



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD DRAFT MINUTES: June 15, 2017

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Member Wynne Furth, Peter Baltay

Absent: Robert Gooyer

Chair Lew: Can we have roll call, please?

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications. The public may speak to any item that is not on the agenda. I don't have any cards for that.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Do we have any agenda changes today? I don't think we do.

City Official Reports

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

Study Session

- 4115 El Camino Real (17PLN-00085):** Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of a Proposed Three-Story, 16,747 Square Foot Mixed-Use Development Comprised of Ground Floor Retail, Second Floor Office and Residential, Third Floor Residential (Seven Residential Units in Total) and Below-Grade Parking. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Phillip Brennan at phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Let's move on to item number two, which is 4115 El Camino Real. A request for Preliminary Architectural Review of a proposed three-story, 16,747-square foot mixed-use development comprised of ground floor retail, second floor office and residential, third-floor residential which is seven units in total and below-grade parking. Environmental assessment is that it's not a project. The formal application will be subject to CEQA and the zone district is CN (Neighborhood Commercial). We have Phillip, our project planner. Welcome.

Mr. Phillip Brennan, Project Planner: Good morning, Board. As mentioned, this is a proposed mixed-use development in the Triangle development area that is boarded by El Camino Real and El Camino Way. The proposal is split up with just under 5,000-square feet of ground floor retail, 2,000-square feet of

second-floor commercial office space and around 7,700-square feet of total residential space on the second and third floors. It includes a proposed 15,000-square foot souterrain parking garage. The proposal is – includes seven residential units in the CN district and one BMR unit and has a one to one RAF as permitted in the mixed-use developments along El Camino Real and the CN zoning district. Some of the primary considerations that the Board wishes to talk about is the preservation of the prominent Chinese Elm along El Camino Way. The dual driveway connections to public streets that access off of El Camino Real and El Camino Way is not preferred by the Transportation Department. The applicant met with – attended one of our development Review Committee meetings, where they received feedback from the various departments and this came up as a primary concern, along with preserving the Chinese Elm. Also, shared common space and open area considerations. The applicant, in discussion with the Board or excuse me the Committee, received that feedback and has come up – made com changes and is proposing some new changes that they are going to present to you today. With that, is there any question for me?

Chair Lew: Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Could you take me through the CN use requirements. How much of this has to be commercial and/or office and how much of it can be residential?

Mr. Brennan: The split is – I don't know if I have that split in front of me right now. I can provide that to you.

Board Member Furth: Basically, what I want to know is this the minimum commercial office space that they are allowed with this (inaudible) residential development or more than that?

Mr. Brennan: Well, let me take that back. The – with the – the mixed-use development ratio is it's a 50% RAF for commercial and 50% residential. How that commercial is split up into retail or commercial office use, I am not sure that this...

Board Member Furth: But for every square foot of residential development, you need a square foot of non-residential development?

Mr. Brennan: Right.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Brennan: Sure.

Chair Lew: Ok, so then let's do the applicant presentation next and you have 10-minutes.

Male: It doesn't need to be.

Mr. Jeffery Potts: Do I need the – how do I start this one up, Phillip? This right here? Thank you. Sorry, I can't read it that far away. How do I – there you go. Thank you very much. Good morning. Jeff Potts, SDG Architects here on behalf of the owners. I'll go quickly through the beginning part of this, based on Phillip already kind of touching on that. To answer your question quickly beforehand, the FAR is split 50/50 in the zone and then we have an additional FAR increase from the density bonus for the residential side that is equal to the size of the BMR. The minimum retail is to match the retail that is existing on site and at grade and so we've balanced all of those factors in. The maximum office is 2,000-square feet also so we are kind of balancing all those details. Again, this is a – the site is in the triangle area, as you can see, along El Camino Real and its border – oh, this doesn't work on the screen, board in the back by El Camino Way and the front is on El Camino Real. Basically, along that triangle you have two newer buildings. There is one at either end that are a little bit more contemporary and then you have several much older buildings in between and we're sort of right in the middle of that at this point. You can see the existing site there and a couple of photos of the existing Chicago Pizza building. Of note is also the

existing access on the rear of the property, which is aligned with the street across and has the large tree adjacent to it that Phillip mentioned as well. The original layout here had an access at the rear, off to one side of the site that was accessing four garages for the larger residential units and some above grade parking. Then the access off of El Camino is the access to the garage for all of these subterranean parking. We've widened out these streets or the sidewalk in front to the 12-foot along El Camino and we've also provided a pedestrian way from the crosswalk at El Camino Way through the structure and the property out to El Camino Real. Then have a large landscaped open space in the rear and then some smaller pockets of open space along the front. I'll go into the revisions for that in a moment. Again, quickly a ground floor retail. It's about – it will be about 5,000-square feet – 4,800-square feet or so. The retail that is existing there is about 4,400- square feet. Then separated from that with the pedestrian walkway, we have the elevator and stair lobby to the second and third floors and in this configuration, a couple of the garages along there. The subterranean parking is 34 spaces, including the 88 spaces and also some bike lockers for both the commercial and the residential. That takes up most of the project site as it's configured. Again, the retail, right now the current configuration in the submittal is the retail with two garages at the back corner of it that are turned away from the street and the two garages facing the street. For the 2-bedroom units and then the large open space along El Camino Way. The building is pushed up to El Camino Real per the design guidelines, to get that frontage on the street. This one is a little bit odd because the back of the site is square and the front of the site is angled unfortunately, to the street. We tried to present a sort of angled façade to that street but also provide a couple of pockets where we could have some pedestrian – larger pedestrian kind of gathering areas. You'll see that better in the updated landscape plan as well. On the second floor, there are three 1-bedroom units and a 2-bedroom unit, along with the 2,000-square feet of office. Each of the residential units have a large deck off of the unit for private open space. You know, all the way to about 675-square feet of deck and a lot of that is function of the size of the building below to maximize that retail space and the lot coverage. Then on the third floor we have one – a 2-bedroom unit also, which the BMR is the 2-bedroom unit below this one and this is an identical unit above which is a for sale unit. Then two larger 3-bedroom units with very large decks from 800-1,300-square feet or so. Architecturally we were trying to come up with a contemporary façade that really faces the street and puts that presents on the street. We've got basically large glass expanse facing El Camino, as well as wrapping down into that pedestrian corridor. Then we have the large stair tower element on the left. We popped out the – a couple of wood elements at the office space to sort of break up that façade a little bit. Then extended the beam elements, both at the first floor and the second-floor line to kind of create a larger presence along the street there. Then we created the screen element at the third floor that kind of helps present a building façade out there at the street but kept it kind of light and see through at different angles. So, as you approach it from different angles, you get different views of it and that would encompass the deck of the third-floor residential unit that faces the street, that also provides some privacy along that area. This is just another view, you can see the screening along the right side to hide the ramp as it goes down under the building and you get a better view of the second-floor deck. Again, to bring some life out to the street per the design guidelines in this area. To get some balconies and a little bit of life out on the street on that side and then also, to give it that full façade along the El Camino. On the rear of the building and again, I'll go through this quickly. We have got some adaptive views of this now based on our conversations with Engineering, Public Works, and the City arborist but you see some well-articulated read with a cantilever wood element. Then the decks and the floor sort of stepping back away from El Camino Way and that building is set a fair distance back from El Camino Way as well. You get a little bit better view of it here. You can see the lower decks stepping out and then the second-floor wall stepping back and the third-floor decks stepping back along that area. This is the updated version of the site plan, which we've kind of gone back and forth a little bit with Public Works and Transportation. We still have the secondary access off of El Camino Way but we've aligned it with the intersection across the street per their request. It also sits in the location of the existing access from El Camino Way to the rear parking lot for the Chicago Pizza. We now have four garage doors oriented towards the street in that area and three surface parking spaces. The large tree – all three of the trees will remain on site and the large tree will screen a great deal of that views of the building as you come down the intersection there. Then we've also got an open space planting area to buffer that parking space and then we maintained that pedestrian access through the building, which the City felt strongly about. Then created an open space adjacent to that on the north as you look at this site plan. Then in the front area, we kind of reworked that little inset into the building

where the glass wall is, to create a little bit more of a user courtyard area. So, as you are going along the street there is an area that can be pulled out. People can sit and there can be benches and tables and things like that. It can be pulled out of the stream of the sidewalk just a little bit. Here you see some drawings of the new rear elevation. Again, actually, the building steps back enough more than it did before because that area grew a little bit in the plan. We're proposing some nice architectural grade frosted glass garage doors or something of that nature in that area. Then still have the screening elements along that wall to sort of break that wall up. Then the balconies will step back and then on the right, we have that cantilever wood element of those two units and there's a mix of the wood and the stucco. We're proposing some sort of metal on the ribs, for lack of a better term, that you are seeing there. As smooth, not shiny but architectural grade metal product there and then glass rails at the balconies. You can see just a couple of different views of this where you can see the stepping back a little bit better on these views here. Then those ribs sort of break up the building into smaller units along that area. Then here you can see the other side where that unit steps back quite a bit and cantilevers out and has that wood element that matches the front. So, you will see that detail on the front and the side as well as this rear elevation. How's that for timing?

Chair Lew: Perfect timing.

Mr. Potts: I am here if you have any questions.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much. I don't have any speaker cards from the public on your – on this particular item so we can move onto Board Member questions and comments. Anybody want to start? Kyu or Wynne? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: I just have a quick question on the new site plan. What is that space next to the main stair and elevator? What does that space become now that it's no longer the garage?

Mr. Potts: What's in there now, you can see from the other one is that we moved the trash room and so you have the main stair and elevator. Then we will have a trash room and some storage in that area. Then the utilities, there is a fin back there that supports part of that cantilever and that's the proposed location for the utilities to come in.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne, did you have a question?

Board Member Furth: Yeah, could you show me how the – on the revised plan, how the guest bicycle parking works?

Mr. Potts: Right now, in both versions of the plan we have bicycle parking in lockers in the underground parking. I think that – as well as that, we'll be trying to work in some more transient racks on that upper area. I believe that's located just where the 26 is on that site plan. I took off the notes.

Chair Lew: I have a question for Staff. I went out to the site and one of the neighbors is the Animal Hospital and it's been there for years.

Mr. Brennan: Right.

Chair Lew: It is pretty noisy and then I was just looking through the zoning ordinance and it seems that it's a permitted use but kennels are not. I was wondering if there is any – if that had come up in any of the CRT meetings; just about the noise from the...

Mr. Brennan: From the kennels?

Chair Lew: From the – yes.

Mr. Potts: If I may, we are actually not adjacent to the Animal Hospital.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I know. It's one property over. Yes, I am aware of that. Thanks.

Mr. Brennan: No. To answer your questions, that was not brought up.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. So, Kyu, why don't you start us off on comments?

Vice Chair Kim: Alright. My comments are maybe a little out of order now that there's a revised site plan and I think a lot of my concerns have actually been addressed. One of the concerns that I had on the original set that we were reviewing was the double-sided entry. I think the way that it works now, as opposed to what was proposed earlier works much better. Then also from a site perspective, I think it's important that from an early stage of design, that you be mindful of where any signage is going to go on this building. From a building perspective, I think you did mention that some of the glass like on the garage doors would be frosted or obscured. I think we would probably ask the same on some of the office space. Particularly on the second floor facing El Camino Real that has large expanses of full height glass. Then while your presentation showed a little bit more information, I was kind of hungry to see some more site analysis in the drawing set that was given to us to show the neighbors and if you could point out who the neighbors are and some of those street elevations. Again, I saw those in the presentation so that was helpful but I think in context, to be able to see in the drawing set would have been nice. Then a question that I have when looking at the overall massing of this building is whether or not we can see the actual massing without the structural, kind of gymnastics that you are doing with these beams and columns. If those were not there, I am curious to see what the massing of the building would actually look like. I am thinking that a lot of those columns and beams actually add some unnecessary mass. I think the new site plan and the landscape plan if we could get some perspectives of the building that incorporate that. I think in the slides that were given to us this morning, it does show a little bit of that but I was more curious, I guess before I've seen these as to how the rear circulation was going to work with the garage parking. I think that now that you have kind of organized that, it's a little bit more straight forward. Just some other nit-picky things on the drawing sets. The upper floor plans seem to have some line weight issues. It was sometimes quite difficult to see what the unit plans actually look like. Then if you could just label the elevations with the cardinal directions as well as the right, left, front and back. I had a question about the fins on the rear elevation facing El Camino Way. You've explained in your presentation that they are metal architectural grade fins, which I think is fine but I am still eager to see some more details with regards to the screen on the very top level, as well as the second level. Dividing some of those balcony spaces and what that screen actually is and how it connects to the building and how that also relates to the glass railing where it comes together and some of those points. Overall, as a start, this is just a preliminary review and I'm excited to see that this site is going to have a much more contemporary use. I think the fact that there is housing, which is obviously required in the case because of the zoning but it's always a good thing to see the BMR unit as well. I'm looking forward to seeing how this design can move forward, especially with the latest drawings that we've seen this morning and thank you for your presentation.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for coming early. I went out to look at these sites at 6:30 in the morning and everything looks beautiful at 6:30 in the morning on an early summer day. This triangle is redeveloping well and this triangle is interesting because it is its transition between the heavily traveled and commercial El Camino. The neighborhood behind it, which is basically residential or quite offices; sort of intellectual offices or personal services offices and a heavily traveled Good Will store, of course. I certainly agree that keeping the trees is important. I am distressed by the reworking of the El Camino open space. I don't think I can argue with Staff's believe that driveway needs to be aligned in a safe way with El Camino. One of the things that I really liked about your earlier proposal was that we got significantly sized and dimensioned common open space, rather than something that complies with the

code but is unlikely to be used. That is how I would describe what we have now. I don't think that's at all a good open space – common open space design. The strip over to the side of the driveway and adjacent to the other property so at the moment, I don't think that works. I was going to ask you to be sure you had a play structure in the larger space if you had a larger space. I do think it's important that these – I had a debate with one of my colleagues about the general issue about open space in condominiums and multi-owner developments. In my neighborhood downtown North, they exist. They are often tucked away. They are often eccentric and whether they are used depends on who lives there but they can be very well used. I think as we get more and more intense developments, they become even more and more desirable. Particularly, if they are a pleasant place to go sit and have a cup of coffee or watch a kid in a secured space – securable space. They work every well so I'm not – I wouldn't find this second open space design to be effective. I'm also somewhat concerned about the large screened enclosed area on the top floor. That doesn't – it may address the fact that we're trying to do an open space against El Camino Real for residential use if I am understanding what the proposal is?

Mr. Brennan: No, the open space is against El Camino Way.

Board Member Furth: The big – the second-floor one? I'm looking at balcony view onto El Camino drawing A-011.

Mr. Brennan: I'm sorry, can you repeat your question?

Board Member Furth: I've never seen on a private open space, a balcony essentially, as completely enclosed as this one. It distinguishes the residential use, which we generally don't support. It makes it unavailable for any kind of softening landscape on the site and it makes the building mass look bigger. Does a big enclosed area that does not get included in the FAR – I'm sorry, the gross floor area calculations, is that right?

Mr. Brennan: Correct.

Board Member Furth: I would be interested in knowing what my colleagues think about this. I can understand part of the drive because how are you going to enjoy a balcony or open space adjacent to El Camino but I am concerned about the adverse effects of it. I am also concerned about some aspects of internal circulation like pedestrian, as well as car. If you look at the second floor, do those apartments share access with the office space? Is that corridor opening to both uses? I am looking at sheet A-001.

Mr. Potts: Yeah, the intent there is that there will be a doorway at the end of the hall adjacent to the first unit doorway that separates the apartment condo unit hallway from the office hallway. The door to the office would be at the top of the stairs so they wouldn't have access to that hallway, except there will likely be an emergency exit at the other end of the office that has access to that back stairway. That would-be alarm...

Board Member Furth: That gets to my point, which I think that as it's shown on our plans, it creates an unsafe and undesirable condition. I am also interested in how somebody who feels vulnerable or is vulnerable gets from there – from the exterior to the interior; from their parking place to their home or from the sidewalk to the home and without that door, I think this would not be an acceptable condition. I mean it's not just going to be fit 30-year old bicycle riders who might want to live here. I think that's it for me.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you and thank you colleagues for good comments. I find myself in agreement with Kyu saying that the frames on the back of the building serve, in my opinion, to make the building look unnecessarily large and massive. I actually carry that through on the front too. You have a different type of frame but a frame nonetheless that I think also serves to enhance the mass of the building; perhaps unnecessarily. I also find myself in strong agreement with Wynne saying that the open

space right now, seems to be quite separated from the residential units and I find that unfortunate. Her comments just a second ago about the circulation patterns for the office and the apartments, I find problematic, to put it nicely. You just can't have office and resident people mixing quite this way. It's just very uncomfortable for the residents. There is no privacy on that staircase or anything like that. Let me step back a second though and say that this triangle site offers a real opportunity to get both residential and commercial development and to do it in a very graceful way by using the two frontages; El Camino Real for the commercial and El Camino Way for the residential. I was pleasantly surprised in going back through the El Camino Real south guidelines to find guideline 2.2.3.1, explicitly saying face each street with the character appropriate to the scale of the development. I mean it couldn't be more clear in my opinion what you should do and what's basically been done out there. I certainly would appreciate that being sent back to the Transportation Department, if there is push back about two accesses. That said, it seems to me that a really good way to develop this would be to try hard to keep the residential stuff on the back, coming in from the back and then the commercial stuff on the front. Then it leads me to looking at your new site plan, which I think is an improvement over the one that I was looking at earlier this week but I am concerned that you have what I count as seven residential parking spaces off that parking lot. If that is indeed to be the residential parking lot and that's – I don't think quite adequate. In any case, I would – if there is any way to get it so the residential parking is one access and one way and the commercial is differently, I think that would be very strong. Just imagine coming home, you would really rather not be in the same parking garage again as an office building. It really begs the question that is there some way to access to get to these apartments separately as well. That let me to my thoughts as I walked around the site, that I use to live not too far from here over on East Meadow and we would walk over here. It used to be [Su Hong Restaurant] and the kids always like to go to good will. It's quite residential, it's a street along West Charleston there and East Meadow with just houses and front yards and stuff. Yet, what you are showing on El Camino Way is really a parking lot and earlier it was just this very densely screened open space that was very private. It seems to me that this is an opportunity again, to get a much more residential character to the residential part of this building. That's reinforced for me when I listen to what Kyu was saying and then I look at your elevations with that in mind. This aerial view from El Camino Way is really not residential by my standard, just in a general sense. It's not really what I think fits for residential development. I would be really nice to see something softer, more landscaping and not a parking lot and more friendly to the people who are living there. As I dive into that even further, I look at the quality of these outdoor decks and I find again that they are kind of failing on the standard of are they quality outdoor spaces. The upper ones overlook the lower ones so the family below never really has a sense of privacy and because they are all stacked next to each other, you are really relying on a privacy screen to make them private. Yet, that results in an outdoor space that's closed on three sides. It's much better if you can get corners or other clever massing to let spaces somehow not feel closed in but also have privacy. I know it's a big more challenging architecturally but it has been done many times and it really can work and just create more interesting and more dynamic spaces. Perhaps not quite as large as this but these are very large outdoor spaces. Seeming more as a means of just covering the lower massing and stuff. I find that the pedestrian walkthrough seems like a very nice feature. As I walked around that community, there is a lot of foot traffic back and forth through El Camino and it's nice to offer that somehow through the site. It does complicate your site development and patterning but I find that a nice feature. I'd like to throw out – I guess I would call it an idea but that's what I do all day long. What if you had facing El Camino, two-stories, contemporary as you like and it could be even a little bit taller of commercial development. Retail on one level and office on the second and the third level was a terrace. A rooftop deck that was primarily outdoor space for the residences. You could put a good deal of greenery up there. They would enjoy a tremendous view of the hills. It would sort of solve – what you have now is this screened off outdoor space, which is going to be noisy and you can't really look through the screening very well but you are right on El Camino. If you put a bunch of landscaping there, pull the larger terrace behind it, I think you would serve to improve the massing of the building and it would be a little bit more compatible with the one-story buildings immediately next to it. The greener on top would be a kind of neat, contemporary feature that also would look nice and would be quite practical because that's an outdoor space that people might really use in that area. Not trying to tell you what to do but it was just an idea that struck me looking at your design and that you really do have a potential for a fantastic view up there. I'd like to reinforce that the El Camino Real guidelines – the South El Camino Real guidelines really do ask for buildings to have the

fronting part on El Camino; a base, a middle and a top or some language similar to that. I'm not quite seeing that with the design that you have now and we're not looking for a Paladin Neoclassical structure but it usually has to do with some sense of a roof. Just some sense of a top and I for one feel that it's important to follow these guidelines and that's one thing I don't quite see that happening on the El Camino Real guideline. Again, if you were to take off that third floor visually, pull the residents back from there, you might find it easier to really accomplish that. I think that's the sum of my comments. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Peter. I think we have a lot of great comments from the Board today. I think there are a couple that hasn't been mentioned that I think are in the – where in the Staff report. I think one is – the first is that the – it seems like the Urban Forestry wants – they wanted to retain the street tree on El Camino Way so I think the root area and the basement are going to be competition there. I think – I'm curious as to your thoughts about that and if there are ways to modify the basement parking. Whether it's the use of parking lifts or what not to get – to reduce the footprint of the basement but still keep the number of cars in there or is there a way to add parking at grade – more parking at grade.

