



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: March 16, 2017  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

### Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent:

Chair Lew: We're ready to get started. Can we have a roll call, please?

### Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications. This is for items that are not on the agenda and I do have one speaker, which is David Carnahan from the City's Clerk's office. Welcome, David.

Mr. David Carnahan, City's Clerk's Office: Good morning Chair Lew and Board Members. David Carnahan from the City's Clerk's Office and I'm here to give you an update on the City's Board and Commission recruitment. The City is currently recruiting to fill two vacancies on the Human Relations Commission, three on the Library Advisory Commission, four on the public Art Commission and two on the Utilities Advisory Commission. All of these terms are for 3-years, ending May 31 of 2020 and the application deadline is April 4<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 PM. Applications are available on the City's Clerk's website, [www.Cityofpaloalto.org/clerk](http://www.Cityofpaloalto.org/clerk). I'm going to give each of you a flyer and encourage you to share this information with the community and organizations you think might be interested and if you could each reach out, specifically, to two individuals in the community who you think might be interested in applying. You are one of our best resources in the community, knowing residences in a way that most of us Staff don't so I'll pass these out and thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you, David.

### Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Do we have any agenda changes today? Great.

### City Official Reports

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

### Study Session

- 2. 1451 Middlefield Road [16PLN-00217]:** Request for Review of Updated Concept Plans for a One-Story, 14,790 Square Foot Replacement and Expansion Building for the Junior Museum and Zoo and Reconfiguration of the Adjacent Parking Lots. The ARB Previously Considered a Preliminary Review Application on January 19, 2017; Applicant Requests Initial Feedback on Design Modifications in Advance of Formal Application Review. Environmental Assessment:

Pending - No Action is Taking Place at This Meeting. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF). For More Information Please Contact the Project Planner Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Why don't we start with item number or our first item which is item number 2 which is a study session for 1451 Middlefield Road. Request for review of updated concept plans for a one-story, 14,790 square foot replacement and expansion building for the Junior Museum and Zoo and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lots. The ARB previously considered a preliminary review application on January 19, 2017. The applicant requests initial feedback on design modifications in advance of formal application review. Environmental assessment is no action is taking place at this meeting. Zoning District is PF. Welcome, Amy French our Chief Planning Official.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: A. French here. Just to make mine brief, you already summarized what happen and what was requested was more of a big idea and some alterations as related to Middlefield Road. As far as building placement and configuration, the applicants are here. They have some big changes to share with you today and John Aiken is to my left.

Mr. John Aiken: That's true and, so all I would like to do is introduce Cody Anderson Wasney, Brent McClure, and Sarah Vaccaro.

Mr. Brent McClure: Thanks, John. Board thanks you for having us back again. After our last meeting, we went back and looked at a variety of different revisions and a lot of the comments we heard were trying to have a great sensitivity towards Middlefield and a present along the street. Not just give so much of a difference to cars but thinking about bicycles, thinking about pedestrians, thinking about the civic presents as how this facility fits within the greater context of the site. Also, thinking about Lucie Stern, thinking about the Girl Scout building and this sort of greater civic complex. Also, take a closer look at the fact that this building is sitting in a residential neighborhood within the Lucie Stern complex and that maybe the architecture – although it needs to be distinctive of its time and not to differential but that it needs to integrate likely a little bit more with building mass and form as it fits within the great surroundings. What we would like to do is go over with you today in this study session are three parts that we will speak to here. One is the site plan and we made some significant revisions with a lot of meetings with the City as well as our client, the Friends. We'd like to then talk about the – we're going to call it the "big idea" but really, the big idea is more about how are we reflecting the philosophy, the mission, vision on the Friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo and this program, into the site, into the architecture and into how we're integrating the whole facility together. Then the third part is that we've got some massing and building forms that are kind of in progress and this being a study session, it's our hope to come back ideally, for a formal review at the next meeting. Even though we are in progress, we would like to get your thoughts and feedback on some of the massing. You're going to see some forms that are not 100% complete yet but they are far enough along that we want to get your input. Quickly, the – as I mentioned, the – previously, this is the old site plan you saw. We had a parking entrance and drop-off off of the intersection. You had to drive way in there with trees along the street with no real connection off of here and this parking edge was really tight to the Girl Scout building -- were designed by an engineer it appears and that the – trying to maximize parking. What we have done is, we met with the City and really rethought how the building sits within the site. We'll go to a diagram here in a second but in essence, what we have done is we have a driveway entrance that's not in alignment with Kellogg, so you pull in over here. The edge of the parking comes in much – it's pulled significantly back to create a larger plaza in front of our building to get more of the civic presents. We have a gateway entrance and pedestrian promenade that we will talk more about in a second, that directly links off of Middlefield, intersects with the park and then creates an access – probably better if I go to this diagram here. This access off of Lucie Stern so what we are trying to do is -- this is an older sketch because we did change the driveway at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour but the idea is that there will be a dedicated bicycle through way that will link through the park and then come down onto Kellogg. Then cars will be pulled separately over into here so disregard that on this sketch. In essence, this diagram is trying to show all the pedestrian pathways and we're trying to create more of a civic present in thinking about how people move through,

in and around the site. Major front entrance and access point off of the Museum and Zoo. Still having the courtyard concept and design, which we will talk about in a second and then the zoo back in over here.

Ms. Sarah Vaccaro: Thank you. Thank you, Board Members. As Brent mentioned, the big idea is this journey -- this promenade that takes places all the way from the street, Middlefield, to our (inaudible) the entrance and then connects to the park arrival plaza. This journey becomes a manifestation of the JMZ mission, to engage a child's curiosity in science and nature. It's this exciting whimsical, playful experience of science and nature exhibits that children can interact with at their scale. The visitor's experience and the public's experience of the JMZ spills out into this entrance plaza. At each of these portions along the promenade, there are different experiences of different types of science and nature. At the entrance plaza, we are thinking of things that engage in the physical sciences. The movements and patterns of wind, the movement of the sun to tell time, the concept of sound and gravity. Around the pecan tree plaza, we are thinking about life sciences. A way for children to playfully role play as animals, to have to peek throughs into the Zoo, to pretend that they can jump as far as an animal. Around the dawn redwood courtyard, we are thinking of ideas around Earth sciences. Telling the story of the dawn redwood and the Jurassic era and the story of geological time throughout history. As well as linking that with the story of nature water systems and how we will be collecting water from and during rain storms and treating that in a bio swell that the kids will be able to interact with, bridge over and play in. Closer to the street we are creating this break in the building and it becomes this tunnel entrance that we are thinking could be themed with the way the light comes in and creating rainbows. Capturing the energy and showing children how that can be used within the facility itself. As you get closer to the park, playing with ideas of pattern and mathematics. Then moving into the park, leveraging this nexus and then the large park beyond to talk about scale -- to talk about a scaled solar system model potentially that links throughout the entire park. Also, talking about the biggest things like a Blue Whale, a Giant Sequoia, things that can be represented along our zoo wall potentially. Really our goal with the architecture massing and inside the organization is to create the stage, the setting for these experiences. The experiences are the big idea and then our architecture supports them and then reinforces them through expression of materials, structures, and systems that support the ideas of science and nature. The massing is really clean and simple. We are referencing a gabled roof but keeping it very clean contemporary. Breaking the mass to create the tunnel entrance off of Middlefield. Allowing the massing to encircle this dawn redwood courtyard. Creating a really strong entrance plaza and strong entrance façade. Creating a sheltered waiting area underneath the pecan tree adjacent to the entrance plaza. Then this mass over here is the feature phase 2 part of the project that we spoke to last time.

Mr. McClure: Tying a lot of these pieces together, here's an initial quick sketch rendering showing some of the things Sarah has mentioned. We're thinking of having a building with tight eaves and in gable form to echo Lucie Stern to some degree and some of the residential context of the neighborhood. Given our budgetary constraints, we are looking at keeping the mass simple. We feel that having a clean, simple form with this courtyard concept and this frontage promenade -- in a lot of ways, echoes the designs sort of ethos of Lucie Stern and then the Neo-Spanish classical architecture but then represented in a much more modern way and more of a period of our time. We also think that by having that contrast of simple clean forms against this engaging, exciting promenade -- we are having this opportunity to take what the JMZ is and put a lot of it outside in the public realm. It almost becomes an extension of the park if you will, that as you leave the park and come through and experience some of these interactive activities, that is what we are trying to turn over to create. Out at the front, one of things that we are thinking about is that this form then extrudes out and becomes a trellised room that then would have almost like a Ned Kahn wind sculpture design so that you're not only seeing things -- whirly birds that are spinning but you start to see that it's more about the engagement of wind and motion. Then you can understand and see the patterns and how it actually works. The gateway entrance into the -- here some images -- just some contextual images of what we're thinking about with forms; possibly keeping things monochromatic even. The idea is that -- how a child thinks about drawing buildings, in simple clean forms. Having some really large skylights that could act as almost whimsical chimneys that pop into the mass themselves. Playfulness with lights either with color and translucency. The end wall of the museum which is back here with the entrance, we're proposing to have this almost be like a translucent material so that it has a glow but it also begins to read as a clean form. Then some of the images there is what I

was talking about earlier. We are really excited about this kaleidoscopic rainbow tunnel that becomes the gateway off of Middlefield as you enter into this promenade. This trellised area becomes almost like an antechamber of experiences that could even have potential – temporary exhibits that they could either hang or use out and inside the space before you even enter into the museum itself. Here's a shot looking out at the street. We're thinking of this being a clean, simple form with this break into the mass. Then you can see how this really starts to create this promenade and this access off of Middlefield. We're trying to find the right balance of not having a huge – gigantic gateway because we're trying to be sensitive to the residential neighbors across the street but then still just say, hey, here's a great pedestrian entrance into the park, as well as the Museum and Zoo; with sundials and wind tubes and then colored fins that could then become more dense to subtly suggest that this becomes this entrance way into the complex itself. With that, I think – questions and hopefully some dialog and we can get some good direction. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you. I will open it up – the hearing to public comments. I don't have any speaker cards but if anybody is interested in speaking, I think now is the time. Otherwise, we can move on to Board Member questions and comments. Does anybody -- this is a study session so we can have a more open format. Peter?

