



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: May 18, 2017
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Lew: Welcome to the Architectural Review Board meeting for May 18th, 2017. Can we have a roll call, please?

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Board Member Wynne Furth, Robert Gooyer,

Absent: Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Member Peter Baltay

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications. The public may speak to any item, not on the agenda. There's a limit of 3-minutes per speaker. I don't have any speaker cards.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Then for Staff, are there any agenda changes?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt: No changes

Chair Lew: Great.

City Official Reports

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

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3877 El Camino Real [14PLN-00464]:**
Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Site and Design Review for the Demolition of the Vacant 5,860 Square-Foot Commercial Building and Construction of a new Mixed-Use Project. The Project Includes a 4,027 Square Foot Commercial Building and 17 Dwelling Units (Flats and Townhouses). Parking for the Project is Provided in a Basement. The Applicant Also Requests Approval of a Design Enhancement Exception to Allow the Basement to Encroach Into the Required Rear Yard Setback Below Grade. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated between March 6, 2017 and April 7, 2017. Zoning Districts: CS and RM-30. For more Information, Contact Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at SAhsing@m-group.us

Chair Lew: Then I think we can move onto the first item which is actually item number two – listed as number two. It's a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter 3877 El Camino Real. Recommendation on

applicant's request for approval of a site and design review for the demolition of the vacant 5,860 square-foot commercial building and construction of a new mixed-use project. The project includes a 4,027-square foot commercial building and 17 dwelling units which are flats and townhouses. Parking for the project is provided in the basement. The applicant also requests approval of a design enhancement exception to allow the basement to encroach into the required rear yard setback below grade. Environmental assessment is mitigated negative declaration was circulated between March 6, 2017, and April 7, 2017, and the zone districts is CS and RM-30. We have our project planner here today which is Sheldon Ah Sing. Welcome.

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing: Yes, thank you and good morning. I do have a PowerPoint presentation and the applicant is also here with their PowerPoint. So, you did describe most of the project in a brief description but just a little bit more of an overview. There is a mixed-use building that will include six flats and then there will be 11 townhomes on the balance of the property. It's an irregularly shaped lot, it's an 'L' shaped lot that has frontage both along El Camino Real and Curtner. The CS zoning district is along El Camino and that's where the mixed-used building would be. Then the townhouses would be along the balance of the site with frontage along Curtner. It's a .75-acre site and there's an existing vacant restaurant that's there with some surface parking in the rear. There are two proposals – two requests as mentioned. You have the site and architectural – site and design with architectural review and then you have design enhancement exception that is for the basement to allow for a deviation from the 10-foot down to 6-feet so that is their request. This project has been before the Planning and Transportation Commission and they did have a positive recommendation of approval to the City Council on the site and design. As well as the adoption of the environmental document. This project did come before this Board last month and the Board did have some direction for revisions on the project. I have just a brief kind of overview about that. The applicant's presentation specifically focuses on the responses to those comments and those are, of course, illustrated in your plans in the packet. The Board did have concerns about the landscaping on the site. It need to be – have more screening and providing some more native plantings. There was also some concern about security. There was some public comment regarding that as well. In particular with the basement, so the applicant has responded with a security plan that they will go into detail about. Then in addition to that, there was some comment on the existing building itself and the nature of it being historic. The Board had mentioned maybe having a commemorative plaque regarding the building's history and past so the applicant has responded on how they would try to address that. I did want to go into more detail about the environmental aspect of the project which is the mitigated negative declaration. That was submitted and circulated between March 6th and April 7th. We did receive a lot of comments and they were all very good, very insightful comments. The consultant that drafted the environmental document did put together responses to those comments and those are included in your packet. Regarding those, there were some topics regarding the cultural resources. There were a number of alterations to the building but still, there are some significant thresholds, that because the building was altered so much, it just did not have the level of integrity to have it eligible for listing as a historic resource. Then regarding the traffic. Again, there are standards such as level service to the closest intersection. That was at Curtner and El Camino Real. That's a level service A, which is the best and the project is pretty small and doesn't contribute a lot of traffic to lower that threshold down to a level where it would be a significant impact. Then there were comments about hydrology and it was found that even though they are doing a basement there wouldn't be any dewatering that would be required. Then having to also deal with hazards and emergency access, the project is designed to have standpipes so you really don't need to have the fire trucks actually go into the site. They are able to address any fires or emergencies through other means that were designed. Those are ok with the Fire Department. If you have any detailed questions about that, we do have the environmental consultant here that can address some of those. After this meeting, if we do resolve everything and there is a recommendation for approval of the project. Then it will go forward to the City Council and that's a decision on site and design, architectural review, and adoption of the negative declaration. Our recommended motion is that the City Council adopt the mitigated negative declaration, approval of the architectural review and design enhancement exception to allow the construction of the mix-used projected based upon the findings and the conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. I would be happy to answer any questions and the applicant is here with their presentation. Thank you.

Chair Lew: You have 10-minutes for the presentation.

Mr. Mark Wommack: Good morning. My presentation was put together to specifically address some of the questions that were raised in our previous meeting.

Chair Lew: Could you just state your name for the record?

Mr. Wommack: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chair Lew: We have minutes and video.

Mr. Wommack: My name is Mark Wommack with the EID Architects. The first item that I wanted to cover actually wasn't on the list that Sheldon just described to you but speaks to some of the questions that you had about the materials that were being used on the project. We have submitted the revised materials board which I believe you have available to you. Yes, ok. In just a description of some of the material -- there were questions for instance about how on the El Camino Real elevation the Trespa Panel details would work and what that would look like. This is a modularize panel system that can be put together to create some really very clean sophisticated looking detail. I chose these images to show to you because they address the issue of what happens at soffits and corners. This particular image you are seeing one of the product lines that's not quite the same tone that we are choosing but the same wood grain product. This is the typical detailing system that is utilized. A rain screen system that allows us to get the tight joints and clean design appearance. This is the product that we will be using the key accents on the buildings. The next product that we are using is the hardy reveal panels. This is a similar product but it's a more cost-effective panel and in our instance, because we are going to be utilizing a hidden fastener system, these panels will be painted to match the color selections on the board. This is the other option for it which has the exposed fastener system but we're not proposing the exposed fasteners. We wanted to show you these though so you get a sense for how these materials will look in a final installation. Moving onto to the privacy screening. The landscape architect has incorporated additional trees places specifically in front of the balconies per your request. In order to do that, this had to be coordinated with the C3 drainage systems and so the design will incorporate some newer products that allow us to incorporate both C3 drainage systems and landscaping together; including trees. Then we can meet both objectives in this instance. Then moving onto the issue of the commemorative plaque. We've reached out to the family and asked them to give us some input regarding what they would like to see in terms of verbiage on the plaque that we intend to place on the site. Blending that in with the bench seating that we are providing. We are also proposing to utilize some of the elements that were saved from the building after the historic analysis. These will be added together to create a commemorative area to celebrate the contribution that the family created in their work over the years. Moving down into the garage to address the site security and lighting design. The security plan that was put together for us by a security consultant that we've engaged on this project includes a number of emergency call box features that are -- moving back here -- located throughout the garage; by elevators, by stair entrances. These will be monitored 24/7 by a security company. It also includes cameras. One of the nice things about modern technology is that these cameras are not only available for monitoring by the security company but also by the residents who can access that through internet web pages. That means that they would even be able to monitor security onsite from their iPhone as they are approaching the site or leaving their house. The gates that we've employed throughout the project will secure the garage completely after hours. Adding to security and that will be augmented by a routine, regular patrols by the security company. The lighting consultant has expanded their analysis to create a lighting plan for the basement. The thing that we want to point to here is that the level lighting that is being provided in this is actually quite good. These are fairly high levels of (inaudible) throughout the garage so we feel that we've really done what is necessary to create a secure and safe environment in that garage. It's a challenge. I understand and appreciate fully the concerns about an environment like that. On the other hand, when more and more projects within the City are moving towards parking solutions that are below grade, this is the kind of balance that I think we have to strike in order to meet the criteria of providing adequate onsite parking and addressing the security needs. That wraps up the presentation on the specific questions. I would be happy to answer questions.