Mr. Potts: I'll answer that both ways. Yes, there are probably ways to add more parking at grade but as we've already heard, the open space suffers, obviously when we do that and the visual of the parking. Lifts are an issue in the area due to the potential of dewatering and things become a problem on this particular site. We have had the arborist – our arborist and the City arborist look at the basement plan and the existing tree and I think they believe that we can make the existing design work and maintain that tree. They have been out on the site and looked at it already and done some measurements based on where we proposed the basement to be. We will certainly try to get as much space around that tree as we can. We will be pulling the front back a little bit because of the angle down below. There are some ways that we can jog that basement structure to enhance the areas around the trees on the front on El Camino.

Chair Lew: Ok, great. Thank you. The – I think as I understand it, the transportation prefers to have just one driveway entrance to the site from El Camino, is that correct and not have anything at all on El Camino Way?

Mr. Brennan: The existing lot or the...

Chair Lew: The proposed project or just...

Mr. Brennan: The proposal has (crosstalk) two points of access.

Chair Lew: Has the revised curb cut location gone through any DRC (inaudible) (crosstalk)?

Mr. Brennan: No, it hasn't.

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) so we don't know – this is the existing curb cut.

Mr. Brennan: Yeah, the renderings that you have before you are recently submitted and they haven't been reviewed again by our DRC.

Chair Lew: Right, this one, this set.

Mr. Brennan: No, that actually has. Yeah.

Chair Lew: Yeah, this one has been reviewed, right?

Mr. Brennan: Yes.

Chair Lew: Then this one hasn't?

Mr. Brennan: Those renderings were in response or just providing (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: (Inaudible)

Mr. Brennan: ... exactly.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Mr. Potts: Just to clarify with Phillip and you, we did...

Mr. Brennan: I'm sorry. Transportation is open to access, it's not preferred. They don't believe that it's the path of least resistance. The path along El Camino Way is the safe routes to school. The applicant – there would be – there is a new transportation project that's – I believe it's the – not Maybelle.

Chair Lew: We've seen some of the bicycle improvements that are being proposed.

Mr. Brennan: Right.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Mr. Potts: We did work with – just to let Phillip know as well, with the City transportation and showed them that alternate site and went through that with them and they were – seemed to be immutable to that second – as long as it was aligned where it is.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. I think that I was in agreement with most of the other comments by the Board and I just wanted to emphasize a couple things. One is that I think the two-sided nature of the site is seemingly is a disadvantage but I want to encourage you to make it work with the pathway that you are proposing. I go out to the site sometimes in the afternoon and you'll see this – the students from the local school like Gun and what not, they like to hang out at the subway. They come in from the back, from the El Camino Way side on that particular development and there's – it seems to me to work really well. I was kind of skeptical about that particular development down the street but the students use it how they – how it works for them. It works for them having the double frontage thing so I do want to encourage you to have the – try to do the walkway. I do want to caution you that we do have problems with some buildings that when you have a lot of glass – you're showing at the moment, just a lot of glass on El Camino and along the walkway. Retailers usually need wall – they need wall space and a lot of times those windows get covered up so I just want to be – just that you recognize that there's that issue that will have to be dealt with. Then also as Kyu had mentioned, that we do want to make sure that building works for the signage for future retail tenants. I mean typically they want something above their storefronts. I think the El Camino Design Guidelines encourage things like canopies and what not for the tenants to give them some visibility. Some of our contemporary designs that have been proposed recently in Palo Alto, the architects design it at such that it's really hard for a tenant to do anything to the building. Wynne was questioning the wood screen that you have on the third floor and I think I was too but at the same time, I kind of like it. We have so many contemporary buildings and they are all kind of look the same and I like that you are proposing something – trying to do something different. I was thinking the wood screen could be considered like a linkage to the Japanese restaurant two doors down. I mean Japanese restaurants typically have wood screens like that in their windows and so I was thinking in a way, that could be a design linkage which we do look for in our compatibility findings. I was concerned about the – to the other neighbor on the north, that Honey Baked Hams. I was concerned that you have this large stair tower with a blank wall – side wall facing a small neighbor and so there are ways I think to design – we've seen way – we've seen other projects where they try to modify the stair slightly to make it a little bit less forbidding but it's a challenge. There are have been previous comments about the beams on the project and I was – they don't really bother me so much. Although, I think that you have the three-quarter view in your drawings of a perspective view of the – at the driveway ramp down to the basement. That one seemed to me to be a little unresolved so it seems a little – just the design at

the moment seems a little chaotic and I would like something ideally with more of a clear design statement or intent there at the driveway. I think with the angled property line is challenging. I think you've done the right – I think you've got the right approach there and with regard to previous comments about the open space – private open space and the common open space is that I think our code allows you a fair bit of flexibility in choosing what you want to do there. It doesn't have to be at grade, as I recall reading the code and the ratio of private to common is also fairly flexible. I think it's partly your choice there but then I think I do agree with Wynne. If you are showing mostly multi – if it's mostly 2-bedroom units or is it mostly 1-bedroom? You've got a mix and if there are kids, I think we do want it to be able to be used for – to have some uses for kids. I think that's all that I have. I think you've got a good start. I think it needs a lot of work. It seems to me that the challenge is the parking and access and the tree. I do – I'm fine with the contemporary approach of the architecture in general. I'm not – I think I'm – on the – as I mentioned before on the beams, I think I'm ok with having the building – trying to make the building look larger than it is. That doesn't seem to bother me quite as much so if you have any other follow-ups? No. Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Not thinking about the building but thinking about the parking, it is discouraging that the view that I am going to see coming up the road to the back of this site is garage doors and asphalt. That's not a good idea and I really hope that we can do something different. Not only are they garage doors but they go one, two, three, four and there's nothing softening it. There's nothing screening it except – I think there is a bit screening it but this is not what we try for and it doesn't – the good thing about it is, is that it's going to be very obvious that there's a driveway there for a pedestrian walking along that driveway – along the sidewalk but it's – we ought to be able to do a lot better. With respect to the original preliminary landscape concept where I was so fond of the big space. I would say, however, that I would not want a 6-foot screening fence or wall in front of that. In my – my garden wall blew down in a storm in January and I live in downtown North and it's quite a busy place and my backyard backs up onto an alley and I ended up replacing my solid fence with an open one. I have a better garden, it's more social ability, it's sufficiently private and it's that being able to see in a bit, that I think really makes these things work better. You get rid of the dank quarters, which plants don't like and people don't like. You get better safety and you get better social ability.

Chair Lew: And Peter.

Board Member Baltay: One last comment and may be directed to Staff as well as the applicant. We just went through a fairly painful process where a commercial development wanted to make retail space into a restaurant. I'm sure Jonathan remembers this. The parking requirement is slightly different. This strikes me as the kind of space where a restaurant may well want to be one day. There are other restaurants and there is a lot of activity there. It would be really great if as an applicant, you realize that might happen and you make sure you have the parking count for it. Then if the Staff were to somehow document that in the approval process so that if the change gets made, it doesn't have to go all the way to City Council. It's a simple thing so I am just putting that out there as a cautionary note that it just happened and it's a painful process for everybody. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Do you have any quick follow-up questions for the Board?

Mr. Potts: I think just a couple points of clarification. We did look at the potential for a restaurant and the parking capacity on this site is not going to allow it. The only way we could even get close was to have a full-on parking lot off of El Camino Way at the back of the building and we were still well short of any – I mean the parking requirement is vastly different. You know, four-fold or something like that so we are kind of precluded from having a restaurant use in this building. Maybe that should be noted, as opposed to trying to fix it because I mean, it's just kind of the way it is. Certainly, we want to clarify that we did look at many solutions and one of our very first thoughts was more a separated two-building, residential buildings at the back on El Camino Way with a separate building at the front on El Camino and splitting up the uses. The problem that we just ran into over and over and over again was the lot coverage issue that just made it impossible to – our original design only had four units. Staff wanted the full seven units, they wanted the BMR, they wanted the full seven units and we just couldn't get the coverage to work in

separating it out like that. That would have been our first and best choice obviously so I think we zeroed in on a solution that we thought was going to be the best look. I agree on the garage doors, it was great – I mean the whole idea was that you would only see two of them and they were pushed way back but again, we certainly understand the access issue with that driveway and that heavily used crosswalk. Again, looked at it and thought, yeah, we absolutely have to move this driveway so there are some fixed points that we are dealing with and we will certainly take your comments into account before we make our formal submittal. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. We look forward to the final – the formal submittal.

- 3. 3200 El Camino Real [17PLN-00155]:** Request for Preliminary Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing Two-Story Hotel and Construction of a new Four-Story 97 room 53,745 Square Foot Hotel. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review. Zoning District: CS. For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Lew: Let's move onto item number three which is 3200 El Camino Real. Request for Preliminary Architectural Review to allow the demolition of an existing two-story hotel and construction of a new four-story, 97 room, 53,745-square foot hotel. Environmental Assessment is that it's not a project. A formal application will be subject to CEQA and the zone district is CS. Yes, please and we do have a recusal and if there are any disclosures by the other Board Members.

Vice Chair Kim: I have been advised by the City's Attorney's Office to recuse myself from this item because I have a previous working relationship, not on this project but on another project, with the presenter Randy Popp.

Board Member Furth: For the record, I visited the site.

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Hi, good morning. Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner and I have a presentation regarding the project. You did a great introduction about it but a little bit more. There is an existing two-story hotel with 36 guest rooms. It's at the corner of El Camino Real and Hansen Way. It's adjacent to the Stanford Research Park. It's an area that is in transition. There are a lot of low-density development area but there is some potential for more intense development. There is an existing 50-foot special setback on Hansen and the property width is 100-feet. The proposal for is a four-story hotel with 97 guest rooms and a two-level basement. The requests are an architectural review, as well as a zoning amendment for the setback and the zoning amendment has been filed and that's going concurrently at this time. There were prior meetings for this project. There was one before this Board back in 2016, with a different design project. As well as there was a pre-screening with the City Council for that same design. The Council wasn't as receptive to that design and therefore, there was a second pre-screening earlier this year. At that point, the Council was a little more receptive to that design, as well as the for the zoning amendment of that 50-foot setback. The project is within the CS service commercial district. It allows for hotels to be up to a 2.0 FAR. It has a very flat topography and it is surrounded by commercial and research park as I had mentioned. Across the street is a very – a surface lot along Hansen Way. It's a very low-intensity development at this point. Just going to the site plan briefly. The architect does have their own presentation that goes into a little more detail but just to show some of the constraints of the site is that it's a narrow lot and it does have the pork chop shape that you can see along El Camino Real and Hansen Way. That creates a little bit of a curved corner there and it also cuts into the site. The building does go to the setback along El Camino. It will have a 12-foot sidewalk as required per the zoning and then along Hansen Way, you have to look at this project as if it's going to have the underlying zoning setback, which will be 0-feet along Hansen way. So, it will go right to the property line as opposed to the 50-feet. The previous project that was before you, it did go right to that corner. It did have a very tall element at the corner and it actually exceeded the height limit so there were some comments about that; a very strong reaction I think from this Board regarding that. The current design is that they pulled it back from the corner, they made some design elements so that it's more squat looking. They did add some landscaping to a terrace and try to make more of a focus on that corner. So just some project

perspectives that they want to share with you and you just kind of have to disregard that sheet of glass that goes through the 50-foot setback. These are the same plans that were used for the pre-screening but it does show the kind of context of the area. Where you have the Fish Market restaurant adjacent to the site, as well as some office building behind it and you can see from the opposite view of how that would look there. Again, more from the corner of El Camino that is slightly elevated and also down to the street level you can see some perspectives of how that would look. They tried to respond to the Board regarding elevations as being a little flat on the opposite side of Hansen so you can see here in the elevations that they've tried to do that. Then here you can see again with that cross section of the two levels of basement parking and then what that looks like with the Fish Market next door and then again from the back. While this is going through this preliminary process with the City's different departments, they did review the project and some of the things that were – that came up with that were the (inaudible) of parking. We will have to address that, I think it's four spaces. The Transportation Department is recommending that the pork chop at the intersection be eliminated so that's something that will have to be taken into consideration. Definitely a focus on the corner as a plaza, that is something that the City Council had mentioned as well in their discussions. Then along Hansen Way, the recommendation is that the sidewalk – as it is right now it's a monolithic sidewalk so it would be a detached sidewalk. So, you would have a curb, a planter strip and then a detached sidewalk. Next steps for the project is that there is no further action is required after this discussion but we do seek many directions regarding the design for this project. Then the applicant will have to file a formal application considering the comments made during this meeting. That concludes my presentation and I would be happy to answer any questions. The applicant is here and they have their own presentation as well. Thank you.

Chair Lew: If there are any questions from the Board? Quick questions? Yep, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Sheldon, when we will we know what the redesign of that intersection will look like when they remove the pork chop?

Mr. Ah Sing: That's kind of an ongoing discussion. We just a DRC last week and so that comment was delivered to the applicant and the applicant – one (inaudible) with the City regarding that requirement. It's still kind of up in the air whether...

Board Member Furth: But this isn't one of those intersections for which we have already – I mean for a lot of El Camino intersections, we did studies about the redesign that we wanted. At least one of them has been implemented. Is there a redesign study and recommendation for this intersection or not? Not yet.

Mr. Ah Sing: From the discussion that we had, this was something that would be borne by the applicant. The applicant would have to do...

Board Member Furth: My point is that this is a lot of area and it's important to this design and it's going to be hard to figure out what to do on that corner if we don't know what the corner is going to be. So, that's going to be crucial to understanding what we should be asking for and requiring.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: I think we are where we are in the process and this is a preliminary review so I think all we can really go on right now is what we have. Of course, when they file their formal application and when we know more about the corner, that will obviously influence the design.

Board Member Furth: If they knew ahead of time, it would work even better. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, so let's do the applicant presentation and you will have 10-minutes.

Mr. Yatin Patel: Good morning. I just wanted to briefly introduce myself. My name is Yatin Patel and my family has owned and operated the existing hotel for close to 40-years. We're starting this process to see

if we can improve the property and have it become a little more competitive in the marketplace. We've been going through this process for over a year or so and as you saw our previous design, we came before you previously and we took into consideration all the comments that we heard. We met with some neighborhood groups and took in their comments. Myself and Jim, the project architect, took all of this into consideration and how hope is that we take the inputs and come up with a project that everybody can be happy with. Randy is going to take it from here as far as presenting the project to you.

Mr. Randy Popp: Alright, thank you very much. Here we are again. I think this one won't be as challenging hopefully. Let's see what you all think. First, I want to recall what we recently heard from Council. It's really important I think, to sort of reflect on this because the pre-screening was a very intentional process. I'll just –actually Sheldon, if you don't mind, I am going to maybe address a comment that you made a moment ago where the first Council pre-screening, Sheldon suggested that they weren't very happy with the project. I actually want to just reflect that my impression of that was that they were just looking for more information. We came in with sort of a land use diagram and no 3-dimensional information for them and before they weighed in on the project, they wanted to see more 3-dimensional information. We actually got some very positive comments from the Council at that point in regard to the direction we were headed but they did not – they weren't ready to make a decision at that point. So, Sheldon, I don't know if that aligns with what your recollection is but we can discuss that. I wanted to just touch on these things really quickly because it is important to us. Karen Holman really appreciated that the project was set back, that it was terraced and that the plaza was really open. Adrian Fine thought the scale was better than what was current and really making use of the entire frontage along El Camino and that was a much better approach than what would have occurred if we were stuck with this 50-foot setback. He was pretty pleased about the building. Lydia was very interested in the pedestrian experience, particularly as it wrapped around and up Hansen. Tom DuBois was particularly interested in the landscaping and wanted to make sure that all the parking was hidden. That the landscaping was really appropriate and thought that we had done a good job on a challenging piece of land. Vice Mayor Kniss thought that the design would specific point of adding to a statement that the Staff had in their report, where they were talking about how this was a much-desired visual improvement to the corner and she added to that, 'and that's the truth.' Councilmen Wolbach said that the design was very attractive. He actually really attached to this wavy format that we have on the terrace and thought that was a very nice element but overall, he believed that it was an appropriate place for a hotel and that design seemed really reasonable. Council Member Filseth thought it was great. He said the site and the location for a hotel. He really like the design and said that it was a big step forward from the earlier concept and that it really brought the average up in Palo Alto, which I thought was a great comment. Councilmen Tanaka was really focused on the TOT and thought that would be great and the Mayor just sort of wrapped things just by saying it was a really nice design. That he found the building to be really attractive and he really liked the destination idea for the plaza. Thanks for indulging me for going through that. I want to just point our quickly that these are some of the important points about our project. We will be fully code conforming. This little glitch about the parking will get resolved easily. We had a couple spaces that we couldn't count so we're going to fix that up for you quickly. The TOT increase is significant and we're expecting a million dollar increase from what we have today. As we have all heard, that's a critical thing for this Council and a big focus for them. They are planning to use that money to enhance infrastructure and traffic and other issues. We believe that this project will be much safer in that it's not only reducing traffic by reducing the VMT's; particularly into the Research Park. Also, relocating the driveway and that makes a big difference. Then in regard to the residential impact, we really are a long way from the neighbors; 560-feet to the nearest end. We're hopeful that the impacts will be far outweighed by the benefits. We did go to Council to correct this funny mistake in the zoning and they've agreed that the 50-foot setback should be removed so we're going to go through a process where a site-specific zone change will be done and that will occur. Just reflecting back here, on the zoning and Sheldon did a good job kind of wrapping this up but we had this great picture from 1948 of what the site looked like when it was first built. You can see in regards to context, that there was nothing when this was built and so it's a very appropriate building for the time. Yes, that is an airplane parked there on El Camino Real. You get a sense of just how barren everything was. This is how we appear today and regarding the context, this is really what's nearby. Some of this is present now and some we know is coming. It's not clear what will be proposed at the Equinox site, which is almost directly across from us

but we know it's going to be significant. We've seen a proposal for that, that was already approved and I think whatever comes back for that will likely be very similar; this is our context. Last time you saw this project, you were presented with this. Everyone agreed that it was too massive at the corner, it exceeded the height limit, it just wasn't well received by you or the community. So, we took in what we heard and we made some very significant changes and here's what we have today as a result. A large open corner, deeply terraced frontages, organized and intentional. Still identifying the corner but in a subtle way – the building identifying the corner but in a subtle way. Pedestrian connections that feel safe due to the scale and the proportion of space. We took this to the neighborhood and some of the neighbors were critical, even of the revised design but we actually had some very positive comments from some of the folks at the Ventura Neighborhood meeting that we went to. Similar to that, at the Council hearing there were people who were upset about it but also very positive so a mixed response. We're here for early feedback from you and we want to know that we are on the right path. Elements such as cornices, railings, forms that are all developed to add interest and manage scale where the sensitive adjacency occurs. We would like feedback on materials as well. Interesting, variety of texture and character, smooth to rough, like to dark, transparent to opaque. Let's focus on El Camino, the current building just feels unsafe. It's so close to the street so part of our project plan is to increase to the 12-foot effective sidewalk and beyond with a landscaping layout that is open and inviting. We've terraced the building so that it feels consistent with the El Camino frontage and the Fish Market buildings next door. There is a huge space between our building and the buildings across the street – across El Camino. Based on really clearly voiced preference, we're developing a corner plaza. This is buffered from El Camino but just the right amount of openness to feel inviting. Wynne, I'll just address your comment quickly. The idea of removing this pork chop is something that the City has brought forward but we're compelled to do yet. There is a discussion going on about this. We won't gain an FAR, there really will be no project benefit to us but we are going to be asked to pay for it. So, we're going to resist this to a great degree until someone can tell us that because of traffic or some other reason, there's a purpose to this that this project really needs to participate in this. That, as Jonathan said, is an ongoing discussion. As we turn the corner, the landscape changes a bit. There is an intensity to this condition that bears looking at. Along Hansen, the right-of-way is unusual. We have 19-feet from the face of curb to the property line. It's a really significant buffer between the street and the building space and we're even going to push our building back from that a bit more. The discussion recently with the folks at the City is that we should put in a planting strip. Then the sidewalk so that the trees will be adjacent to the street and we're discussing that shift and how that all will occur. In regard to ingress/egress, three lanes coming into a relocated driveway from where it is today and one land going out. I think I got just a little bit – yeah, ok.

Chair Lew: You can (inaudible).

Mr. Popp: I've got one more slide. We feel that this is safe and convenient and very logical. So, where are we headed, that was what I was going to leave you with. What we are hoping is that the ARB will really weigh in on how we've arranged the use of the land and the character and the quality. We've got the PTC focused on the amendment that is coming and then eventually, we will turn back to Council because that's the required process. With that, I'll leave it open to discussion and look forward to your comments today. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Randy. Now is the time where we do public comment and I have one speaker card and that's for Jennifer Voorhies. If you can come up to the microphone and you have 5-minutes.

