sustainable building and it strikes me that on an afternoon sunshine, it's going to get pretty hot inside this glass and the air conditioning is going to be cranking. That's why a lot of building aren't 100% glass like that but I'd like to see you really think through, do you need to have it be 100% glass? I think you could accomplish your butterfly effect with

your design with still have solid chunks of the wall as well. I just don't find myself convinced that the aesthetics meet finding number 6, which is that the building is sustainable. Last thing would be to find some better parking arrangement. Although, once you explain how you have a dedicated bike area downstairs, that tends to work well. I think in this case, it would be better if it were just more accessible and more celebrated. There's a lot of people coming on foot and bicycle here. Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Thank you to the applicant. Thank you to the neighbors for coming to speak to us. It's always difficult when we have conflicting testimony. I will say that I agree with the Staff's interpretation of the Sub-Division Map Act and I don't think you're really asking for design enhancement. You're asking for a code amendment and that's not within our purview. If the Council thinks that this kind of increased height is a good idea, they can amend the code but we can't really do it vice via what's essentially a variance. I'm glad to see the Bol Park Path connection. I understand Staff concerns and would like to see that worked out better. I'm concerned about – first of all, it looks like a lovely building and a lovely thoughtful series of gardens so, I should put that out first. I appreciate your taking the time and my colleagues listening through that more detailed discussion on how you've tried to address the habitat issues. I'm concerned about the uniform frontages. In a world that doesn't have uniformed solar exposures, I have absolutely no sympathy for, why is my window smaller, question. Anybody working here ought to know the answer. Perhaps, one of the things this building could do is educates us at to the answer. You know, we're way behind on meeting California's carbon reduction/ (Inaudible) Reduction Standards and we're going to have to up the game a lot if we're going to do it. I do ask that you do more to address the problems of solar gain in this building. I will defer to my colleagues to whether or not the building is visible and if it's not, that's good. I think that are down lighting requirements should help reduce glare problems. On bicycle parking, generally, we've not favored tucking it into the basement. There may be some people who want – you find that useful and accessible but I'd like you to think about putting it much more visible and celebratory. Some people may want to lock away their expensive bikes but some people may want to show them off. When I look at your landscaping over on the podium – of course, the thing I have in my mind is Stanford's meadow landscaping in front of the hospital parking garage; which is the first big one of these I saw. The space – I can't tell because I'm not clear on the scale but the space for actual plants and butterflies and creatures seems very divided; very chopped up. So, I'm concerned that it won't in fact, function as a good habitat but you know more about this than I. I'd like to hear more about that. I don't believe that the 2-acre hydro seeded meadow is adequate, even if it has berms. That seems to be a pretty low-efficiency kind of creation that – I sympathize with the notion that it goes – parking lot isn't the look we're going for and I don't know that trees are what you need there but I suspect you need bushes for this to really meet the standards. Thanks.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back with the presentation. I echo a lot what the previous two Board Members have said but maybe to just reiterate a few of the points. The Bol Park bicycle path, while I appreciate the connection that you've made. It seems to me that the path that you're showing on the site would really only be for users of the site itself as opposed to the public that is coming through. The public will have the alternate path neighboring your site so, I think perhaps it makes sense to bring that path all the way up to the main level of the building, to the courtyard level. I think – you almost show that in one of your circulation diagrams but I just wanted to see if that would be a possibility. Also, the bicycle parking, while I think the positioning of the long-term parking in the garage by the stair and elevator makes a lot of sense. I think just getting there may be a little bit dangerous. I'm having to navigate around cars especially, at a time where people are commuting to work and cars pulling in and out and so forth. As far as the glazing on the building, the building having a similar architecture style and look from all 4-sides, I think this – to me actually, maybe I'm on the other side of the fence here but I think the orientation that you have as far as the building layout with regards to Cardinal North and the trees that you have towards the south. I almost feel like this building could actually work. I don't know if I necessarily agree with the shading diagram that you have shown on the slide up here but I think a lot

of the open glazing with no shading is actually facing true north and so, I think you would actually bring in a lot of north light, indirect light. As far as the west and south, I feel like you have enough planting and trees to ensure that the building will be shaded and of course, the actual building shade features as well. Perhaps it just takes another energy analysis or some kind of a study to convince the rest of us. I'm actually somewhat positive that it could work the way that you have it. I also do agree that you're cooperating with the neighbors and I appreciate that and I also appreciate the neighbors coming out. Seeing that we could have more public – in testimony on some of the other projects but I think it's a valid concern however, I do feel that you are addressing it as best you can. I do think the berm and landscaping will help. With regards to the DEE, I think in this case I would really prefer to have the deck and I want to be able to support it, however, with the way that we have to make the findings for it. I just don't see how that it can be made. It's not facing towards the residential neighborhood but it's really facing out towards Hanover and I think even the level of it – because Hanover does slope up in that portion, I think it makes a lot of sense but as far as making a finding for it, I think it's tough and I agree with Board Member Furth that it's really more of a change in code that has to happen to allow for taller buildings in this area. In closing, I guess it's been studied but with the garage being underneath the podium and its distance away from that Heritage Oak Tree, I just want to make sure that there is enough protection to keep that Heritage Oak alive. It does seem a little close. I trust that it's been studied and it's been placed – that the garage has been placed far enough from the roots of that Oak but it would be nice to get some confirmation on that. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Can somebody answer the question about the Oak Tree and the garage?

Mr. Sharp: We looked at that specific condition with Dave Docker and Dave (Inaudible) when we were out there and we're comfortable with the corner of that garage.

Male: Dave is comfortable with the garage as well.

Mr. Docker: Thank you for inquiring about the health of the tree. Yes, the garage buffer zone has been deemed adequate for the health of the Oak. Those tolerances have been built into the system and the Landscape Architect has been instructed to take care of all of the surface and root impact area adequately with their arborist so, we feel comfortable. Staff feels comfortable with the Oaks being adequately maintained as with the rest of the environmental nodes and area. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. You all done? Great. I would just say I would – Oh, that's right – I didn't want to forget Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I like the design but with that, you said it does bring some challenges. I agree with a couple of my fellow Board Members here. I think the berming and the way it's positioned on the site, I don't have as big as concern about light pollution as I think some of the neighbors do. Also, I think your design or your layout for the shading at 3 o'clock is probably a bit optimistic but I'm more concerned about 1:15 in the afternoon, than 3 o'clock. The way you've got the trees done. I think you're going long ways to shading the building but I think it probably wouldn't hurt having a secondary study to double check that. As to the Design Enhancement Exception, I mean, there much a reason why you don't show a 16-foot high elevator shaft sticking above your building which theoretically, if I'm thinking – at about 30-feet at the roof deck, to a 46-foot height, I think would almost look like a chimney on the thing. You know, there's architectural license but there's a reason why you don't show that. I mean – now there is – I mean, usually, the biggest problem with elevators why they have to have that much is the motors and everything else up there. The other alternative, which I've done in the past is to use a hydraulic. You're only going up two floors, which would eliminate probably 6-feet of that height up on top. She can go pretty much up to the second floor, where all the mechanism is done in the – you know, underground. I mean, if you can bring it down somewhat, I would be amenable to it or at least consider it. Also, the screening for the – for your mechanical equipment, you show basically a piece of mechanical equipment that's probably 10+ feet high. Now, I know that's not a usual size but now a day, I've used equipment that has become more – I don't know – lower or whatever. Obviously, it takes up a little bit more of the footprint but because of these things, I've used equipment