Chair Lew: Ok, so we can do questions or also if there are any members of the public who want to speak. I don't have any speaker cards but now would be the time to submit a card. Robert, questions? Wynne, you have questions?

Board Member Furth: Yes. Could you take me through what the experience of a pedestrian walking by the building would be on El Camino? What portion, if any, of the site, would they see as welcoming to them if they weren't spending money on whatever the retail project turns out to be?

Mr. Wommack: Sure. Let's see.

Board Member Furth: And if they were making use of the retail project, to what – how far back into your landscaping and courtyards would they be invited?

Mr. Wommack: Ok, on sheet A1.0, this gives you a bird's eye view from the El Camino Real perspective.

Board Member Furth: My set came stapled in a usual fashion. You have to turn it upside down several times to find the sheets. Where did it go? This one is amazing. Thanks.

Mr. Wommack: Ok, so what we have done here is first we have the driveway ramp down into the garage that we've placed next to Starbucks. This was placed on this corner specifically to address concerns from the owner of the Starbucks property. (Crosstalk)(inaudible)

Board Member Furth: So, that's adjacent to the Starbuck's drive through.

Mr. Wommack: So that creates a fairly wide-open vista starting at that corner, where you can see all the way back past the mixed-use building into the residential portion of the site. As you pass by that driveway, you enter into an open area that's underneath the floors above but again, this vista is unimpeded except for the security fence that segregates the residential portion of the project from the commercial portion of the project.

Board Member Furth: Excuse me, and that's the fence that's behind the ...

Mr. Wommack: Yes. Yeah, where you can see...

Board Member Furth: ... where the ramp goes underground.

Mr. Wommack: ...you can see the large column.

Board Member Furth: Yes.

Mr. Wommack: It's in line with the first of the two large columns.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Mr. Wommack: That's really the transition from the Paul Book space – the plaza that services the retail area and the entrance to the mixed-use portion of the building. The view corridor draws your eye all the way back into the site. Obviously, for security reason, you don't want to invite the general public to have complete access to the residential portion of the site but by hold this building up the way that we have. We've really taken almost 50% of the frontage of the property and created a view corridor that goes all the way back to the first down home.

Board Member Furth: If I wanted to sit down, where would I sit?

Mr. Wommack: There are a number of places where you could sit. You don't see it from this perspective...

Board Member Furth: Right.

Mr. Wommack: ...but the backside of that planter that faces the retail area, on both ends of those there will be benches to sit on. I think you can see that on – oh, I miss spoke. It's just the first one. On sheet 2.1, there is a bench that starts at the first column of the building and goes back to the second column of the building.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Mr. Wommack: So, that's the bench seating for the public area of the project.

Board Member Furth: Then the commemorative plaque, which I am very appreciative of. Where is that? Is that in the public area or the private area?

Mr. Wommack: Well, we've got two places...

Board Member Furth: You have two places...

Mr. Wommack: ...where we have proposed that it could be placed. We had quite frankly...

Board Member Furth: One on the pillar.

Mr. Wommack: ...we had hoped that we would be able to have more interaction with the family to move this a little bit further forward because obviously, what we want to do was make sure that they are...

Board Member Furth: Of course.

Mr. Wommack: ...happy with our solutions. On sheet A3.1, you can see that the idea is to place this plaque into the backs of the bench seating. In here, we are showing a potential location that would locate this in the commercial set area of the project, which I think is probably the most appropriate because you want this to be available for the majority...(crosstalk)(inaudible)

Board Member Furth: I would certainly be in favor – yes, if we are trying to let the public know about the history of this site, that would make sense.

Mr. Wommack: Right. The other opportunity that we've shown is on the next page, 31-B. That would be back in the common use area of the project. We – as I said, I personally believe that the public area is probably the more appropriate of the two. Our intention was to work with the family to make sure that we can incorporate the verbiage that they want and any sort of imagery. It's a work in progress.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for you. On the mixed-use building -- a portion of the building on El Camino – facing El Camino. You do have a large recessed area on the first floor or it's not a recessed area. It's an area that's covered by the second floor.

Mr. Wommack: Right.

Chair Lew: You have a large blank wall on the ground floor unit that faces...

Mr. Wommack: From the front elevation?

Chair Lew: Not on the front elevation. This is on the – yeah. It would be on the – I'm trying to figure out – the southeast? The long elevation, the right-side elevation.

Mr. Wommack: Right.

Chair Lew: That's where you have a – in the landscape plan you have like the acanthus plants.

Mr. Wommack: You're speaking of the wall that is in between the store front and the opening for the lobby of the mixed-use building on sheet 2.5, drawing number two.

Chair Lew: When I get to the elevation—let's see. Yeah, so A2.5, right. Drawing number two? Right. Yeah, so it's the long wall on the first floor on the right side.

Mr. Wommack: On the right side after – ok, yeah. That's...

Chair Lew: Yeah, so I was wondering if there is room for – my question is if – what is your thinking about that because that's a pretty long blank wall. It's in the – I think I am understanding that you want privacy to the unit...

Mr. Wommack: Right.

Chair Lew: ...there. I do understand that there's a planter there so it won't be completely blank. That will be filled with – that it will be filled with plants. I was just wondering what you were thinking about in terms of the big idea of that.

Mr. Wommack: The landscaping is the intended solution. You are absolutely right. That it was a privacy issue and that's why we didn't put windows on that wall. We wanted residents who are entering the site to be focused more on the common use areas that they are beginning to experience as they enter that space. We wanted that wall really to be more of a backdrop to what was happening. We certainly didn't want views into a private residence, which is what's behind that wall, from that very public courtyard area. Yes, landscaping is the intended focal point along that section of the wall.

Chair Lew: Ok, and is it a raised planter? I don't really quite understand the podium.

Mr. Wommack: Yeah, because everything underneath this building is parking.

Chair Lew: Right, yeah.

Mr. Wommack: In order for us to put any meaningful landscaping in, we have to build planters. There are obviously some plants that we can deploy across the site that don't require much soil to live in but to get any substantial landscaping into the project, we're going to have to bring in planters. Some of the planters are going to be used to help with the C3 drainage but not in this instance here. So, that's why we do have raised planters in this area.

Chair Lew: Ok, and it's not – those aren't shown in the drawing, in the architectural elevation.