Board Member Baltay: I'm confused, the drawing I have, shows the parking further down Middlefield towards Lucie Stern but the first image you showed us showed the parking coming in – right into the main parking lot.

Board Member Gooyer: He said this is an earlier version.

Mr. McClure: We were working on the parking lot up to the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and 59<sup>th</sup> minute between us and the City so I think the image that is most current is this one. I think with the graphics it is not as legible because we are showing all kinds of things on this but if I go to this diagram, in essence, it's more or less this image but the driveway for cars enters here. This is a bike/pedestrian-only entrance here. As you can kind of see here, bike/pedestrian entrance here with the bike path that comes and then comes straight across this connection point here into the entry plaza to the park. Then the driveway into here with a bus drop-off zones back in over here and some accessible parking (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Board Member Baltay: Could you show me with your cursor, where's the farthest most edge of the parking lot closest to Lucie Stern? Not the bike access but the actual place where cars drive.

Ms. Vaccaro: I can show you on here. We also have print outs if that would be easier to look at

Board Member Baltay: Just show me with the cursor.

Ms. Vaccaro: Right now, the edge of the parking comes here and it stops at this edge, so the cars would not pass beyond this edge. There would no longer be a vehicular loop around this cluster of oak trees. The idea is to create a safe entrance for bikes only, for cars, and for pedestrians. That is working in conjunction with the City – with the Planning Department and looking at their long-term bike plans for this area.

Board Member Baltay: Thanks.

Chair Lew: Any other questions?

Vice Chair Kim: I have a question. Is there a delta in the parking count?

Mr. McClure: Yes. When we met with the City what we – initially we were pushing for a maximizing parking and I believe we were – we had a net increase of parking with the previous design. In meeting with them, we were able – we said we needed to relax one of these variables and try to see what we can

do. What we arrived at was that the parking would hold close to I believe – Sarah? Are we at – we’re neutral with parking?

Ms. Vaccaro; Right.

Mr. McClure: Yes, so we have the same number of stalls that are currently there now.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert, will you start us off?

Board Member Gooyer: I like this approach much better than the first go around. It – obviously, there’s isn’t much to look at when we first got it but the way you’ve described it, I definitely think this is a much better approach than what you had last time. It makes it more of a unifying factor with the entire complex. You’re absolutely right, there is going to be a – some thought given to the – if you want to call it the pedestrian entrance, whether you make it the tube concept or enhance it a little bit. I think I still – especially for kids, be more towards the tube concept than making it a big bold statement. I think that’s it at this point. It’s a little early to – I definitely think that you’re on the right approach.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back to us. I think –especially civic architecture like this, it’s really important to understand and to tell the story that the architecture is telling. I think before, I was very confused as to what that story was but I think -- I’m very encouraged by the approach that you’re taking now. Especially with simplifying the forms but also keeping it interesting and really having a clear direction that I think has been laid out for you now and I’m very encouraged by that. I appreciate the images you have shown as far as the ideating for different concepts that you have like the tunnel, the wind tubes, so on and so forth. Having said that, I am interested to see how that story that you’ve started to tell with the outside of the building, the promenade, how that continues inside of the building as well. I like a lot of the changes that you have made. I like the fact that we’re not losing any parking. I like the safer drop off inside of the parking lot. I appreciate the greater buffer that you are giving to the Girl Scout Building and I think just overall, I’m a lot more encouraged by what I am seeing. I feel fairly confident now that you will be able to take that with the building itself as well. One or two little comments or question that I might have to add on to my previous question was certain components of the building that aren’t clearly shown yet, such as the area that you are calling the tunnel between the bicycle parking and the wing of the building itself. Is that an area that’s fully covered or is it open? Is that open 24-hours a day? Is that open just during museum hours? Also, with the entrance way that you were showing, it looked like there was as a structure where currently on the site plan at least, it just looks like an open courtyard. If you have any additional comments on those two areas, that would be appreciated but I’m sure we will get into those details as we proceed. Thank you very much.

Mr. McClure: Just to answer your question, I think the idea – we don’t – we haven’t finalized the design of this – we’re calling it a tunnel. We are working towards getting it at a – parts of it to a childlike scale. We’ve talked about, can you make it actually into a rainbow kaleidoscope? There’s been a lot of really exciting – a lot of energy and enthusiasm behind this experience. The idea here is that – I think as of now this – we’ll call it a walkway or promenade, is open 24/7 to the public and that really the edge where the cursor is here and then back to here is an – it would be more – this is an enclosed rectangular courtyard that’s part of the visitor experience once you’ve entered but even this trellised entry plaza/antechamber here, is also open to the public. There’s a lot of opportunities to experience kind of playful park-like activities that engage you to – people just passing through and using that to turn it in – the facility inside out and draw people in.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, yes. I share my colleague's enthusiasm. It really is a much-improved design. I'll bring my comments down from the way you started with the site planning, then the child's journey and the massing. There are two comments I have that you should consider I feel, on the site planning. In general, I really think you're really doing a good thing here. One is that you've created this strong access for pedestrians through the building and it terminates – as far as I can tell, sort of glancingly off the corner of the Girl Scout Building and I think it's very important that that access terminates in the park somehow; visually, physiologically. I can't say whether it's ok or not the way it is but my gut feeling is that it – if it just sees the corner of this older building, that's probably not a successful visual termination. Either you need some landscaping or shift the access a little bit. One of my thoughts was if you put it off 5-degrees further or something, it probably doesn't affect your big idea. I would be very focused on making sure that the concept carries through at that point. The second concern I have is not to do with your parking itself. I think it's a great layout but that, there has been a lot of historical issues with people driving through from Hopkins to Middlefield through this parking lot. That's part of why it's so circuitous right now. It would be a real shame to see you put this beautiful parking arrangement together and then have some neighborhood out crying and having to put bollards or some way for it not to function properly. Maybe this is better for Staff to approach but it would be nice to be sure that you have neighborhood by in as well. That there's not going to be a huge outcry when you've created a very easy path through or you do something to prevent that. That's just a heads up but your concept doesn't work if it becomes a street, not a parking lot. I have to commend you on the child's journey presentation. It's one of the best I have seen for understanding architecture – civic architecture being brought to the community. It's a fantastic way to explain it. It really sings, thank you.

Mr. McClure: Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: On the massing of the building, I think it's great that you're creating this courtyard space which is very reminiscent with many historic Birge Clark buildings, the Lucie Stern Center, the Palo Alto Historical Museum. It's fantastic to see you doing that massing. I'm concerned, however, that the façade along Middlefield – as best as I can tell, is over 100-feet long, of a simple form. I think there it's not going to be so successful. It's just a little bit too long and too unbroken to fit in with the residential scale of the street. I think you really should consider strongly whether you can really pull that off or not. I think it will – in the end, not be just a simple form but rather just not be loved and it will hurt what you are doing. I think you want to probably give it some variation or modulation or at least give it some more thought. The concept is good. Then I'd like to add two thoughts I guess. I was at the Lucie Stern Center the other night, early for the theater – sitting in that wonderful courtyard outdoors, thinking about your project and thinking, what was it that makes that space so great? What is Birge Clark doing because he would also argue that it's a building of his time, it's a simple – it's not a traditional mission building in the least. So, studying it, I realized that he has created a fantastic outdoor space. Just the small details in that courtyard, the way it's landscaped and lit, make it so inviting, so pleasant. That reflects what Kyu is saying about keeping that pedestrian alley open to the public. The way that Lucie Stern is open all the time but to really think hard about the detailing and don't let your desire to make it modern mean that you don't do anything. It's not just a concrete straight walkway and we're not trying to do Le Corbusier here. Birge Clark, when I was looking at it, didn't. He really believed in putting some details like different tile patterns, a special kind of brick, carefully laid brick in different patterns. Not necessarily expensive but it really works. I was also really taken with just the simple embellishments on the Lucie Stern Building. The rod iron light fixtures out front are fantastic, simple designs that are timeless and it's crying out to have more of that on what you're doing. Again, you're not harking back to another era to put carefully thought out details. You can do them with stainless steel instead of rod iron but look at that stuff and think about it. The – he also does a really neat gave ample detail at the end of the edge of the roof. Just a slight modulation, it's not a big overhang, it's a simple mass but it's carefully done. Don't give us Huge Jacobson's absolute nothingness, put some detail into it. That's the historical context that you are in, there is detail on that building so don't ignore it. The third thing he does, which is maybe more difficult but he creates wonderful covered outdoor spaces. The covered porches out – along the entire perimeter of that courtyard is part of what makes it so inviting. The building is not so front and center. There are people there and it's very practical in the rain. Again, you might consider that as – you're already doing some of that I can tell, with your walking here but those are things that I think you can take away from

the Lucie Stern Center building. Lastly, I think – I understand that there's already a historic report being done on the Girl Scout building but I think it's important to consider that building as well. In initial thoughts about that building and how it fits, it's one that almost wants to be this little wooden hut off in a park, which is fine and it's good. It doesn't want to be the building at the end of an access, which is kind of where I'm bringing to here. Right now, you've got that building doing that and I don't think that's appropriate but certainly, I'd rather hear you just address that yourself. To close my comments, I greatly support the site plan. I think you are moving in the right direction. I also have to say that I feel that's really important that this building be considered as part of a Class 1 Historic Complex and as I've been out to that site several times more and just recently thinking about it a lot more. That Lucie Stern building is pretty special and this building has to somehow respond to that. What you originally presented didn't so I'd like to see you keep that in mind here. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you and Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I share my colleague's happiness to seeing your revised plans. It's quite breathtaking. Where's the stroller parking?