that has gotten lower so you ought to be able to bring that down. Using those things, if you can cut 4 or 5-feet off of those things and bring them down. I would be more than willing to listen to that because I do like the whole idea of a roof deck. Let's see, I do agree, however, that the parking is really odd. I agree with my Board Member that maybe what you need is you need one – instead of two small entries into the parking garage, you have one major one that is pretty much aligned with the front door or the apex of your – and make it more of a statement and then, that becomes a big driveway in. Even if it's in a loop and then out again, something like that because you're absolutely right. If I take a cab to that place and it's raining and they say, ok, there's the front door about 40-foot away. I'm not going to be a happy camper. I mean, I don't think anybody would appreciate that. I think you need some sort of out of your car, under a cover or at least real close to it covered the situation. I do like the – possibly the idea of an opening right by the front door, something like that so, that you can see the relationship between the parking and the building but I do agree that the parking – probably the whole thing – the parking I think is the biggest problem here. Much more so than the building. I also agree that – maybe because it use to be that way that you might want to do – I appreciate the fact that you've made the slope a lot less so that there isn't a proverbial down shift and crank on the gas but maybe if you could push that a little bit further away or whatever. If you can't, then I think you've gone a long way to mitigating that problem. Let's see – I think that's probably it at this point. Like I said, I think it's coming along real nicely but I do have some serious concerns. There you go. Now you can...

Chair Lew: Excellent. Thank you, Robert. I do have a question for Staff. I did want to follow-up on – I think this is Mr.[Lavinski]'s the third question about the full development potential and that also came – that was sort of addressed by the Board previously. They were sort of concerned about the remaining allowable building area. I was wondering how the Staff handles those kinds of situations on other projects because I don't recall that we've every required a full design – like a full (Inaudible) at the time, you know, of an initial application.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. There are not many projects that come in like this where there's sort of additional FAR leftover but to the degree that there is, Staff is only able to review the application that is in front of us. There's no other application on file or that we know of that's even coming in in the near future. We have no idea when that's going to come in and so that would be speculative at this point for us to be looking at additional FAR.

Chair Lew: On his first question about the subdivision and parcel split. I mean, that's normally a Planning and Transportation Commission and a Council item. Like subdivision maps and – is there a separate process for that that's happening in current with this project?

Ms. Gerhardt: Commercial lease lines do not need a subdivision application.

Chair Lew: I see. So, it's not – you're saying it's not a subdivision?

Ms. Gerhardt: No. No. It's just – we certainly –through this process, we're taking a look at the new lease lines and we do have that annual Mayfield Report where it is recorded there.

Chair Lew: Ok. Thank you.

Mr. Owen: If I could just add one thing. The sheet C00 in the project plans does show the two lease areas so, it does describe the new orientation of the lease areas.

Chair Lew: Oh, ok. Thank you. My take on the project is that I was kind of struggling with the basic organization. I think maybe similar to Board Member Baltay's concern about the – that he expressed. I guess I – I'm sort of inclined that I think that you – I think that you've picked the right solution because I think what's happened on this project is that the existing site has really offal grading. I mean we just don't do that anymore today. I've worked on sites like this before. The option is to – if you change the grading back to something more – whatever natural or the way it uses to be, then you end up removing all the trees, right? You did that on your other project on – on one of your other projects on Page Mill

Road, where we actually lost almost all the – you know, most of the trees internally in the site because the site was regraded. It seems to be that even though there are some weaknesses to me in the site planning. We're getting the lower meadow along the – on the Bol Park bike path. All the parking is – almost all the parking is underground and so, that to me seems to be two huge pluses. Then we do have some downsides where you can't really see the entrance from the first -- you know, from the driveway from the street. There are some awkward things about this site but it seems to me a net positive, to me and on balance; at least at this time. I think I can sign off on that in my mind. On the landscaping, I did have some concern if you – about the lower meadow. I think all of those plans are actually very wildlife friendly, especially, the Pines and stuff. I was wondering if the – if a future tenant is going to be ok with that in the middle of the summer because it's not going to look – it's not going to be pretty in the middle of the summer and so, I was wondering if there are any ways of addressing that? I think the other thought was I think you were showing a pathway possibly through the wildflower meadow but nothing is shown in the plans. It seems to me that that's important in making it desirable for people. You're creating a – I went to this great lecture by [John Greenly] who's a big (Inaudible) of meadows but he's like, you have to make the – you can create something for wildlife but it actually has to be attractive for people otherwise the people won't take care of it and continue it. Wildflower meadows do need some tinkering. They don't always – they don't necessarily sustain themselves, you know, fully every year. A lot of times – yeah, we have to reseed them and whatnot if the hydro seeding doesn't work. I have some concerns about the existing – I think you have existing barb wire fences around a lot of the property and I think we don't allow the barbed wire. It seems like it's been removed in some places. It's like barb wire on top of chain link fence. I think we haven't really heard anything about the existing staircases. (Inaudible) staircases connecting the site with the upper Lockheed site and what's happening with those. I mean at the moment they're all fenced off. On the neighboring – with regard to the neighbor's concern and Mr. Palmer's concern about the glass and the light. I am sympathetic. It seems to me you're showing a lot of photos of other buildings in the Research Park and I think normally we actually – in our findings we actually do – have to show that – have to find that the new building is compatible with the existing context. In the Research Park, we actually don't have the same – those context base findings that we have on, let's say downtown. We do though have regular findings that say that there should be transitions. In fact, I'll read the words – I'll read out the exact language because they've been revised. Number 2D is that we provide harmonious transitions in scale, mass and character to adjacent land uses and land use designations. I think to your point is that this big glass thing against the – probably the most rural portion of Palo Alto. I mean that back corner of Barron Park is, you know, very different than what's being purposed. Yeah, it's a tough one but I did walk up and down Matadero Court and the lot sizes there are enormous and the amount of existing planting is pretty amazing, I mean I'm very jealous. I guess it comes back to is how much glass there is and I have to say, Bob, you have a lot of glass on the building and when I – I know you used the same energy consultants that I've worked with. I mean, they always say that the glass below desk height isn't giving you anything in terms of light. It's actually, usually, pretty ugly too if there's furniture up against it. It seems to me that there's ways of reducing the amount of glass in the building that wouldn't necessarily impact – although it would be better from the outside and I'm not sure if it would really hurt anything on the inside. I know when you walk into these all-glass buildings. When you first walk in it's really amazing to see the open space and then what I see happens is that people have computers screens and they end up closing all the blinds. It seems to me that there should be a middle ground somewhere, particularly, facing the neighbors. I do think you do have a lot of shading. The deep overhangs are a huge plus, you have on the building and you do have the – a lot of the cut grading and existing trees that provide a lot of shade and buffer to your glass walls. That's where I am on this one. I think that the – oh, I do want to – just agree with previous comments made, I think by Mr. -- Board Member Baltay about a larger opening down to the garage. I think that's a great idea. Get more light down to there. Having the bike path go to the entrance is great. I'm a little concerned about the parking – the bike parking in the garage. If there was an easier way for them to get to the bike room instead of having to zig zag through the garage, I would be more agreeable to having it in the garage. Then on the – oh, then on the DEE, I'm ok with the – generally – normally I'm ok with the roof decks. I do see that the Staff has an issue with the findings so I guess I would agree with the Staff. I would say that I think I might be inclined to say that the – that portion of the building is at least 10-feet or more, right? Below grade of the street and so it seems to me that there's something unusual happening there. I think that I might be able to say that there's something unique about your site. Then,