Ms. Jennifer Voorhies: Good morning. My name is Jennifer Voorhies and I am one of the owners of 3150 – 3170 El Camino Real. We have wonderful long-term relations with our tenant, the Fish Market Restaurant who an excellent operation. This property has been in our family's ownership for over 40-years. It is our understanding that the proposal will avoid the City's required setback and have the new project wall facing us at our property line, where the existing hotel wall exists. The existing wall is a negative adjacency as it is and will be far worse with the structure twice or more as high and extending the full length of the parcels. The existing wall – the avoidance of such negative adjacency seems the exact purpose of these zoning setbacks. A combination of such a taller structure and not just a non-

conforming setback but no setback seems unacceptable. Especial as the proposal that exists is suggesting a teardown and rebuild, which would allow for the current setbacks to take place. We do not object to any other setback. We do not object to this proposal. These are our neighbors, we wish them the best. They are beautiful plans, we only object to the setback issue that goes against our property and the way it affects our tenants. We ask you to please consider this impact on us and our tenants as you review this. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much. I'm sorry?

Mr. Lait: So, that the – I mean, if that's – I don't know if you want a comment from Staff on the setback issue for clarity or do you have an understanding of the issue?

Chair Lew: Yes, well, we – I think – sure. Why don't you chime in because I was going to ask it later but we can do it now, that's fine.

Mr. Lait: The setback in question has to do with a setback from Hansen and not from the interior side property line, which is a zero-setback line as I understand it for a commercial building. That's not what's proposed for the project. I think there is a setback proposed, at least with the development and the Board will have a conversation as to whether that's sufficient or not. The deviation that the applicant is seeking through the legislative process is – has to do with the Hansen orientation so I just wanted to clarify that.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Peter, would you like to start us off, please?

Board Member Baltay: Sure. Overall, I find it to be a handsome proposal and I did listen to the entire City Council meeting and find your summation of what they said to be fairly accurate. I find myself fairly well in sync with what they are saying. I'd like to make three general points towards helping the project along. One has to do with the sidewalks, the second with the front plaza and the third with the overall building massing and materials. On the sidewalks, what I found walking around the site is that it's really nice to see that you are proposing to continue the wider sidewalk along El Camino from the Fish Market. That would really be a positive thing. On the Hansen Way side though, it struck me that you really want to see the sidewalk be continuous with the rest of Hansen Way and I'm concerned. I heard you say that you are considering putting street trees just in front of your property and pushing the sidewalk in. I 'm not sure how that aligns with the rest of the street and that struck me as an important thing to just bear in mind. That you want – you really do – this is the entrance to the Research Park as Council Member Kniss talked about and the sidewalk being continuous visually is important. That's just one person's opinion on that issue but I suggest that you take it to heart. I feel that the public plaza at the corner actually should be more than that and I think I heard several Council Member actually say that there ought to be a public café. Some sort of amenity that anybody can stop and get a coffee or a cup of juice or something. Walking around the site, there is a lot of pedestrian activity there and it's only going to be more as time goes on. This whole area is developing quickly. We are charged to meet the El Camino Real Design Guidelines and one of those is to have prominent corner features. It might be a twist but to my way of thinking if you can really enhance that corner with a plaza. With a place where a lot of human activity takes place, you've met that requirement in an odd way. You've created a really interesting focal point there that's a negative in a building sense but it's really quick a positive in the sense that there is a lot of activity there. I do think, however, the way that you have it now with a fairly large entrance walking in off the corner is almost detrimental because it feels like – when I first saw these drawings, I thought that was where you would drive into the hotel. I think you want to be more clear that the plaza is protected from the street at the same time and maybe make a more discreet and distinguished entrance into what's a seating area for a restaurant. I think that's really the public amenity. To think of it as just a general plaza where somebody goes and brings their brown bag lunch is probably not realistic but if you had a small shop there that would serve anybody for lunch, it's a wonderful spot to sit. It would be a wonderful public amenity. I put out there to the Council that hopefully, they hear our minutes, that we are granting a change to the zoning and it's not unreasonable to request that you create some public amenity, such as a place to sit outside there. That said then, it seems to me that the

second-floor terrace with the wavy façade, which is quite attractive, is a wonderful spot to put additional dining spaces for hotel guest. I'm sure you are serving them breakfast and you could separate them from the main restaurant by having additional seating up there. That would further reinforce the idea of a corner plaza. You might even create a staircase connecting the two outside. Again, more pedestrian activity, more life going on the corner will create a stronger corner and a better building. If I could ask for any one thing on this, I would say to do more on that corner to bring public activity into that. I'd like to put out for the record that since I have been scanning through these design guidelines so carefully, South El Camino Real Guidelines 3.1.6-point blank says that the entrance to the building should face El Camino Real. I'd like to just put into the record that I think on this particular site, that's not really possible and that's because of the large radius on the corner there. You really have so little frontage of the building, that bringing the entrance off El Camino is just not realistic in this case. I think what you've done with your circulation is terrific in coming in off Hansen Way with the parking and the entrance to the hotel. It really works very, very well and I am just putting that out there for the record. Yeah, my notes here are that I thought it was logical and clear how you are entering the whole site. Then, to look at the building itself. I think overall, it's quite handsome. I wonder though if you couldn't take the corner element of the building and not have two layers of glass reflecting the two-stories but some stronger vertical element. Floor to floor glass elements going all the through, up and down, just to give it a bit more character there. Then I am curious to see some material samples of what that – it looks like some kind of a mesh on the face of the building is and just to how that works exactly. I am also mildly concerned to see some more detail on how the large parapet – how the large eave projections intersect with this vertical element. On one of them, it overlaps on the left and the other one it's flush. Those are small details but it would help. Then I do think that listening to the neighbors' concerns about the setback. That was my very first concern about this whole building is that you essentially have a four-story wall facing a one-story building and it was just too much; too tall, to directed looking in at them. In walking the site, I realized that there's a tremendous amount of street trees and canopy and it will not be nearly as visible as what's shown in the drawings here. That said, I would like to see more modulations on the third and the four floors of the hotel as it goes back on the outside opposite of Hansen; the north façade. Looking at the floor plan, it really just means that you need to readjust your hotel room layouts and counts to have some ins and outs on the building. Perhaps some terraces or just get more modulation on the third and the fourth floor there. I would really like to see that to break up the mass a bit more and to make it more palatable to the neighboring property owner. The last comment is that -- what looks to be a wide surface for the third and the fourth floor is perhaps a bit too bright and again, I'd like to see real materials but that's just concern of mine. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great and Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. This just doesn't quite expect me to talk. Thank you for the earlier letter on the Council hearing. I to listened to it but it's helpful to have a written summary. I am never quite clear what the emphasis on TOT are. We've got out standards and our finding to make I would hate to think that you are trying to tell me that I should – forget, I'm sure you weren't. I do think this is vastly more attractive. I am in support of this site being redeveloped. I think it will be better more intensively developed. I don't view that 50-foot setback as some weird mistake. I view that as part of a design about entry into the Research Park but I don't think it works. I am sure that the thought was that at the time this was redeveloped, it would be redeveloped in a way that's more compatible with that 50-foot setback further up the road and I think you're getting there. My question to the Staff about the redesign of the intersection are because usually when you take out a pork chop, you also put in – you tend to do things like push out the sidewalk so that you don't make the pedestrian 100-yard dash longer. You do bulb-outs and this is going to transform what might happen there so I understand that we would rather spend the developer's money than ours but it would be helpful just know how this might happen. Is there no parking along the Hansen frontage? Is parking not allowed? It's a bicycle path, there's a bike lane so it's no parking. So, we don't have to worry about car doors swinging out. I think my colleague Peter Baltay's comment about continuity of sidewalk is important. I also think that it's nice, particularly in heavily traveled areas, to have a sidewalk buffered by a parkway. So, I'd like both those aspects of it thought about; the pedestrian experience. Of course, where I really want the buffering along El Camino, where it's really not fun to walk close to the traffic but 12-feet may be enough there. Let's see what my notes

are. Ok, so my first priority for this project is that it does whatever – having relocated the entrance around to Hansen, for which I am grateful, is that to take whatever steps are necessary to keep a magnificent row of trees over at 60620 Hansen healthy and happy and thriving. I am concerned also – that means not just underground, not just at ground level but above ground level where the building moves out towards them. I also think that with this enhanced and more usable site, that if it's at all possible that there should be additional planning on this building site that provides the second row because we keep seeing that for these taller buildings, double tiers of trees make a really big positive difference so that's what I would be looking for. Similarly, with respect to the [Voorhies]'s family comment, I think we all know that Fish Market is an attractive location and it's got a lot of outside seating. The existing wall isn't great but the new wall should be and for me, I know we have little drawings of trees or something green on the edge of this. I think that if you are going to have a four-story wall, you need significant tall trees with room for them to grow both underground and above ground so serious landscaping, which can be enhanced if the building goes in and out a bit, I think could address their concerns. One of our requirements is that this building not adversely impact the ones next to it. I think that the Council's comments about a café or something similar are important. That's what will decide whether the plaza in fact works. I think it's essential and if it serves wine so much the better but we tend not to go places where we can't get something to hold in our hands. It's still very noisy at that corner and I wonder if we're at peak noise in the substitution of more and more electrical vehicles is going to make that better 10-years from now. Right now, I am going to want to know what you are doing to address the measure of noise levels there to make these good places to sit. When I tend to go try out the ones up and down El Camino, a number of them fail that test. One thing that struck me and one of the things that we are supposed to look at is whether the design works well for the occupants, the neighborhoods, and the owners. The ground floor design does not seem to make sense. It has a gym – an exercise facility facing El Camino. I have to trapeze all the way through the lobby? First, I have to come down to the ground floor and then I have to trapeze through the lobby and then come back looking even less attractive. That doesn't seem to make sense. The meeting spaces seem very cramped and small. It might be a great thing to have small spaces that you can book because we tend not to interview people or meet with them in our hotel rooms anymore so a small space could be good but I don't understand how that works. If it interferes with a better use of this high traffic, ground floor area, then I think it should be changed. I realize this lovely elevation is what, low drone level? I mean that's – it's not ground level. It's certainly very attractive and certainly, makes the building look lovely. I am going to want to know details on the second-floor landscaping and I agree that bright white would not be a good color there but this could be a place that really makes this corner a much livelier and lovelier place. Thank you. Oh, one more thing, I do think that the entrance is too wide. Anything that looks like a car could go through it ends up having to have bollards added and I think it would be better to think about that differently from the beginning.

Male: The plaza entrance?

Chair Lew: Yeah, could you clarify – can we go to the site plan just – can you point to me exactly what –

Board Member Furth: This.

Chair Lew: The corner plaza?

Board Member Furth: Yeah and I may be completely wrong but this looks big to me. I don't want it to look like you can drive a car into it.

Chair Lew: Yes, I think I understand. So, your – it's like the column spacing, right? Not the actual dimension of the space. It's just the building design.

Board Member Furth: It's the entry from the sidewalk. It doesn't look pedestrian oriented and I don't know how we would experience it close up but at least in this view, it doesn't look right to me.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Wynne. Thank you, Randy. I think this is a vastly superior scheme to the previously presented scheme from last year. The things that I like are the corner plaza. I also like that the massing has been stepped back on the El Camino and that you have added a lot of planting on top of the first-floor roof. I think I also do like the deep cornice and in general, like the window patterns on the building so I think that is all good. My main concern was actually the side property line to the [Voorhies] and I was wondering if you could explain how you have situated the building? What were the constraints because on --- basically, you've put the mass 5-feet away from the side property line and I was wondering what was governing that?

Mr. Popp: Maybe I'll just use this as the image to show that. We – it's still only a 100-foot wide site and in order to get the underground parking, which unfortunately is such – pardon the pun but it's a driver in the project. It's the dimension of that parking placement of structural columns and the organization of building on top of that really is becoming a limiting factor in the design for us. I think that the comments that I heard from the [Voorhies] folks today are really welcomed and it's our intent to try and work to make this a project that everyone is happy with. I'm trying to get to a side view here for you but the – I just don't have an easy image to show it. I'll stop there. The efficiency of the structure and the efficiency of the hotel -- at this stage we're still early. This is a study session and so we start with a pretty efficient building and we'll pull in and push out and organize things as we need to. The intent was to leave just about 6-feet on that side and that's what we've got. I think it's 5-foot 11-inches from the property line to the element that is closest to the property line. Then other pieces will step in and out from that a little bit but we can certainly look at trying to articulate that side of the building a little bit more and push and pull on it to try to give some relief to that edge and make it more acceptable to everyone.

Chair Lew: The driveway ramp is wider than the minimum code – City requirement. I was wondering if...

Mr. Popp: The driveway ramp you said?

Chair Lew: Yeah, it seems like it's – I don't have the exact scale but it looks like you're – it's like 30-feet. Is there a reason for that? Was it like a turning radius issue?

Mr. Popp: It actually has to do with turning radius. It's a pretty short throw and so it's a result of turning radius and again, structural dimensions. You know it's just efficient to leave it that wide.

Chair Lew: Ok and if we do end up with the rooms 5 or 6-feet away from the property line, right? Say something happens on the [Voorhies] property some day in the future. It seems to me that could be a negative, right? I mean you've got the hotel rooms looking out to something that might not be so desirable. I mean, I think just – I would just say consider the fact that something else could happen some day on the other side of the property line.

Mr. Popp: I think that's a valid point.

Chair Lew: Yeah and it could hurt the value of the property. Ok, is there another way – is there another location for the trash? You've got it in the front entrance. It seems highly undesirable place. I think Wynne had mentioned the redwood trees. It seems like that could be beautiful – if there was landscaping, instead of the trash enclosure, that could be a beautiful entrance – part of the entrance.

Mr. Popp: Do you want me to respond?

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Mr. Popp: Thank you for that comment. I really appreciate you saying that. We are, of course, just on the heels on a DRC meeting, where we heard from solid waste that they would like the trash to be as close as possible to the street and we would like to push it farther back. I think that the comment is welcomed and we'd like to work on that and try to improve that so that visibility to that grove of redwoods along the back edge is greater.

Chair Lew: Do you – this is a naive question but do hotels generate a lot of trash compared to like an office? I worked in an office and we generated so much paper waste but what comes out of – how much waste comes out of a hotel?

Mr. Popp: It's actually not very significant...

Chair Lew: Yeah, they do a lot of laundry, right?

Mr. Popp: ...compared to other uses. Yeah, all the laundry is done in-house and particularly, a hotel built today is much more focused on sustainable and green practices where they are trying to minimize waste. We've got in every room, not just a trash can but a recycling bin and there's a lot of attention paid to the waste stream and trying to make that more efficient and reduce it in every way possible.

Chair Lew: On the – ok, so there is – I think we're (inaudible) comments and I think I share the comments from the other Board Members about the white paint. I think Peter was asking about the metal. I do like that you are trying to do something different on the corner and then I would just caution you that it seems like you are showing the same material upon the mechanical screens. I have seen some – we have some preferred metal mechanical screens at Stanford and depending on the light conditions, they are almost see thru. Not all the time but when light hits it a certain way...

Mr. Popp: It needs to be backed.

Chair Lew: Yeah, so I would just caution you about that and that's important. On the pork chop, my recollection is that the City did one at Stanford Avenue and El Camino and my recollection is that it was like a million dollars. I don't know because you are moving traffic lights and you are dealing with Caltrains on a highway that has to be kept open. There were a lot of drainage complications as I recall, in doing bulb-outs. It seems simple if you look at it on a plan, it's like oh yeah, let's just do it but it's actually a million dollars of work. I think that needs to be...

Mr. Popp: And tremendous time delay to get it organized into a project.

Chair Lew: Because you are dealing with Caltrains. I think we have to – yeah, I think – I don't think it's the Board's place to sort of impose that on you but I just wanted to say that it's a huge – I think it is a huge ask on this – on the property and I think it's though, that it's highly desirable to do so. I do use the one at Stanford Avenue and El Camino and I do think it's better. I don't really like the way the corner is now, just in terms of pedestrian use so we will see where that goes. Yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Getting back to your references to TOT tax earlier or TOT, yeah. I think that what – I am not suggesting that the City impose this condition on the organization, nor am I proposing that they allocate money to do that now. What I am asking is that if possible, you think about, just on the sketching level, how you would deal with that different reality if it happens. If suddenly there is ever more space and maybe that – maybe the answer is you won't do anything but you would have another 20-feet of concrete, right?

Mr. Popp: More.

Board Member Furth: Some it might be dedicated back to – the City might give up its dedication because it didn't need that sidewalk anymore. If you are not putting in 50-foot foundations on marble columns, the corner would probably be easy to change later. That is what I am asking, is to think about that may be a different environment that you – that the hotel will operate in, even as a tall building on the Fish Market site is a future environment that is may operate in. Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Did you want me to respond to any of the other questions that came up during the discussion? Some of the question about the sidewalk and the café and noise and meeting space?

Chair Lew: Yeah, I don't think we're – we're fine on time so why don't we go ahead and yeah, if you could, that would be great.

Mr. Popp: In regard to the sidewalk, again this was a comment that came up at DRC. Dave Doctor suggested that we should create a landscape buffer that has the trees between the street and the sidewalk. I tend to agree that aligning the sidewalks seems like a more appropriate choice so we will work with them on that but I appreciate your comments about that. Perhaps the answer is two rows of trees, perhaps the answer is a sidewalk that moves in and out a little bit. We will figure out something that makes it look purposeful because I think that's the end goal. In guard to the café, we are totally committed to that. We think it's a great idea and we'd like to be able to welcome the public in and I thought that your comments about that today were great. Very early in my career, I was kind of the draftsmen on the Borrone's Café and Menlo Center project. The sensitivity to designing a café right on El Camino is challenging but by creating some landscape buffer and I think that the idea of maybe necking down the entrance – the pedestrian entrance will be helpful in that. Giving places to sort of tuck behind a little bit, can make it feel much more comfortable. Control the concerns about acoustics and other things. In regard to the internal organization, certainly, our goal with the meeting space is only to have that available for use of the hotel guests. It's not a public meeting space that will be rented out. It's not a money-making venture for the hotel. It's really just an amenity for the hotel guests and so they are intentionally quite small. I would tell you that the interior organization of the building is the thing that is least baked at this point and so comments about mixing suits and sweats in the lobby and all of those things are well taken and I appreciate that.

Board Member Furth: So, since we have time, with the tearing down of our brutalist high or mid-rise on El Camino, we lost a big public amenity, which was a second-floor garden terrace restaurant.

Mr. Popp: [Bambini's].

Board Member Furth: Right and Peter's thought about a staircase linking to your upper terrace, if that makes any sense in terms of the hotel operations, is enormously attractive to me.

Mr. Popp: I think that's a lovely idea.

Chair Lew: Ok, that's it. Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Thank you very much for your clarity and precision today.

Chair Lew: Great. Ok, so let us move on. Ok, we are going to take a 5-minute break and then we will hear item number four.

4. **QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2755 El Camino Real [16PLN-00464]:** Consideration of a Site and Design Review to Allow the Construction of a New Four-Story Multi-Family Residential Building with 60 Units and one Level of Below-Grade Parking. This project will also require legislative actions that are not subject to ARB review. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: PF (Public Facility). For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Ok, we are ready to item number four; 2755 El Camino Real. Consideration of a site and design review to allow the construction of a new two-story -- four-story – I'm sorry. New four-story, multi-family residential building with 60-units and one level of below-grade parking. This project will also require legislative actions that are not subject to ARB review. Environmental Assessment is an initial study is being prepared pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act and the zone district is public facility. Welcome, we have Claire Hodgkins.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning Board Members, Claire Hodgkins, project planner. I wanted to start out today by providing a brief summary of Council Member comments, as well as a brief summary of last night's Planning and Transportation Commission study session. Key input from Council Member primarily included support for multi-family housing at this location. As well as the idea of higher density and reduced parking. However, comments did vary regarding appropriate floor area ratio, parking ratios, and other design considerations. There was an interest in the idea of a pilot program to allow for this use but with narrow application. Support – they supported the idea of workforce housing but there were a lot of questions on how to best implement that idea. So, last night we had a study session with the Planning and Transportation Commission. Consistent with Council Members, many of the Commissioners expressed interest in the idea of reduced parking requirements and higher density near transit. As well as the idea of providing preference to local works. Multiple Commissioners expressed an interest in both Staff and the applicant further researching developments with similar concepts throughout the Bay Area and beyond. As well as further researching how preferences could be appropriately incorporated and enforced for the project. One Commissioner noted an interest in exploring other services for residents that would help eliminate the need for trips, such as grocery services or laundry services. One Commissioner expressed that mixed-use retail residential would be preferred and asked Staff to explore the idea of requiring the project be fully parked but to open that parking up to other residents in the neighborhood as a paid parking lot. With that, just a quick location map. This project is on the corner of El Camino Real and Page Mill, across from Palo Alto Square. A brief overview of the project, the proposed development includes a four-story building at 50-feet with 60-units and 65 parking spaces are proposed. The project will require a comprehensive plan amendment to address the site and density at – the use of the site and the density that is proposed. It would also require a zoning code text amendment and a zoning map amendment, as well as site and design review. Just quickly on the neighborhood context, there are various different zones and uses surrounding the site. There is senior housing and condominiums to the north and west immediately. Retail and office use to the east and Palo Alto Square across from the site. Just quickly, this is looking at the project from El Camino Real. This is looking across El Camino Real to Palo Alto Square and the Mayfield soccer complex and this is looking across from the site too – across Page Mill Road to the AT&T building. This morning is just a study session seeking preliminary feedback from Board Members. There are several policy considerations that Staff is still evaluating, such as the perimeters of the pilot program, the density standards, basic development standards, land use designations and regulatory and legislative review process. Staff anticipates that formal hearings will start this fall, on the project. Today, the key input that we are asking for from ARB is input on the overall design of the project like massing, materials, articulation, architectural relationships to other improvements in the area and consistency with the outcoming El Camino Real Design Guidelines. With that, I will turn it back.