Mr. McClure: Sarah?

Board Member Furth: This is the question I get from the general public.

Ms. Vaccaro: Yes, yes. We understand that that's a very important topic. I'm a mom myself so I share your concern. I think there are many opportunities. In the exterior plaza landscape, I think there's opportunities kind of within the more sheltered area underneath the pecan tree. I think there are potential areas underneath – in this entry plaza that could store a few strollers. Then once visitors actually enter into the paid experience of the exhibit hall and of the zoo, we're going to carefully plan for stroller areas so that moms and dads feel comfortable leaving their belongings in a certain place and then venturing out with their children but allowing them to be close.

Board Member Furth: I look forward to seeing adequate stroller parking in the unpaid area. Could you explain to me how the dawn redwood courtyard works in terms of areas that are closed off or gated and areas which are not?

Ms. Vaccaro: Sure. Let's see, what's a good (inaudible)? This is probably the best image to speak too. The main entrance into the Museum and Zoo is right behind this windscreen if you will. It's where this blue awning is represented so this main – the taller mass of this building is the main exhibit hall and then there will be doors that take you out to the Zoo experience beyond the pecan tree here. There will also be doors that bring you out to – almost a slightly elevated deck area around the pecan tree. The pecan tree has a very shallow root system so we want to be very respectful of those and build up above the ground plain. We are proposing a slightly elevated deck experience. Paid visitors will be able to circulate around the dawn redwood and children will be able to climb down into different areas that have rocks to play on or different things to investigate. The science classrooms are also ringing this courtyard and so the ideas that those classrooms can spill out into the same raised decking area and then so climb down into this – we're proposing that this area be slightly depressed and act as a bio swell for water treatment and so forth. The idea is that the kids would be able to climb down into this slightly depressed area and climb over rocks and investigate plants and so forth. The idea is that that slight change in grade is what keeps the paid public out, as well as some railings and...

Board Member Furth: Is there a fence that I'm seeing along the walkway?

Ms. Vaccaro: We like to think of it more as an exciting railing – guard rail if you will, that will have...

Board Member Furth: Is this a place where I'm going to tell my child no, you can't climb that, it's private?

Ms. Vaccaro: Exactly.

Board Member Furth: Then it's a fence.

Ms. Vaccaro: We will make it fence like enough.

Board Member Furth: It's a barrier.

Ms. Vaccaro: Yes, it will be a barrier.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so I can press my nose to it. Great and then – let's see what else – did I have any other questions? I very much like your idea of using that space to show scale and I – you're going to need to get a park improvement ordinance anyways for the zoo so if that includes continuation of your scale demonstrations into the main park, I think that could be fascinating. I lived for a while in [phonetics] [Gideon], which runs the solar system down its main street or its main pedestrian street. It's quite effective I think. I think it all looks quite possible. I do agree that – I – one of the things I really like about this design as oppose to the earlier one is you can imagine turning a kid loose without having them get hit by cars. I very much like the idea of your opening. This entry into the park, it seems to me that it doesn't quite do it. It seems to me that it's slamming into the Girl Scout – Lou Henry Hoover House still and so I look forward to seeing how that might work more effectively. We're still moving asphalt 30-feet closer to that house so I'm looking forward to – I'm curious as to what our better discussion of that building function and history tells us about whether we can do that appropriately. I think this shows enormous promise and achievement.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I have a couple – I have a question for Staff on this and I think this is a – I was trying to understand Peter's comments with respect to the Lucie Stern Center. We have – I guess we have two things. One is the HRB reviewed the existing building, right? Would they weigh in on this project as – with regard to it being a historic site?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Lew; Ok, great.

Ms. French: I mean, the code does say the ARB can refer projects to the HRB and this is one where we naturally expect to have it referred to – because the site is a listed registered historic site.

Chair Lew: Right and then the thing with the Girl Scout building...

Ms. French: Yes?

Chair Lew: ...is not technically is my recollections?

Ms. French: There's no write-up of that house but that is happening with the consultant. Page and Turnbull is preparing...

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) eligible.

Ms. French: ... a historic resource evaluation about that and so that will be available to the ARB and the HRB at the next – for the formal review of this project.

Chair Lew: Great. Then our PF zone, Public Facility Zone, doesn't have compatibility requirements as say downtown so how would – our standard findings would apply, is that correct?

Mr. French: Correct...

Chair Lew: I was wondering what...

Mr. French: ...no context based design criteria but...

Chair Lew: So, in theory, this could be – our code doesn't require it to – our zoning ordinance doesn't require it to be compatible with the Lucie Stern Center or the Girl Scout Building but it does have to have transitions, as I understand the code.

Ms. French: Correct. You're going to have the architectural review findings combined with the Secretary of Interior Standards that look at not impacting a CEQA resource with what's being introduced.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you very much. I don't have anything to add that hasn't already been said. I think the other Board Members have said it will. I support the project as you're proposing it now and then I think the only comment that I had was that you're showing the park arrival place in between the Girl Scout building and your phase 2 piece. I think I might argue though that the – my recollection is that from the master – the Rinconada Park Master Plan is that they are trying to connect the – extend their access through the park and I might argue that you could bring the park entrance somewhere out towards Middlefield. That's maybe not your project but I mean in the Master Plan possibly. The existing driveway around the big tree, closer to – what is it, Kellogg Avenue? That could be a nice arrival point as you have your bike – you're proposing the separated bike path. I mean that seems to me to be a really nice entry point.

Ms. Vaccaro: Sorry, which location were you saying?

Chair Lew: Closer to – is it Kellogg?

Mr. McClure: Kellogg.

Chair Lew: Over there, I mean that could be an entry point into the park. That's what...

Mr. McClure: We're getting rid of the parking that's going around those oaks so that then can be this park promenade as you then come in. You'll still need to go along that walkway that cuts through the parking lot but we're already planning to make that nice and special. That's an interesting idea.

Chair Lew: I don't know if that's really part of your project or not because that's – it seems like that might be part of the Park Master Plan.

Mr. McClure: Yeah, so there is a gateway entrance here, as you then pull in this way.

Chair Lew: Yeah because they're really connected to the neighborhood and sort of make this park seemingly bigger. That's all I have, I think you are on the right track. I think everything is looking good and we look forward to seeing your final application.

Mr. McClure: Thanks for your comments everybody.

## **Action Items**

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 240 Pasteur Drive [16PLN-00362]:**

Recommendation on the Applicant's Request for approval of an Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a new Biomedical Innovations Building for the Stanford University School of Medicine. The Approximately 215,000 Square Foot Building was Previously Entitled in 2011. The Proposed Project Includes Architectural Modifications to Reflect Updated Internal Program Needs, Surrounding Pathways, Heritage Trees, and the Architecture of the Adjacent Hospital. Environmental Assessment: An Environmental Impact Report was Previously Certified for This Project Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: HD

Chair Lew: We will move onto the next item, which is item #3 which is a public hearing / quasi-judicial matter for 240 Pasteur Drive. Recommendation on the applicant's request for approval of an architectural review to allow the construction of a new Biomedical Innovations building for the Stanford University School of Medicine. The approximately 215,000 square foot building was previously entitled in 2011. The proposed project includes architectural modifications to reflect updated internal program needs, surrounding pathways, heritage trees, and the architecture of the adjacent hospital. Environmental assessment is an EIR was previously certified for this project pursuant to CEQA and the zone district is HD. We will just take a moment to let the Staff make a transition. We have Rebecca Atkinson, planner for the project. Welcome.

Ms. Rebecca Atkinson: Good morning, thank you. The project is as you described, thank you very much. The background information on the School of Medicine Master Plan and the overall Stanford Medical Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project is contained in the first Staff report for this project. As an overview and to reiterate, the School of Medicine Master Plan was approved in 2011 as part of the overall Stanford Medical Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project. The Master Plan included demolition of 4 existing buildings and replacement with 3 new – what was previously called Foundation of Medicine buildings. The first building, FIM 1, which is before you today under a new name, Biomedical Innovations building, was previously reviewed by the Architectural Review Board and the remaining two buildings have not received architectural review approval to date. The site plan is shown in your project plans, as well as here on the site – on this slide. The proposed building – the north side of the building faces Pasteur and to the east is Edwards and to the west is Lucas. The proposed elevations are the same as what you saw before in December and the ground floor plan remains the same as well. There have been some modifications to the Landscape Plan and so forth, as shown in your updated plan set from March 9<sup>th</sup>. I have the previously approved elevations from 2011, should you need them in your discussions today. Also, the previously approved ground floor plan, you also have that in the plan set you received in December. These key items are under the – undergoing review by Staff and detailed conditions of approval are being prepared to address these key items. Including referment of the need for the 2011 conditions of approval to remain in effect, as well as the previous Stanford Medical EIR mitigation measures. The conditions of approval would also contain a confirmation of how much floor area would be used in this first BMI building versus what is remaining because there is a requirement for a no net loss or sorry, no net gain of floor area. The total School of Medicine Master Plan build out would be the demolition of 415,000 – sorry, 415,000-square feet of total gross floor area and there would be no net loss. In terms of actually considering this by a medical innovation building today, before -- since December -- since you saw the project last in December, the floor area has been confirmed to be 202,450-square feet and the remaining would be 212,763-square feet. At this stage, Staff would welcome comments from the ARB including comments on the building design, Landscape Plan, and any item requested to return to the subcommittee for this BMI building; if there happened to be anything. Also, any feedback from the ARB on future distribution and massing of the remaining floor area or any comments on the design of the corner – design on the corner of the forthcoming second building in order to create a gateway. To reiterate, the – any forthcoming building would come back to the Architectural Review Board. At the last ARB meeting, which was in December, the applicant heard the unanimously approved motion from the ARB to provide a more detailed Landscaping Plan and also provide studies on building entrances. The applicant has provided an updated project description and a response to ARB comments in Attachment A and they also have a detailed presentation for you and a model that they would like to show you. Since the submittal of this project, Staff has not received any public comments on the project. Staff recommends a review of the project today and recommendation to Staff and the Director regarding approval. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you. Oh, I forgot to mention that the March 9<sup>th</sup> plan set, there's a new page submitted At Places. It's an updated site utility plan and stormwater plan that attempts to reconcile those sheets in the March 9<sup>th</sup> plan set – reconcile to the landscape plans. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Jonathan.