I think the Staff is getting stuck on the idea that the stair towers are actually making the building more attractive. I think that that's – yeah, I think I get stuck there too. I think you would normally think people would argue that the – some sort of canopy structure could make the building larger but we discouraged you from doing that last time. That's where we are on this one. That's all that I have. Do you have any – if you have any follow-ups?

Mr. Giannini: Actually – Oh, thank you for the opportunity. Just a couple of things. The bikes in the garage – so, originally – I'm with you. Normally we put the bikes – the long-term parking outside up on top but we were forcibly made to move them down by transportation. They took it – we studied it for a few weeks or whatever and they actually thought, in this case, the bike really ought to be down there because – I actually kind of agree with them. You know you could enter the garage at the lower level so you don't have to go that last 15-feet up and then kind of come up right in the center of the courtyard. Another topic – maybe a different way to think about it. If you think about old estates, you use to – you know what was cool about those is you would drive in. You'd go down a long driveway, you'd pass things, you'd see the building from a couple of different angles and then, you'd sweep up and you'd be at the building. The notion of actually having a little bit of secureidus path can be quite exciting, actually, where you – because this is going to be occupied by – somebody will be there. They'll know the project so the idea of being able to come in and see this sequence as you go up the hill is a good one. The only reason that little bit of parking is really there at the end is because it's required by the Fire Department. They have to be able to get to that end of the building at grade. In the event of a fire, that's really who would go up there. I agree with you that making a better path through the garage and sort of celebrating that bigger opening would be terrific and I'd be very excited to study that. The all glass building – well, of course we have our 1050 Page Mill project under construction right now. It is more all glass than this building, if you can believe it. It's leed platinum. I know how to make glass buildings work but I think probably the smartest thing to do would be to, you know, to do the energy model which we actually have not done yet. I might be a little cavalier, you know, so we need to do the energy model and come back to you and show you that that could work. I agree with the clutter comment and that's why we went with fritted glass on the whole bottom bend of the project, which we did it in [Vitia] and a lot of other projects. It works pretty well. From a distance it does a pretty good job of blocking. We can certainly make the building less glassy but if it's not helping energy – it seems like an awful esthetic hit but we could replace glass with solid. It just feels like it's kind of, you know, kind of hurting the big idea. Oh, and the elevator. The elevator is shown. The elevator is not as tall as the roof screen. On the mechanical equipment, it is 10-feet, your right. Recently, we've been doing VRF units which are smaller units but then you've got this other piece of equipment up there that's the same 10-feet. I'm fighting that on other projects to try and get the mechanical equipment down and we will but we probably will use that kind of system and we will try and get the mechanical unit as short as we can. The elevator actually doesn't even stick up as tall as the mechanical. The reason you don't see it is the elevator and the stairs are pretty buried into the mechanical design. (Crosstalk) There's no chimney. (Crosstalk) Yeah, but the mechanical equipment is 35-feet plus 40 – I think it's a little higher than 10-feet. We're allowed 15-feet over 35-feet for the mechanical equipment which would be 50-feet. That's why you don't see it. We did – also, those shades are right out of our sun modeling computer so they are accurate. The shades would even be deeper at noon or 1 o'clock in the day. The suns a little lower as it goes, you know, as it goes into afternoon. The 3 o'clock – those are accurate but I think – I would be very happy to come back with energy models to really show how the building works. Thank you.

MOTION

Chair Lew: Thank you, Bob. So, it's time for a motion. Anybody? The Staff is recommending to continue the project.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll move that we recommend continue of the application to a date uncertain based on the information we've stated today.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Ok, that's 5-0

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Chair Lew: Thank you, Bob. We look forward to you in the future.

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3181 Porter Drive [16PLN-00209]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Three Existing Office / R&D buildings at 3181, 3221, and 3215 Porter Drive and Construction of a new two-story 101,083 Square Foot Office Building on the site. This Project is a Designated Project Under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. Environmental Assessment: An Addendum to the Mayfield Development Agreement Environmental Impact Report has Been Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: RP.**

Chair Lew: Ok, you guys, we're a little behind schedule. We have one – we do have one more project. So, we have item number 5: 3181 Porter Drive. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of three existing office and R&D buildings at 3181, 3221, and 3215 Porter Drive and construction of a new two-story 101,083 square foot office building on the site. This project is a designated project under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. Environmental assessment: An addendum to the Mayfield Development Agreement EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA and the zone district it the Research Park. Staff? Welcome.

Mr. Owen: Thank you again. My name is [Graham Owen], Staff planner with City. I'm working with the applicant on the project ton 3181 Porter Drive. I have a Staff report. Project overview. There are some slight modifications to the RIF but they're relatively minor and actually reduce the square footage beyond or below what's included in the Staff report but I can answer any questions you might have about that. This is a proposal for a two-story office building with one level of subgrade parking and associated site improvements on the project site at 3181 Porter Drive. It is a Mayfield Development Agreement designated project which means that it's subject to the Mayfield Development Agreement and the associated Environmental Impact Reports and mitigation monitoring – mitigation measures for the project. Just a little -- just a kind of quick summary on what the Mayfield Development Agreement was. It's an agreement between Stanford University and the City of Palo Alto from 2005 in which Stanford University constructed soccer fields on the 6-acre Mayfield site and leased the facility to the City for 50-years and as a part of this agreement, Stanford was able to build 250 units on two different sites. One on El Camino Real and Cal. Ave. In addition, the square footage that was associated with those sites – those housing sites, was allowed to be transferred to other sites as designated by Stanford elsewhere in the Stanford Research Park. On each particular site, you could increase the maximum FAR from .4 to .5 and so, that is what is being proposed at this particular site. Here's an aerial photograph showing the total site area. It was until last year three distinct leased areas. Those have since been consolidated into two and I can describe a little more about that on the next slide but it's located at the junction of Porter Drive and Hanover. Hanover is essentially right here. The previous site that we were discussion is just a little bit up the way from this particular site but it is also at the intersection of Hillview and Porter. It's surrounding context -- surrounded by office R&D, as well as associated site improvement; surfacing parking etc. Here's the site plan for the new proposal. As I said it's been – the lease areas have been reconfigured on this site such that you would have a building site, which constitutes 4.8 acres and then a site that would remain vacant with the exception of a ground water pumping station that's in the rear and this is 1.6. For the purposes of calculating the development standards, we're using the 4.5-acre site. This area does not have baring for the current proposal in terms of FAR or coverage. The overall plan – it's an 'L' shaped plan with the primary frontage on Porter. Then surface parking lot would be in the rear – tucked into the rear and you would also have one level of parking below, underneath the surface lot.