Mr. Wommack: Yes, and the reason why they are not shown in the architectural elevation is because we've put these – the architectural aspect of the drawing, including the Revit model that was utilized to present the 3D views. That work took place prior to the evolution – very recent evolution of the landscape design.

Chair Lew: That's fine. Ok, and on the – if you could go to the – I have a question on lighting. I think you're – the lighting – I think you're cut sheets, I think you included four fixture cut sheets and then I think there are five fixtures being called out on the lighting plan.

Mr. Wommack: Is that 6.1 or 6.2?

Chair Lew: This would be – let's see, it's at the back. I was actually interested in the – my concern was the wall pack fixture. I'm looking for the sheet right now.

Mr. Wommack: Yeah, I'm not sure which fixture you're speaking of but the intent of the selection of the lighting was to try to avoid glare. Similar to the type of requirements that we have to meet when we're building residences in Woodside. Where they have very strict...

Chair Lew: Right, that's...

Mr. Wommack: ...requirements regarding glare.

Chair Lew: That's my concern too. So, it's on 6.1 and I think on your – on the schedule it is fixture number – which one is it? C, LED wall pack. My main concern is that wall packs are usually – they do cause glare because they're shining – often times they are shining directly outwards. I mean sometimes some wall packs shine down but I just – I want to make sure that we sort of close the loop on this one because you have so many of them. You have them on all of the building and on all of the – on most of the fronts and backs. (Inaudible)

Mr. Wommack: Well, we would welcome a condition that spoke to eliminating glare and not utilizing fixtures that create that problem.

Chair Lew: Yeah. Again, it's just – I think you have five fixtures and you're showing four cut sheets so I'm not exactly sure what you're proposing in this location. Ok and I think my last question is on the mailboxes. You're showing a mailbox area inside the gate on Curtner.

Mr. Wommack: Yes.

Chair Lew: I was just wondering if it made sense to have them outside the gate. I mean that's up to you and the post office but there's package drop off and stuff that usually happens outside the gate. I don't think we have to resolve that at the moment but it was just a question that I had.

Mr. Wommack: Ok, I was trying to determine whether or how we would incorporate that outside the gate. What structure that we would need to put out there to screen it and make it attractive. It could be done.

Chair Lew: You don't have to -- we don't have to design it now but I just wanted – have you reviewed it with the post office?

Mr. Wommack: No. No, but we have a number of mixed use multi-family projects where the mail rooms and the package drop-offs are within a secure area of the buildings.

Chair Lew: That's fine. Why don't we move on to – if we are done with questions, we can move onto comments. So, Wynne, will you start us off?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Well, thank you for persevering with this. It's good to know that we'll have some more housing in a fairly – extremely accessible location. I realize that what we see is virtuous because it provided additional housing can also be seen as difficult for people trying to get in and out of Curtner. I think some of the responsibility for that really has to lie with the City and not this particular project. Staff, did we hear anything back from our Staff – Public Work Staff about the design of the street? The use of rolled curb on what's now a more intensively traveled street. Do we still think that's appropriate? I'm not asking whether the applicant should deal with this but what our own Staff thinks about our own responsibilities.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director: Thank you, Board Member Furth. Jonathan Lait, assistant director. I did have a conversation with our Transportation Department and that design, with the rolled curbs, is not

something that is imploded anymore. It's not a desirable street design. It's not something that we continue to do, there is – I know that we heard in the public testimony some concerns about vehicles parking over the rolled curbs and into the sidewalk area. Which is not actually a permissible activity by our local regulations. From time to time we do code enforcement or courtesy notices to remind property owners of that issues but yeah, it's not a design feature that we do today.

Board Member Furth: So, my comment basically is that I think that we should or I would like to mention to Staff that when you are thinking about capital improvement project plans for the City, that maybe we're at the point where we need to be doing some retrofitting. That this was built under county standards and most of the county won't let you do this. I found that when I've been walking it, every single car has been parked on the sidewalk because they feel that if they don't park on the sidewalk, you can't get traffic through there. I think that this may be – as we continue to intensify housing, it has many upsides but if we want to reduce the downsides for the people who live in that area. Perhaps the City needs to spend some of its own money on that frontage. I was good – happy to hear the answers to the questions about how people would sit and how they would be invited in and the view corridor in, I think was very appreciative of housing that makes its self-known on the street. This should be inviting and attractive and I like what you are proposing. Staff, I did have one question about flat 101, which is the – I was trying to figure out that wall related to the garden on that ground level as wells. It's a below market rate unit and it's comparable in size to the other below market rate units. It only – it seems to have very limited natural light because of the narrow setback – relatively narrow setback on the north side. What I think of as the north side, towards downtown and because it's got a completely blank wall on the other side, how does this compare with the natural light in other units?

Mr. Ah Sing: Maybe we can have the applicant respond to that. Thank you.

Board Member Furth: Thanks.

Mr. Wommack: The configuration of the windows in flat 101 mirrors very closely to the configuration of the windows in 201 and 301.

Board Member Furth: Which is on page...

Mr. Wommack: Above them.

Board Member Furth: ...22?

Mr. Wommack: Oh, I am sorry. Sheet 1.2 and 1.3.

Board Member Furth: Ok, I'm looking at 2.1.

Mr. Wommack: Oh, that would have worked too.

Board Member Furth: Those work also, right?

Mr. Wommack: Yeah, I just happened to open to the site plan instead of the building plan.

Board Member Furth: They are a little bit bigger.

Mr. Wommack: The wall that faces the courtyard on the stories above, is the (inaudible) wall in between units, on the second floor.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Mr. Wommack: So, the unit directly above it has no opportunity...

Board Member Furth: So, no natural light in the kitchen is a recurring condition.

Mr. Wommack: I'm sorry, I don't understand.

Board Member Furth: Not having any windows in the kitchen is a recurring condition.

Mr. Wommack: Yes. Right, the – from a functional perspective, there really is no difference between 201 and 101.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Wommack: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: I see you do have lighting on two other sides but—natural light. Thank you. I was curious because of our requirement – our goal is that these units be comparable to the others and I'm satisfied with that answer. I defer to my more knowledgeable colleagues.

Chair Lew: Did you comment on the DEE?

Board Member Furth: I have no objection to the DEE in this case.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: I (inaudible) – when – just as a side note. My first house that I had, had a kitchen that had no windows in it. Based on how the lighting is done, it works just fine. There really isn't that big of a problem and it is true, I didn't have a big issue because the first floor and the second floor are exactly the same. Anyway, having reviewed this, I'm relatively happy with all the modifications that you made and so I'm – the only thing that, I guess just sort of caught my eye as an afterthought is the plaque. Which has 15 lines of text on it and it's 8-inches high. Come on, give me a break. It – we're talking about a plaque this big with 15 lines of text on it. That might as well just be a – nobody is going to be able to read that. That thing is going to need to be at least twice that size.

Mr. Wommack: I agree that a larger plaque will probably be required. Until we...

Board Member Gooyer: I mean I saw your comment about, or larger, but in any kind of thing like this. When you are sitting here, I never like to see, or larger or smaller, because then that – who knows what we are going to end up with.