Mr. Jonathan Lait: Great, thank you. Thank you, Rebecca, and Board Members. Just to reiterate, there was a discussion that the Board had in December and there were a variety of comments that were made. The Board's motion focused on two discrete aspects of the project, which are detailed in your Staff report and that's the focus of the Board's review this evening. That is having to do with the entry and the Landscape Plan and that's where the focus of the review should be and our recommendation again is for approval of that project.

Chair Lew: Great. Now is the time for the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Justin Brooks: Good morning, Board. Thank you for having us back today. I'm Justin Brooks from ZGF Architects. I'm joined today by my colleagues Tom Leader and Eric Prince from TLS Studio, our Landscape Architect on the job. I wanted to spend some time today talking to you about the two key design issues that were just laid out. First, the discussion of building entry and its disposition, particularly in relationship to the overall campus planning construct of the school of the medical campus. As well as invite TLS to spend some time explaining in detail the landscape approach and the landscape plan. In regards to building entry, first I want to bring us back to –we're orienting where this building exists within the context of the school of the medical campus. It exists at the corner adjacent to the medical center but it is a building that is a part of the School of Medicine. In the slide that is indicated on the screen, that is to the south, right? This building is really serving the vast majority of its population (inaudible) nearly all, is being served from the south of our site from the School of Medicine as oppose from the hospital. We effect very little cross traffic in terms of actual building users coming from the hospital into this facility. In fact, would encourage that there should not be – this is a research building that is intended for research, which needs to be in a fairly secure and discreet environment. The School of Medicine campus is comprised of a series of gateways and campus nodes, which create entry points. The gateways are generally more out scaled elements or apertures or openings at the edge of the campus armature. The nodes exist after those gateway points and that is traditionally on this campus, where we find building entrances. There is a sequence – an expected sequence of building entries where you move through a gateway element, which is as we described to you in our last meeting, that has been created through the formation of this large overhanging trellis, which celebrates the heritage coast live oaks and brings you into what we are calling BMI plaza. That BMI plaza, which is the top left square indicated on the screen here, really becomes the organizing structure for building entries both in our facility, the CCSR facility, Beckman to the south and future BMI too. We are using that space as a wayfinding device for the physical building entry – (inaudible) gateway. The trellis really is the campus entry indicator, if you are to move from Pasteur or from the hospital onto campus. Within that exterior space, the BMI plaza – our building lobby is intended to extend the interior space into the exterior and vice versa. The ground plan has been treated in such a way to pull exterior materials through into the building lobby. We're using high transparent glass to increase the visibility into the lobby space and have carried interior and exterior materials on the soffits and walls of that space, inside and out. So, it's really to indicate and give the impression that this building is putting a foot into the BMI plaza. In terms of wayfinding, it really allows you to find your way into the space in a logical way arranged with the CCSR entry porch to the south. Looking at that entry condition from the BMI plaza and just passing through the gateway element as I mentioned, we are using high transparent glass so low iron glass is something that we've explored since last speaking with you, to try and increase the transparency, minimize reflectivity's so that there really is a view into the space. It gives you a sense of what is going on within that space and gives a sense of the materials extending from the plaza inside of the building. Again, here you can see a relationship between this building entry and the building entry of the CCSR project to the south and in the distance here. So, having those relationships is important because that's where we see the interaction and overlay of building users coming from. Looking to the north, back towards the hospital again, that extension of materials inside and out. Looking back through the large gateway aperture which is the trellis mounted at the edge of Pasteur. I invite TLS to spend a little bit of time talking about the programmatic elements around the site and how each of these spaces is to be used, relative to gateway and entry and some of the secondary (inaudible) spaces. Tom, if you don't mind?

Mr. Tom Leader: I'm Tom Leader, TLS Landscape Architecture and I'm joined by Eric Prince, my partner. I figured out this morning – I have been working on this piece of land since 1988 when this was all just a

big parking lot for the hospital. It did have some big majestic oak trees and over the course of the years, we've – different things have occurred, obviously. First CCSR was built and I was involved in the design and construction of the garden there and the plaza that currently exists that is shared by [Beckman] entry and CCSR. It was envisioned as a sunny living room space where we could gather together people from those two structures. In 2001, we were involved in the beginning of the planning of the medical school campus and Dean [phonetics] [Philapesso] was key in this. His vision was that we needed to get researchers out of the hospital, we need to have our own campus and although we've got Clark Center and we've got CCSR, we need to develop a whole campus of its own, strictly – with a face – putting a face on research. The plan that came forward during that time had a few key principles. One was to create a series of porches for arrival to these buildings so there's not just a door. That there's a space out in front where people can gather as they move in and out. To see each other – people that are working inside of the building and then second, to organize these porches together and to aggregate them so that – off of a few key spaces like Justin outlined, you will bump into various people from other facilities at the same time. During that planning, it was really – felt important to take that existing plaza at CCSR and group more entries around it and its one of the most interactive spaces frankly, on the whole, medical school campus in that regard –(inaudible) would like four porches all working together. Then we – during the --I don't know – several years ago, we presented to you the planning of the area and it was called thin planning at that time; foundation and medicine. This idea was brought forward of aggregating four entries around this plaza and then facing the hospital is a gateway that is really an entry to the entire medical school and it's not identified only with one facility. That was kind of the key principle of what we were doing and now we are at that moment where something will be built and I will just take a moment to say that one of the key reasons why you do these things is for collaboration. These are researchers and they are a closet away at their desk and when they come out at lunch and when they enter and exit the building, it's good to cross paths with other people not only in your facility but other facilities. That collaboration really happens, researchers exchange ideas and social life really develops really in that space; it's the living room for the whole school. That is really why that this has been figured out this way and it's been that way for a while. I think that this is really a key issue and that the entry was really on the front side, they are going to be separated from the life that is moving in and out of the other three porches; they really ought to be together for that reason. On the – sorry, let me just go back. (Inaudible) plaza was really shared by four and then there were two key spaces at the front. Those ancient oak trees, they are still there and those spaces are about making a home for them. Making sure that they survive, that we are following the most important and functional horticultural principles like exposure, drainage, and use of materials that will reduce impact and compaction of soil. Things that are a detriment to big oak trees so they're spaces for use but that entry at the front is a lot about making space for an oak tree that is less traffic and is also 4-feet down from the entry to the building. We – for a horticultural reason, we really want to separate the entry and locate it at the plaza. This is the space – one of the spaces at the front where the oak tree finds a home and we have it -- cypress trees indicate the entry to the entire campus and is relating to the Tommy Church entry to the hospital in general. I'm going to ask Eric Prince to kind of go through the detail of the landscape as we move around the building.

Mr. Eric Prince: Ok, well, I'll touch on this really quick so you can have time for questions. This is a gateway plaza, it really is a gateway where we are allowing – putting a frame around that oak tree and material and grating and allowing a plaza to exist outside of that oak tree as a threshold from the promenade into this space; this is slightly more social in nature. Then zooming out along Pasteur, these oak groves are interrupted by an alley of elm trees that move throughout Pasteur that are greater than this sight but move along Pasteur. In between, we have a light well and you can see a section in the upper left. This light well is bringing light to the lab buildings but then along that slope it's planted with some native woodland plantings along that slope; they are really diverse and beautiful. Then the northwest oak grove is more passive in nature where we are using a lot of existing materials like stone and aggregate mulch and leaving that platform very open and flexible. As you turn the corner along Governors Avenue, we have this as being a major bike corridor for the University with a lot of bike facilities and bike parking and an alley of sycamores that are moving throughout. Lastly along Cooper Lane, this is a very shaded alley of using native planting along that way. You can see a view here and under the canopy of CCSR, with some lawn panels for gathering. Then lastly, this is all just to say, all the planting is working within the existing planning context whether the cypress trees are pulling from the

hospital to the alley of elms that are moving along Pasteur. We are using this palette that engrains and works with a greater campus seating in addition with the heritage oaks.

Mr. Brooks: Thank you so...

Chair Lew: Great, thank you.

Mr. Brooks: ...(inaudible) answer questions.

Chair Lew: Yes. If there are any members of the public that would like to speak to this item, now is the time. Seeing none, we will move on to Board Member questions. Any questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I have two questions. One for the applicant regarding the gateway plaza, is there a direct connection from the building to the plaza? I see on the plan here a series of – it looks like thicker pilasters on the building and glazed openings. Then secondly, what is the elevation difference between the interior floor of the building to the plaza? I'm sure all that information is here but there are over 100 pages.

Mr. Brooks: There is not a direct connection through those thickened pilasters beyond – it's a visual connect through the thickened pilasters to the gateway plaza. You've hit on a good point which is sort of a limitation on why there is not. There is a 3 ½-foot grade difference between building grade, which is working around the entire site to make primary and secondary work. That grade is fixed because we are working very hard to protect those heritage oaks so not over grading them, not changing the grading condition or constructing ramps/stairs or otherwise mitigate the grade change in that space.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. My other question is for Staff. Again, there's such a pile of papers, it's hard to find the answer. I'm sure it's here but where are the findings that we should be using to approve this? What is see is a set of findings from 2010 with all 16 of them. Is that what we are following?