Access would be off of the south and you'd be able to access the subgrade parking via a ramp right around here. This is the elevation from the west. This would be the view looking – if you're entering the site and you're looking at it from the surface parking lot, this would be the elevation that you would see. Primary composition of the materials – the exterior cladding materials are primary concrete and Zinc but there are some other elements that are – other types of metals especially, aluminum. This is the primary frontage on Porter Drive so, the kind of – the main frontage of the building from the public view. As you can see they have these large arch elements that help articulate and break up the façade and those have wood like soffits underneath that provide a little bit more differentiation between the concrete which is a little bit more brutal. This is another elevation from the surface parking lot and this would be the south elevation. If you're entering the building from or entering the site, excuse me, from the drive isle, this would be the primary elevation that you would see. This is the elevation from the north. If you're standing on the area that's going to remain vacant, with this development, this would be the view. So, a couple of key questions that we have during the development of this project where the preservation of the frontage landscaping. There are some wonderful mature Oaks as well as Canary Island Pines that are in the 50-foot setback along Porter Drive. Careful tree preservation plan was very important for this project. Another element that we wanted to take a look at was bicycle and pedestrian connectivity as well as bus connectivity. We feel as though the application at this point has adequately addressed these main issues which is wonderful. In particular, the site doesn't have a sidewalk currently and the proposal would have a new sidewalk along the entire frontage. There is – I'll go back two slides to the site plan. There is a currently – There is currently a Zebra crosswalk right where the existing drive isle would be located so if this project were to move forward, our transportation planning division would require or recommend a condition of approval to relocate this off site so that it would be closer to the existing bus stop that's directly to the west. We recommended continuance of this application because we hadn't fully done the research that was necessary to peer review the historic resource evaluation for the project. That research has been finished at this point, as of yesterday, and there's no identifiable impacts. Our continuation recommendation is what we have in the Staff report but if – at this point, if the Board where want to entertain a different motion, we could move forward.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Do we have time for the applicant presentation? You have 10-minutes.

[Ms. Tiffany Griago:] Good morning. My name is Tiffany [Griago]. I am responsible for the Stanford Research Park. I work for Stanford and so, together, with [Zach Posner], the University's Director of Architecture and Mark [Roddy] of Smith Group as well as Julie Jones from [Perkins Cooe], we are very excited to present to you this application for 3181 Porter and we are hopeful that you will make a motion today to recommend this project for approval. Because the City and Stanford have a shared vision for the Stanford Research Park, we are proposing to transform this site from what is currently occupied by three obsolete buildings into a futuristic, modern, state of the art facility for next generation R&D. Since 2012, Stanford University has been actively investing in what I call, the heart of the Research Park along Porter Drive and in approximate areas and we have developed 1701 Page Mill, 1450 Page Mill, 1651 and 3170 Porter Drive. Two of those projects have been Mayfield designated sites. All of those projects won accolades here at ARB and have turned out be very successful. I like to think that they are successful because we are actively pursuing a very specific spectrum of urban planning goals in this area. When we have the opportunity to develop our sites, we are on a broad sense trying to humanize the Research Park and address the pedestrian at every opportunity we can as well as enhance life on the street. When we can, we are trying to locate lobbies as close to the sidewalks and as close to the street and bus stops as possible. We are trying to locate as much parking underground as possible and we are trying to focus always on wayfinding for the pedestrian and for the bicyclist. Bike parking is a huge priority. We try to make sure it's ample and that it's well located and of high-quality design. Then, we are always actively focused on bringing important amenities to locations that conserve to activate the public realm. We also have been strategically trying to use the Mayfield footage along corridors that are already well served by both public and private transit and as we're doing here in this project, we're completing sidewalks where gaps currently exist so, this is an extremely important opportunity as well. As it relates to the crosswalk and any other issues related to pedestrian's circulation, we've addressed all of the concerns and we're fine with everything that the Staff has addressed. It's actually a condition, it's part of 3170 to relocate the sidewalk they're talking about. It's already a condition for another project and so, we have the intention

of putting it back where it started. This is the fifth Mayfield designated site. I'm here today to answer any question you have about the Research Park or about Mayfield in general and I want to beg for your forgiveness, I have to leave in an hour to attend a funeral but I am here in the meantime. Thank you very much. Mark [Roddy].

Mr. Mark [Roddy]: Good morning. My name is Mark [Roddy], I'm a Design Director for Smith Group JJR. I'm pleased to present the project to you today. As you know the project is located at – sorry – the project is located at Stanford Research Park near the intersection of Hillview Ave and Porter Drive. The site's biggest asset is the number of mature trees especially, long Porter Drive and this was a source of inspiration for our design. Along with Porter, as mentioned there's a new sidewalk but currently, there are 5 curb cuts; we'll be reducing that to two, which will help unify the streetscape. The project contains a high level of quality found in the Research Park and we've learned from existing projects – like there are no 1651 Porter and 3160 – I'm sorry 1651 Page Mill and 3160 Porter. As Tiffany mentioned our design goals included incorporating sustainable strategies. We're tracking CALgreen Tier 2 currently and we're providing a slow ready roof. We've place majority of parking below grade. We're creating engaging architecture by using high-quality materials and creating spaces that invite the public in. We are celebrating the landscape by using existing trees along Porter, using it as a design feature to soften the transition from street to the building. Then we are also promoting pedestrian interaction and thinking about it from a multi-(Inaudible) perspective and as you can see, there's 5 transit stops through adjacent to our site. Our site designs strategy really started with the idea of right-sizing the building and parcels for appropriate lease deal; approximately around 100,000-square feet. We then began to look at the site and looking at the trees to determine the appropriate place to put the building without destroying the trees. We then created a winged plan, that was flexible for multi-tenant space but also hides parking. Then we created a big architectural gesture that connects the landscapes from one side of the building to the next. This resulted in a frame that visually connects the outdoors activities to the building with the interior and it's a perfect location for amenity space. Along with Porter Drive, the frame acts as a lobby and a kind of a porch with active outdoor uses on both levels, you can see. A multi-use lawn for company meetings and events is the foreground for the buildings front door. A very much a public face of the building. Combining formal and informal landscapes, you can see in the front of the image, a bio-retention area doubles as a seating area and to the right, you can see a fire truck access lane that doubles as a generous pedestrian walk and bike lane to access the building from the public transit along Porter, Hillview, and Hanover. Bike parking is located just to the right of this entry. On the internal side of the site, the frame connects both sides of the building visually with the landscape. We're trying to create a kind of pavilion in the garden kind of experience for the main lobby. This plaza in the foreground you can see has a smaller outdoor meeting and casual gatherings and it acts as the vehicular drop off and also has bicycle parking adjacent to it. The limited above grade parking is primarily used for visitors and is treated more like a parking court. Something you might see in more of a hospitality situation. Vehicular drops off in the plaza anchor the north end of the plaza or the parking court and employees who park below grade can use the exterior stairs -- you can see one just on the right side of the image – they can use exterior stairs to extend to the parking port. It gives them a chance to connect to the environment before entering into the building. Of course, there's also an elevator that takes them directly into the lobby if they so choose. The lobby entrance makes a strong identifiable statement and brands the entry on both sides of the building. On our site plan, you can see and as described earlier, on the right is a pass of the landscape, until Stanford develops it and it retains access to the existing pump station. Many of the existing trees on the site will remain and the open area will be planted with flowering perennials. The building is nestled within the existing and new trees. We walked the site with Dace Docker and discussed the health and the quality of the trees and this was very helpful in developing our design forward. You can see that on either side of the lobby, the court plaza and garden plaza offer flexible outdoor use for the tenants and as you can easily imagine, given that orientation, that during the course of the day or during the course of the year, the people will be able to kind of migrate to each one. Whether they prefer more sun or they prefer shade; we love that kind of diversity. Also, considering the multi-modal approach that I talked about earlier, we've looked at the choice of how people will arrive to the site. First, walking with all the transit stops, we've added the sidewalk along Porter Drive. The top end of the site, there's a path that connects to the plaza on the internal side. Adjacent to the drive in, there's also a path for pedestrian use. Then, of course, at the bottom right-hand side, the main – the