Mr. Wommack: We didn't know the final size of the plaque because we haven't resolved the final design with the family. If you'd like to put some condition that specifies a minimum size, we're more than happy to work with that but we were really thinking of it as not so much as trying to minimize the display but rather that it's a work in progress. We still have more information to gather from the family before we finalize any design on the plaque.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok. That was basically the main thing that I saw. I can approve it the way that it is now.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. I would say that thank you for the project. This one has been in planning for several years. I think this is approvable – I think I can recommend approval for it today. I had a couple things that I – I think that it may be better to come back to subcommittee. One is the lighting. I think you are admitting that the first-floor covered area that we were talking about before with the acanthus and the blank wall. That's not showing on your drawing at the moment and I think that's important because that's pretty – kind of a public area. I would want to see how that's being illuminated. Then again, the wall, I would like more information on the wall pack fixture. On the landscape, I do think that the changes that you have made to provide more screening to the neighbors; I think that's good. We do

– we did change the finding for landscape for native plants and that happened recently. That was this year and I know your project has been around for several years but it is a finding and it is going to Council. I think I would recommend that to come back. I think the landscape design, I think is – has the landscape architect – I think has picked out sort of architecturally – have like architectural foliage and they're very attractive and durable plants but I think we're actually – from the City's point of view, we're looking for something different. We're actually looking for habitat for wildlife and I don't really see very many plants on the plant list that fit into the plant communities of Palo Alto, which are coastal sage scrub and oak – central oak woodlands. I think that there – you can make quite a number of substitutions but without really effecting anything. You could get the same – achieve the same look with native plants. So, I think that's – it's not a – that's just mostly the shrubs. I think the trees can all stay as proposed. I think maybe also at the same time, I'd be kind of curious to see the hardscape. I think you have some notes on the hardscape about what it is but I'm curious to see more in terms of the materials. It's mostly because you've got a very large podium. It's kind of – you've got something unusual there with such a large amount of podium space. Also, at the same time – yeah, if you've resolved the mailbox design with the post office, I would be curious to see that as well. Regarding the plaque, I think that – yeah, I don't have any specific comments about the plaque but I think that the idea of incorporating the plaque and artifacts in there is good. The – I can support the DEE for the rear setback – encroachment into the rear setback for the basement, mostly because this is a very unusual, very difficult, very narrow site. On the parking, I would say that I think your drawings are saying that everything is going to be designated parking and in a way, between all the different uses – right, so the residences have designated parking and the office and retail have separate parking. In a way, I just want to generalize, I would think it's a missed opportunity for shared parking. Underground parking is very expensive and the City does encourage or I would say allows parking reductions for mixed use buildings. It's really – the point is to be really efficient and not to build unnecessary spaces that stay empty all – for half of the day. I do realize that parking on El Camino and Curtner is limited and so I think what you are doing is probably the right solution in this particular instance. Then I think my last thing is that I was a little bit concerned about the blank wall. It seemed like you could have small windows that are up high that wouldn't – that would allow light into the unit and allow for privacy. It's not really on the major public face of the building so if you want to keep it the way that it is, I would not object to that. Then I think my last comment is not really sorted of the purview of the Board because it's more of the inner workings of the units but on those – on the flats in the mixed-use building. I would kind of be more tempted to put the living unit – the living rooms down at the end where you've got the balconies. That means that you would have to go through the bedrooms – like have a hallway from the front door. It seems like that's the more public – you would be putting the public space of the unit or the more public – the more – the living areas of the units facing the common area. Anyway, I think that's not typically a Board – ARB concern, right? So, Wynne, I think you had one final comment? You had a follow-up.

Board Member Furth: I did and this is both for Staff and the applicant. This is going to be divided or is already divided into two parcels? One for the commercial building and one for the residential or is it a single, unified parcel? Is it going to be under one ownership with – and everything will be rental or will some of it...

Mr. Ah Sing: I think we'll have...

Board Member Furth: ...or will it be condominiums?

Mr. Ah Sing: ... the applicant describes that for you.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. What I am trying to figure out is how the security plan for the garage is managed and paid for.

Mr. Wommack: This – the plan is that this will be a condo project...

Board Member Furth: Alright.

Mr. Wommack: ... but it is one project and it is one parcel. It just happens to span across two zones within the City, which made it a very challenging project because we had to treat it as though it were two parcels. Meaning that we had to comply with all zoning criteria on each end but it will be one homeowner association – home perhaps may be miss leading because it also includes some retail space.

Board Member Furth: Yeah.

Mr. Wommack: The retail ownership will also be part of that association. Jointly, they will manage the property and the security and all other aspects of the operation.

Board Member Furth: That will be a complicated sense of CCNRs.

Mr. Wommack: That's why we have (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: Department of Real Estate is going to have an interesting time with that one. For Staff, my concern is with condition ten because we're not doing a Conditional Use Permit, are we? We're just doing a design review essentially and a DEE?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes, that is correct.

Board Member Furth: So, we don't have that enforcement mechanism that we will, for example, have with the school project that comes next. The enforceability of this is going to depend upon the way the CCNRs are drawn and reviewed. Whether the City has a right of enforcement with the CCNRs and I think that's important. I'd like to ask you to consider – I'd like to recommend that condition ten be modified so that the review includes the review of the relevant – we probably—in some cases, we're always reviewing CCNRs. I don't know if we are going to be here but includes reviewing the relevant portion of the CCNRs to ensure that there's adequate enforceability by the residents. If necessary the City, with respect to this safety program and I'd also – would it be acceptable to ask that where it says approval from the City, that would include review by the Police Department since they are the people most knowledgeable about security issues?

Mr. Lait: The – from time to time we do ask the Police Department to review...

Board Member Furth: For comment?

Mr. Lait: ...plans to address areas that they might think are problematic from a security standpoint.

Board Member Furth: Public safety point of view.

Mr. Lait: Dark corners or things like that, that might contribute or facilitate activity that is not legal. We can certainly do that and have that reviewed. As far as the CCNRs go – and so that review would be – perhaps there should be some other language in here that talks about the Director of Planning and Community Environment shall approve a security plan and in the course of that review, we shall consult with the...(crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: Enforceability and – practicality and enforceability.

Mr. Lait: Enforceability and it would also be – yeah, and also have the Police Chief or his designee review the plans.

Board Member Furth: Well, if you're in the custom – if you're in the practice of doing that, we don't need to put that in the conditions. That's just going to be good practice on your part but I would like to add that with the City, for a plan – and shall be reviewed for practicality and enforceability (inaudible)

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I think there's sufficient authority in the ARB findings to enforce this condition. As you do look at the safety and security of and access to the site, which would include pedestrian access and so forth. I think there's sufficient leverage for the City to enforce this but we'll look at opportunities to tighten it up.

Board Member Furth: My experience is that it's more useful if the people who are living there have the ability to resolve these issues internally because they're going to be the people most interested in having this work. If we have back up enforceability, that's good because I agree that we wouldn't approve this design if they didn't have adequate security measures.

Mr. Lait: Right and then perhaps the condition could also reference the map that eventually comes through and the encouragement or the requirement for a condition be imposed on the map itself. So, that we are reviewing that when we are looking at the CCNRs.

Board Member Furth: Review the CCNRs. Fine.

Chair Lew: Ok, so are we ready to make a motion?

Board Member Furth: I don't know if I took enough notes on your matters to be (inaudible). I can start.

Chair Lew: Start and then I'll add...

Board Member Furth: Alright.