Mr. Lait: Yes, so because the project is subject to the Development Agreement, it locks in the findings that were in place at the time that the agreement was entered into so it's the – you may recall, it's the 16 findings that the Board had; it's those same findings. Now the responses to those findings may get adjusted if – as needed to respond to this specific project.

Board Member Baltay: There are no written findings specific to this project in this packet?

Mr. Lait: We've borrowed from the previous project and the same conditions. As we indicated in the Staff report, there might be some adjustments that we make to some of that criteria when the Director signs off on the project. However, the Board is certainly welcome to make comments on the findings if – as needed.

Board Member Baltay: Just to understand, the findings that I am seeing here, are the exact same findings as was approved in 2010? Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question if nobody else a comment. I think mine is actually a comment. The – for Staff, the listing for this project and also some references in the drawing sets mention heritage trees and I've been corrected by the City Attorney on past projects. We have heritage trees, protected trees, and regulated trees and so heritage trees are only ones that the City Council has designated as being special for historical or whatever reasons. Other Cities use heritage trees to mean – what we call protected or regulated trees, meaning large oak trees or large redwood trees. I think it's not quite right in the description of the project and there are some references to -- in the landscape plans – in some of the landscape plans it mentions heritage trees but then it also lists protected trees so it's a little – it's contradicting itself. (Inaudible) our – excuse me – our Cities code. That's all I have for questions and we can move onto comments. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for the – as always beautiful presentation. My principle concern last time was finding number 7, which requires that you provide a good setting not only for the people who are going to be in the building because they have business there but for the community around it. While this is part of the research aspect of the medical facility – I mean medical school, it's moving out from where it use to be adjacent to the hospital. It still has a neighbor which is people seeking treatment and their families and that's why I was concerned that – in my experience, people seeking treatment and their families what to get out of the hospital and if you're going to go for a walk and you don't want to shop, you're going to head for this area. That was why I was concerned about, can you find access to a bathroom, is there a place to sit, is there a drinking fountain? I'm satisfied that you have addressed that adequately so that addresses my concern. I did have one question, so the security – where does this space become secure?

Mr. Brooks: Within the building.

Board Member Furth: Within the building. I was reading that right, thank you.

Mr. Brooks: If you look at -- in the books, you have received, plan sheet 16. The secure facilities begin at – I'll reference grid lines, maybe that's the easiest way to navigate. In the east/west direction, grid 17 indicates a doorway sort of just to the left of the toilets, that would be a secure point. Additionally, in the opposite direction, just north of the Orange colored stairway, there is a doorway there as well so those apertures – there's another to the south. Those are the points at which there would be secure access. That said, we would expect fairly low – quite low public traffic into this building and the University would be looking to, in fact, discourage that at some level.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne, is that all?

Board Member Furth: It is.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I don't have any comments other than to say that I think we can make the findings to recommend approval. I think if anything, on the older findings, I think with the original building design there was that front door – I'm reading the last sentence in finding #2. A new front door for the school of medicine along Pasteur Drive is created in relationship with the new Stanford Hospital. I think that has changed a little bit so if maybe we could just strike out that sentence. I think I can make the other findings as is and you've clearly shown that you've got this (inaudible) of parts and you guys know what you are doing. I don't have any concerns and I'd be fine recommending approval. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Based on the limited finding or I should say the limited scope of this portion, I can approve it the way it is. My biggest concern – I'm just going to throw it out again. I'm just not a big fan of the kit of parts concept. Never have been because after – that's a very attractive looking building I think there but the reality of it is that I've been in project – long term situations where after you building 5 or 6 of these things, after a while they just begin to look way too much together and the average person walking by goes, oh ok, now is this building 12 or is this building 14? They all begin to look alike. As I said, seeing as though that ship has passed, it – I can approve it based on the limited scope that we have. Although I do want to say that in the analysis here, the concept says or it's written in our thing that the City and Stanford have a shared interest in quality architecture, place-making, and overall urban design. While there may be some refinements that some may suggest could be made to enhance the landscaping or the other features, Staff concludes on balance that the project meets the required findings for approval. To me, that is settling and I don't like that. That's it.

Mr. Lait: If I could just comment if it's appropriate. I think the comment isn't there from a place of settling but with the recognition that the fact that there's still some zoning related matters that we need to sort that out and we think that they're going to be addressed but that's what we are getting at there.

Board Member Gooyer: I understand but what I am saying, this paragraph fits perfectly with the concept of a kit of parts so that was my main comment on that. I can approve it the way – based on the scope.

Chair Lew: And Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I share Robert's reaction to this and feel that the gateway plaza and to some extent the other plaza facing Pasteur are – I guess lost opportunities. They are outdoor spaces that could become really good pedestrian space and I don't think you're going to get them there because there is no way to get into them easily and they are not really connected to the building. That said, I understand and agree with your logic about the overall planning and how you want the building to be entered from the other side and that's what functionally makes sense. Reluctantly, I am happy to settle that I can make the findings to recommend approval.

Chair Lew: Wynne, did you have a question?

Board Member Furth: I was just confused by Staff's statement. We don't know yet whether this building complies with zoning?

Mr. Lait: It does. There are some minor detail that we are going to address in plan check that are having to with underground tunnel or the – some of the utility stuff that was still – at the time that we prepared the report, didn't have those answers to but you'll see in the Staff report that we're also going to include a condition that if there are any substantive changes as a result of the plan refinement, that we would come back to the Architectural Review Board. The plan that you see before you is the plan that would be approved.

Board Member Furth: The aspects of the plan that we are looking at are not involved in the zoning compliance issues?

Mr. Lait: That's correct.

Board Member Furth: Which involve an underground tunnel and utility placement.

Mr. Lait: Right, areas where we believe the Board would have areas of interest or purview, we believe that those have been addressed.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question regarding the landscapes. It seems like from the last set of plans that we received, there is a change in one of the – there's an addition of an additionally relocated oak tree in the northwest oak grove. I was wondering if you could explain that and where is that tree coming from?

Mr. Prince: The source of that tree is yet to identified. It could come from a number of sources, whether it's at a nursery or from the campus. Internally, if there's a tree that needs to be located but the idea is that it's a large coast live oak that matches the grove there so that it reinforces the character of the oaks that are there. It's – again, not probably the same scale as those existing ones. Those are very large but it is something in nature of – something that's like 25-feet in the canopy. They are big and so something that we would then again, reinforce a teenager like age oak tree in those areas.

Chair Lew: Ok, good. Is there in the light well along Pasteur Drive, you're showing a lot of shade tolerant plants that light moisture. Are there any issues with planting that type of plants that require that kind of water near – in the proximity of the existing oak trees?

Mr. Prince: I wouldn't say that they are like a wetland type planting. They are plants like Mahonia, that can tolerate to shade but can also tolerate more drier conditions in these California woodland environments, where you won't get rain in the summer time. The excess of water is the regular type irrigation zone for ground cover planting. The slope is fairly shallow so it's not too steep as to sheet off all the water but it's kind of achieving this delicate balance of getting shade -- diversity of plantings without requiring a lot of water.

Chair Lew: Thank you for that. I think that's all that I have with regard to the project. I can support the project. The findings I think need -- the existing findings, I think need several edits. I think one was mentioned that was about the -- was #2, right? I think the entry was mentioned and then I would say that the -- I would just add a comment. My comment is that the existing Lucas building has a similar entrance location to this proposed project. On the -- what do you call it? More on the Campus Drive side of the building, in the corner. It's not like it's something new, it's something that has already been done there. In #4, it mentions the red roof entry elements that were in the previous design and I would say that it's been revised to a trellis element.

**Male:** That's correct.

Chair Lew: In #7, it mentions that there is a new series of quads and porches. I know you guys have been calling it a porch but I would actually argue that they are closer to plazas. I don't know, maybe that's semantics but if we're -- I don't really like the -- we're putting porches in the findings. We're putting porches in quotes and it just -- it doesn't seem quite right because it seems like it's hinting that it's not a porch so why don't we just call it an entry plaza. Then in #11, I think maybe we should -- which is about natural features. I think maybe we should state what's happening. Let's just say that the -- that there are 3 or 4 oak trees being removed and a certain amount being relocated, right? I forgot exactly how many -- because it's just not -- it's just a little fuzzy there. It's not really saying that the -- anything is being removed. Those are all my comments. Do we have a motion?

Board Member Baltay: On finding #7, you're talking about the help -- buildings help establishes a new series of quads and porches or however you find it along both Pasteur and Cooper Lane. I don't find it (inaudible) along Pasteur. Can we describe that?

Chair Lew: We have porches but I think that they -- they are trying to create plazas at the -- in the oak groves, at the two ends of the building.

Board Member Baltay: That was precisely my comments to them... (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: That there no entry.

Board Member Baltay: ...that they are not really successful plazas so I don't support that there are plazas along Pasteur.

Chair Lew: I would say that it may not be an entry plaza to the building but it's still a plaza for the users in the vicinity. If you go out there at break time or between shifts...

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: ...people are walking all -- people are walking around taking breaks and chatting on their phone (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Board Member Baltay: We want the change to the word quads and porches to plazas, is that the proposed change then?

Chair Lew: Yeah because I think we all agreed that it's not really a porch, right?

Board Member Baltay: So how is it proposed – what are you saying we should make this then?

Chair Lew: I mean – I was thinking of plaza. Why don't we go to the sheet, I mean they have created all these benches and I've never seen benches quite like...

Board Member Baltay: I'll grant you it's a plaza, yes.

Chair Lew: I would even say that it's not even an entry plaza, right? It's a landscaped plaza.