broad walk gets you from the park – I'm sorry – from the transit stops as well. These are also used by bikers and we have strategically located long term storage and short term storage bikes at both of the main entrances. We also have bike storage below grade for the long term as well.

Chair Lew: You have about a minute to wrap up.

[Mr. Roddy:] I'm sorry?

Chair Lew: You have about 1 minute to wrap up.

[Mr. Roddy:] Ok. Then of course the cars, one vehicular entrance on the south keeps it very simple for visitors to go to the top and employees at the bottom. In regards to the elevations, we tried to keep a dynamic approach with varying window size and keep the hierarchy of the building really at the main entrance. Materials talked about are GFRC board formed wood, zinc and glass. We've been working closely with our sub-contractors, building mock-ups currently. We've very excited about this innovated approach; it's a custom panel. We think it looks a lot like bark on tree and you can imagine the diversity of the play of shadows and light. It is board formed and then, the nuance of it – speaking to the quality is that all of the rives are hand broken so, it gives a really kind of interesting approach. We're talking about a very high quality surface there. In summary, the design – in summary, I'll answer your questions.

Chair Lew: You can finish up here.

[Mr. Roddy:] I was just going to say, in summary, the design is well organized and is architectural – as an architecture refined solution. The site has an engaging appropriate scaled outdoor space for occupants and visitors. The site preserves and respects an (Inaudible) existing natural features such as the beautiful trees. The project demonstrates a high quality and is consistent with the context of the Research Park development. We hope to get your support on the project. I look forward to answering your questions.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you for your presentation. I don't have any speaker cards for this item so, I think we can move to Board Member questions. Any questions?

Board Member Furth: I have two questions. The first one was simple. Looking at the illustrations, I think there's exterior seating near the sidewalks but I wasn't sure. Is there?

[Mr. Roddy:] Yes. We've provided...

Board Member Furth: Could you show me?

[Mr. Roddy:] Yes. So, we've provided – sorry. I need to make sure I speak into the microphone. As mentioned, we've provided seating at the bio-retention area around here. We also have provided seating areas located here. So, we've divided this space up into a series of planters with seating opportunities but then we're also looking at adding additional loose furniture so, that people can kind of organize it as they want per their kind of outdoor meetings.

Board Member Furth: I was really focusing on the – you're talking about pedestrian amenities and that tends to include places to sit down in the course of your walking so, I was focused on sidewalk oriented seating which is by the bio-retention?

[Mr. Roddy:] Along here we – the sidewalk, along with the street, we do not have seating opportunities. We have a path that meanders through the landscape here. We have a seating opportunity there so, it offers a destination. So, it's kind of nice little amenity for folks – can get away from the building and then have kind of a quiet spot within the trees. Then I would say, the more kind of – I would say, the more kind of soft and more of a kind of formal – relating more to the building and kind of meeting functions.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I have a question for Staff. The suite parcel, the commercial leasing line divides the undeveloped section from the other and that remnant is – meets the standards for another new parcel, it's wide enough? Long enough? Big enough?

Mr. Owen; I believe it does. I can double check really quickly, of course.

Board Member Furth: Thanks.

Vice Chair Kim: I have a question for the applicant. With regards to that concrete pre-cast panel. Could you just tell me if the board forms spacing will be consistent throughout each panel or is it meant to be random or ...

[Mr. Roddy:] It's meant to be random and if you'd like I can – can I approach the (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: Yes.

[Mr. Roddy:] (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: I need you to use the microphone and we have a – do you have the portable microphone here? No, we don't have it anymore. Ok.

[Mr. Roddy:] I just wanted to say that we have a large-scale model there and then we did – we've done some obviously, some prototyping here to look at it. The idea is that their random so it's not consistent. We're really looking more for an organic feel so, this was a model that we produced to give to the sub-contractor. Then they took their interpretation of actually -- craftsman. They picked the different wood sizes based on just kind of our idea. We had a chance to actually go out and look at it. The sample on the right, you can see that was actually, broken by Stanford Staff with a rubber mallet so, we had a chance to kind of play a little bit as well. It was pretty cool.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? No. Ok, Kyu, would you like to start us off on comments?

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for the presentation. I think overall, I'm kind of refreshed by the material choices that you have here and by the simplicity of the design. I think there is kind of a fine balance between a building being too plain and too simple and at the same time too complicated and overdone. I think you've managed to find a pretty nice balance here that I can appreciate. Again, I like the choice of materials and I really like the concrete – that you have (Inaudible) panels that you're planning to use. One other question, so these are panels so they're actually hung on the structure?