Chair Lew: Thank you so let's do the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Tod Spieker: Thank you. My name is Tod Spieker with Windy Hill Property Ventures. Thank you, Staff, thank you Board Members for giving our project thoughtful consideration and feedback. Windy Hill Property Ventures is a small Palo Alto-based real estate development company and I am one of three partners. We primarily work in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties with a strong focus on transit-oriented development sites. Within the last year we have entitled and built a transit-oriented project in San Manteo and we have entitled a transit-oriented project in San Carlos. A little bit of history on the VTA site. As Staff mentioned, this was the former VTA site. It was purchased by Pollock Financial in 2014. At the time, they then proposed a primarily office project. As part of the feedback during their pre-screening, seven of the nine Council Members mentioned the either jobs/housing imbalance and the need for more housing or this site being an appropriate location for more housing in Palo Alto. Based on that feedback from Council, Windy Hill and Pollock Financial formed a partnership where Windy Hill would propose to entitle this smaller unit housing project. Last September we had a pre-screening with City Council on whether the majority of members gave positive feedback for a dense housing project on this site. So, what is this project? This is four-story residential project above one level of parking. The building is comprised of 60 studios and 1-bedroom units with an average square footage of 570-sqaure feet. These units are intended for single and some cases double occupancy. These are meant for people

looking for a place to live close to where they work. As mentioned in the Staff report, given that these are small units, by their nature they will be more obtainable than more typical sized 1-bedroom or studio unit in Palo Alto and because of the size of the units, we can fit more within the building envelope and that's specifically helps meet the City's housing goals. The majority of the first floor is raised 4-feet above grade and we did this to provide the ground floor units privacy and alleviate any safety concerns a tenant would have being on the ground floor of an active intersection. This also allows us to make these parts of the pedestrian walkway more pedestrian friendly. The garage is one level, partially underground and access via El Camino. Originally, we proposed 45-parking stalls but based on the feedback from the community and Council Members at our study session, we are now proposing an increase of 20-stalls to 65-stalls; 61 of which are accessed through parking lifts. This comes out to be 1.08 stalls per bedroom, assuming a studio is equal to 1-bedroom. Other newly approved and newly constructed projects are in this same range. As a point of reference, four recently constructed projects in Redwood City; Marston, Franklin 299, Low Cal and Indigo all range from .91 to 1.0 for stalls per bedroom. Two newly constructed projects in Mountain View, Montara, and Carmel the Village, are .81 and 1.00 stalls per bedroom respectively. For bikes, we are showing storage on both the garage level and first floor for a total capacity of 74 bikes. On the ground floor, we have a bike kitchen. This bike kitchen will act as a bike storage location with other bike amenities. In addressing the feedback for ground floor retail, we are open to having the bike kitchen available to the public and possibly leased or given to a Palo Alto-based bike shop where they can sell supplies, advertise and provide their services to the residents, as well as the general public. This site receives a walk score of 83. A walk score is calculated by measuring the proximity to amenities such as grocery stores, restaurants, and other retail, as well as measuring the proximity to transportation options. For a point of reference, the newly constructed apartments called Carmel the Village, located at El Camino and San Antonio Road has a walk score of 79 and the eight-story project on Everett at Cowper Street here in downtown Palo Alto north, has a walk score of 87. We are currently preparing a comprehensive TDM plan and as we continue to refine the plan, we are finding that we are able to affect a substantial reduction in vehicle trips and parking demand with the implementation of the following measures. Caltrain Go Passes and VTA Echo Passes for all residents and unbundled parking. Admitting pricing separately for all parking makes the rent more affordable to those who do not want a car while placing a premium on those who want guaranteed parking in a transit-oriented environment. There are bike parking and a bike kitchen. We will have information kiosks and information boards showing VTA, samTrans, Marguerite Shuttle and Caltrain schedules. We will also have an on-site transportation coordinator. I think this is an important part and it kind of got missed a little bit last night but we are – as part of our proposal, we will be deeding 1,485-square feet of our property along Page Mill Road for a future right-hand turn lane that the City has said that they really want and really need. This will greatly improve the flow of traffic at this intersection. In terms of community benefit, I think this meets those standards. Our environmental approach, we will be building to a lead-silver equivalent. Some of our features are an all-electric building with the exception of water heaters, drought tolerant water light landscaping, electric charging stations, comprehensive robust TDM package and remediation of a contaminated site. Why? Why do we want to build this project in this location at this time? We have heard it 1,000 times, the jobs, housing and balance and that voice is getting louder. For the Cities most recent data, there are 3.05 jobs in the City of Palo Alto per one employed resident. That means on any given day, we have over two people coming outside of Palo Alto into Palo Alto, causing traffic and parking congestion. In 2016, the City of Palo Alto conducted a poll of residents regarding a variety of issues and one of the questions was regarding housing. In 67% of those polls, housing was a problem here in Palo Alto. Obviously, this project will not fix the problem but it can help bring 60 plus people, who are working in Palo Alto, looking for a place to live close to where they work. There are more than 23,000 jobs across the street in the Stanford Research Park; we are looking for 60 of them. Based on that data alone, we are open to giving preference to people currently working or living in Palo Alto as long as we are in compliance with fair housing laws. Now, it was brought up last night, as well as in our City Council study session about the preference for City workers or City employees, teacher housing and based on conversations we have had with our fair housing attorney, that would not be in compliance with fair housing laws. So, as much as we would like to give preference to the Palo Alto teachers and Palo Alto City employees, we simply cannot do that. We are open to further investigating it if it's something that Palo Alto leadership would like us to do. In closing, we feel that we are implementing what Palo Alto leadership has asked for. The CAC and City Council and Planning Commission are working on adopting an

updated Comp. Plan and as part of that Comp. Plan, the City has identified sites with an amenity-rich and transit-proximate areas that would allow for adding up to approximately 5,000 housing units over the next 10-years. Our site is within the area identified in the updated draft of the Comp. Plan. There may be a debate about how much housing Palo Alto should be responsible for the building but there is a consensus that some level of housing is needed so why not here? With a walk score of 83, this is the perfect place for a moderately dense housing project with small units in Palo Alto. I would encourage questions and if I cannot answer them, we have our architect, landscape architect, and structural engineer here to help you answer questions. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much. I don't have any speaker cards for this project so we can move onto Board Member questions or comments. Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Question for Staff. I noticed in the El Camino Real Guidelines section 4.1 calls for a rear daylight plan. Is that shown or considered in this presentation? Am I missing – did I just

Ms. Hodgkins: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: 4.1 of the South El Camino Real Guidelines. It just struck me a fairly significant limitation and I wanted to know if I am misreading the guidelines.

Ms. Hodgkins: (Inaudible) Oh, sorry. I will note specifically that there are very specific guidelines relative to residential uses so I'd have to look at it further to confirm how that applies to this site. I believe that section also references back to code sections if I am not mistaken.

Board Member Baltay: I just – that's what I read so why don't you research it.

Ms. Hodgkins: Ok. We'll look into that. Thank you.

Chair Lew: South El Camino Real Design Guidelines are un-adopted guidelines, right? So, the zoning trumps what's in the guidelines. Jonathan?

Mr. Lait: I believe that to be correct and we do use the guidelines as that, as guidelines to help us evaluate new developments to existing neighborhood context. I will say that this application – excuse me – it's a little bit unique, in that the overlay that is being sought or at least contemplated would allow for consideration of deviation from certain standards. That could include the guidelines but that's part of the dialog that we are having here today, is to sort of understand where that push and pull is with respect to certain development standards that we would typically expect of a development – balanced with the interest in housing.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Where is the nearest on-street parking in relation to this site? I am assuming that there is none on Page Mill, right?

Ms. Hodgkins: There is across the street on Page Mill, there actually is parking right now but as part of improvements – future improvements along Page Mill, that's part of the proposal that the County is looking at. The land dedication for this site would be one part of the process but as part of the improvements to that whole street to allow for the lane, they would actually remove the parking along Page Mill across the street from this site. Right now, that is the – I would say that's the closest parking. There are other residential areas to the – I believe it's to the north...(crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Ms. Hodgkins: ...of the site but recently the City passed the RPP program for, I believe it was the evergreen and this site is not included as part of that RPP. So, residents at this site would not be able to obtain passes or permits.

Board Member Furth: What about in the adjacent buildings, the existing condominiums?

Ms. Hodgkins: Say that one more time?

Board Member Furth: The folks in the condominium – sorry, I didn't get the addresses but immediately bay-way along Page Mill, they would be able to participate in that?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes. I believe so.

Board Member Furth: So, there is no parking along either frontage of this – no public parking along either frontage of this building?

Ms. Hodgkins: Correct.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Through the Chair, would it be possible to have the applicant explain in more detail how this City lift, triple stacking parking device works?

Chair Lew: Yes, and I am also curious as to how the bike racks work too.

Mr. Spieker: I'll let my architect answer the question on the bike racks but I don't have – we are working with David [Lacoco] at Archery Designs. He is not here today and he's helping the City of Palo Alto numerous times. He's helped multiple Cities up and down the peninsula so basically in the center – I can go to – I can't figure out how to do it but if you go to the garage, the stackers in the center are triple stackers and the stackers along – I can do it now? The stackers along the wall over the driveway is our double stackers and so basically, it's the puzzle system. There is always one opening so you never – it's not a tandem where – some people get confused where you have to have one car back out, the other to come down and then back out. This is not that so anybody at any time can come and get their car and whether they are a resident or whether they are a guest.

Board Member Baltay: Perhaps just explain – I am pretty dense on this. How does it work when you have the car in the very back corner there, which is blocked from even the roadway by another car and it's stacked up somehow? Just explain it to us on how it works?

Mr. Spieker: You have – the triple stackers you have three. One above grade, one kind of below grade and one kind of at grade if you are talking about the garage at grade. So, you always have one opening so wherever that one opening is, you shift the cars over and you are able to bring it down and pull it out of any of the grade level spots.

Chair Lew: I think what Peter is asking is how does it work with the tandem stackers you've got?

Mr. Spieker: There are no tandem stackers. These are all the puzzle system, meaning...

Chair Lew: No, I understand that but you've got them back to back. You are going through a lift to get to another lift.

Mr. Spieker: I am going to let Ian take this over and maybe he can answer better than I can.

Mr. Ian Murphy: Yeah, I apologize, it's hard to tell from the plan but in every planned row, as Todd was saying, there is one stall that's left empty and they work in unison with each other. So those rows – those that are left empty will actually line up to allow someone to access a car in the back row, to get their car out and pull it through the empty row ahead of it. Basically, it creates a situation where you don't have to give two stalls to one unit. Everyone can have one stall and they are all accessible at the same time and the key is that both row kind of shift with knowledge of the other row. I am not sure if that helps a ton.

Board Member Furth: So, it's like moving stacks in libraries.

Mr. Lait: Chair...

Mr. Murphy: It's very similar to that, yeah.

Mr. Lait: I just have a question based on that actually if you don't mind me asking a question? I thought I heard what you said was if you have one of these spaces that are sort of in the front, do you – does the person have to walk through the one opening to access the car and then drive through the lift – the empty lift to exit or is it presented right at the first bank of cars?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, the lifts are constructed in such a way that they have walkways built into them so if your car is the back row, you are walking through the opening in the front row to pull your car out.

Chair Lew: Can...

Board Member Baltay: I think I understand, thank you.

Chair Lew: On – I guess when you go forward in the next – if you come through with a formal hearing, I do want – I would want to see more information on the lifts and the height in the – in your garage because my understanding of the lifts is that the heights can vary but also that clearance – the walking clearance between – in the lift also gets reduced when you squish the lifts down. Also, I do understand...

Mr. Murphy: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: ...just let me finish my thought. That some lifts have weight capacities and restrictions on the type of cars that can be used on the lifts and so we would want all – I think from the City's point of view, we would want to know what limits, if any, are on the system that you are selecting.

Mr. Spieker: I think the City has adopted an ordinance for parking lifts and height, weight and I'm pretty sure we are compliant with those. We did this for Staff but we are happy to do it for you too and having Archery come in and give you a presentation on kind of what we are doing so we are happy to do that.

Chair Lew: Ok, that would be great because the new ordinance is very new, it was in March?

Mr. Spieker: Very new.

Chair Lew: I think it was during March so that would – it would be useful. Then did you have any – then on the bike parking, I wasn't quite sure how that works? I have not seen that before.

Mr. Murphy: Yeah, so our office, BDE, does a ton of market rate apartment buildings all across the Bay area; Sunny Vale and Santa Clara and San Jose and so forth. These are pretty much the universal systems that are being used in most of those apartments. It's double height and the top row of bikes has a trough that the wheels go in that pulls down and is mechanically operated in such that you lock your bike in, then your bike pushes up and it's stored one bike on top of another. It allows us to get a much higher density of bikes, without having anyone having to heave a bike up.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne, please.

Board Member Furth: After recent back surgery, a member of my household had a 10lbs lifting limit. Could they use this?

Mr. Murphy: I am not sure the exact lifting limit would be because it would be dependent upon the bike but I think in the case of someone that has a special injury that caused that, there is a row -- 50% of the bikes are on the lowest level as well. Having used them many times myself, it's very easy to load a bike onto the top rack and kind of push it up.

Board Member Furth: I'll be interested in knowing universal aspect – universal access aspect of this part of your project – I mean universal design.

Mr. Murphy: Ok.

Board Member Furth: Compatibility.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Maybe just adding on to this whole bicycle thing. I may be kind of a stupid question but could you just lead me through that let's say I get up, I get on my bike at the Caltrain station after work and I am biking home. How do I get to the bicycle parking?

Mr. Murphy: We have two primary bike parking areas per resident. One would be sort of proximal to the bike kitchen, right off the entry. So, you would roll your bike right in and lift it onto the – roll it into one of these stacking racks, lock it up and then immediately head to your unit. Alternatively, you would roll into the elevator, go to the garage level and...

Vice Chair Kim: So how do I access that elevator? Do I go through the bike shop or the just the main lobby?

Mr. Murphy: Yeah, just the primary entry lobby.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, so I go through the mail lobby, go through the corridor into the elevator and then down?

Mr. Murphy: Yep and then when you come out to the elevator the bike room is down a short corridor to the side of the garage elevator lobby area.

Vice Chair Kim: You would always be taking the elevator as opposed to the garage access room?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, we would want to avoid people riding their bikes down the ramp.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Mr. Murphy: I think that would be a – part of the management of the building to avoid doing that.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, then while we are on the topic of the ramp, is that truly a 22% slope?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, and this has been figured out in conjunction with providing the best stacking racks, kind of to some earlier questions. To provide the height for those stackers with the most amount of cars, we think that we would be providing a 22% ramp.

Vice Chair Kim: Are there transitions to this ramp that are being thought of or is there a section through the garage ramp at all?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, there should be a section through the garage ramp in the package that was provided to Staff and there are 10-foot transitions at half the percentage on either side of the ramp.

Chair Lew: So, I did want to bring this up later, is that the table of contents does not reflect what's in the drawing set, unfortunately. So, things that say building sections are actually just details and then things like the site lighting plan are miss numbered, just in terms of page numbers. I didn't see – I was looking for a section and I didn't see a section. It was just...

Male: Thank you.

Chair Lew: ...on the – yeah. Well, the bike parking is in there but yeah, the page numbers are off.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, I am done. Thank you.

Board Member Furth: So, take a different hypothetical, I am bicycling over there to have a dinner with a friend so I am not a resident, where do I park and how do I get there on my bike?

Mr. Murphy: In the covered outdoor area, we are currently showing eight short-term parking stalls so...

Board Member Furth: This is like sheet LO?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, that's one of the sheets where it will be risible is the landscape – the illustrative landscape plan. Directly behind a bank of planters, near the main entry to the building, we have eight short-term parking stalls that would primarily be meant to serve guests visiting friends or family.

Board Member Furth: So, there is actually a very small doorway into the lobby or am I missing the doorway into the lobby?

Mr. Murphy: The doorway to the lobby is directly opposite the bike racks – the short-term bike racks.

Board Member Furth: And it faces Page Mill?

Mr. Murphy: Yes.

Board Member Furth: That's a very small door for an entry.

Chair Lew: I have a question for you. So, the outdoor – the common outdoor space is on the podium so that's 4-feet up and so what is happening on the adjacent properties? They have open space along that shared property – along the shared property lines but I haven't seen it. I haven't gone – it's all fenced off so I haven't been able to go back there and look but do you know what's there or if we don't know, can we document it in your formal application?

Mr. Murphy: Yeah

Chair Lew: Just to see what actually are those spaces and what landscaping is there?

Mr. Murphy: Yeah, we can look at that in more depth. We've done some landscape sections to kind of talk about the screening elements that would not hamper too much of the visual presence of the building but would kind of separate the use of our podium. In the landscape package, there should be a couple but we can provide more information in the formal application.

Board Member Baltay: I did look into that question, Alex and the building just to the north of this along El Camino, there is quite a nice outdoor garden at grade. A sitting area, a planting little – this...

Chair Lew: You are saying the senior housing?

Board Member Baltay: I think it's the senior housing. This space right here.

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: There's quite a bit of nice outdoor seating area that appears to be well used and I'll note that it is at grade.

Chair Lew: Ok, so let's move onto comments. Anybody want to go first? Wynne, thank you.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. The first that I did this morning was get up and read the chronical where the neighborhood was resisting a developer attempt to increase the parking ratio at 1 Oak from .25 to .45 so parking debates come in all forms and sizes. With respect to this particular project and this particular place, it is lovely to see a proposal for (inaudible). I can imagine a very successful small unit project here. I am old enough so these units don't seem that small. I don't think it's there yet and I certainly hope that it can get there. I'll do my rant about the public comments later but I will note that Palo Alto Forward had a really interesting workshop where they retired Santa Clara County Official a couple years ago. He said he was all in favor of the City maintaining its zoning and up zoning when it was worth it's while and this is certainly a case where one would hope a development agreement would make this actually function as intended because I think it's quite clear that the market multiple constrained by tax policy, zoning regulations and most of all, the distribution of income and wealth is not going to deliver workforce housing just by building smaller units. There is way too much leakage in (inaudible), Airbnb, Third Houses but that's not something that we need to solve. We need to see how we can make this project work for itself and the neighbors. I generally like the design, at least as depicted. I know we like corner statements but I actually think this looks like a corner statement this entry way. I am disturbed by that skinny little doorway. Maybe I am miss reading the plans but how am I getting my bicycle through there? Particularly my bicycle with the child trailer behind it and if not, where? I am concerned about podium level for the ground floor. I am mostly – for a couple reasons. Sunrise, which is just to the north, what is that use? It's skilled nursing, isn't it?

Ms. Hodgkins: No, sorry, Silverwood I believe is the senior housing. The other adjacent use is I believe just condos.

Board Member Furth: Sunrise is not just condos, it's either assistant living or skilled nursing. (crosstalk)

Ms. Hodgkins: Silverwood condos and Sunrise – yeah.

Board Member Furth: I think we need to check because I think – I suspect that somebody knows.

Mr. Spieker: Sunrise is an assisted living facility.

Board Member Furth: Right, thank you so part of my point there is that people who live there may be more likely to spend more time in their homes than other people. So, light and air is more important for those units than for anywhere so I appreciate the way the design pulls back but I am concerned about how this actually delivers. This is more or less their southernness exposure so not casting them into shadow too much is important. I am also concerned about how a 4-foot grade differential and outdoor space would keep – would not turn their outdoor living area into a kind of depressing hole. I have similar concerns for the condos to the other side about light and air. How much up-zoning is involved in terms of density and height limits with this – if it's changed from PF to this new zone? In other words, how much bigger of a building would we be talking about, than they might have reasonably expected under the old zoning?

Mr. Lait: The PF zoning doesn't allow for this kind of use so...

Board Member Furth: I understand that but I am talking about building mass. What's the FAR?

Mr. Lait: We have a chart on that I think.

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry. Yeah?

Mr. Spieker: So, the highest density zoning currently in Palo Alto RM40.

Board Member Furth: No, I was just asking what PF allows.

Mr. Spieker: Oh, ok.

Board Member Furth: Sorry, my – sort of in a roundabout way, what I am trying to get to is that we don't expect that a parking lot if going to stay a parking lot. That's not a reasonable expectation but you might expect it to be developed consistent with zoning and if the existing zoning would allow 2.0 FAR and similar occlusion of light, then that's going to be something I think about when thinking about what this building needs to do to address adverse impacts on adjacent properties.

Ms. Hodgkins: It's a one to one far for PF zoning.