Board Member Baltay: If we just change it to say proposed building help establish a series of new plazas, is that good?

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, then I am fine with that.

#### MOTION

Chair Lew: Ok, I'm not supposed to make the motion but I will make the – I will make the motion since I made all of the comments on the findings. I will make a motion that we approve the project as proposed including the Attachments A with the following revisions. That we delete the front door sentence in the existing findings on #2. #4 we delete the red roof reference to the red roof elements and we replace that with a trellis element. #7 we delete porches and replace it with plazas and under #11 if you would just itemize the number of trees being removed and relocated. Then also, maybe if we could correct the heritage reference and maybe put in protected or regulated trees as needed. Does anybody want to second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Thank you. All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed? None. Thank you, that passed 5-0

#### **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0**

Mr. Brooks: Thank you, Board. Thank you for your time, this morning.

Chair Lew: Thank you. We're going to take a 5-minute break so that the next project can set up.

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 475 Cambridge Avenue [16PLN-00250]:** Request for ARB Hearing of a Tentative Approval of an Architectural Review to allow a Steel Beam Trellis Structure Over a 28,051 Square Foot Area to Support a Solar Development on the Top Floor of an Existing City Parking Structure. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From CEQA per Guideline Sections 21080.35, 15303, and 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: Public Facility. For more information, contact the project planner Amy French at [amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org)

[Is being reviewed with Item #5]

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 275 Cambridge Avenue [16PLN-00278]:** Request for ARB Hearing of a Tentative Approval of an Architectural Review to allow a Steel Beam Trellis Structure Over a 20,645 Square Foot Area to Support a Solar Development on the Top Floor of an Existing City Parking Structure. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From CEQA per Guideline

Sections 21080.35, 15303, and 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: Planned Community (PC-4127). For more information, contact the project planner Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Lew: We've item #4 and #5 and we're going to group them together because they are related. They are – they have been separated because they are different zone districts. Item #4 is a public hearing/quasi-judicial matter for 475 Cambridge Avenue. Request for ARB hearing of a tentative approval of an architectural review to allow a steel beam trellis structure over a 25 or 28,051-square foot area to support a solar development on the top floor of an existing City parking structure. Environmental assessment is its exempt From CEQA per Guideline Sections 21080.35, 15303, and 15301 and that district is PF, Public Facility. Item #5 is 275 Cambridge Avenue. Request for ARB hearing of a tentative approval of an architectural review to allow a steel beam trellis structure over a 20,645-square foot area to support a solar development on the top floor of an existing City parking structure. Again, that one is exempted from CEQA but this one is in a PC, Planned Community zone. Amy French, welcome back.

Ms. French: Thank you. Amy French here and I have a PowerPoint today that does lump both projects together. The one slide showing on the screen shows both of the bird's eye views of 275 and 475 Cambridge. As noted, we have one that is zoned public facilities and that is 475 Cambridge and the other, 274 Cambridge is zoned planned community. These structures were built – 475 Cambridge in 1986 and 275 Cambridge in 1994. They both have some life ahead of them. I'll start with 475 as it's first on the agenda. I have some images on the screen showing the contextual site plan, showing the buildings in the immediate vicinity and the roof plan showing the solar panels placed on the trellis. Here is another image showing the site plan. I have a section showing the framing. This is through the middle of the site lengthwise, you can see the ramp here. Then I have a canopy framing plan so here we have the supports and the steel members that are being placed on the top of this garage at 475. Here are some images of 475 before on the left and after on the right. These images are showing that the steel structure is supporting these solar panels that are not solidly placed; there are spaces between them. Before and after for each. This image shows a lighting plan and photometric plan so, underneath the canopy, there will be good lighting for people who are parking on that top parking deck. Now I am over onto 275 Cambridge, the planned community. You can see here from the site plan that there are some blow ups in your plan sets showing spacing of the solar panels on top of the structural steel frames. For 275 Cambridge, there are two structures that leave the center – 30-plus-feet in the center, an opening between the two structures. This is facing Cambridge, this is facing Mayfield. Here are some images before and after; left is before after is to the right. We have a photometric plan for the lighting on the – underneath the canopies. We're here because we have a request for a hearing following a tentative Staff action. This is all laid out in the zoning code. We have here architectural review findings in the approval letter that went out that's attached to your report. Then we have an original request that was submitted for the hearing in a timely manner and we have the second email that was delivered on March 15<sup>th</sup>, yesterday, with some reasons why the request was submitted. In addressing Mr. Borock, who is here today, his statements in his letter of yesterday – I have some comments. He raises CEQA concerns and so I would say to that, that you may or may not agree with the parking deficiency concern for Cal. Ave area but this is an existing condition. It will not be exacerbated by the proposed project. The base is for determining whether significant impacts will occur, is the existing condition and there's no obligation to consider the potential beneficial impacts of a substitute project. The second important CEQA issue is that California no longer considers parking deficiencies in themselves to be a CEQA significant impact. There's no evidence that's been provided that these solar panels -- structures supporting the solar panels would result in significant impacts. In fact, it's designed specifically to not eliminate parking spaces. This may be a policy matter but it's not a CEQA concern for this project or these projects. The Architectural Review Board's focus is the support structures for the solar panels, not the solar panels themselves. Those are not design review in the State of California. They are not subject to design review. Back in September as noted in the Staff report, the Council reviewed 4 projects like this; two downtown and two on Cal. Ave area and they agreed that these could be considered as minor architectural reviews. Then there were quite a few parameters that were set. Don't lose parking spaces was one of them and then we analysis them to make sure they comply with applicable codes. I've just put up the ARB findings for later but we do have Comprehensive Plan Policies that are met with this project on the screen. I have put up there

finding 2 and we can come back to it if need be and findings 3, 4, and 6. Why don't I put back the images for the discussion and you can start with 475 first if you'd like. Then let me just say two things, our applicant is here to answer your questions. He did not plan to present anything and then secondly, they hearing request from Mr. Borock had requested in an earlier letter notification and my error, I did not send an email to Mr. Borock about today's meeting but he is here so he will have the opportunity to comment and make a presentation, I believe he submitted a card.

Chair Lew: He submitted two cards, one for each project. I think that means 10-minutes as I understand it. Yes, Mr. Borock, please. Yeah, there's no – they are here for questions.

Mr. Borock: Thank you, Chair Lew and good morning Board Members. I did submit a request for a hearing before the Architectural Review Board on these two projects because of the issues stated in the letter that I had emailed to you and also delivered yesterday morning. To make sure that a copy of (inaudible) because I've noticed that from recent times, from a number of projects – ones that I've not been involved in at all, people do have problems receiving notice of what's going on so it's not just this particular project manager or this particular project. It may just be those that come in the post office just don't arrive because I do have mail problems as well. In general, those who received copies of Staff reports by other means, see that notice has been given to people within a certain distance and they say no, we never received it. I thought it was important to make this request and I've also copied Jack Morton, former Council Member, who is the president or CEO of the Business Community Association of the California Avenue both because I've quoted him in my letter and also because it's in the area where he could talk to other people in case they hadn't received notice of the project; just as a courtesy so that -- he may want to come and talk. It's partly a policy question and partly the environmental question. In regard to the environmental question, it is true that this is brought before the City Council on September 26<sup>th</sup> but there was a new project submittal application on November 15<sup>th</sup> for all 4 of the garages. It's hard for the Council or anyone to make a determination on an application that hadn't been submitted yet. I don't think we can rely upon what the Council did 6-months ago. Also, the Council would be an impleaded body for any decision that is appealed and it's not appropriate for them to make a decision on something that they are going to appeal on or make that decision before the items even heard before you and before – and when – even those that were there, isn't an appeal. Finally, under the California Environmental Quality Act, the decision maker is responsible for making the decisions both on the project and the environmental determination. You can say something is – doesn't apply to CEQA, then that doesn't apply but even when something is exempted, there still has to be an initial study made to cover all issues rather than just the exemption one. The reasons that have been stated in my letter, these two projects, unlike the ones downtown (inaudible) projects, have the ability to have more parking. There is clearly a problem in the California Avenue area and whether anyone else is interested in that, that wants to pursue this further, they have to take this step first. They can go to the Council again on this issue unless this Board first hears the project and somebody appeals it. I thought just of the interest of competition and giving everyone an opportunity to follow through on this problem that I have identified - the fact that as you can say these two parking garages can have levels added, just like the one at 520 Webster – the (inaudible) Webster one had a couple of levels added after it was built and that's my main issue and I appreciate you for providing time for me to speak and having a rapid meeting this morning. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Mr. Borock. Are there any questions from Board Members?

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah, for Staff.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Maybe for the applicant as well.

Board Member Furth: Two questions, you referenced a State exemption of review of solar panels so I wonder if you could tell me a little bit more about that. Then secondly, where these garages engineered and designed so that additional floors can be added on top of the existing structures?

Ms. French: I have not investigated the structural stability of the existing garages for subsequent levels. What I know, though, is that the City has been focusing on an alternative site, not these sites, for a new parking structure in the Cal. Ave area and it's on Sherman. You will be seeing these in months to come. In fact, the Council will be discussing this in April. The – that's your second question. I don't know the answer to the structural capabilities of those buildings for upper floors but again, coming up with funding for that is not subject to this application. The first question had to do with – remind me?

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Ms. French: I don't have the code references but the State does not allow – State legislation does not permit Cities to do design review on roof top panels. They are not being placed on the roof because that's where people park. They are being placed on these new structures and the new structures are subject to design review, upon which the solar panels would be placed.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Can I ask what the parking count is for each garage respectfully? Do you have that by any chance?

Ms. French: I'm sorry, I do not and ...

Vice Chair Kim: That's fine.