[Mr. Roddy:] Correct. GFRC so it's a panelized system, yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok. As far as comments, I had a few. Just looking at the elevation and the perspectives, while I like the approach of this kind of portal and the front back portion that has the wood soffiting and the darker metal panel. I do feel like it could be maybe differentiated a little bit more from the concrete. Right now, it looks to be about the same height. Looking at your study model over there, it does look like there is a slight change in height there but I don't know if that was an intentional decision or if that probably – maybe has to do with something with your design. I thought maybe – I think you do have at least a foot to play with. I don't think you're right at that 35-foot height limit yet so, maybe there is way to either bring down the GFRC or to bring up the Zinc metal panel just to give it a little bit more differentiation. I think the two elevations where you see the portal, to me are a little bit different. On the east elevation, I can appreciate it more because it seems to be – there's a little bit of a transition between the GFRC and the portal itself. There's that area of glazing, however, on the west elevation, it looks like when you're in the parking lot, perhaps you do see that buffer but I almost feel like it still could be a little bit pulled away from the corner. Right now, it's sitting right at the corner. I'm not seeing this

just from an elevational standpoint but I do also feel that at the perspective stand point – the human perspective, that it does feel like it's a little too close to that corner. Perhaps, there's a way to pull it out just a little bit to give it a little bit more differentiation and buffer. I appreciate the details that you've given us but I think that there are a couple that I would like to see if this project were to come back; such as the metal shade around some of the windows that you have. I don't think I saw a detail for that. Also, the Zinc filler panel. Is there a sample of that here by any chance? Perhaps in the future, if we could see that? Maybe a closer up perspective, just to see how those materials come together, where you have the filler panel, the GFRC, the glazing and even some instances of the metal shading fins. Let's see, some of these were answered. Just another observation – this is strict observation but I think as somebody being dropped off at this building, it seems to me like you don't get the grand view of the main lobby from the parking lot. It almost seems like you're dropped off and then you have to turn around to see the main entry. That's kind of a shame in and of itself but at the same time, the elevation that you see as you're driving up is really a long elevation of GFRC. While I like the material and I like the ways that you're going about using it, I almost question maybe it's a little too much GFRC, maybe it's a little to plain right now. Again, just an observation but overall, thank you for explaining the design concept. I think it works well and maybe in closing, just a quick question. You don't have to answer this now but it looks like in some of the perspectives, the metal Zinc panels that wrap the soffited wood, that boarder seems to be different in some of the renderings here. For instance, on sheet 1.17, it looks like the left side of that zinc paneling has a thicker profile than let's say at the roof or on the inside where it meets the wood and I noticed that it's actually even on some of the sketched-up renderings that you have later on. I don't know if that's intentional or not but it's just something that caught my eye. Maybe that's where the down spout is or something but I think overall, it's a very good looking project. I think there's some additional details that we'd like to see before we could recommend it for approval but I appreciate your presentation and thank you.

[Mr. Roddy:] I'm sorry, could you clarify the page of where you were looking at?

Vice Chair Kim: I guess it's on the cover as well but if you're looking at the left edge of this portal. You have a pretty thick edge condition there and it's different than at the roof. I don't know, it just caught my eye. If there's a way to make them match I think it would feel a little bit more natural but –

Male: It's the same profile all the way around. It's a continuous profile.

Vice Chair Kim: It is? Ok, so that same thickness all the way around.

[Mr. Roddy:] The intent is it's continuous...

Vice Chair Kim: The intent, ok, understood.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Just a quick question, on these panels, I mean you show them – you show it here as 4 x 4 panel. Is the intent that they're going to be full height?

[Mr. Roddy:] The actual construction of the panels?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah.

[Mr. Roddy:] They come in different components based upon how they're fabricated. (Crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: Well I was thinking...

[Mr. Roddy:] The fit like a jigsaw puzzle.

Board Member Gooyer: ...I was thinking like on the front sheet of your packet here, those panels on the side looked – have a – they have a vertical seam and now horizontal seam. So, is that one single panel?

[Mr. Roddy:] The impression – based upon how they construct it, they are able to hide any kind of horizontal joints. We're working very closely with – to make sure that we express a vertical grain to the building.

Board Member Gooyer: The only reason I question that is because that's different – you said these panels were going to be random and if I see 4 or 5 random panels standing on top of each other, it's going to be a whole lot different than this look.

[Mr. Roddy:] I'm sorry. I want to be clear about the random – my random comment. Basically, they look at – they do an analysis of what the most efficient kind of panel size is. They put those together on a frame and so, based upon – like an 'L' shape perhaps, then they are able to you know, caulk the joints and use sand so that they can match the actual finish so, that we can, you know, make it look – where there isn't a joint, we don't have a joint.

Board Member Gooyer: Theoretically, make it look like it does here.

[Mr. Roddy:] We want to make it look like that, yes. I think if you – I'm sorry – if you also look at the model as well, we're indicating – in front of you. There is a strong horizontal line at the...

Board Member Gooyer: Right. I see that but the thing is or maybe it's just the way it's done but these don't match up so, there's a definite distinction between the lower and the upper panel.

[Mr. Roddy:] Great. I'm sorry.

Board Member Gooyer: I don't like that.

[Mr. Roddy:] We're very much – we're looking for that opportunity for a more organic kind of look and so, we purposely are looking at having that not – you know, not having it be perfect – perfect per floor and then have there be a little bit of an edge – you know, a kind of a visual description there. (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: I guess think that's sort of funny with this is – this almost – you know, I'm old enough to remember the old two-story tilt up buildings. This is like you're trying to recreate something we were doing 35-years ago, in a system that seems to be a whole lot tougher, a lot more complex to do it. Never mind. Never mind. That's just an opinion. Ok.

Male: Sorry, can I respond to that Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Go ahead.

Male: We've done board from concrete on campus on a couple buildings recently and as you guys all probably know that the craftsmanship on board form has just become really difficult in California. We end up spending a lot of money to sandblast it, acid blast it, come back and make it look at perfect as we all intend.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm not saying you should go back to the old tilt up...

[Male:] Right.

Board Member Gooyer: ...I'm just saying it...

[Male:] This is a way to execute the product in a much better way we think.

Board Member Gooyer: Have you got anything like this anywhere that – on campus?

[Male:] Nope. This is – We're really excited about this because we think this is a way to get a really great look in a new technology that we can control a lot better and work with a really talented sub-contractor to get exactly what we want. Not have to come back and patch and fill and blast it.

Board Member Gooyer: Alright.

[Male:] Yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Ok, so, anyway, I like the basic concept of the two – the only thing is – you can just sort of see it – same thing with the model, is that you've spent a lot of time on the – if you want to call it, the two entry areas; the metal and glass portions and I think the concrete version suffers a little bit because of it. I don't think they're yet. Now, part of may be – I'd like to see a little bit more relief, maybe in the windows. Now, I know that's a – you know, that sort of thing. I'd like to – I don't think the one lives up to the other one. Although, the concept of the two (Inaudible) opposed materials I like. I think that's probably all I have at the moment.

Chair Lew: Ok. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Well, I'm going to be fairly complementary. Starting with your presentation, which I think is excellent. I greatly appreciate the numerous renderings, the thoughtful put together plans, the way that we can really understand what you're proposing, you're diagrams of how you developed some of the solutions. To me, that's symptomatic of something. It means that the design itself actually, I find also was thoughtful and well put together; the same adjectives. I find this is building that I can make the findings to approve it as it's presented to us. So, then, I'll address my comments to my fellow Board Members. It'd be nice to sometimes, let a good one go through on the first time. This is a good design guys. This is thought through. They've done a lot of things that we've been working on all morning with other people. If we just send this one back for another round as well, what are we really saying to people? Come to us with your second-best effort and then we'll let it go? I think we should consider finding a way to approve this today. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok and Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I was wondering if you were using the term guys in West Coast dialect, which includes women or East Coast dialect which doesn't.

Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I was completely impressed by this presentation and thought it was quite a gorgeous building and site. I have two questions – if I can find that sheet of paper. One of them came up in the course of this discussion of glass fiber reinforced concrete, is that what it is?

[Mr. Roddy:] Yes.

Board Member Furth: In some of the illustrations that we have, there's this sort of exhilarating sense of a unified line going all the way up, like all wood formed concrete and in others, it's pretty clearly a series of distinct pieces that make it up. Which is it? When I look at this wall, am I going to see a bunch of ...

[Mr. Roddy:] No. It's going to be very consistent.

Board Member Furth: A group, sorry.

[Mr. Roddy:] I'm sorry, it's going to be very consistent with the model that you see right up there. We're very much interested in breaking up the height of the 34-foot building and having it read as kind of two levels but we want that kind of vertical grain. We want the first floor to read. We want the second floor to read but yet, we still want it to kind of all work together. This is a building – and the design has a lot to with I think, the subtleties.

Board Member Furth: When I look at this illustration. The illustration shows it as looking as if it were a single panel. Is that what I'm going to see or am I going to know that it's made up of multiple panels?

[Mr. Roddy:] It's going to look like it's two panels.

Board Member Furth: So, there's going to be a dividing line somewhere like that?

[Mr. Roddy:] Right. Could you please pass the model down to her? Could you pass the model down?

Board Member Furth: (Crosstalk)

[Mr. Roddy:] Often it's hard with some of our renderings. It's amazing how much – how realistic they are because they'll put the light on it and things that are modeled, don't always necessarily show up when it gets kicked out of the computer.

Board Member Furth: That was a feature I liked. It doesn't exist but it doesn't mean that I don't find what you've proposed acceptable. I think that it was very interesting to hear your presentation about the pedestrian friendly transformation of the Research Park because we don't usually think of the Research Park in that regard. If you have to sit through our discussion of more urban areas, you know that we're going – I go on at great length about where's the bench? So, having brought that up, that's my comment on this one too. It seems to me that you have some around the little bio-retention area by the pedestrian walkway, which is in turn close to a tram stop or a transit stop. What's at the transit stop? A sign or a place to sit and be out of the rain?

[Mr. Roddy:] Currently, there's a bus stop there.

Board Member Furth: But what is it?

[Male:] Sorry, there's a wood bench with a back. There's also a concrete retaining wall that people sit on and there's signage that has the schedule for the buses and everything.

Board Member Furth: So, it's transit is marginal. I would hope that that would get better as part of this. If it's really going to be encouraging, I've spent a lot of time riding buses lately and it makes a big difference whether there is actually a transit stop or just a sign and a neglected bench and a wall to sit on. That, I think could use a little more attention and I would think that it would be important to keep those benches that you show because that's a lovely area. We also do have this new finding from the City Council about using suitable plants that provide good habitat for non-human life. I know, from what little I do know, I know a lot of this is supportive but it would be helpful to know a bit more if we don't approve it today or to have somebody come back to a subcommittee and demonstrate that. Thanks.

[Mr. Audit Paul:] Good afternoon. I'm [Audit Paul], Landscape Architect with BFS Landscape architects, on this project. Our earlier experience at the City of Palo Alto was the entire Hoover Campus development. To answer the Board Member's question. The 50-foot setback and even more than that, which Mark has referred to, has a series of clusters of very large and mature Pine Trees – Monterey Pines, Afghan Pines, and an absolutely, grand, majestic Valley Oak and a couple of Coast Live Oaks and some Sweet Gums. What we're doing – and that can be seen in our latest permit submittal drawing, is in this entire buffer, we are planting it with more Valley Oak, Coast Live Oak, and Black Oak, which we've worked with Dave Docker, the City Arborist before on the Hoover project. We will be planting field grown specimens so that they grow more quickly so that if we extend this landscape into the future – as I like to

say, long after I'm dead, you're going to have this wonderful, Evergreen tree buffer of California native trees. At the ground, plain, along with that entire Porter frontage, what is now sort of undulating pieces of lawn, is going to be a mixture of Ceanothus, Arctostaphylos, Coffee Berry and a whole bunch of – sort of California native shrubs and bushes. It's supposed to feel like an informal landscape as you drive down – a buffer – a grand informal – sort of a stylized if you will, California native landscape and all of those shrubs – I know from my own experience – they attract hummingbirds and they attract bees and birds out there. That's our strategy for the main Porter Drive buffer. On the podium parking where we have – except for the trees – where we have over 3-foot depth for the tree planters – because we have shallower depths for planting out there, we are planting a bunch of climate adaptive, more colorful Australian and South African native like [Nepofia] and Kangaroo Pole, which also tend to attract birds and smaller wildlife. I'm not sure any 4-footed wildlife is going to want to go on the podium anyway but there's the bigger landscape there for them. Along the west buffer and the north buffer under the shade of, what are going to be Afgan Pines and [Brisbain] boxes, we are planting a sort of a hedge like the planting of Coffee Berry and Coprosma. Those again, all of these works towards providing actually, quite a wonderful habitat for birds and animals in the future.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. That's it.

Chair Lew: Staff has something?

Mr. Owen: Board Member Furth, I just wanted to answer your question about the vacant site. The Standards – the (Inaudible). With the lease areas, it's not necessarily required that it be, you know, conforming to the parcel dimensions but it does confirm if we were to say so. So, 191-feet in depth – or excuse me, in width. Much more than 150-feet in depth and over an acre.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I was asking not because they have to, you know, make it compliant with the Sub-Division Map Act but if we don't pay attention, then the next thing we have is Variance Request, which may or may not be useful. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok. I have a question for Staff. In our packet, we do not have conditions of approval and then the findings are – draft findings are blank at the moment. So, I was wondering if it makes sense for this to come back or even if we do – maybe approve it but have it come on consent so that we actually review the findings because I think we have the new findings. I don't think the Council wants us to approve it without even having anything. I mean, it seems not quite right.

[Mr. Owen:] We didn't include conditions or findings at this point because ultimately, when we compiled the Staff reports, we didn't have recommendation of approval at that time due to the historic – outstanding historic question but since that's been answered at this point, we – we do have conditions drafted and findings drafted so, we could bring it back if you would like.

Chair Lew: My take on it is it should come back somehow. I think that we can indicate to the applicant that we're generally comfortable with the project.

Mr. Raschke: Certainly, it's the Board's discretion to decided how to go forward with it. I would say that the Board could also articulate its findings and a motion to approve if so interested in that and there's a number of – I won't call them necessarily standard conditions because they do change a little bit but there are typical conditions that we apply to projects and you've seen them in other projects before – which we could apply to this one and these are mostly comments we get from other reviewing departments about – basically, some code complaint issues. The Board could articulate any special conditions that it was interested in seeing and that could be memorialized in the director's determination letter if you wanted to go that path as well.