Board Member Furth: So, this is more than double? Thank you. Although this is targeted towards workforce housing, I think it's important that it also be housing that is accessible to a wide range of workers and that means not assuming that everybody is physically fit and 35 or 25. One of the things that I wanted to know is – I wanted to think about is that commute trips are important in terms of TDM but really – what we really notice of late is that there is great congestion all day long so that errand running becomes more difficult. When I look at this project, I think if I have a friend who can only come to visit me in a car, where would that person park? If that person uses Lift or another ride service, where is the drop-off and pick-up point? When a household employee comes to work on my house, where do they park? When somebody – when a visiting physical therapist comes, where do they park? I had wondered when I saw this very intricate and elegant parking lot, whether it requires an attendant? I mean I am most concerned actually about the pick-up/drop off aspects because I can imagine that a lot of people on this site would be making use of ride – car services, ride sharing services when they weren't making use of bikes, pedestrian access or transit. I don't think they are going to be able to operate without a drop-off/pick-up point and I am not clear where that is yet. I am also – I use to spend a lot of - my job uses to involve negotiating plan – negotiating development agreements for restricted housing developments and I know it's complicated and I think we have no idea where the federal government is going on this issue but we still have our State government. There is this tension between not creating restrictions that exacerbate racial segregation on the one hand and certainly limited local preferences that are allowed. I mean I think it's interesting to contrast this with what Stanford is doing. They just signed a Master Lease and leased up a whole apartment building and that's how they got employee housing. There are mechanisms within a whole bunch of results can be achieved but I am glad that is not our problem. Looking at the, what we might call strictly design issues, my concerns are not blighting the residents at Sunrise, having reasonable light and air for the adjacent property owners on Page Mill, having good places for drop off and pick up and thinking about non-commute trips. I am also concerned about ground floor units along Page Mill and I am not sure the 4-foot rise works. I am so sad that we are widening the road there and further constraining this site because I think what the adjacent site has done with respect to Page Mill works very well. Thank you.

Ms. Hodgkins: Can I just get clarification? You mentioned the 4-foot and you are not sure if it works. Are you thinking that it needs to be lower or higher?

Board Member Furth: Lower. I mean generally – I mean if you have watched us recently, we have been asking that podium parking be reduced to ground level because of the way that it interacts with the street. This – these are highly unusual streets but you also have this direct access with the garden portion of Sunrise and I am not really saying what the solution should be but the idea that it goes up 4-feet isn't – it may or may not be optimal. It's a potential problem if I am reading the plans right.

Chair Lew: Ok, Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I am going to pick right up where Wynne left off. If you turn to sheet LO, landscaping plan, you will see the – at least three apartments have balconies which are within a foot of the sidewalk. Am I reading that, right? All be it, they are 4-feet higher than the sidewalk but that's very uncomfortable and I am afraid you just need a bigger buffer for those units. Page Mill is one of the busiest streets in town. This is probably the busiest intersection in town. I couldn't even drive out to the parking lot yesterday because there was so much traffic. To have an apartment right there like that just doesn't work. If you proceed along Page Mill just a little bit, the adjacent – I think we are calling it Sunrise unit has a very broad sidewalk, which is somehow nicely landscaped in a way that it feels comfortable to walk on the sidewalk and the units – the housing behind it feel shielded somehow. I just think it's incumbent upon you to do that, in order for housing to work on this corner. I am not going to dive into whether or not there should be housing there. That is a political question that the Council will answer but if there is to be housing on the busiest intersection in town, you've got to allot more work to make it comfortable, appropriate housing. You can't just have a balcony a foot from a sidewalk. The second comment has to do with your podium design and I think that while you do need to raise the housing somewhat off the grade level, that's what it's going to take to make it work. Maybe not 4-feet but something, your open space on the other hand needs to be at grade. I think the way that you've got it with a raised 4-foot terrace patio outdoor area in the back will result in you looking down upon the senior citizen's next door who are 4-feet below you or they are going to have a 10-foot fence to get some privacy; it just doesn't work. You have got to be at grade with the landscaping next to them, which comes around to big issues with your parking lot underneath it. How do you get any kind of landscaping there and whatnot but I do think that the way you have it – again, a 4-foot podium for open space in the back will sort of tower over your neighbors in a very unpleasant way; you just have to do something better than that. I find the bicycle parking – I hear you say you've designed more buildings like this but this bike parking just seems to me to be ridiculous. To come home, to squeeze through a door, to go down an elevator, to squiggle around a hallway to get my bike parked. I am just going to ride down the ramp until somebody gets hit by a car. You've just created a very dangerous situation by trying to stick all this parking down in the back of the basement. I mean surely you can do better, bicycles aren't that large. Secondly, all the other – the guest parking, the eight spots for 60 apartments is right next to the front door. I mean it's right there in your face as you walk in and out. It really feels like some engineer just didn't really think about – who doesn't ride bicycles, didn't think about it. It's just not acceptable. This is a town where everybody is riding bikes or bike racks are routinely full up and you have eight spots for all the guests in this apartment and that – those are the eight spots that everybody is going to park in because nobody wants to haul their way through an elevator down to the garage. Some person doing this late at night and it becomes a security risk. I mean I can go on and on and on but you have got to think it through better than that. I find that the automobile parking – well, let me preface this, it is a political and planning question of how many parking spaces you would need? I don't think it's appropriate for us to even weigh into what that number is. I think it's very appropriate for us to say that whatever number of parking spaces you have, they have to work. They have to be functional, they have to be useful and what you have presented to me, I believe does not work in the least. To have this tandem stacked parking arrangement is something that you are really going to need to be experienced and trained to use this machinery to function in. To expect me to walk through one lift to another, maybe I am late, maybe I have groceries. I think it's a joke. I mean the code now that we've passed allows for mechanical parking to be used to augment the parking arrangement. It doesn't mean the whole thing can be a Lego garage stacked full of cars and that's what you have designed here. I am afraid that I think you've just – you need two stories of parking. You need to have some regular parking places because Wynne so carefully pointed out, all the other functions of people coming to visit, people coming to service, people coming to drop off groceries or whatever it is, you don't have any of that. It just doesn't work. I am afraid that you're parking as proposed doesn't cut it. Same thing applies to – again, where does the Uber driver pull off? Where do I stop just to do anything here? Again, just yesterday going to visit the site, it was tricky just to figure out how to get in and where to go? It's a very busy intersection. You have bit off a challenging, challenging site and you are proposing something that overall is a good use for the City. The housing is a good thing there but you've got to address these issues. When I look at

the bulk of the building I feel that -- again, it just feels too tall relative to the buildings next to it. Both of those, senior housing center and the Sunrise facility, have much more residential looking sloped roofs stepped down some. I think your choice of style is fine to be a more contemporary style but you've got to at least architecturally say hey, I see that you've got a cap on your building. I don't know what you are thinking because right now you have a four-story blank wall with three windows punctuating it, next to this basic roof form. I mean that's architecture 101, you don't do that. You respect the neighborhood, you build with it, you match -- you build lines across it. These are things straight out of the design guidelines but they are also straight out of basic design principles. I think what you are looking at is a building that probably should be more like three-stories for the bulk and maybe four stories at the corner where you want to mark the entrance a little bit more. What I see now is lacking the top, the cap, the roof, that third part of what a building needs to have. Especially along El Camino with these design guidelines and more so when you have these adjacent buildings which are so clearly having a roof and residential looking. I have said all this fairly forcefully because it leads me to conclude that you are just trying to fit too much onto this site and it's not too much FAR or too many apartments. I support high density but this is too much. You don't have enough parking, you haven't addressed the bicycles, the massing on the exterior is just too big and it doesn't fit. So, I think you need to -- I'm afraid but go back to the drawing board and just pair down what you are trying to fit on the site. Really resolve some of these functional parking issues. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: So, yeah, I applaud your attempt at trying to squeeze as many units as you can onto this lot. I think it's a pretty funny thing in several aspects. One is to call it multi-family housing is kind of funny in my regard because they are mostly single occupancy, double occupancy at the most so they are more like multi-people housing than multi-family housing. You are not going to have very many families larger than one or two people. Also, City Council's comments that they really want this housing to be Palo Alto focused is a good comment but it's also kind of ironic that we're talking about this being a TDM, which is transit-oriented development. So, it's close to Caltrains and it's close to bus lines but if people living here are really working in Palo Alto, I don't think they are going to be taking Caltrains. They are not going to be taking the bus. They are going to be bicycling or driving or perhaps walking. There are several things that we're trying to do that is best for the environment and best for the City but at the same time, it goes against some of the other elements that we have to think about. Again, I applauded the attempt at trying to squeeze as many units and I think even though there are some problems with parking and other concerns as far as circulation, I think it's great that you are trying it at least. Obviously, you are going to try to work out these kinks and issues but to add onto some of the concerns that I have, the 22% ramp slope really concerns me. When I was doing similar project, 20% slope was considered the max and even that was pretty tough. To be able to get 22% with your transitions, I'd like to see it in a building section. Again, we didn't get that in our packet but I guess you have that so I look forward to seeing that and seeing how that works. That also leads to things like the trash. It's nice that you have this trash chute throughout the four stories of the building but once that trash goes down there, who is taking it out and how does it get out? I think the ramp is too steep of a slope to be able to roll any kind of carts and if you have to use the elevator, I think that just causes a kind of mess. Again, even if you go up the elevator, you're caught at that small single door as the main entry to your building. Then the elevator, you've got 60 units and just a single elevator and that concerns me. What happens when the elevator is out? If the elevator is out, then none of your units except for one is really accessible because you have to go through those stairs to go up the 4-feet. Looking at the building from a site perspective, I think, to me at least, this is kind of gateway to Palo Alto. I know that you are not crossing the City borderline here but once you get off 280 and you're coming down Page Mill through Stanford Research Park, to me this is really the big intersection where it says that you have arrived at Palo Alto. I think your building is fairly good looking but I think you could do a little bit more and I think you could make a little bit more of a statement to say hey, this is Palo Alto now. As I look around the building to where your building neighbors the others, I think the sunrise transition works a little bit better than it does with the other one on Page Mill as it goes to the condominiums. I think that space between buildings becomes a little -- maybe even a little bit dangerous. I think it can become a dark, middle ground between the buildings and I just don't see anybody who would want to go up those steps to be able to access that

shared open space. As you are going up those steps, then you've got this exhaust fan and to me on the elevations, it looks like the exhaust fan actually goes up to the second floor but on your floor plans, you only show it on the first floor. From an elevational standpoint, it's not the best-looking thing there and I think it really turns people off from wanting to use that corridor to get into the open space. Some other things are like the planters and just the pedestrian streetscape as you are walking around this building, both on Page Mill and El Camino Real. I realize it's a busy intersection but I think there could be a little bit more done to encourage people to walk by your building and to experience it and maybe take a little break and sit down. I know there is a big lunch crowd that crosses the intersection so wouldn't it be nice to create an area along Page Mill and even El Camino, besides your main entry point, where people can take a seat and relax a little bit. There was talk about drop off and pick up, I was thinking Door Dash is a great new service that a lot of people utilize and I think a lot of people that live in these kinds of units would use it but where does the Door Dash person stop and give you a call? Where are you supposed to meet them to pick up your food? Then, I think the common open space is a problem to me. It's just in the shade and it's between two tall buildings. I am wondering if there is any flexibility to be able to move that somewhere else; maybe the roof even? I know that there are some height restrictions with elevators having to stop perhaps at that 50-foot point. Maybe there is a DEE that we can incorporate into the project but I think it's just kind of a waste. The neighboring properties have these sloped rooves and it doesn't make sense to have a roof deck but I think here, where you are going with the contemporary approach with a flat roof, I think it just makes sense to be able to offer some kind of a roof deck or roof common open space. It doesn't have to extend to the edges of the building, maybe it's a smaller area but it just feels like a waste not to have anything up there at all; other than the cooling units that you are showing. Overall, again, I applaud you for trying to squeeze in as many units as you are trying to do. I think the approach, the look – the overall concept and look of the building is not bad. I think it can be a little bit more massaged. I think there are some larger corner elements where you have the darker brown stucco, I think it is. That maybe could be divided a little bit more but I am very excited for the project and I hope it can – I hope we can maintain the amount of units that you are proposing and somehow find a solution to parking and the other aspects of common open space and so on and so forth. I hope we can make it work and thanks for your attempt and I look forward to a formal application and formal hearing of this project.

Chair Lew: Thank you for your presentation and I just want to say that I've lived in a lot of different Cities. I lived in New York City and Rock Ridge and Berkeley and Oakland and Palo Alto and Mountain View and Palo Alto is just, to me, is like hopelessly suburban minded. We really need to get on board and move forward. There are lots of people who come to Council meetings in Mountain View asking for this type of housing and I imagine that they are here in Palo Alto too. They are just – they haven't really been coming out that much to the ARB meetings but people want – there are people that want this type of housing and it's just embarrassing that we don't really have any zoning that fits this particular type of use. I think we just have to – we're going to have to just plug away at it. I've worked on projects nearby, in Stanford, that have 150 units with one elevator. They're 300-square foot studio apartments for grad. students and some of the grad. students think that those 300-square feet are so much that they could add a roommate illegally, into the 300-square feet. So, they are different – people have different standards and I think a lot of times we have a – in Palo Alto, we get single-family house owner mindset about housing and parking but it seems to be that we should be open to more different types of living and parking. I've seen projects in Berkeley that have 100% lifts – puzzle lifts and I think in Berkeley, it works because they have unbundled parking, I think for all new projects as I recall. Generally, here in Palo Alto, we're still sort of set on our suburban parking standards. I am open to the unbundled parking. It seems to me that we should – I don't know, I guess I would hope that we would consider it in a Comp. Plan update. The – I am generally supportive of the design of the building. It seems to me that the Staff mentioned maybe making a transition to the neighboring buildings with the roof like maybe a sloped roof or some sort of alternate. I would say that the El Camino Design Guidelines sort of encourage you to do a flat roof. I think would argue that the context is more important and to make some sort of transition to the – I think I share Kyu's concerns about the open space being in shade mostly, just given the solar orientation. I am also concerned that it's 4-feet higher than the neighbors and so I do want to see more information about that. I also share Peter's concern about the units – the ground floor units facing Page Mill Road. I mean, in my mind you could make a better – there could be more design articulation at –

from the sidewalk level up to the first-floor window height. I think you are just showing it blank at the moment but that could be designed well. Also, with regards to the ground floor units, you know Mountain View has been building them on El Camino and I have really mixed feelings about them. I think we should debate – yeah, we should just debate that and the setbacks and the amount of landscaping and open space along the sidewalk. My take on it from living in New York City is that the 4-feet is good. I wouldn't go – I don't think I would go lower than that so that's a tough one. I mean I would say that's the traditional way it's done on the East Coast and also even in the mid-west. When I lived in the mid-west, even just regular houses were built 4-feet above grade. You had a half of flight of stairs just to get into your house and actually, in my mind, it actually made the City more – I don't know if I would call it urban. It's just more stately, it's more vertical orientation, it's more civic I guess I would say. I also do share other previous comments about visitor parking and service deliveries. You may be able to – in some of the projects that I have worked on, we've done exterior staircases with a roof so it's covered but it allows you to have a glass – if I recall the code correctly, it allows you to have a glass door at the end of the hallway, instead of having a solid door. There is a code – it's a very tricky code thing and it depends on how the stair are designed but having the light at the ends of each – of – at the end of each corridor makes a huge difference just in terms of being in the unit – walking through the building. I also would encourage you to do the roof deck. The roof deck has been a controversial issue on a lot of projects in town so I think you really have to be careful about that but it seems to me that you have a beautiful view opportunity to the foothills. We have hotels on El Camino that have pool roof decks up there and the views are really fabulous so it seems to me to be a missed opportunity. Also, on the El Camino Design Guidelines, it does call for a recessed window or trimmed windows and I think some of the drawings are showing flush. I think some of the details show a 2-inch recess and generally, I think more is better. We have some hotels that have 8-inch or 12-inch recessed windows and I realize that eats up a lot of space and it can be expensive but more is better. I think that is all that I have. That's all that I have on this but generally, I am supportive of the project. So, we have follow-up comments, yes?

Board Member Furth: Could – I am having trouble figuring out the entry to the building. I am looking at sheet eight, floor one plan, so I actually walk in, turn right through the bikes and then go through the – how does this work? I must be misreading this.

Ms. Hodgkins: I believe there are two different doors. There's the door to the bike area and then there is a separate door to the main lobby.

Board Member Furth: Closer to the driveway? Is that it?

Ms. Hodgkins: No, no, not closer to the driveway but further in on Page Mill.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so you enter in the main lobby? Careful with the spelling, yes? Ok.

Chair Lew: I have a thought on this but we had that 800 –801 Alma affordable housing project and at the time one of the Council Member's – this is a Yoriko Kishimoto, she had actually wanted all of the bike parking at grade. She didn't get it but in a bike room so it's like losing a unit but I would just put it out there for consideration and that we lose a unit so that all the bike parking is convenient. It makes a huge difference because go down through the – when you are trying to go get the – when I – I am bicycling more than most but the logistics of going down to the basement from your unit, getting the bike, going back up and out or whatever, it's enough to make you just say oh, I'll just hop in the car. In this particular project, getting the car out, you have to go through the lifts so it's maybe a wash. We will see.

Board Member Furth: On that same topic, I mean I am always unloading and loading groceries or whatever from my bike basket so I really want a place where I can pause and do that and not put it down on a dirty floor. Then this always comes up but if you have people with a child, you are going to have somebody with a bike trailer. There should at least be one space for that person.

Chair Lew: Can I also – I just also want to add to that there was a comment – I think somebody commented that these are small units and they are mostly for single people but I have to tell you, the

way the prices are now -- I am a landlord. I have a tenant who makes over \$100,000 a year and she lives in a 1-bedroom apartment because – and she has a kid. She is a divorced woman and that's just the way the economics are today and the rents are crazy high and salaries are high too but it just doesn't go very far in this location. Ok, thank you, guys. Do you have any follow-up?

Vice Chair Kim: On other closing comment?

Chair Lew: Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: It's not a big deal but just when it comes back and especially when it goes to Council, there is just a couple spelling errors that I saw and I would just clean those up so that those don't...

Mr. Spieker: Yeah, thank you. Only one more comment that I would just say is that I think this term – because it was on the front page of the Daily Post when we started it but these are micro-housing units. These are not micro-housing units. These are – I mean the studios are over 400-square feet; in the high 400s and the 1-bedrooms are over 600-square feet. I think these are – if you look at a 1960's and 70's constructed building, these are virtually very similar in size. So, when you hear micro-housing, it's like 250-350-square feet. This is not that so while they are smaller than what is allowed in typical multi-family zoning in Palo Alto, they are still bigger than what you typically see in inventory. Dually noted on the bike parking and we will work on that so thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. We look forward to seeing this come forward.

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Are we ready to go onto the next item or do we need to take a break for them to get set up? Ok, we're going to take a 2-minute break and then we will hear – what? 2-minutes break, right? Just to get them set up and then we'll hear the last item on the agenda.

Action Items

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 567 Maybell Avenue [15PLN-00248]:**
Recommendation on the Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of Four Single-Family Residences and Construction of 16 two-Story Single-Family Residences With Basements. Environmental Assessment: Consistent with Previously Adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project. Zoning Districts: R-2 and RM-15. For More Information, Please Contact Contract Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us

Chair Lew: Public hearing on a quasi-judicial matter for 567 Maybell Avenue. Recommendation on the applicant's request for approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow demolition of four single-family residences and construction of 16, Two-story single-family residences with basements. Environmental assessment is that it's consistent with previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project and the zoning districts are R-2 and RM-15. We have Sheldon Ah Sing, our Project Planner, welcome.

Mr. Lait: You know, Chair, maybe before Sheldon speaks I think it might be a better protocol for us to have the disclosures before we get into our presentation so we don't forget about it. So, if there are any ex-party communications that the Board Members want to share.

Chair Lew: I don't think we have any.

Mr. Ah Sing: Ok, thank you. I prepared a PowerPoint presentation and the applicant also has one that goes into much more detail about some of the changes that they have done since the previous meeting. Thank you for the good introduction about the project. Just to remind the Board about the previous meetings, there was an approval already of a tentative map last year that kind of set the stage for the subdivision itself. The applicant has since filed for a final map and following up with that. Then, of

course, we had the previous formal ARB meeting back in April and at that time, the Board had a number of comments for the applicant and just kind of running through those and summarize those. There was one about parking, about the amount of guest parking and parking within a private street area. Then just to kind of summarize that, again the project did have an approved tentative map and that map did – it was consistent with the City's private street requirements and so this project was designed to the private street width. Also with the setback to include the driveways that would have guest parking so we will have a diagram on that later in my slides. There weren't any changes to the plans in response to that but just as stated in the Staff report, that the project is consistent with the City's requirements there. There were some comments about that the plans needed more information to help with the evaluation from the Board so the revised plans do show separate floor plans and some clarity to identify the lots. Also, other information was updated and you can tell that the plan set is much more robust. There was a comment about the covered patios and the depth of the covered patios. There was a minor change to that but I think we do believe that was a step forward and to hear from the Board to hear whether or not that was sufficient. There were also some changes with respect to the garage and driveways along Maybell. All the garages are front facing and there is no side entry type of garages. Then there was a comment about the design being kind of complicated so I think that as you hear in the applicant's presentation that they streamlined some of the design aspects of the project, reduced the amount of stone, and simplified the color pallet for instance. Then there was also a comment lastly about privacy and there was an exhibit about what windows may affect the neighbors and we can go into more detail. If there needs to be a condition of approval regarding obscured glazing with that respect. (Inaudible) the site plan and as mentioned, that all the garages along Maybell are now front facing and that's really the biggest, I think, site change that you will notice there on that. In respect to the parking, this exhibit shows the required parking, there in blue is the one uncovered space and then the covered space. Then you have the cars that are on the driveway and those are in pink and those would be for the guest parking. If a delivery truck comes in the middle of the day, that really is temporary and it shouldn't really effect the circulation on that street and within the neighborhood. Then these are some of the elevations showing just a variety of architecture that is being provided and again, the architect will present some of the changes that they have done and we believe that they are adequate. With that conclusion, the project complies with the objective development standards set forth in the City's zoning code. The ARB did identify a number of issues previously at the last meeting and those concerns, we believe, had been adequately addressed in the proposal. With that, we do have a recommendation that the Board recommends approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Sheldon. We have – the applicant will have 10-minutes for their presentation.