Chair Lew: ...to it.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Pardon. I move that we recommend approval of the application for 3877 El Camino Real. Both for the site and design review and the Design Enhancement Exception with the findings and conditions presented by the Staff but subject to the following modification. First, that condition number ten be modified as per Staff's statement to be reviewed for practicality and enforceability of the security plan and that the following matters be referred to a subcommittee for further review. That would be the location of the mailbox and box drop off, the landscaping along the wall – the kitchen wall of flat number 101, and what else?

Board Member Gooyer: Do you just want to say the landscaping plan because we talked about possible native (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: Further review. Oh, yes, the substitution of native plants suitable for habitat in the landscaping plan.

Chair Lew: Yeah and then I think in the recessed area was just the lighting.

Board Member Furth: Oh, and the lighting, further review of the lighting. In particular, along with the recessed area adjacent to flat 101.

Chair Lew: Ok, is there a second?

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

Chair Lew: So, we have a – yes?

Mr. Lait: Chair, just before you vote. You had some other comments about hardscape and more information on the wall packs. Did you want that to return also?

Chair Lew: Yeah, so I think on condition – I think the fourth item that Wynne mentioned was lighting and so that was the wall packs in the recessed area.

Mr. Lait: Got it, thank you and the hardscape?

Board Member Furth: Do we want something specific about plaque size?

Chair Lew: Oh, yeah. Plaque size? I don't know.

Board Member Furth: And that there be a further review at the subcommittee level of the size of the proposed plaque.

Board Member Gooyer: I figure with the plaque; the family is not going to be happy with an 8-inch by 12-inch (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Board Member Furth: In argot type, yes.

Board Member Gooyer: ... with a text on it.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm assuming that they can figure that out themselves.

Chair Lew: So, clarification – there just to clarify, so there's a recommendation for approval. This is site and design so it's going to Council so we're –it's a recommendation to Council. We normally do it to the Director. Ok, and then the plaque size. Why don't we just say this, the final design...

Board Member Gooyer: Why don't we it with a minimum or that – or I'd say change the minimum from 8 x 12 to let's say 16 x 24.

Board Member Furth: I'm happy to add that.

Board Member Gooyer: Twice its size.

Chair Lew: Ok, so that's the six items. So, all in favor? Opposed? None. So, that's 3-0-0-2. Congratulations.

MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE 3-0-0-2 WITH BALTAY AND KIM ABSENT

- 3. QUASI-JUDICIAL MATTER/PUBLIC HEARING. 689-693 Arastradero Road [16PLN-00089]:** Consideration of the Applicant's Request for Approval of an Architectural Review Permit for the Demolition of Three Existing Single-Family Homes and Construction of a New Preschool for up to 60 Children That Would Also Serve as a Satellite Expansion of the Existing Bowman School on Terman Drive. Three new Single-Story Structures Will Have a Combined Floor Area of 17,132 Square Feet and Will be Used for the Preschool, Gymnasium, and Classrooms. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated From January 19, 2017 to February 21, 2017. A Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is available. For More Information Contact: Claire Hodgkins at: claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: We can move onto item number three which is a quasi-judicial matter and public hearing for 689 and 693 Arastradero Road. Consideration of the applicant's request for approval of an Architectural Review Permit for the demolition of three existing single-family homes and construction of a new

preschool for up to 60 children that would also serve as a satellite expansion of the existing Bowman School on Terman Drive. Three new single-story structures will have a combined floor area of 17,132 square feet and will be used for the preschool, gymnasium, and classrooms. (Inaudible) in there. Environmental assessment is a draft initial study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated from January 19, 2017, to February 21, 2017. A final initial study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is available. We have Claire Hodgkins for our Staff planner here getting ready for a – oops, there we go. Welcome, Claire.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Staff Planner: Good morning Board Members. I'm Claire Hodgkins and I'm the project planner for this project. Also known at the Bowman school project and it's located at 689 and 693 Arastradero Road. Just a quick overview of the project. The proposed project includes construction of a new private school for up to 60 students, ages 3-5 and satellite break out space for students at the existing Bowman school campus at – which is located at 400 Terman Drive. The total gross floor area proposed is 17,132- square feet. This includes the children's house which includes a classroom and administrative office for the preschool students, in addition to a science lab, art building, and a gymnasium. There would be an exterior play garden – play area, gardens, sunken learning circle, associated landscaping and a parking lot drop off area. Total enrollment at both sites will not exceed the currently permitted 300 students the Bowman school campus at Terman Drive. The project replaces three existing single-family residences. This map is just a quick map that shows you the location in reference to the existing Bowman school campus. This map just shows the neighborhood context and surrounding uses include mostly multi-family residential and single-family residential. Just north of the site is the Palo Alto Christian Reform Church and just south of the site is the Hitachi right of way pedestrian trail and Alta Mesa Memorial Park. Key considerations, the ARB raised a few key items for consideration during the first formal hearing. In particular, consideration of circulation in traffic specifically concerns for queuing on Arastradero Road where raised. Staff believes that the alternate parking layout better addresses this concern along with other concerns raised by various different departments across the City. Additional information regarding circulation between the main Bowman School campus and the new annex campus at 693 Arastradero Drive has also been provided to provide additional clarity about that circulation. In addition, the ARB raised concerns regarding shading at the adjacent Young Life Preschool and the applicant has made revisions to the roof line based on a recommendation from various Board Members, which has reduced shading on the adjacent property. Today, Staff is recommending that the ARB consider the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project and approve the project with Staff's preferred alternate parking layout to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on findings and subject to conditions of approval. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Claire. We can do the applicants presentation now and you have 10-minutes. John, if you could just state your name for the record, please.

Mr. Jon Daseking: Thank you. Just waiting for the presentation to get up. Oh, I'll start. Good ahead. Good morning Board Members. My name is Jon Daseking as you may recall and I'm the architect for Bowman School. With me today is Mary Beth Ricks of Bowman School –head of school, as well as Colleen Reilly who is the project manager and representative for Bowman School. [Bob Cleaver], landscape architect and Robert [Eckles] for traffic consultant are here today to answer any questions that you may have. As Claire mentioned or we – this is our third time in front of the Board here. At our last meeting, I think we – the Board had a very favorable opinion of the project. There were a few items that they wanted us to address, which Claire outlined well in her Staff report. I won't go through all of those but there was just a couple that I wanted to touch on. The first one was on this slide here, there was a concern with the doors into the mechanical room on the Children's House being – maybe looking too much like the entrance for the building. I think part of that was due to the way that it was presented. We had shown individual buildings and when you do that, I can see where that concern comes up. We – so we did this drawing which is – shows the full campus with both buildings, the materials rendered and so on and I think you can see from here what we are showing – I don't know if I have a little pointer on this. Where did it go? There we go. With – note this area here is where those doors are so they're pretty subdued because they are meant to blend in with the wall. Also, there is – there was originally a plan for bicycle parking in that area because it's sort of a natural and nice little notch for them to be parked in