Chair Lew: Thank you for that. I don't really have a lot to add. I think really in my mind, I don't have two big concerns. One was the concrete – the GFRC because I've never seen anybody try to do a board formed GFRC. It seems like with all the mock-ups and everything, I think that you've been thinking about

it carefully. Then my second concern was really that you have the two-sided entrance. It seemed to me that the entrance facing Porter Drive, facing the street – like the connection to the street seems kind of weak. It seems kind of strange if you're coming down Porter and you saw the entrance and then the sign there, closer to that entrance but then the automobile entrance is way farther down – you know, farther down the road. It seems slightly strange but you know, I don't think that's a deal – to me, that's not a deal breaker for the project. Then I think I mentioned on the last project, I think that the existing site has barb wire/chain link fence and I was wondering what is being proposed along the adjacent property lines or like lease lines. You have new and existing lease lines.

[Male:] Sorry, Alex, could you clarify which property line you're talking about? At the top of the page?

Chair Lew: Yeah, the lease lines. Yeah, I think it's on the top edge. I think I – I don't think I brought it with me but I think I photographed it yesterday.

[Male:] That remains as is. Along with that top of the page.

Chair Lew: You don't really see it from this site because there's a hedge, right?

[Male:] Right.

Chair Lew: There's an Oleander or there's some – there's a tall hedge.

[Male:] Right and we're increasing the buffering there with the understory and the trees that are planted on that property line so I don't think you're really going to perceive that fence very much.

Chair Lew: I don't remember. Could we remove the barbed wire and leave the fence?

[Mr. Paul:] (Inaudible) Sorry. It's a 6-foot high chain link fence all of – Alexander Real estate manages the next property and as [Zack] pointed out and you point out, there's an existing hedge out there which we are leaving in place and where it's kind of falling apart, we're going to buffer it out with more planting.

Chair Lew: Ok. I'll double check the photos that I took yesterday and I can check in with the Staff about that. Ok, so that's all that I have. I would say we can continue it, right? We can approve it with it to come back to consent so, if there are items and details, it would give the Board Members one last chance to do it and then we could weigh in on the findings. So, those are options. Yes, Wynne.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Well, I would be in favor of asking Staff to prepare findings and conditions of approval for approval of this project based on our conversation today and return to us with that at your earliest convenience.

Chair Lew: (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: Well, that would do just on a consent calendar, wouldn't it?

Board Member Furth: You can put it on the consent calendar and that just means there's no debate. It goes quickly but it's still publicly noticed. So, either continue to a date certain or re-advertise. If you have a date certain, we can do that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. If we continue to a date certain, there's no need for new notification. If there was no need for a new Staff report then we could quickly turn this around to 2/2 – February 2nd but if you're wanting a Staff report with some additional information we would need to go longer.

Board Member Furth: I think the additional information is the Conditions of Approval and the Findings of Fact to support the conclusions of law.

Ms. Gerhardt: Ok and I think the finds and the conditions we have pretty well drafted so we could turn those around quickly to February 2nd.

Chair Lew: Do you want to make that motion?

Board Member Furth: So, moved.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Mr. Raschke: Ok, so just so we're clear. We're closing the public hearing and having this return on consent on February 2nd.

Board Member Furth: No, we're continuing this matter because we don't – well, you can close the public hearing but we're continuing the matter.

Mr. Raschke: But you're going to consider on the consent calendar on the 2nd.

Board Member Furth: As I understand it – yes but as I understand it, the consent calendar simply means that unless somebody, a member of the public or a Member of the Board pulls it, there's no public hearing but there may be a public hearing.

Mr. Raschke: Board Members could make a motion to pull it and – but otherwise, you'd just make a motion to approve the consent calendar and be done with it.

Chair Lew: I do want to clarify for the Board Members because we do have some new Board Members. When an item comes to the Council on the consent calendar – we have 9 Council Members, it takes 3 to pull it off the consent but for us, it only takes one person to pull it off of the consent calendar if there is an issue that you are not comfortable with or want to discuss.

Mr. Raschke: Yeah, I would – you know I don't think we have any specific rules like the Council does as far as pulling things off and the reason they would pull things off is to have a public – a future public hearing about it. Anybody can request – the process I'd recommend is that any Board Member could request that it be pulled off the consent calendar and it would be heard that day, that moment in time.

Board Member Furth: I have a bias in favor of always continuing the public hearing because otherwise, in theory, we're not supposed to be inquiring a City applicants as anything that they might clarify so, I just continue to prefer to continue the public hearing as well.

Mr. Raschke: I don't have any objection with that. In fact, you don't even have a consent calendar line item on your agenda because we have so few items that we typically consider and each one is pretty straight forward. I think it just sends a different message if anything else but I don't think there's any harm just continuing the public hearing to the 2nd and dispensing with this as the first item on the agenda when it comes back.

Vice Chair Kim: I'd actually like to – ok, so if it's coming back then I just wanted to reemphasize that I would like to see a revised detail specifically, on sheet A4.4. There's no mention of the actual depth of the GFRC panel or the wall system. How much is the window actually setback from the GFRC and the detail...

[Male:] I have the answer to that if you like. It's 6-inches.

Vice Chair Kim: So, the wall system is 12-inches then?

[Male:] Yeah about 12-inches total and we also submitted a material board if you want to take a look at the Zinc sample and the tone of the concrete. Staff has that as well.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, if it could just be noted perhaps. I don't know what the best way to go about this is.

Board Member Furth: If it's not on the record, it doesn't exist.

Ms. Gerhardt: We can add that as a condition if there's something specific you're looking for.

[Male:] You're looking for a blow-up wall section detail that shows the depth of the façade and the face of GFRC – two face of glass.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah and actually if this was just going to be on the consent calendar, I was just going to ask that it come back as subcommittee but since we are going to continue the hearing, I feel like you might as well bring it back to us when we meet again.

Male: We'll bring that detail.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Chair Lew: Should we add – do a – amend the motion and second it? Do it officially?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Move that continue this matter to March 2nd – February 2nd, sorry and request that Staff prepare Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval for this project and that, when it comes back to us, it includes a revised section A4.4 showing the additional detail as shown in the minutes.

Board Member Baltay: So, I'll second that again.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor?

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

Chair Lew: So, that passes 5-0.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Chair Lew: So, thank you, guys.

Vice Chair Kim: Can I just add that I'd like to caution you on the spacing of the board form. I think that it's rendered and the way that I see it here is actually quite different. I don't know if that is still being studied but...

[Mr. Roddy:] This is the mock-up that we've been looking at (Crosstalk) and it gives you a much better understanding.

Vice Chair Kim: (Crosstalk) It's fine. I think we've closed the item. I think when we come back to it we can discuss it then but thank you.

Approval of Minutes

6. December 15, 2016, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Chair Lew: Ok, so we have the minutes to approve for December 15th, 2016. Are there any comments? Yeah, there's very, very long minutes. I perused them but I didn't read every word.

MOTION

Vice Chair Kim: I'll move that we approve the minutes from December 15th, 2016.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Board Member Furth: I just have one comment. A lot of that language is from applicants.

Chair Lew: Thank you. So, that's 5-0. Ok, so that's close of the meeting. Thank you, everybody.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

None.

Adjournment