Mr. Ted O'Hanlon: Thank you, Board, we are very pleased to be back here. It's been 4-months since February and we're hoping that we've provided you guys what you need.

Chair Lew: Can you just state your name for our records, please.

Mr. O'Hanlon: Of course, my name is Ted O'Hanlon and I am a consulting project manager for the owners Golden Gate Homes. I have been involved in the project for 3-years now, as a matter, a fact and I am going to hand this over to our lead architect but I did want to speak to something. We just want to make sure that is our clear and in the open and that is related to parking on the site. Sheldon recognized that in his with the exhibit, which is A-0.5C, which shows that these aren't homes with aprons and really no driveways. They will provide a level of guest parking in and of themselves. It remains to be seen what the 26-foot wide street will provide and where red striping or no parking signs might be at the requirement of the fire marshal but in any event, the homes do provide a nice chunk of real estate for (inaudible) cars. We're a little bit defensive about the issue and it took us a long time to get here. The tentative map that was approved last year was a combination of collaborating with two different neighborhoods that were very sensitive to how these 16 homes were going to approach their houses. That is how we ended up with that 5 11 combo and we tasked Studio S Squared and said, this is a little bit different. Here is your tentative map and those are the lines, don't color outside from them and don't

try to maneuver them. Maybe we can move a tree or two but you really need to respect this to its greatest degree so, at this juncture, that's really what we are hoping that ARB will see that through. Eugene is going to take you through all the changes between February and now. Thank you so much.

Mr. Eugene Sakai: Thanks, Ted; Eugene Sakai, Studio S Squared Architecture. I want to thank, first of all, Sheldon, for working closely with me and my firm and helping to distill the ARB's comments from the last hearing. As we went through in detail and looked at them with respect to each unit, we found that they were very sound comments and ultimately walked away with a profound appreciation for our thoughts from last time. With 16 individual designs to through, I am going to have a hard time covering all the changes to the respective units in this approximately 6 or 7 minutes that I have got left. I will race through as many as I can and I'll try to highlight kind of the overview of the changes and Sheldon touched on some of those earlier. Basically, what we tried to take was an approach of an overall simplification. Simplification in roof lines, simplification in color palettes, simplification in materials, window forms, even trim details, railings, going – really drilling down to the level of detail that I think your comments warranted. We also tried to eliminate, as I mentioned, stone, which we had probably a little bit of an overabundance of. I mentioned color changes and window changes. There was a comment from the community regarding rooftop views and what they would see from their units looking down onto the project, which we hadn't really carefully considered. So, where we do have low sloped roofs with basically a single plan membrane, those will now be covered with decorative river rock or gravel. Basically, I did touch on the railings earlier so as I mentioned, I will try to get through as many of these units as I can. I think as you will see, there is kind of a commonality to these changes. In these slides, basically the top image represents what we presented back to you in February and the lower image is what we are presenting to you today. Just in bullet point fashion – you will see these in common on many of these units but we had siding running in different directions. We've opted to make that uniform across all units so basically a clear hard western red cedar vertical wood siding. Where we had bold white linear forms, we've opted to either remove those or where they've remained, change them to more subdued color. In a lot of case, we haven't completely eliminated the decorative stone but we have toned it down and changed a lot of that either wood or stucco. A lot of the stone fencing has gone to a much more similar wood fence detail. Metal railings, we have unified those to two different types so more of a cable railing look for the contemporary style homes and then a more of a raw iron look for the more traditional homes. Then in terms of form, just beyond sort of detail changes, we've attempted to change roof lines in certain cases. In this particular case, reducing the scale of the front elevation along Maybell by actually reducing plate height and sort of changings some of the forms in the roof lines. So, I think you can see on the lower image how much less massive the front elevation looks for this particular unit. On the back side – the front elevation looks for this particular unit. On the back side, again, the vertical wood siding change color, stone to stucco, fencing, railings, etc. One thing that I did want to touch on, which was a comment that Commissioner Baltay had was with regard to our rear covered patios and the need for them and the use for them and how important they were to the design. We actually opted to not really modify these designs that significantly because we do feel that this is a – it's a true amenity and something that gets highly used in pretty much all of the custom home designs that we do for individual homeowners. It's a common area that essentially is an extension of the indoor living space. Typically, these are spaces that have lights and in some cases, speaker and heaters and they are basically – the intent is that these are outdoor rooms that really can be used three and a half seasons of the year. We've added some patio furniture just to kind of give you a representation of the type of scale of these spaces and how they might actually serve for both dining and seating and possibly even future outdoor kitchens and the like. This is a – it's a representative traditional style house and some of the changes here are most significantly we reoriented the garage. On the tentative map, which we were given, there was sort of a side entry garage which raised concerns at the last meeting. We've redesigned this unit to have a front facing garage, which is in keeping with all of the other units on the project, along with an uncovered parking space immediately adjacent. That resulted in some form changes as well. Then the backside here, one of the comments about the Spanish style house was the desperateness in arched topped windows and flat top windows so we basically have unified the window treatments pretty much throughout all these traditional style homes and in most cases, add some decorative trim. This is unit three or lot three is a pretty good example of where we've attempted to soften the roof lines. There was a concern I think, largely by the community that the project was overly contemporary so where we felt

warranted, we've modified roof lines to soften sheds. As you can see on the top left there, there was an upward shed which we've since toned down to reduce the mass and scale. Then sort of a flat roof porch element which we've modified to basically a sloping, more traditional style porch roof but overall, we've kept the contemporary feel of the design. I am kind of race through here. Similar changes in the back. I am really going to start to speed up now.

Vice Chair Kim: You've got a minute.

Mr. Sakai: Ok. I guess I am going to conclude and I think you should have this presentation and I am not going to belabor you with a more detailed laundry list of changes but the first three or four units that I presented do represent kind of the tenure of the overall second look that we've taken of the design. We did take your comments to heart. We felt they were well founded and judicious and so I hope that you will see these changes in the same positive light that we do. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. I don't have any speaker cards for this particular project so I am going to bring it back to the Board for questions.

Board Member Baltay: I have a list of questions, is that ok?

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: For Staff to start with, please. I noticed that a number of the basement extend beyond the footprint of the building above. For example, house number ten and I wonder if that's – I think we spoke about this last time but I am concerned. I do a lot of residential design in Palo Alto and this is a rule that is consistently enforced very tightly. I am finding here that it does not seem to be the something. If you look at number ten in front of the garage, the basement seems to extend 4 or 5-feet further below the driveway under the garage doors.

Mr. Ah Sing: What sheet is that in the plan set?

Board Member Baltay: Well, let's see.

Vice Chair Kim: A-10.1.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, 10.1 and I have marked it out here.

Mr. Ah Sing: Right, so I believe there is a completing the square and that's what the City allows.

Board Member Baltay: Well, I am aware of that but completing the square is generally considered a small thing. A couple of feet here and there but this is a space approximately 16 by 5, which is not completing the square. It's adding to the size of that basement. This is something that I brought up last time. I remember it quite clearly speaking to you guys about this and every one of these houses, mark one, has this type of situation in it. That's just a question, is this something that you looked at or where do we stand with that? Question number two, I notice a number of these covered patios seem to extend into the backyard setbacks. I am aware that there is some exception allowing some projection into the backyard setbacks across some percentage of the width of the lots. I'd like to ask if you've actually considered that or are these not? For example, house number 14, so I guess probably sheet A-14.1, seems to have both the covered porch goes into that side or that backyard setback and then there is another covered canopy area that also seems to be within the setback. Again, the question to Staff is have we looked at this? Is this something that is allowed and I am just missing it?

Mr. Ah Sing: We did look at the setbacks for each of the lots and the zoning districts and so we did ensure that they complied.

Board Member Baltay: These covered patios in the back would be required to be in the setbacks of the building envelope, wouldn't they? They are fairly large elements of the house.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, let me look up the standard and I can site that for you.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I don't want to put you on the spot now but I am just saying that I noticed that. The third question is to the applicant, in your set of general notes on sheet A-0.2, you allude to we provided a second story site plan sheet showing 45-degree view lines from balconies and windows etc. I don't see that in the package. Am I missing it again? There is a lot of pages here, I understand. Where is the drawing that shows the privacy site lines that you are talking about here? That was a concern of ours last time.

Mr. Sakai: I can't speak to what you have in front of you but I know that I have the full PDF of the assembled set here in front of me and there is that sheet. I am not sure the number right now but I was looking at is earlier.

Chair Lew: A-0.5B, right? Is the site plan (inaudible)?

Mr. Sakai: It's earlier in the set. It's one of the first few sheets and it's basically an upper – it's a second-floor site plan showing second floors of all the lots and the proper orientation with 45-degree lines from each second-floor window that has a lower sill. Then that same site plan also shows privacy planting as designed by our landscape architect who is here, if you would like to ask him a question.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you. The third question is alongside of the private street, on the right as you walk in, I see what looks to be like a sidewalk. Am I reading that correctly? That is a nice amenity but that's on private property though. Is there some easement dedicated or how does that partially done? Is it just sorting of putting it out there for people to walk on regardless? It seems to me on the right-hand side of the private road, all the way along to the back, there's a 4-foot sidewalk or something. The same thing applies to – as I dive into this, there seems to be a bunch of street lights shown. Am I right on that again? That you have street lights proposed?

Mr. O'Hanlon: Regarding the sidewalk, that was in the tentative map. It's meant – it is an amenity for all the homes to use. It was Public Works that requested that we have a pedestrian access on one – at least one-half of the private street.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I think it makes sense to have it there. The question really is, which side of the property line is that sidewalk on?

Mr. O'Hanlon: That is on the lots so that will be an easement.

Board Member Baltay: So, there will be an easement for that?

Mr. O'Hanlon: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: Is that part of the tentative map situation? The same question applies to the street lights that you proposed. As I noticed, there are a number of street lights throughout. It seemed like a good idea and again, are the street lights on private property or on the roadway property? How is your plan to deal with that from a legal point?

Mr. O'Hanlon: There will be a CCNR that will operate these common areas on behalf of all the homeowners to maintain the sidewalks and the street lights.

Board Member Baltay: The sidewalk will be a common area?

Mr. O'Hanlon: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you. Ok, that's my questions. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? No? Sheldon, did you want to follow up on the – on Peter's question?

Mr. Ah Sing: Right so the code does allow for projections into setbacks – required setbacks and there are certain conditions that they have to meet. For instance, canopies and patio covers may be located in a residential district in a required rear yard or a portion of the interior side yard, which is more than 75-feet from the street. Any canopy or patio covers shall not be more than 12-feet in height and in the section, they specifically do call out the heights there. The canopy or building – or patio cover shall be included in accommodation for building coverage. So, we believe that it does meet the criteria set in the (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: Great, thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, who wants to go first? Peter, did you want to go first? Peter, we are all voting for you to go first.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, ok, well, I am sorry but I really do have a couple of issues with this project still and I cannot make the findings to approve it today. Rather than drag everybody through the detailed stuff I had done, I want to see what the rest of the Board thinks, if that's ok with the Chair before I outline everything? Let me put my comments into a couple of issues. I have an issue with the parking and the driveway situation. In detail, on lot number six, because of the oak street trees, you are forced to do quite a bit of maneuvering to get into that garage and I find that the parking just doesn't work. So, if you look at sheet – where is it that I had seen – well, anyone of the colored site plans, A-0.5A, lot six has a large oak tree basically in front of the garage there and so it requires fairly careful driving to get into that parking places but then to get out is even much more tricky. Again, I know we spoke about this at the last hearing and the solution honestly is to design that building differently so the garages are more aligned with the street trees or to modify – petition to remove the tree. I am afraid that I don't find it's been addressed and one of the findings that we have to make is that the site and design are functional. I don't think this is functional yet. My other concern has to do with the width of the street and the fact that I don't believe there's really that much room on the side of the street for additional parking for visitors, guests, things like that. I acknowledge that the tentative map is set and I am no way suggesting that you should be required to change the tentative map. What I am hopeful to see is some sort of just showing off what the design of the street really is; the curbs and things like that. If you can't have some pull outs or some dedicated spaces that would at a minimum level give a visitor, a guest, a delivery or an Uber drop off a place to just pull to the side where they don't block the traffic. What I am afraid of is that otherwise, you create really what is a dangerous situation in that people will just start parking out there. The family with five cars or the kids visiting from – my family, the kids had friends from college and there were six cars on our property. It just doesn't fit and what they will do is a park in the street anyway. It's 26-feet wide and that's just enough to do that but then really, what they are doing is impeding the fire safety access. In the event of an emergency, all of sudden there is not enough room and I find that it just needs to be thought through a little more carefully. I don't want to be constituents saying that I think you need to change your tentative map or reverse all these approvals you had but I am hopeful that you can just show us the design of the road itself and find some way to get these extra spaces. I was asking the questions about the sidewalk and the street lights to point out that it is possible to have some public amenity space type spaces on the private property, which is what one of these pullouts or parking things might be that allow this type of use. I'm – we're tasked, on the Architectural Review Board, not to approve the tentative map but to make a certain series of findings. One of them, finding number four, is the project is functional for its intended use and I am afraid that this type of a hammerhead, cul-de-sac driveway street thing with ten houses on it, without a provision for just a person who is not going to park in your driveway to stop their car, is not functional. I did go through – the applicant sent out an email addressing exactly this question and at first, I was very hopeful. They pointed out a number of other subdivisions on other streets like this, where they said this was not required and that felt that it would be really great because that would prove that the City accepts these kinds of things. In every case, the right-of-way was between 40 and 60-feet. I'll pass to my colleagues a photo I

took off of Google on the Internet showing one of the streets, the narrowest one, with a car parked on the side of it and you can still see that because it's a wider road, there is provision a fire truck still can get passed. It's still a safe, functional situation. Unfortunately, what we have here is much tighter street and so it needs to be designed more carefully. I am not saying you have to redo the map. I am not saying you have to change the size of the properties but if you could just please address the issue that the way it is now, people will park improperly and it will become unsafe. That's my big issue on the parking and the cars and stuff. I acknowledge that you've made some great changes to the other driveways and street parking and that's much appreciated. I think it really – everything else works quite well. I am just left – my second comment is really just that I called it out of context and I went back to the neighborhood again yesterday and I've really given this a lot of soul searching. What we are seeing is 16 houses designed to the absolute maximum allowed by the zoning code, in a neighborhood that's really very modest, not designed to the maximum residential use. The houses are what I call sort of light residential and they are not bulked up. As I have gone through your designs, again I design these kinds of houses a lot, you are just pulling every trick in the book that's allowed on the FAR. The bay windows, the second story sort of over the staircase where it's only 15-feet so it doesn't count twice, stretching the basements underneath the footprint as far as you can push it and that's fine. Those are the codes and we all follow it but we're tasked to review three or more houses at once on the Architecture Board. We are not the individual review here and the reason we are tasked to do that is because when you have a multitude of houses all doing this at once, it has a bigger effect on the community, on the neighborhood, on the context. That's where I'm just saying to my fellow Board Members that this is 16 houses, every one of which is to the absolute maximum and collectively. Even – not just the houses but the design elements. These cover patios in the back also serve to just make them look bigger and heavier, taller, larger and I just find myself uncomfortable with that. It's just a little bit too much, probably a lot too much. Especially in this neighborhood of much lower level of development and I think a lot of it can be mitigated with careful design. I appreciate the work you have done to step towards it. It's very helpful to have detailed floor plans for each house. Nonetheless, when you have 10-foot and 9-foot or 10-foot and 10-foot plates, in places they are 12-foot plates, large non-functional porches in places, large canopies in the back-covering patios, that's just a little bit too much for my taste. The last comment and I don't want to be labored right now but I did go through every single house design and I could pick out four or five things on each one that I feel could use further revision. Basically, with the goal of mitigating the effect of building to the maximum FAR. I don't want to drag us through that unless there is some desire on the Board to continue this and look at that more. So, with that, I'll leave my comments to my colleagues. Thank you.

Chair Lew: We can do two rounds if you want to circle back to – if that's where we end up.

Board Member Baltay: Let's see what everyone else thinks first.

Chair Lew: Ok, Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for addressing a lot of our comments and making these revisions. I think having the – there was a lot of paper but I think it was worth it in this case and I appreciated the level of detail that you are showing this time around. I think from an overall perspective, as a unified development, I think it's at a level where I feel fairly comfortable with it. On some level, I agree with Board Member Baltay's comments that maybe they are a little bit too maxed out but you know, I think we're kind of setting a precedent here. Especially in a time where that's what people are doing. If you are buying a lot and you have the money to develop it, I mean who doesn't want to max it out. Is that a good thing for the City, I don't know but it's what people are doing and I don't see too much that we can do about that. Again, from an overall perspective, I am appreciative of all these changes. Especially the unification of materials and it just looks like a much cleaner development that's much more unified and has had that additional round of refinements. When I look at each unit individually, there are little concerns here and there that I think hopefully can be taken care of at the next building and planning levels as you are going through building permit. Maybe just to point out one or two of them. I notice that on the type one units, that on the second floor where you have the master bedroom and bathrooms. I think you only have one master bedroom window and it's obscured. I mean, that just seems a little odd

to me that you only have this one window for the master bedroom and as you walk into that space, you've got a frosted glass window. I can understand that maybe there was a privacy concern. I was looking at the site plan trying to match things up but to me, it seems like those areas are where you are facing the rear of the property and so I don't know that you necessarily have to have those obscured. I don't know if it was a comment that was made previously by us but that's just something that I would take another look at. Then also, just some more comments on my end that don't necessarily stop me from liking the overall project and having the confidence to recommend approval. I am still not sure that these diagonal columns fit into the language that you have going on some of the unit types. I am not real big fan of those but other than that, some other smaller comments are that I noticed that there are a couple basements. I think like on lot five – I don't know if that's a particular unit type but on lot five I was looking at the basement plan and there's a bedroom that you haven't called a bedroom because there's no natural light but it's obviously a bedroom because it's got a closet and a bathroom inside the bedroom. Those are things where I am thinking is that – I don't know. Again, those are the kind of smaller, looking at every unit type of thing but from an overall standpoint, I am appreciative of the changes that you've made. I think I feel good enough that I could recommend approval of the project. I feel like I forgot to mention something but I noticed that a couple of the keynotes on the elevations were off. I think as you were updating the background elevations some of those keynote trackers just kind of got miss placed. Maybe if we had a key map of where the unit is in relation to the whole site plan on the floor plans, that could be a little bit of a time saver instead of having us flip back and forth all the time. Overall, I think the changes actually go a long way and I am happy that you were able to solve a lot of the concerns that we had.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I agree with Commissioner Baltay's comments on lot number six and that's not functionally parked. I read Lee Prince's letters to Council for the applicant on the issue of parking. I must say that it's distressing to think oh, this is what we do everywhere and then discover from Commissioner's Baltay's work that in fact, we only have done this on 40 and 60-foot right-of-way's. The problem we have here is that we have a skinny road, we have a number of houses loading from it, it's on Clemo Avenue so the parking is parking for the park across the street. This is highly desirable public parking and instead -- again, it's the same problem we had without high-intensity development. It doesn't deal with the drop off issue. It doesn't deal with the fact that vehicles come up and they need to be there temporarily. It's not quite so bad with a ride service because there is somebody in the vehicle but this does not seem to meet our standards for approving a project. What I can't tell is whether the finding we ought to be making -- assuming you share my view that it doesn't work, is that it doesn't work but the City has tied its own hands. Therefore, we must expect this condition or whether we have the power to ask that it be improved. So, I need guidance from Staff on that. I am not going to take our legal advice from Council for the developer. I understand incidentally of course, about the nature of a final map and a tentative map and easements versus other thing but there is a homeowner's association. They do have a mechanism for which to address issues.

Mr. Lait: So, it's true that we cannot require changes to the map at this point.

Board Member Furth: Right, no debate on that topic.

Mr. Lait: Ok, and the other item that is before is the discretionary entitlement and the 16 homes and subject to the ARB findings. So, these approvals of one does not necessarily ensure approval of the other. You need to review this project to the findings that are before you.

Board Member Furth: But I'm – what I am asking Jonathan is if it is in fact beyond our discretion as the applicant argues to ask for any or to require a better parking situation, is that the City's Attorney's Office opinion as well?

Mr. Lait: Right so we don't believe that – I guess I would phrase it a different way. I probably would need to confer this again with legal but I don't believe that we can require the -- can you pull – I need the

findings for the – I just want to pull up the findings for the ARB for a minute. I would answer your question this way, you've got finding number four and if you believe that the design does not meet that objective, then you would make arguments as to why it is not consistent with that finding.

Board Member Furth: Ok, I don't want to get us in trouble but I realize we merely recommend. I have no other comments.