and so we have that there as well. Then we're also showing in this the Paseo entrance. We did some revisions to that. It always had an open gate entrance way but we met with Palo Alto fire further since our last meeting and refined their requirements in terms of the width of gate access and so on. So, we were able to refine that and I think the scale of this one is much nicer than the one we had before when we had the wider gate entrance. Then lastly was just to show the – to illustrate the open fencing that was in front of the ideal lab which was another concern of the Boards on that. Let's see, then this slide was just to show an enlarged view of the Paseo entrance, as well as how that bicycle parking lays out in the plan. Then the second item that I want to touch on was in the shadows. We had met with Diane Chambers of Young Life Preschool a couple of months ago. We had – before doing that, we took your comment about creating a shed roof over the bleacher portion of the building to reduce the shadows so we did that. Then we produced this drawing that we shared with Ms. Chambers and I'm not sure if she is here today to talk about it but I think it was a favorable meeting. This illustrates sort of item or section four shows what is allowed by zoning—current zoning and then one, two, and three. One being the initial proposal that we had when we first met; here. Then two is when we rotated the gym showing further reduction and then three shows how we changed the roof line over the bleachers. Also, it shows what's happening inside the building when we do that. I think we've really reduced this tremendously each time we've done that and we're well below what could have happened. These little pie charts just help illustrate again, how we've reduced – what time of year the shadows actually are cast and showing how with each revision, we've – the cone has been reduced and reduced. Then these are just the shadow studies that are part of your packet. The next was on landscaping and for that, I'll let [Bob Cleaver] make comments.

[Mr. Bob Cleaver]: Good morning. [Bob Cleaver] landscape architect for the project and that I'd want – I want to first address is the parking – I'm sorry, planting area along Arastradero. It's the public section and it's a strip between the curb along Arastradero and the public sidewalk. We propose a narrow planting of a native sage Juncus. We chose it and we're not planting the entire width of the planting area but we're providing if you will, a hedge of the Juncus. The plant material is evergreen and it's a good solid dark green. It grows upright and we chose it so that it had a minimum of maintenance, either flopping or growing over the curb or the sidewalk. We feel that although management, meaning watering, it could be a series of seasonal watering where it's deeply watered and then allowed to dry out and then deeply watered. It wouldn't be a constant water requirement and then over time, it doesn't get very tall and it doesn't need a lot of maintenance so we felt it was a good choice for a public zone. Going the wrong way. The next item that I wanted to talk about was that there's a series of questions and clarification for the existing oak tree; maybe I'll go back one slide. The large oak that is really the hallmark of the design of the [Paseo] and how a lot of the buildings are located. It is between the Arastradero road and the parking strip and the [Paseo] and the main corridor through the buildings is centered on this tree. There are protection measures and planting measures that deal with raising the driveway above existing conditions – above the existing grade and having a series of either geo-mats and root protection material that allows the driveway to occur above existing grade and still protect the tree itself with – well, during construction some silt fences. In the long term, a geo-grid that is protecting existing grade from the proposed parking above. Then a nice soft, simple transition off of the parking and paving area. Then, I believe just as a clarification, there was an issue brought up about the clearance from the tree to the parking. Our 9-foot dimension – I'm going to ask Jon to weigh in as well. He might clarify it further but the 9-foot dimension radius that we have as a clearance was from the Arborist Report. If you look at our plans, there is a further distance beyond the 9-foot that is actually clear. I believe we have an 11-foot clearance available to the – from the tree to the paving at the parking area. I believe the recommendation from the Staff report was for 10-15. So, I think we're close – I believe we are complying and we're – but I just wanted to clarify where the 9-foot came from and that we exceed it. I'm available for questions and I'll let Jon continue.

Mr. Daseking: Thanks, Bob. The last slide I was going to show today was just to show that Staff had referred to the Staff preferred alternative parking layout. This drawing slide shows both parking layouts side by side with the Staff preferred parking layout on the left and the Bowman original proposed layout on the right. The only thing that I want to say on this was that Bowman School feels strongly that their proposed parking layout, rather than the Staff preferred alternative, is the better design for numerous

reasons but primarily for children safety. However, with that said, if the project can only be approved with the Staff preferred alternative, then Bowman School is willing to accept that option. That is, it, I thank you for my time and if you have any questions, please let us know. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Are there any members of the public that would like to speak to this item? No. Are there any – yes. Yeah, please state your name and you have 5-minutes.

Ms. Christina Hildebrand: I don't need all 5-minutes. My name is Christina Hildebrand, I am a parent of two children who attend Bowman and I live in the area. I just wanted to give my support and ask you to approve the project and I did write a letter as well, which sort of expanded on my thoughts on the matter. I also ask you to approve it with the current CUP as it stands. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. I will close the public portion of the hearing and are there any Board Member questions?

Board Member Furth: Could Staff go – I have two questions. One was in regard to Penny Elson's letter of May 2nd. One of the concerns that she raised was the impact of this project on traffic in the bicycle lanes. I understand that we have a Conditional Use Permit condition that essentially says no traffic back up allowed so whatever is necessary to make that happen, will happen. Could you explain to me what, if any, impact – adverse impact this might have on bicycle lane use during the hours in which the school is loading and unloading?

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Ms. Hodgkins: I did, yes so, a couple things. Firstly, we are not anticipating an impact as outlined in the final initially study Mitigated Negative Declaration because we aren't anticipating based on the anticipated number of drop offs at each time period. We don't anticipate that queuing would happen in the street. However, we have provided additional measure just to ensure the contingent item...

Board Member Furth: The unpredictable.

Ms. Hodgkins: ...ensuring – I want to also note that the way its design is essential that you would move into the bicycle lane and then turn and that's kind of per MTUCD standards in terms of how you're supposed to turn into bicycle lanes. So, instead of turning over the lane, you would merge into that bicycle lane and then turn into the site.

Board Member Furth: So, you would be going bicycle speed, we hope.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes.

Board Member Furth: Then with respect to these alternative proposals for getting on and off the site. Could you take me through that just briefly and explain to me how it relates to the proposed Arastradero median islands and what not. Did the original plan assume a gap that doesn't exist?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes, essentially it looked at a design where there was an option to turn into the site from the westbound – going westbound and the Fire Department did anticipate that they would have that option. However, in coordinating with Public Works Engineering, they identified that as a potential landscape area that they really wanted to keep as part of that Charleston/Arastradero corridor project. In discussing with them and discussing fire, fire indicated that if Public Works – if they couldn't have that option, they would prefer not to be turning into the egress to the site because that would have them going into oncoming traffic.

Board Member Furth: They'd enter at the other end of the sight. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: You're looking for questions? Yeah, so can you – the request was obviously made to have a complete redesign of the front parking lot. Can you basically describe why the Staff thinks that this alternative design is so much better than the existing one or the one that they proposed?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, of course. I've actually – I have outlined in the Staff report under the analysis section on page 84 of the packet, a number of different reasons why we feel that this preferred – this is the preferred parking alternative. I think I spoke to a couple of those reasons that were related to Public Works engineering really wanting landscape in that area. There are not a lot of opportunities for landscape along the Charleston/Arastradero corridor and based on public comments going back to, I think 2004, in creating that concept design for Charleston/Arastradero that was approved by Council. This was a real opportune area so there's that and based on that and addressing fire's concerns and still having access to the site. The other reasons were – that we outlined where this – the way this is designed would allow for queuing at a point in the street where there is more room essentially; not at the narrowest point of the street. So, if queuing were to happen, we wanted to mitigate that issue by providing opportunities for a car to still be able to move around them. As you know, Charleston/Arastradero corridor is – has a lot of traffic on it so we really want to ensure that flow is maintained. I think that's all.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. That's all I needed.