Ms. French: ... I don't see Public Works here.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, again for Staff. It's a procedural question I suppose but it's my understanding that City Council explicitly said that the architectural review of these rooftop structures should be a minor architectural review?

Ms. French: Yes, they did. They said that it – it seems to be eligible for that. I should say that 3 of the 4 projects were planned communities and they recognized that this would be a minor alteration to an existing structure and so, yes.

Board Member Baltay: That's said -- as a follow-up and I suppose there's not really an answer to this but if we were to feel that we did not agree with the – what do I call it? Appellant, A person that is requesting the hearing, should we then be pushing this back to the minor level review or are we supposed to be now reviewing it that same way every other project is reviewed?

Ms. French: Now your task is to see if Staff's ARB – architectural review findings that we use to approve the project at a Staff level are adequate for your action and we do request action today if that's a possibility.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Ms. French: It's a public hearing, it's not an appeal, just to be clear. This is an opportunity for a public hearing on the project.

Board Member Furth: Are we using the same set of architectural review findings for a minor or major project?

Ms. French: The architectural findings are not specific to major or minor, they are just the findings.

Board Member Furth: That would be a yes.

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for – I have a comment for Staff. I think Wynne was asking about the State requirement. I think the California Solar Act and there's also another one, I think the Solar Shading Act. I don't have the – I haven't read them in a couple years. The Shading Act says that if the City – for example, if the City provides a setback to the panels from the property line, then it has some protection from – say like neighbors planting trees, which would shade on the panels. In this case, if we're putting the panels right up on the property line, I don't know – we have alleys and stuff so I don't know – there are a couple adjacent neighbors. There could be a new building on some of those sites which would shade the existing or the proposed panels and that would – we wouldn't have any recourse as my understanding, from the State shading – Solar Shading Act; in that case. I think it's really – the one that would be affected would be the 2 – I think is the 275 which has some adjacent neighbors right at the property line. That's the only question I had – I guess comment that I had. Any other – yeah, Peter, do you want to start?

Board Member Baltay: Sure. No questions but I'm glad to take a crack at this. I find myself convoluted. I do not agree with what Mr. Borock is saying about why this shouldn't – doesn't meet the standards. I find what Amy French put forth is logical and convincing. That said, if you are asking me to review this based on the findings we have, I cannot make architectural finding #2 nor architectural finding #3. I feel that these structures – I'm referring to the structures and I'm referring to them on both of these projects, are not compatible with the building they are being mounted on. They are just a totally different non-architectural style. They are not a style, they are just a metal framework. Each of these buildings – each of these structures, these parking garages have a distinct architectural style. They clearly do and I would expect anyone designing this to think about that a little bit. To put some sort of a column detail or some technical way of putting it together nicely and that makes it look better. They are actually fairly large steel elements holding these up. They are big expands and they are fairly deep and to just leave the end of an eye beam showing at the corner is the easiest way to do it. I find that finding #3 a high aesthetic quality, the only reason given is because they are painted gray. I'm sorry, I know we're kind of in a bind here perhaps but I asked, if you wanted my opinion on it, it's just not cutting it. I guess I will just be eager to hear what my colleague's think.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I thought I was the only one being nitpicky about it but I guess I feel exactly the same way. I figured this could go either one of two ways. I've seen panels go up where they are totally utilitarian but yet the – so they have aluminum frames for instance, where they are set on and you understand that that's what it is. This particular design looks like they were going to put a second or third floor on the building and then ran out of money and just stopped. I agree with you completely as far as the eye beams being exposed. Something like this is either going to need a metal fascia around the exterior so it just looks like a canopy or whatever but the way it is now, I can't find the – make the findings work either.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: This is a – it's tough. I guess while we are commenting, I'd just like to go on the record and say, a structure like 475 Cambridge that's nearly 50-years old, to put a structure to hold solar panels to last another 25-years just doesn't seem right to me. It seems like it's a lost opportunity to either rebuild that parking garage as a taller structure, designed with PV panels to be integrated into it or just something else to be done to it. It's already an ugly parking structure that has horrible circulation around it. It's really horrible around it, it's a one-way circulation around the back alleys and to think that we're just going to slap on some PV panels with a structure in the most utilitarian way possible to meet City energy goals, to me is quite preposterous. The City deserves better, the residents deserve better, we deserve more parking there if anything. I do actually have some questions for the applicant. Perhaps I just haven't spent enough time with the drawings but I'm looking at sheet S-3.0 for 275 Cambridge.

Mr. Robert Laubach: Ok. Hello, my name is Robert by the way.

Vice Chair Kim: Hi Robert. Welcome. The canopy there shown on my drawing is actually different than what was shown on a previous slide. Could you clarify what's going on there? To me, it looks like canopy section at grid A, drawing number 2 – maybe it is the same it's just an optical illusion in my sense but that drawing compared to the perspective drawing on sheet A-1.0 -- on sheet A 1.0, it looks like the right – is there another perspective you've got of that? Ok, so on our sheet A-1.0, it looks like half of the structure is actually tilted in the opposite direction than what you are showing the elevation. I think overall; this drawing package was very difficult for us to understand as people that have reviewed drawings for buildings. I understand that it's just meant to be very practical for a very simple structure to hold the panels but if we are being asked to review it, I just couldn't make too much sense of it. A second question is the structure itself that's holding these panels different for both garages? It seems like one is a tube structure and the other is more of a wide flan structure? Am I reading that correctly?

Mr. Laubach: No, they are both complimenting the same structural elements. The HSS tube still is the vertical column that is attached to the existing structure and then the spans are out of wide flan (inaudible).

Vice Chair Kim: Wide flan...

[Mr. Robert ??] ... in both cases.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok. We're missing two elevations possibly. I understand that for 275, there are some buildings on each side but...

Mr. Laubach: There are some elements on 275 that are worth noting and that is...

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, if you could go over that.

Mr. Laubach: ...that is that it's a very awkward structure. Let me back up a little bit and say that as a design builder, I'm contracted with a solar PPA provider who entered into a contract with the City's utility to sell the City renewable energy on a feeding tariff. The City chose these locations in that request for proposal and identified these four garages in particular as good usable space for solar, for the purposes of not having any impact on trees. Basically, encouraging the public to park on the top floor, which typically people don't want to drive all the way up and then park their car in the sun. There was a lot -- like you say, practical application to one, why the sites were chosen and two, how we approached it with respect to keeping a trellised style look, managing the open-air elements that are necessary to prevent fire suppression issues that would be associated with the building approval process and that sort of thing. On this particular building, I'm not sure exactly what they were thinking when they built it but they have this store front style façade. It's almost like you were in a movie theater for an old wild, wild west. That center section, which is a brick styled pop up basically, blocks the view of this really weird hump in the middle, which give you access into the garage. The design styling – remember the objective from the developer and us was to fit as much solar on these as we can so we can have the best possible carbon

offset characteristics and generate the most electricity. When you build a solar system, the modules are always going to be oriented as closely as possible to the south. In which case, both of these garages, the modules will be oriented in the short direction south towards El Camino, right? When you asked the question which way are the modules tilting? If you're looking at that picture, obviously, the top cross section, the left side is south, the right side is north. That's why the elements of that structure are south sloping on that and then they are leveled out because those pop-ups are at different elevations. Then the slope on the modules is achieved by tilting each individual module rather than tilting the structures in and of itself. That gives us spacing between the panels for (inaudible) and it also allows a little bit more open air kind of concept. That center section was deliberately left open so that it would – it is the architectural feature of the building, right? That's why there's a gap there because there's a big old hump there. We're really trying to take these and make them functional for what the intent of the RFP from the City was and still have them work both structurally and architecturally. I can say, that neither garage structurally has a capacity to increase or build another story on it. We know that for a fact because we did the structural design for the canopy itself.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for you since you are standing there. On the 275 garage, one portion of the photovoltaic is sloped and the other is flat and it seems like it's slope in the wrong direction relative to the solar orientation. Is there an advantage...

Mr. Laubach: If it's sloped in the wrong direction, that was not the intention. It should be sloped south towards 475. Both the panels and then the southern half if you will, of the garage is...

Chair Lew: I think the efficiency of the array is not my – it's not one of my findings but I was thinking I would – just architecturally, it might look better if they both matched and maybe the drawing – well, maybe if we can pull up a drawing. Do you have the sheet S...

Mr. Laubach: I don't have the plan set that you're looking at...

Chair Lew: I have...

Mr. Laubach: ... I kind of have it on my computer, which is...

Chair Lew: I was looking at...

Ms. French: Sorry, what image are you...

Chair Lew: Sheet S-3.0.

Mr. French: What's the image? What's the image, I can maybe pull it up on the screen?

Chair Lew: Canopy – yes, canopy section at Grid C.

Ms. French: This is for 275, correct?

Chair Lew: I'm looking at the Cambridge Avenue facing façade. Yeah, so that's the top image there. It seems to me that south would be on the right side, towards – which would be El Camino. Just as – in your diagram, the panels are facing the other way and the slope is also facing...

Mr. Laubach: Yeah, that's a little miss leading because (inaudible), there's a left and right side so they're – they – one should be flipped but – in which case the Mayfield land view is the proper view. It seems to me that your...

Chair Lew: Yeah, something is...

Mr. Laubach: Yeah, you're facing Cambridge view, it just needs to be flipped.

Chair Lew: Right.

Ms. French: Technically, this is – I'm sorry, I'll weight in. Technically the top image is not an elevation, it's a section (crosstalk) and it was taken along...(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: The wrong way.

Ms. French: ...that edge and so I didn't flip it to show you what – how it would really look. I'm sorry about that.

Mr. Laubach: That explains why you guys were saying, this pointed the wrong way. Now, I see what you're saying.