Chair Lew: I don't have a lot to say on this particular project. I did have a question for you, do the houses have air conditions and have you shown the condenser locations on the site plan? I was looking for them but I couldn't find – I could not find that information.

Mr. Sakai: I don't think they are on the site plan just because of scale but we have shown them on the floor plans. For example, I've got lot six, A-6.1 open right now if you look at the ground floor plan of that, you will see two AC units tucked in right adjacent to the bedroom and bath four. That should be representative for all units unless we've overlooked that.

Chair Lew: Ok, good so they are typically in a corner out of the setback.

Mr. Sakai: Right, yeah, out of a setback.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you for that. Ok, so I guess my take on the project is that I don't like the skinny street with a hammer head. I think I am respectful of the long process that this has gone through so I guess my take on it would be to recommend approval of the project but I really – yeah, I just don't – I don't like the design at all. On the architecture, I think I agree with Board Member Baltay and Furth about the back-up from unit six. It was brought up – lot six – it was brought up before and it doesn't seem like it's been addressed. With regard to all the other units, as I was flipping through them and I didn't look at them very carefully but I would guess that I saw little things on all of the building. I guess at this point in the process, I was thinking that they were all approvable or they were things that could be resolved without a lot of effort and it wouldn't necessarily have to come back to the full Board for review. I guess, Peter, I would say that lot six is a no, in my mind unless the applicant has an argument for how the backup can work. Then if you want to on the other items, I think we have time. We are a little ahead of schedule if you want to go through your items. I would be interested if the Board thinks they have to come back for a full review or if it could be done at a subcommittee level. Why don't you give us an example of one or two and then we can see?

Board Member Baltay: Let me point out the one thing that I found most disturbing. It was on – I believe it's building number five.

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) type five.

Board Member Baltay: Type five, if you look at sheet A-5.2 and look at front elevation, the middle on the top there. It shows a vertical element with vertical siding and a gabled roof over it. If you look at the perspective on the lower left, that wall on the left-hand side of that is the same wall.

Chair Lew: Right. I think we talked about this at the last meeting.

Board Member Baltay: To me, that is just an example of whereas I've gone through this, it's just not carefully done. I think I would feel embarrassed to have my friends say gee, you're on the Architecture Board and you approved this.

Chair Lew: And it's showing – they are showing a shadow as if it were 3-dimensional.

Board Member Baltay: As I have gone through the houses, about half of them have large covered balconies in the back that are not carefully integrated into the design. Again, it is not for us to say you can or can't have certain architectural features. It is within the parameters of the zoning code to do these

things as Sheldon explained but they still need to be well designed into the building itself. Another example would be, I think it... (crosstalk)

Mr. Lait: (Inaudible) is aligned with the perspective.

Board Member Baltay: ... was building number nine. Indulge me further Board Members, drawing A-9.2, on that sheet in the lower left-hand side shows a perspective view of what is the front of this house. This is the part that faces the street, you have on the second floor there a blank vertical wall of wood siding that, as best I can tell is an 11-feet tall and you have two narrow slit windows. Looking between it carefully, if you really dive in, that little square is the vent from the gas fireplace. That's the family room behind it there. This is facing the front of the house and then the front door is a solid glazed door off that porch. It's really not the front of a house. It's too tall, it's out of scale and the windows don't really work to the function inside it. If you look at the next page, A-9.3, that perspective shows you how the building looks in the back or how the neighbors see it. It's rather tall, it's rather massive. This goes to my comment of that it's one thing to design to the zoning maximum. As Kyu said, that's what everybody seems to be doing and it's not for us to judge that. That is what the zoning code allows. I put it to the Board, however, the reason we are looking at this is not because we are looking at any one house. The Council -- the law charges us to look at developments with more than three. The reason being is that there's a magnification effect. When you have three -- when you have 16 houses designed like house nine here to the maximum in every respect, it is incumbent upon us to do something about it. To say wait, this is too much. That's what I am saying here. Shall I keep picking more, Alex?

Chair Lew: Can we -- let's -- can we -- I wanted to chime in a little bit on the maxed-out nature comment.

Board Member Baltay: Let me point out one other thing that was really bugging me and this is more of an aesthetic thing. A number of these houses have paired, fairly large chimneys or even single chimneys. Look at house 12 on sheet A-12.2, the upper right-hand corner elevation shows what looks like a fairly elegant tall chimney. It measures on the plan if I remember 4-feet by 5-feet or something. There's no chimney inside that. There is nothing there what so ever. It's stacked on top of, I think it was the living room below. I would say that about a third of these buildings have single or double chimneys. A fairly large mass that is in no way functional chimneys. The chimneys on these are all simple gas vents going out the side. That's sort of what you see on Safeway on the corner as you go down El Camino. These large decorative clock tower type elements. It's really not appropriate here, it's too much. Again, it's just another way to broaden your shoulders and through you weight around. This community is not one that will readily accept that. It just doesn't fit.

Chair Lew: My take actually on the massing was that they had a fairly strong one-story element on many of the houses and there are large elements -- there are some large shed roofs that I think are a little bit bigger than I would like typically. I think that they've tried to make a horizontal element -- design element through many of the houses and I would say that the neighborhood is mixed. There are one-story, mid-century houses and then large two-story Mediterranean-style house and it's pretty eclectic. That is where I am on this and I think on the chimneys, I mean is it not better to have a decorative chimney than it is to have an ugly gas vent poking out through the roof? I mean I think it's better to hide it, no? I think I understand you're -- if you go to Green Acres Two, where all the houses are fairly uninformed with hip roofs, like there I get it. Here I think, this is (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Board Member Baltay: Look at sheet A-2.3, that's a good example of the chimneys I am referring too.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I have no comment on that. Does anybody else have a -- any other Board Members have an objection?

Board Member Furth: I can -- I am mostly concerned about the houses that front on Maybell and Clemo. To a certain extent, if the applicant wants to build houses that are very broad shouldered, in your face or as big as they could possibly be that look at each other, I think that's their affair. They're not diminishing their neighbors. This is what they want to create and it's fairly self-contained. I do find the idea of overly large ornamental chimneys and all the other things going on in the on lot two, not particularly compatible

with the neighborhood and not high-quality design. This is – those are the houses that most concerns me and those are the houses which still seem to me to be overdone and over barring, those are not very technical terms, I realize. They are also disrespectful of their context and I –because the applicant has already heard us say these things, I don't know how to proceed. I appreciate that this has been a long and difficult struggle and I appreciate that some of the things that I found most distressing are gone but I mean, if I look at this streetscape and I look at – I am looking at sheet A-06 and I look at lot two. What? These are not manner houses, what are we doing with double chimneys?

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to remind the Board that the first time we had this project, we did not have these drawings. We had a series of floor plans and elevations that were sort of typical for the whole thing. I felt this is the first time we could really look at all this so I am extremely appreciative of the changes that were made based on the very generic feedback we gave; too many materials and simplify the forms. At the same time, please understand that this is the first time we've actually seen the design of the houses. I do applaud you for the quality of the presentation. These are well-presented designs and the information is here now but I remind my fellow Board Members that this is the first time we've actually seen these.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I think maybe just to clarify my previous comments. I definitely think you're headed in the right direction. I think the changes you made again, are exceptional. I think some of these concerns that have been mentioned are, to me, I think they're getting to be significant enough where I don't think reviewing them just by the subcommittee would be fair to the Board as a whole. I am actually leaning on seeing if you would be up for coming back on a date certain perhaps, with some additional modifications that appease our concerns. Does that sound reasonable, Chair Lew?

Chair Lew: Ok, then I think if – that sounds like the – ok, I think that if it's going to be continued, then I think we should be fairly clear and very specific and we should just take the time and do it and not drag this out more than it has to in terms of like three or more hearings. Let's just get it – let's just address all of them and – now. Let's go – if you want to go through unit by unit, let's do it.

Board Member Furth: Frontage by frontage?

Mr. Lait: It the process question...

Chair Lew: Yes.

Mr. Lait: ...or option. The – one way to maybe do this is that we know that the comment expressed by a single Board Member is shared by the rest of the Board is to maybe start off with a motion. It sounds like this is heading towards continuation so you might want to say – we might want to have somebody make a motion and have that be seconded if for continuation. Then thereafter, we can go through a series of friendly amendments if it's agreed by the maker and the seconder to add it because, at that point, we have a sense that a majority of the voting Members would be in general supportive. You obviously have the right to change your mind later but that might be a way to sort of get a clear direction as far as what's going on. So, if there is an issue that came up with lot six parking, yeah, let's fix that. If there is an issue about something else but you didn't get the support, then we can maybe move onto the next item.

Chair Lew: Let's do it that way because that way it's clear and it's not – because otherwise, we'll get questions later like did you want it this way or that way or whatever. Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Would this motion be a movement to – moving it to continue to either a date certain or a date uncertain, depending on how you direct this, with a request that the applicant makes further revisions to address the following concerns. Is that the format? Well, so I make – is it date certain or uncertain?

Mr. Lait: Well, I think...

Board Member Furth: You don't know yet.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I mean I think that's in part going to be...

Board Member Furth: I'll say date uncertain at this point... (crosstalk)

Mr. Lait: Right, (inaudible)...

Board Member Furth: ... and we can change that later.

Mr. Lait: ... maybe if when the applicant hears the list, they can say yeah, we can turn this around in 4-weeks' time or something like that. (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: Ok. So, what I previously said and the first item one would be for revision...

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry, is this your motion?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Yeah, only I am not good at saying it the second time. Did you get – Ok. Move that this item be continued to a date uncertain with a request that the applicant propose revisions to the submission to address the following issues. Item number one is a revision of the driveway and parking access on lot six to create a safer and more functional parking situation. Item number two is the addition of off-street, short term parking on the private road if the City's Attorney advises that such request can be made.

Mr. Lait: Can I make a request...

Board Member Furth: Sure.

Mr. Lait: ...or a suggestion? Can we start with just the motion to continue and then do the individual amendments?

Board Member Furth: Well, I will – alright.

Mr. Lait: Just – that way – because I don't know where the rest of the Board is on the parking issue. It may be that you have agreement but...

Board Member Furth: Right, good point. (inaudible)

Mr. Lait: I think, what you had moved was a continuation of the project.

Board Member Furth: Alright, to a date uncertain so I need a second.

Board Member Baltay: I'll second that.

Mr. Lait: Ok, and then we can begin with a series of friendly amendments.

Board Member Furth: Well, I can't (inaudible) the motion.

AMENDMENT #1

Board Member Baltay: I make the first amendment is that the applicant works on lot number six to make the parking and driveway situation safer and more functional.

Board Member Furth: I accept that.

AMENDMENT #2

Board Member Baltay: Well, let's address the – amendment number two is the issue of – how do I phrase this? Request that the applicant demonstrates a minimum of four – I don't want to use the word parking places but four places where a vehicle could pull out of the way of emergency vehicles on the public roadway.

Board Member Furth: It's the private road, right?

Board Member Baltay: Private roadway to allow for temporary parking of vehicles. Chime in people, I don't know how to quite put this but that's what I think we need to do. I want to be careful that we are not asking for them to make easements or change the tentative map. We just want to see more functional parking situations.

Board Member Furth: I guess one of the questions is how do the rest of you feel?

Mr. Lait: I don't mean to be engaging in your deliberation but...

Board Member Baltay: Please do, please do.

Mr. Lait: ... it might be that we treat that one as an unfriendly amendment just for the process of the procedure. I know the maker and the seconder are probably in agreement on that issue but if we treat it as an unfriendly amendment, then we have a vote on that single issue before we move on to the next item.

Board Member Furth: Ok, I won't accept it.

Mr. Lait: Ok, it's been unexcepted.

Board Member Furth: So, it's unfriendly.

Mr. Lait: So, Chair, at this point you have a ...

Chair Lew: We can vote – we're going to vote on this amendment.

Mr. Lait: So, we actually – before – I'm sorry to be so clumsy about this but I just want to make sure we get the process right. So, we have a motion – a request for a friendly amendment. The amendment has been rejected so now Board Member Baltay is saying that there is still this interest in having this four parking spaces available on site.

Chair Lew: He needs a second, right?

Mr. Lait: He would need a second from either the Chair or the Vice Chair so that we can vote on it. That seconding doesn't commit you to voting in the affirmative, it just prevents the opportunity for a vote.

Chair Lew: Ah, ok.

Mr. Lait: Or Commissioner or...

Board Member Furth: Or we could just discuss it.

Board Member Furth: Or Board Member Furth can second it and – but as an unfriendly just for the purpose of voting.

Board Member Furth: Well, leaving aside procedural niceties for a minute, I am interested in knowing how my colleagues who haven't addressed this use feel about this issue.

Board Member Baltay: Alex and Kyu, where do we stand?

Vice Chair Kim: I am not so – I am not as concerned about the parking on the private street.

Mr. Lait: I'll tell you from a – my conversations with the City's Attorney's Office, the only way to achieve this is through some kind of a – well, there are two ways. One is a modification to the map, which we decided is not feasible. The other is thru some kind of a lease or an easement that would be available to the association or guests of the association are – in our conversations internally about that, is that the easements have been identified on the parcel map. So, we feel like adding an easement at this point is not an ideal situation and not something that we, from a Staff level, would support. The parking layout as we see it is something that we're sort of bound to and is consistent with the code.

Board Member Baltay: Is it true that the easements for the streetlights and sidewalks are actually on the parcel maps? Those have been thought through?

Mr. Lait: I actually – we have to pull up the...

Board Member Baltay: Because I...

Mr. Lait: ...plans for that to know. I don't know if you have that information.

Board Member Baltay: I guess frankly, I would suspect they are not. I've just gone through a similar subdivision and a lot of that kind of stuff is left to the end and that's where I feel -- this is similar to a sidewalk, that is what we are asking for and it ought to be treated that way.

Board Member Furth: I am going to suggest that we put this one aside till we finish addressing our other issues and then treat it as a separate matter.

Board Member Baltay: How does a tie vote stand, Jonathan, with us?

Board Member Furth: It's a no.

Board Member Baltay: A tie vote is a no?

Mr. Lait: Tie vote is a technical denial on that issue or technical no, yeah.

Board Member Furth: My comment on this is that I know it's not ideal to be using easements but it's not ideal to have this design and I don't know if you are moving towards telling me it's not legally possible or not.

Mr. Lait: I guess I can be a little more affirmative on that. Conversations with our legal office has advised against it so that's as far as I can articulate that, I think at this point.

Board Member Baltay: Let me move on...

Chair Lew: Why don't we just – so, nobody has seconded the unfriendly amendment so at the moment we're not – (crosstalk)...

Mr. Lait: (Inaudible)...

Chair Lew: ... at the moment we're not even (inaudible).

Mr. Lait: ...revisit it at the end and – so you don't lose that if you want.

AMENDMENT #3

Board Member Baltay: Let me request an amendment for house number one and I'll just work through these. On house number one, I think I'd like to see three things get changed. One is that on the second floor, the two wood-clad elements should not be the same height as the rest of the building. Make them a little bit lower and a little bit taller. Those are bay windows technically so they don't count towards floor area. The second item is that the main window out looking over the street in the bay window again – this is on sheet A-1.2, is really rather large and out of scale. Then lastly and probably most importantly is that the element that creates the front porch is out of scale and harmony with the rest of the horizontal grayish elements on the house and could use a little more design work.

Board Member Furth: Peter, could you reframe that as the – you want a revision that does what?

Board Member Baltay: Three things, on the second floor the two-wood clad bay window elements should not be the same height as the rest of the building. They are flush, the same and there should be more differentiation. The large window in the front is – looks too large is what I wrote down.

Board Member Furth: Should be reduced in size?

Board Member Baltay: Right and lastly, the element over the front porch – defining the front porch is too thin relative to the rest of the elements on the house.

Board Member Furth: Ok, accepted.

Board Member Baltay: That's the kind of comments that I have as I went through this and I really would appreciate my colleagues telling me if they think it's too much, then say so because I don't want to go through this for the next half hour.

Board Member Furth: With respect to lot number two, I can't tell you what I think we should ask the applicant to do. I can tell you that my impression is that the house is overly large in appearance from the street. That the two chimney elements are out of character for the neighborhood and beyond that, I couldn't go.

Board Member Baltay: Let me understand, I just made a friendly amendment for house number one and she accepted it so that's it's, we're just going to the next one.

Mr. Lait: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: That's done.

AMENDMENT #4

Board Member Baltay: So, should I make a friendly amendment for lot number two would be to remove the decorative chimney elements altogether and there are two horizontal window elements showing on the rear and labeled left side elevation so the right-side elevation on sheet A-2.3, which are out of character in proportion with the rest of the windows on the house.

Board Member Furth: And that they are two small or too big?

Board Member Baltay: They are just the wrong shape. Everything else is more vertical. Lastly, the front façade has effectively one 50-foot long eave line over the front porch and garage and there should be more modulation somehow to that.

Board Member Furth: So, additional modulation in the front porch eave?

Board Member Baltay: On the front first-floor elevation...

Board Member Furth: Front first...

Board Member Baltay: ...first floor of the front elevation.

Board Member Furth: Ok, is that clear enough Jonathan?

Mr. Lait: It's helpful to have that restated.

Board Member Furth: I understand the elements of this to be that the ornamental chimneys should be removed. I am starting from – I am looking at the front elevation. That the 50-foot long or the eave at the first-floor level along the front side of the building should be modulated so as not to present an undivided expanse. On the rear, as shown on sheet A-2.2? Is that, right? Is this the one with the improperly proportioned windows? Which elevation are we talking about?

Board Member Baltay: I am looking at sheet...

Mr. Lait: A-2.3.

Board Member Baltay: ...A-2.2, the elevation labeled front – no, I am sorry. A-2.3, drawing labeled rear elevation on the upper floor on the right-hand side there is a horizontal window. Then drawing labeled left side elevation on the main gabled element on that elevation, there is another horizontal window.

Board Member Furth: Which is, in fact, a right elevation?

Board Member Baltay: Which is, in fact, the right elevation, yeah, but that's just a...

Board Member Furth: The two horizontal, second-floor windows on the rear elevation and the incorrectly labeled right elevation on sheet 2.3 should be modified to be more consistent with the rest of the design?

Board Member Baltay: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: I accept it.

AMENDMENT #5

Board Member Baltay: I then – I am going to skip house three unless anybody else sees something with that. I am looking at sheet A-3.2, then I make an amendment to have house number four modified to have the front elevation...

Board Member Furth: This is sheet 4.3 again?

Board Member Baltay: 4.2.

Board Member Furth: 4.2.

Board Member Baltay: ... has a – the roof eave elements. One is a large horizontal white band and one is a sloping black band on the drawing and they just don't seem well integrated. The roof eaves on the front elevation should be more carefully integrated.

Chair Lew: This is between the first floor and the second floor?

Board Member Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Furth: That would be a modification to house number four, which would be redesigning the first-floor eave elements...

Board Member Baltay: The second...

Board Member Furth: ...so that they are more integrated.

Board Member Baltay: Right and the second element was the second floor has what's effectively a pair of shed roofs, where the lowest level – let's see. That the shed roof on the lower – second floor be lowered.

Vice Chair Kim: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: There are two shed roofs, right? You are saying you want them to match?

Board Member Baltay: No, I just think they are two tall.

Chair Lew: Both of them?

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I mean (inaudible).

Chair Lew: I understand. No, I...

Board Member Baltay: Those shed roofs start at a 9-foot plate height on the second floor and go up. I think they should start it at 8-foot plate height at the minimum.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so the second part of this would be that the shed roofs on the second floor be lowered both as to their starting point and their finishing point basically, right?

Board Member Baltay: I think they need to be a foot lower.

Board Member Furth: Be lowered by at least a foot. I accept it.

AMENDMENT #6

Board Member Baltay: Amendment on house number five that the elevation facing Maybell Avenue, which is best shown on the front elevation on sheet A-5.2, be modified so that the vertical element is actually projecting proud of the building or some other architectural modification.

Board Member Furth: This is the (inaudible)...

Board Member Baltay: The wide vertical element, yes.

Board Member Furth: So, the white vertical element as shown on the front elevation on sheet A-5.2 be modified by establishing it at a different – what did you call that? You want it pushed out, right?

Board Member Baltay: It needs to be pushed out by at least the depth of the roof eave above.

Board Member Furth: Be moved forward by at least the depth of the roof eave above. Is that clear for Staff? I accept it.

Mr. Lait: With the – I just – went on that, is that an architectural projection, that vertical element? Is that one that – is that floor area in there?

Board Member Baltay: That is, unfortunately, floor area. It's not a trivial change.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, so I just don't know if it could extend as far out maybe because of the setbacks. I would just have to take a look at that.

Board Member Furth: Well, maybe you have to move the rest of the wall back.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I am afraid that's really, unfortunately, a fairly challenging design thing to make that work.

Mr. Lait: Ok, so I – so this is good. This might be a moment where if there's – I'm getting the sense and you don't have to say yes or no on this but it sounds like some of these changes – maybe that the Board is supportive of these. If this is a more major change and some Board Members have a perspective about whether this should or shouldn't happen, we might want to have a debate about it if it's going to be an issue. If...

Board Member Furth: I am assuming that everybody will chime in at this point if they don't want us to go ahead. That's the operating assumption I am using.

Mr. Lait: If that's the case, I might just suggest that this might be one where we want to make it an unfriendly amendment, that you might vote on.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) colleague's want?

Chair Lew: Typically, in the past, the Board does not like – things like this that are coplanar, so it means either projecting it out or removing it and just integrating it into the rest of the building. So, it could go either way but not to try to have it both ways in the thickness of a piece of paper, right?

Board Member Baltay: I have to say I am extremely uncomfortable doing this exercise. I think we're trying hard to get you guys through the gate here and I really feel like we've said this already once, this is pretty basic architecture stuff so telling you how deep it has to be is very awkward.

Board Member Furth: Is it –would it be ok to say –sorry, go ahead.

Vice Chair Kim: I was just going to concur with Chair Lew that perhaps they can unify the material there and change the roof form instead of introducing that gable out of nowhere. If they just continue the gable facing Clemo all the way across, I think they can eliminate that roof and unify the material and make it work.

Board Member Furth: So, make it a choice?

Board Member Baltay: That would certainly be a good direction. It does speak to our earlier comments the last meeting about this being the corner of the entire development. We want this building to anchor and look good on that corner. Hopefully, they can come up with something that makes sense that way.

Board Member Furth: Then you would at least want them to modify this elevation by removing –what do you call this thing? A two-story white gable element? Modifying it either by removing it or making it not coplanar? Does that work?

Vice Chair Kim: I think that works.

Board Member Baltay: Sure.

Board Member Furth: Then I accept it.

Board Member Baltay: That works.

AMENDMENT #7

Board Member Baltay: Ok, amendment on house number six, the second story shed roof to be lowered by a foot, as seen in the perspective on sheet A-6.3. Secondly, the chimney element – no, let me just leave that alone. I don't want to do that. Just the height of the shed roof on house number six. Unless somebody else has other ideas?

Chair Lew: Nobody seconded that yet.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: I am fine with that.

Board Member Furth: Ok, I accept it.

AMENDMENT #8

Board Member Baltay: Ok, an amendment on house number seven that the front chimney element be modified so that it's not coplanar on the first floor with the siding on the front of the house.

Board Member Furth: I accept that.

Board Member Baltay: Secondly, that the window shapes be made more consistent; best seen on the front elevation on sheet A-7.2 where you have two large horizontal windows.

Board Member Furth: I am sorry Peter. Are you saying that's an example of what you should be doing or what you shouldn't be doing?

Board Member Baltay: You should not be. I'd like those two horizontal windows on the first floor of the front elevation on sheet A-7.2 should be modified to be more consistent with the proportions of the rest of the windows on the house.

Board Member Furth: I agree they are (inaudible). Perhaps the rest (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: Lastly, the shed roof as seen on the front elevation on sheet A-7.2 should be modified so the ends of the roof are more consistent with the rest of the house. You have a shed ending on the left and a hip ending on the right. It's best seen perhaps on the roof perspective drawing on the same sheet.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) mess, isn't it? Is there a consensus on that?

Vice Chair Kim: That one is not quite as a big of an issue to me.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, take that off. Take that off.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so what's left on that one? Oh, the windows, the fenestration?

Board Member Baltay: The windows and the chimney element.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so revise the fenestration on the front elevations so that that the windows are more internally coherent or something and what was the deal with the chimney? What was the second one?

Board Member Baltay: I used Alex's fancy term but it should not be coplanar on the first floor with the rest of the siding. Right now, it's...

Board Member Furth: That sounds good to me. I accept.

AMENDMENT #9

Board Member Baltay: Amendment on house number eight, that the decorative chimneys be removed.

Vice Chair Kim: Well, I think only one of them is perhaps decorative. I mean I see the family room chimney extending up on the outside of the master bedroom and that's a real chimney.

Board Member Baltay: I don't think so, Kyu. Unless there is a second-floor fireplace there.

Vice Chair Kim: I am looking at A-8.1 if you look at the family room right next to those air conditioning condensers; there is a fireplace.

Board Member Baltay: Right but that chimney is a couple feet in from that.

Board Member Furth: Want to get guidance from the applicant?

Board Member Baltay: The chimney on this house if you look at the floor plan A-8.1, the chimneys are essentially on top of the island in the kitchen and on top of the dining room table there; the sofa as best I can tell.

Mr. Lait: Well, so...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lait: ... the decorative chimneys shall be removed. If it's not decorative then it doesn't need to be removed, right? Is that what we are saying?

Board Member Furth: Well, one of them we definitely want to have go or at least I do. Could we hear from the applicant as to whether they are decorative or real or what purpose they serve?

Mr. Sakai: We use those for primarily hiding HV/AC...

Chair Lew: Could you come up to the microphone just so that it gets – that we can get it on the transcript, please.

Mr. Sakai: Where we have the tower roofs, we typically like to avoid penetrating them with pipes and flues and what not. So, we tell the plumbing contractor to sort of run the chimneys were possible to -- basically, a stacked vent, which is what those chimneys end up being.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, so you have seconded that?

Board Member Furth: Well, now I am lost as to what the – I am sorry, I lost track. Where are we on this motion?

Mr. Lait: This is dealing with lot eight.

Board Member Furth: House number eight.

Mr. Lait: The decorative chimneys shall be removed; that's where we are.

Board Member Baltay: I want to stand behind that. I think there are other ways to accomplish plumbing venting and these are just too big.

Board Member Furth: Then I will accept that.

AMENDMENT #10

Board Member Baltay: House number nine, I'd like to amend that the second floor be reduced in height so that the plate height is closer to 8-feet than 11. Let's say an 8-foot plate height as best seen on the right-side perspective elevation on sheet A-9.2. Secondly, that the windows in the family room be modified to be more appropriate for windows facing the street. Is that ok to say it that way?

Board Member Furth: Does that mean larger? What does that mean?

Vice Chair Kim: Windows in the family room?

Board Member Furth: You mean the slit...

Board Member Baltay: The slit windows.

Board Member Furth: They don't – I agree with you that they don't seem consistent with single family residential but ...

Board Member Baltay: The windows be modified to be more consistent with residential design. Is that ok?

Board Member Furth: Well, I think it's helpful to say you had in mind larger if larger is what you had in mind? I'm not quite sure why – I don't understand why they are the way they are. What are they trying to achieve?

Board Member Baltay: You know, let's just leave it off. Let's ask them to reduce the height of the roof, that's the real design element.

Board Member Furth: I'll accept that.

Board Member Baltay: Unless somebody else – it was the height of that, that was the biggest issue.

Board Member Furth: This is one of their interior lots, right? Or is it exterior?

Board Member Baltay: This is an interior lot. This is way back in the depths of the hammer head.

AMENDMENT #11

Board Member Furth: If they want slit windows, fine with me. So, if I could add to the motion a request that Staff obtain confirmation from the City Attorney that we may not require additional pull over or parking areas on the private road and if that confirmation is – if the City Attorney says that we may

require additional pull over or parking areas on the private road, that we see a design that allows at least two. I am going to be ok with two. I can't make a friendly amendment to my own motion.

Board Member Baltay: We're going to get to the parking in a second.

Mr. Lait: You can if -- but I mean, the seconder would need too...

AMENDMENT #12

Board Member Baltay: Ok, if I could amend on house number eleven...

Mr. Lait: No changes on ten?

Board Member Baltay: No changes on ten. On number eleven, three things, the decorative chimneys be removed. Two that the roof pitch of the front entry feature be made consistent with the roof pitch on the rest of the house. Thirdly that the bay window on the front entry on the second floor, on the right be reduced in size to be more in keeping with the scale of the building. This is best seen on sheet A-11.2, on the front left perspective.

Board Member Furth: So, that would be (inaudible)?

Board Member Baltay: The bay window element is just too big, I think so I'd leave it to the architect to figure out -- reduce the scale was the word I used. So, three things, the decorative chimneys, the bay window and then the roof pitch at the front really should match the roof pitch on the rest of the house.

Board Member Furth: Accepted.

Vice Chair Kim: Board Member Baltay, you skipped unit or lot ten but lot ten also has decorative chimneys.

Board Member Baltay: Let me see that. It does. I guess I felt that it wasn't rising to the level where these others do. I think of...

Vice Chair Kim: That bothers me a lot.

Board Member Furth: Ok, I'll take a friendly motion from you.

Board Member Baltay: So, speak up Kyu. I mean (inaudible).

AMENDMENT #13

Vice Chair Kim: I would make a friendly amendment that we also eliminate the decorative chimneys on lot ten.

Board Member Furth: I would accept that as the maker. So, Peter needs to accept it as the seconder.

Board Member Baltay: Oh, I do, yeah. Thank you, Kyu.

Board Member Furth: Did we just do eleven? Ok.

AMENDMENT #14

Board Member Baltay: Ok, so amendment on house number twelve that the large decorative chimney be removed, best seen on the front elevation on sheet A-12.2. Then, secondly, I couldn't actually figure this one out but there's something about the roof forms on the second floor that have a combination of hips

and gables that seem awkward. I guess I'd say that the roof forms on the second floor be made more consistent...

Board Member Furth: Be simplified?

Board Member Baltay: Just made more consistent.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Board Member Baltay: As seen – best example is on the front elevation on sheet 12.2, where you can see one side is a pitch and the other is a shed roof but it's not – I just couldn't tell from that what you are really looking at because there is a whole bunch of roofs going on up there.

Board Member Furth: So, does it go back – does it jigsaw back? I can't quite figure out what's happening.

Board Member Baltay: Or seen from the rear elevation on sheet 12.3, where you have a hipped roof on the right side and a gable end roof on the left side. I'd like to just leave it as to be made more consistent.

Chair Lew: The perspective shows the roof better than the elevation.

Board Member Baltay: It does.

Chair Lew: Because from the front, you're going to see two hipped roofs and the gable is in the back and in the elevation, it all sort of blurs together.

Board Member Baltay: You know I – maybe we should just leave that off. I am not sure you can see it. That's being too picky so on house number twelve, we are asking to remove the decorative chimney.

Board Member Furth: So, I have a question, which is about the size of the bay window the left. It looks to me like it takes up the entire wall which I don't think bay windows are supposed to do. Am I wrong? Is that really just fine?

Board Member Baltay: On this front elevation?

Board Member Furth: I'm looking at front elevation 12.2 – no, I'm looking at front right perspective, yeah; the left-hand window. I mean in this drawing it looks like the supporting braces practically hit the roof below it. I mean it's – bay windows are separated from other elements. They should be separated from the roof below or the grown. They shouldn't go all the way up to the roof line. It just seems wrong to me but I could be wrong.

Board Member Baltay: Well, the code has very clear descriptions of bay windows and I've steered clear of getting into that because Sheldon, I am sure is looking -- it's a 50% of the glass area (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: Well, I wasn't talking about whether it meets the code. I was talking about whether it was going to look bad.

Vice Chair Kim: I am ok with that one.

Board Member Furth: Alright.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I didn't feel it raised to a level of...

Mr. Lait: Ok, so just to clarify, the amendment is to – on lot 12, is just to eliminate the decorative chimneys?

Board Member Baltay: Just chimney, there is one of them.

Mr. Lait: One chimney, ok.

Board Member Furth: I accept it.

AMENDMENT #15

Board Member Baltay: I don't have any changes to house thirteen. It does have a chimney though, Kyu, if you want to chimney in.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, to me it's not at the fireplace. I mean it's in the vicinity maybe but it's further in, in the family room so I would say let's get rid of it. It's a decorative chimney in my opinion. I would make a friendly amendment that we remove the decorative chimney on lot thirteen.

Board Member Furth: I accept.

Mr. Lait: Board Member Baltay do you accept that as well?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I am sorry. I accept that.

AMENDMENT #16

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I amend that on house number fourteen, we remove the decorative chimneys, as seen on many of the drawings.

Board Member Furth: I accept.

Board Member Baltay: That's the only amendment, yeah.

AMENDMENT #17

Board Member Baltay: Ok, on house...

Chair Lew: Can I ask a question on the garages – on the detached garage on lot fourteen.

Board Member Baltay: Sure.

Chair Lew: This is for the applicant. So, if it's on the property line, do you not – we do not have to put in a parapet to protect the roof? Like an unrated roof?

Mr. Sakai: Not based on our experience in Palo Alto. It does have to be a 1-hour wall with no eave overhang but we haven't been restricted to doing a parapet type roof typically. I mean usually what we do is a shed or a hip roof.

Chair Lew: Then draining onto another property so, like the downspout location and all that, you can...

Mr. Sakai: Oh no, we will typically set the structure slightly in off the property line so they are not really right on top of the property line which leaves room for the gutter to be on the owner's property and then yeah, drain.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, amendment for house number fifteen, three things, that the decorative chimneys be removed. That the roof element over the front porch on the first floor be sloped or otherwise reconfigured to be better integrated. The roof element on the first floor over the front porch be sloped or otherwise be reconfigured to better integrate with the design of the house. Lastly, that the bay window elements; two of them on the front of the house, seen on the front perspective on sheet A-15.2 and the third one is on the back of the house seen on the rear elevation. Where the perspective be reduced in scale and size.

Board Member Furth: Before I accept that, I have a question. When I look at the front left perspective drawing – sorry. When I look at the front left perspective drawing on A-15.2, it looks like this terribly heavy element; way too heavy. Am I reading that wrong?

Board Member Baltay: Over the front door in the middle?

Board Member Furth: Yep.

Board Member Baltay: That's exactly what I was talking about. That element I said needs to be sloped or otherwise reconfigured.

Board Member Furth: It's way – my version of that is its way to heavy visually. Ok, accepted.

Board Member Baltay: For what it's worth, let me point out to the Board that on that elevation if you look at the middle height piece over the front door. That's a sort of half height story, the reason for that is that's the landing for the staircase going up. If you hold that to that height, it doesn't count toward FAR again. That's the whole rationale for doing. That's what gives this façade a cacophonous feeling with so many roof planes.

Board Member Furth: It really messes it up badly.

Board Member Baltay: I am not asking them to change that. That's a difficult design thing again. We're trying to get it the door but I am put pointing that out to the Board Members. That's just another example of pushing the limit as far as you can; almost every place they can.

Board Member Furth: So, it's part of the problem that fine, you can have a stairway there but to have this roof element in front it makes it all not work visually.

Board Member Baltay: It – I am not going to use the word no work.

Board Member Furth: I will as an amateur but your motion is accepted.

AMENDMENT #18

Board Member Baltay: Ok, on house sixteen, is that where we are then? That the chimney element on the front façade on the left be designed to project from the wall that it's on or otherwise be better integrated into the design of the building.

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry, which perspective are you looking at?

Board Member Baltay: I am looking at drawing A-16.2 and what's going on is that tapered chimney you see is flush or just about flush with the wall on the first floor and it's just a really sloppy design. It should be sticking out at least as far as the roof eave next to it.

Board Member Furth: So, it's only sticking out on the second floor presently?

Board Member Baltay: And what happens is if you stick it out that far on the first floor, it's sticking out too far on the second floor. Those are design issues that have to be addressed.

Board Member Furth: So, the motion is to modify the chimney on lot 16 as shown on sheet A-16.2 so that it is not coplanar on the first floor?

Board Member Baltay: Well, I was going to use the words better integrated because I don't want to tie their hands. There are many ways they can fix that. Then the second thing on – nah, forget it.

Board Member Furth: I'm lost. I am sorry but about what better-integrated means. I understand that it shouldn't suddenly pop out on the second floor.

Vice Chair Kim: I think just an easy way to clean that up is that it should not be co – the chimney should not be coplanar with the wall on the first floor.

Board Member Baltay: Fair enough.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Vice Chair Kim: I am looking at that second-floor plan, Mr. Sakai. There appears to be a window at the toilet that is going to get covered by the chimney. There was another instance of that on another – same type but a different lot if you just want to keep that in mind.

Board Member Furth: But this is a real chimney?

Vice Chair Kim: Technically – as far as my definition it would be because there is a fireplace, right.

Board Member Baltay: I think this one does have a real fireplace, yeah.

Board Member Furth: Ok, accepted.

Vice Chair Kim: Is that it?

Board Member Furth: We are running out of houses.

Vice Chair Kim: Where there any additional friendly amendments that we needed to make to this?

AMENDMENT #19

Board Member Furth: That depends on what my colleagues are thinking. I am going to have trouble making the finding that the traffic design – that the circulation pedestrian whatever is ok on the private road when there is no place to pull over and so I envision people parking on the sidewalk or otherwise impairing access. I don't know that we have any ability to do that but I don't know that we have any ability to do that. I think Jonathan is telling me it's 90% sure we have no ability to anything about that and I guess I would like for our next meeting clear direction from Council – from the City's attorney's office that as to what, if any, power we have to require additional parking for the purpose of accommodating particularly short term pick up and drop off kinds of things or short-term visitors – I am not saying this very well.

Mr. Lait: I get the idea.

Board Member Furth: You know who we mean.

Mr. Lait: We'll ask the City's attorney's office for a memo on this issue of providing street parking on this private street.

Board Member Furth: If we do have the power to do it, then it would be good to have a short study from either the applicant or transportation showing how at least one or two such spaces could be provided. Thank you. If there is another way, I mean I don't know what kind of sidewalks they are. I don't know if they have rolled curbs and if they don't, that will help etc. So, I am done. That meandering amendment.

Board Member Baltay: Sure, yeah, I do accept it. I guess I feel that I want to get to a resolution and I want to get this project through. Then I guess I want to respect the Chair and the Committee on how you want to get us there. I have made my views pretty clear.

Chair Lew: Ok, well it sounds like we are ready for a vote. We have...

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I would just say...

Chair Lew: Yes?

Mr. Lait: ...now we have to revisit this issue of date uncertain or date certain and so the applicant has heard a list of suggestions to modify the project. I know from our end, we're going to need two or three weeks to respond to anything that the applicant addresses and I am looking to the applicant to find out how many weeks they may need so we plot a date. So, we're looking for applicant time need to submit – resubmit to the City and then we would add about 3-weeks to that to get to the next Board meeting. Do you have a sense for that?

Chair Lew: If we set a date and they are not able to meet it, we can still push it back.

Mr. Lait: That's right.

Chair Lew: So that's – it's not – it just – you don't have to re-notice, is that my understanding? That...

Mr. Lait: That's right.

Chair Lew: Yes.

Mr. Lait: Just like to try to get it dialed in if we can.

Mr. O'Hanlon: We could bring new drawings back to the City in one week.

Mr. Lait: Ok.

Mr. O'Hanlon: Based on these comments on the individual units.

Chair Lew: Ok, so then we are looking at the month out for the City to – and what's on the (inaudible) calendar?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I am just looking for what's on your agenda. You got a really packed agenda on July 20th.

Chair Lew: Yeah, the joint – we have joint HRB/ARB meeting and other items after that as well.

Mr. Lait: Oh, did the meeting on the 3rd get canceled?

Chair Lew: Yes. That was my last – that was the last that I had heard. That's the July 6th or – the first meeting in July, right?

Mr. Lait: July 6th.

Chair Lew: I think Jodie had said that was going to be canceled and they would be consolidated to the 20 –to – the met – the meeting on the 20th.

Mr. Lait: Ok, so one, two, three, four, five, six so you have seven items right now on your July 20th agenda.

Chair Lew: I didn't hear about that.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I am not sure all of those will go but it's clearly a lot. On August – so, we can schedule this one on that date or we can come back on August third where you have, right now, two items and some of these from the July date are probably going to move to there. So, you have a sense for the changes that need to be made. The applicant says that they can turn it around in a week. We need 3-weeks to make our changes so the two dates that we are looking at are July 20th or August 3rd so we'll look to the Board for a date.

Board Member Furth: I won't be here on August 3rd.

Chair Lew: I think the maker of the motion needs to include a ...

Mr. Lait: We're – instead of doing it to a date uncertain, you would amend your motion to have this item come back on July 20th.

AMENDMENT #20

Board Member Furth: So, this amendment will say if it's acceptable to the seconder, the motion would say that this matter be continued to July 20th, 2017?

Board Member Baltay: That's acceptable.

Chair Lew: Ok, so are we ready to vote on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? None and one absent. Just for the record, I am actually ok with the decorative chimneys but I will go with the majority of the Board. Ok, we are not done yet. Thank you all. We will see you shortly.

MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER GOOYER ABSENT

Approval of Minutes:

6. May 18, 2017, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Chair Lew: We have the approval of the minutes for May 18th, 2017. I have some comments. Are there any other comments from the Board?

Vice Chair Kim: I wasn't here for those either so I don't know if we can have a vote.

Chair Lew: Oh, we don't – we can't vote on – we don't have – we have two Members who weren't at the meeting and we only have two Members here so we will continue this to the next meeting. Then I think the next one, Robert will be back so we will have – we should have three people to vote on it. Should I give you the comments now, just so that we can – or we should just wait? Ok.

Subcommittee Item

Chair Lew: Then we don't have any subcommittee items.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Chair Lew: I just wanted to mention that the Marriott Hotel project went to Council. This is on San Antonio Road and it was approved. 8-1 with Kou – Kou was opposed and the other item that we saw recently which was 260 California Avenue, that was on the consent calendar on the Council and only two members voted to pull it off the consent calendar so it was approved as well.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: The restaurant, 260 California Avenue but three Members of the Council did speak about the square footage and calculations and parking – about that but it was approved. Ok, so thank you all. We are adjourned.

Adjournment