Chair Lew: Thank you for that. I am – I think I understand all the Board Member comments. I don't think I really disagree with them. I guess my take – my hunch though on this was to let it move forward because the Council has already seen this. They weighed in and they said it was ok and so we're just having a hearing – a public hearing at the request of Mr. Borock. I was thinking that this should go forward but I'm not seeing a lot of support from the rest of the Board. I guess I have a question for Staff if the Board can't make the findings, what would happen? You would have to come back for the – with a redesign?

Ms. French: Yeah, we're asking for a recommendation, if you can one way or the other today and then the Director...

Chair Lew: The Director's decision.

Ms. French: ...would then make a decision and if it needs to go to Council, it goes to Council.

Chair Lew: Got it.

Board Member Baltay: A question, has the Council really seen these images? I'm looking at sheet A-1.0...

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: ...showing the image of 275 and they've seen it this way?

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: With that on top like that?

Ms. French: Yes, we've had revisions submitted to – back in November but they – all of these images – we had images for the Council to see, before and after. You can – the applicant can tell you what they had provided in their earlier packet but I believe many of these before and after images were provided to the Council in September.

Board Member Baltay: I'm of the opinion -- I'll speak to my colleagues and that we should just plain say no as a recommendation to the Staff. Let the Staff bring it up – Director bring it back to the Council and let the Council decide on this. I don't see any redeeming quality at this elevation. It's just not doing it. We routinely push other applicants significantly more and I don't think it's a matter of asking for a few pieces of extra steel. I agree with Robert that it could be done but maybe this is better to let powers that be make the right decision.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. First I wanted to say, I'm not quite sure where we are in the procedure or process but I wanted to say about the CEQA issues that Mr. Borock raised. We now have information uncontradicted that this would not support additional stories presumably without either building a steel cage around it or tearing down the building. I don't think that the lost opportunity rises to the level of the CEQA problem and I also want to note that section 15 of the lease, gives the City the right to relocate this facility as long as they are willing to pay the essentially, cost of relocation and the lost revenue stream to the other party to this lease agreement. This is not something – this is a problem solvable with money. I can't make the required findings and Program B-5 is cited by the Staff and that's the program that says let's have simplified review processes in order to encourage this kind of thing. I want to encourage this kind of thing but this is not what's known as a self-executing provision. If the Council wants to exempt solar car ports, it can exempt solar carports but we can't. We don't have that authority and I devoted my professional life to the proposition that law and language have meaning. My basic feeling is that if the Council wishes to change the review procedures, that's within their power but it's not appropriate to ask us to make a finding that is not supported by the evidence in front of it. My only option here is to vote no.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I think...

Chair Lew: We need a motion before we start saying where...(crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) say no to the project., I beg your pardon.

Chair Lew: Any other comments before we try to make a motion?

Board Member Baltay: I guess...

Chair Lew: Chair but isn't it pretty much also if nobody makes a motion, then it's pretty much dead anyway? Ok.

Board Member Baltay: I guess I want to ask Staff, we want to work collaborative, we want to see this get done and this could be redesigned and approved with some work. With some – designers having some different set of goals. Respectfully, you outlined what your intentions where...

Mr. Laubach: Yeah, as directed by the City's RPF so because the City's contracted for the purchase of electricity at a fixed rate, the – you can do a lot of things. You can make it pretty but it will affect the contract.

Board Member Baltay: If I could, though, I think that he designed this with a certain objective in mind and I think we would agree that he achieved his objective. Our standards are different and it's really a question of what standards we're holding this too like we said. Maybe Staff should help us out, do you want a quick no, you can run with this as you like or do you want a long process of revising the design?

Board Member Gooyer: Just because – I understand where you coming from completely and you did what you were basically requested to do. I have no problem with that but I'm also not going to say well, in that case, I'm going to vote it's ok. I'm still going to vote no. I think we just vote no and then, basically leave it up to the City to either overrule us, which the Director can do or move it up to the City Council.

Board Member Baltay: But what if they want to just make a revision to it and see if they can bring it into...

Board Member Gooyer: Because – I don't mean to talk for you but that's going to cost a whole lot more money and if he bid on it, that means he bid on it based on a certain design and not something that's been elaborated with putting a fascia or whatever the case on, which – let's face it, is going to knock it out of his calculations.

Board Member Baltay: I was hoping to get what the Staff thinks would be the most helpful.

Board Member Gooyer: OK.

Ms. French: Part of this whole set up had a time certain for the applicant to get through the process with the lease so there are options as far as extending the lease. There are also other providers waiting in the wings in case this doesn't get approved. Just to give you the scenario that we have out there. This applicant has an interest in this project and a lot of money has been spent already. It would be up to them to pretty much negotiate an extension of this lease and see if that works. Over which time some changes could be made or – and that's one way to do it. Is to continue it to a date uncertain and they can see if they can extend their lease because they won't meet the current leases terms or you can offer a quick recommendation for denial. It goes to the Director and the Director could refer it to the City Council for them to make a decision.

Board Member Baltay: With respect Amy, you just told me was what I told you. We wanted to know what you guys think we should do? What do you want?

Mr. Lait: I think...

Board Member Baltay: Just looking for some guidance because we don't want to be against each other. (Crosstalk)(inaudible)

Ms. French: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: I appreciate that. (Crosstalk)(Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) from a different angle then, you mention that the City Council has seen these drawings of the before and after.

Board Member Baltay: That's true.

Board Member Gooyer: Now, I get the impression they didn't have a whole lot of heartburn about them.

Mr. Laubach: It was a unanimous vote in favor of moving forward with the project, yes.

Board Member Gooyer: Then what I'm saying is that we're looking at this differently than they are looking at it.

Board Member Baltay: Fair enough.

Board Member Gooyer: I think we need to do what we need to do and stay true to what our function is and if they want – if they don't agree with that or they want to override that, they have the ability to do that. To keep on track, I think the easiest solution is to just vote no and then go back to the City Council. I mean that's probably the fairest way for them to keep it on track. Considering that they voted – is it 9 whatever – unanimously to approve it...

Mr. Lait: I just...

Board Member Gooyer: ... they couldn't have too much heartburn based on that.

Mr. Lait: I want to just clarify something. We took the application – we went to the City Council, what in September?

Ms. French: September 26<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Lait: Last year because one, we wanted to affirm our perspective that the proposed solar structures were consistent with the Planned Community Ordinances that were approved for two of the parking structures and with the zoning regulations to support the structures. In communicating – in trying to seek that guidance from Council, we also informed them that the process that we intended to evaluate these solar structures was going to be through a minor AR review, which is a Staff level approval. There was some discussion about that and the Council did have copies of the photo simulation and plans but their vote is one of yes, it's consistent with the codes and yes, we support the process by which the structure would be reviewed. Understanding that that could have requests for hearings and appeals and so forth.

Board Member Gooyer: I understand that but it's also – if I was in their place and looking at it just – is the thought that if I really didn't like the way that this looked, I think I would have said something rather than just yes, ok, you're telling me that it meets all the code requirements but this is going to be built in my town or my City I think it's ugly or whatever the case is. As a Council Member, I would assume that I would have said something.

Mr. Lait: Right and I don't think either one of us could speak on behalf of the Council...

Board Member Gooyer: No, I understand that.

Mr. Lait: ...Members but I think the process was understood. I think that's what they were – the conversation was about and also, the Council -- clearly as we noted in the Staff report, there is competing interests here to or maybe not competing but there are shared or additional interests of how we support our sustainable energy resources. I think the Council, as they do with many decisions, have to balance different, potentially competing (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Board Member Gooyer: But then from a pragmatic standpoint, doesn't it make more sense to just vote no and let the process go on?

Mr. Lait: To that point, if I may, I think Board Member, your comments from a few minutes ago, where probably the most salient to the conversation when you outlined the process. The Board – I would encourage the Board to make a decision. I don't think the timeline provides one for review and iteration. I don't think that's where we are, unfortunately, for this particular application and your – the Board's recommendation goes to the Director, the Director could support that decision or make an alternative decision. That decision could ultimately be appealed by the applicant or any member of the public. I think that's the most expedient way to move the project forward. If there is a recommendation for denial, we would recommend that there be some findings to support that based on your 6 – not all 6 but just – I think you mentioned findings 2 and 3, if you could provide some color to that?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: Ok, are we ready to have a motion then? I move that we recommend denial of the project based on finding #2 not being met in that the design – neither the design for 275 nor 475 has a design that is unified and coherent with the design of the existing buildings.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: Then finding #3, I also find that we're unable to make and that the design is of a high aesthetic quality and I do not find that the design is of high aesthetic quality. The design is of a very utilitarian quality and very little effort has been made to make it above a standard – a normal standard of esthetic quality.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed? That passes for the recommendation for denial is 5-0.

### **MOTION PASSES 5-0**

Vice Chair Kim: I'd like to go on the record once again, that even if we were to make this a pretty structure. It's still a huge lost opportunity, especially with the garage that's nearly 50-years old. I just want to say that on the record.

Mr. Lait: Just to clarify, that was for the two items that you have on your agenda, item #4 and item #5, that motion cares for both of them?

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: Do you need two separate ones or something because...

Chair Lew: It's two projects.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

#### **6. February 16, 2017, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes**

Chair Lew: We have one last item which is the approval of the minutes for February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017. I think Wynne, you had mentioned that you have some comments on that?

Board Member Furth: I realize that my comments were actually about a previous set of minutes where I said let me stress heirsch, h-e-i-r-e-s-s, not eras, e-r-a-s but I don't think that rises to something that needs to be addressed by this group. I'll send the correction to Staff. Move approval.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed? None.

Board Member Baltay: I abstain.

Chair Lew: Ok so that's a 4-0-1 abstain by Baltay. Ok, thank you, everybody. We are adjourned.

### **Subcommittee Item**

### **Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements**

### **Adjournment**