Chair Lew: Ok and I have one question for the – I guess this is a landscape question for the landscape architect. On the – adjacent to the Hetch Hetchy right of way in the multi-use trail. I think you're – there is an existing fence, which I think you are proposing to remove, I'm guessing from the drawings. I was just wondering what you're proposing there along the – in the front setback area in terms of plantings and if there's – and fence design?

[Mr. Cleaver:] Ok, thank you. The existing fence is in pretty poor condition and we were discussing replacing it with a wood fence – solid wood fence that would have a – let's call it a natural finish. It would not be a color, it would have either a weathered or a color compatible with the buildings and the other improvement but it was a simple, solid fence. It would wrap from the Hetch Hetchy towards the Children's House – towards the main building and there are utilities that the fence would separate from the children's play area and the parking area. The intent was just to have a simple clean fence with no distractions for kids in the children's play area and for privacy or views in – from Hetch Hetchy to be minimal.

Chair Lew: Then closer to the street, what were you thinking in terms of planting?

[Mr. Cleaver:] We – I'm going to ask Jon for a – to follow up. Currently, our fencing was stopping at the return of the fence to the Children's House and there is the bike path that comes between the parking and Hetch Hetchy. I believe there's a turn-off and I'm trying to look at the screen and if I can point it, I want to say that – no, I'm not getting...

Mr. Daseking: (Inaudible)

[Mr. Cleaver:] Right. Thank you, Jon. So, with the bike parking – bike path in there between the parking and Hetch Hetchy, there was no fence proposed. It was just a planting buffer and literally, the fence would turn back onto the Children's House.

Chair Lew: That's fine. I was actually interested in the actual plants that you're proposing and then I think there's an art piece proposed in the walkway and I was just trying to understand – just sort of conceptually understand what's happening in there; like the big idea really.

[Mr. Cleaver:] The planting I can speak to directly and the art piece, I think Mary Beth the school Director can help us with that. The planting is all native and mostly evergreen and it's mostly low because of the narrowness of the planting areas. In the importance of visual, being able to see bike paths, being able to

see out and people being able to see in onto the bike paths and people on it. The planting is mostly mixes of grasses and things that are relatively soft. The intent was to use a mix of plants that didn't require a lot of maintenance and that would have a natural look to them. There are oak trees proposed and again, we were thinking that they were standard form from where the branching was high enough that – again, visual would be easy in and again, see the interaction of people on the bike path. Can I clarify further or?

Chair Lew: Nope, that's good. Thank you. I was mostly concerned because there really isn't anything – there isn't very much planting on the Hetch Hetchy and I was just trying to figure out how you're going to sort of blend in and I think it's actually better not to have the fence in this particular location. Great, thank you.

[Mr. Cleaver:] Understood, thank you.

Chair Lew: The art piece, I am interested in that. Welcome.

Ms. Mary Beth Ricks: Good morning, my name is Mary Beth Ricks, I'm the head of school at Bowman School in Palo Alto. The art piece currently being proposed is a collaborative work between an artist and our students using the ten sorts of tenants of Montessori, to create some large embedded pieces on the sidewalk that goes on the school property part. Not the public sidewalk but the school sidewalk so that will be accessible to the public and that you would walk over these pieces of art as you entered and exited our building.

Chair Lew: Great, sounds good. Thank you. Ok, if there are no more questions, why don't we move onto Board Member comments. Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I appreciate the efforts that were made to reduce the shading next door. I'm sorry that there are still shade impacts on a nursery school play area but I think that you have done what you can and that the impacts are no more severe than would be provided by a single-family development here. I think we cannot really ask for at this point so it's regrettable but I think you've minimized it to the extent that you can. I suspect the Juncus can be used for craft projects as well as landscaping. It's a nice plant. On the parking, I'm convinced by the Staff analysis, which I think was on page 87. I went over it fairly carefully and drove by the site and walked it a couple more times. I realize – schools are interesting. I mean they get conditional use permits because they are a desirable use but they need special handling so as not to adversely affect their neighbors and the disadvantages of schools as a neighbor is that they involved peak traffic at peak hours. The advantage, of course, is they are schools and particularly, in this case, it's a community that has a lot of power to regulate the behavior of its own participants and to work together to make this possible. I realize that it will require lots of education and training and reinforcement to have people use this system the way that they need too but I believe the Staff recommendation is the better one. Staff recommendation is the better one. So, I would support this enthusiastically with that proviso.

Chair Lew: And Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree that the modification that you've made, I think to work very well, especially with the gymnasium. Like I said, that's about the best that you can do other than making it an impractical building for what the function is. I do also agree that having done various schools, there's always when you get with the little kids, the queuing and dropping them off and everything else. I like the alternate if you want to call it, Staff requested alternative better and I think I'd be willing to approve it with that; not the other one.

Chair Lew: Ok, so I think we're – I'm in agreement as well with the other Board Members. It seems like the alternate is better for –(inaudible) – for off – I think it helps with the drop-off but also it mostly helps with – to me with the flow on Arastradero. I think it's better not to have a great separation between the parking entrance and then the Hetch Hetchy multi-use trail because I use the trail occasionally and I

think that particular corner, where the trail hits Arastradero is pretty tricky at peak hours. It's pretty difficult to cross there so I would support that. I do understand that you're losing three parking spots. It seems to me that 90 degrees parking a little harder to turn into than the angle parking that you had. Yeah, I understand both sides but it seems to me that – yeah, that the Staff alternate seems to meet all the City's department requirements so I'm fine with going with that. I have one last question for Staff with regard to the oak tree so tree number two. I think the Staff report is recommending modifying the condition of approval if I understand that correctly. So, we have an existing – we have an arborist report, right? Then we have their drawings and we have an existing condition of approval, right? Which is 30—is it 29 or 39 – where is it? 39 and so I guess my question is does 39 cover everything? The 9-foot that is listed in the drawings and the arborist report and then the 10-foot that was suggested by I think another Board Member.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, so I have added a condition of approval to provide a 10-foot radius from the tree.

Board Member Furth: And where is that?

Chair Lew: Do you want – well these are a draft, right? I think these are draft conditions.

Ms. Hodgkins: These are draft conditions.

Chair Lew: Yeah, you're thinking or are you proposing to amend 39 or were you thinking of adding something in addition to that?

Ms. Hodgkins: I'm trying to find it.

Chair Lew: 39 was on page 104.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, so actually I had added it under planning condition of approval. I had added a requirement for a 10-foot radius so I had actually put it under our conditions rather than Urban Forestry Conditions. It's under number 7, additional parking layout refinements. It says in addition; the parking layout shall be revised to provide a 10-foot radius from the nearest parking stall to the trunk of the protected oak tree prior to building permit issuances.

Chair Lew: Ok, so then I think we're good to go as is. Ok, I'm willing to entertain motions.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Ok, I move that we accept Staff's – that we recommend to the Director of Community Development that having considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration previously adopted, that we recommend the approved project with Staff's preferred alternative parking layout included in Attachment one or I, sorry. To the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in Attachments A and B to the Staff report number 7845.

Chair Lew: Is there anyone seconding?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Excellent. All in favor? Opposed? None so that's a 3-0 with two Members – with Baltay and kyu abstaining or absent. Yes. Congratulations.

MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE 3-0-0-2 WITH BALTAY AND KIM ABSENT

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Do you need a break?

Board Member Furth: That would be nice.

Chair Lew: Ok, we're going to take a 5-minute break and then we'll hear the last item,

Study Session

- 4. STUDY SESSION. 250 Hamilton Avenue [17PLN-00033]:** Preliminary Architectural Review of Location and Design Options for the Deployment of Verizon Small Cell Wireless Communication Equipment on Utility Poles in the Public Right-of-Way. The Proposed 18 Small Cell Node Locations in this Preliminary Architectural Review Application are Considered a Cluster of Nodes Within the Proposed Overall Deployment of 92 Small Cell Locations. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review. Zoning District: Varies. For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Rebecca Atkinson at rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: [Video started midsentence] ...the address is 250 Hamilton Avenue here on the agenda but it's actually multiple sites in south Palo Alto. Preliminary architectural review of the location and design options for the deployment of Verizon small cell wireless communication equipment on utility poles in the public right-of-way. The proposed 18 small cell node locations in this preliminary architectural review application are considered a cluster of nodes within the proposed overall deployment of 92 small cell locations. Environmental assessment is it's not a project. A formal application will be subject to CEQA review and the zone district varies. We have Rebecca Atkinson from the Planning Department here. Welcome.

Ms. Rebecca Atkinson: Thank you so much Chair and Board Members. Good morning. The project description for this Preliminary Architectural Review application is as you stated. There are 18 proposed small cell deployment node locations which are considered one cluster of nodes. Specifically, in this application for the Mid-Town, south of Mid-Town, St. Claire Gardens and Palo Verde neighborhoods and vicinity. Verizon proposed a total of 92 small cell deployment nodes that will be identified and similarly clustered together in future applications. Today, Verizon prepared three proposed equipment configurations for preliminary public and ARB review and comments. This location map was included in your Staff report and on the project plans but generally, this shows the distribution of proposed small cell nodes. They reflect the tolerances that each small cell node has in order to provide coverage and so forth. The applicant can provide more information on how frequent a node would be necessary in order to provide 'x' amount of coverage. Here's an excerpt of a proposed or comparison of the proposed 3-configurations. Generally, each configuration has the same antenna and attachments; a wood (inaudible), fiber and these locations would be provided through an aerial drop. The difference begins with the various equipment, cables, and mounting attachments proposed for each configuration and of course, configuration one has a ground mounted equipment cabinet. Key considerations, formal applications will need to demonstrate compliance with FCC emission standards for health and safety. The proposed equipment configurations are for wood poles only, at this time. You can see the design per street lights in a future application. Wireless carriers also appear to have different designs for their small cell deployment per informal communications that I've had. In the future, formal applications will be reviewed for constancy with the Comprehensive Plan. We included a summary of Comprehensive Plan goals and policies in Attachment A of your Staff report and that starts on page 155 in your overall packet. Staff also included a copy of the wireless portion of the Municipal Code and that is Attachment B, starting on page 158 in your overall packet and that's another key item that the formal applications will need to conform too. Of course, architectural review findings, conditional use permit findings and the before mentioned FCC standards. The purpose to the Preliminary Architectural Review meeting today is to receive early feedback from a member of the public and from the ARB, to discuss the key questions that Verizon has posed beginning on page 1 of the project description. Also, to discuss the City Department preliminary location and criteria, the configuration design criteria and the configuration design options that are outlined in the Staff Report. Next steps include the discussion today. Obviously, Verizon will submit formal applications and there will be detailed Staff analysis. I also included contact information from

members of the public, for the Architectural Review Board Members and also my Staff contact. I am happy to answer any question that you have. I included copies of public correspondence received since the production of the Staff report. I also include the paint samples for the proposed ground mount equipment and those are At Places. There was a mock cell site, non-live, installed near 1350 Newell and I don't know if you have had the opportunity to go out but I do have photos. We also have quite a few Staff members here from our Utilities Department; electrical Jim Fleming, Gregory McCrunan and Jimmy Carter. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Rebecca. So, now is the time for the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

[Mr.?? Angeles:] Chairmen and Members of the ARB, good morning. My name is (inaudible) Angeles and I'm the manager of the (inaudible) limitation for Verizon Wireless in northern California and...

[Mr. Matt Yergovich:] I'm [Matt Yergovich], the applicants permitting agent.

Mr. Angeles: ... we're here to present the Verizon Wireless small cell project in the City of Palo Alto and seek recommendations from the ARB in our design concepts that will be utilized for this project. In this presentation, we'll go through the project overview, such as the objectives, deciding criteria and the design configurations of the project. At the end, we have a list of questions for the ARB that we would like to discuss with you that pertains to the design concepts. You also received a detailed packet from us that has more detailed information about the project, such as photo sims, individual site criteria and also some sample paint colors for the equipment. The main objective of this project is to improve the wireless compacity and coverage in the City of Palo Alto. In the past 5-years, we've seen a significant increase in wireless data usage and we need to address the – not only the capacity concerns currently but also to improve – to keep up with the current trends in increased usages for our customers. To accomplish this, we will be implementing this new wireless solution called small cells. Small cells are low power sites that typically cover about 500 – 1,00-feet and they can be mounted on existing utility poles in a right-of-way. They work in conjunction with existing macro sites that surround the Bay Area. They are – since their footprint is very limited, they can only be placed in strategic and targeted locations. So, think of the macro sites as the overlay coverage in the network. These small cells are underlying coverage that assists in improving the capacity and coverage. The current project comprised of five clusters and this is the first cluster and all of the design configurations in this cluster will apply to all the different five clusters. In general, 2016 we – Verizon Wireless and the City of Palo Alto executed the Master Lease Agreement that would give Verizon Wireless the opportunity to attach to utility poles. This next slide shows the coverage condition here in a neighborhood in Palo Alto just south of Oregon Expressway. These are the neighborhoods so Palo Verde, Mid-Town and St. Claire Gardens. Color scheme, the red means poor coverage, yellow means marginal and green means excellent. The map on the left shows the current coverage condition here in this neighborhood. As you can see there are a lot of reds in this neighborhood. Those little circles are actually the small cells that we're proposing. The map on the right shows our projected coverage after the system has been implemented. You can see from this map that the reds have been replaced with the yellows and the greens. We're expecting a significant amount of improvement in the RF conditions in this neighborhood after the project is complete. What makes up a small cell? This diagram here gives you an example of a small cell drawing. The must haves for a small cell are the following, the antenna that transmits and received the signal. They are typically placed on the top of the pole, the three radios that are mounted in the middle of the pole. These are the ones that process the signal that's being communicated and then each small cell has power and fiber. To power the equipment and also to communicate to our centralized sub location. An optional equipment that we are adding to our design is the backup battery and this helps the sites stay on during the case of a power outage. Then there is also some other axillary equipment to connect the equipment together and as Ms. Atkinson mentioned, there is a mock site that we completed right across the Palo Alto Art Center. Hopefully, you folks have had a chance to visit it and we would like to hear some feedback from you from that installation. How do we select the pole locations? There are three key items that we have to meet in order to finalize the site locations. The first requirement is our Verizon engineering requirement. As I mentioned earlier, they only cover a very small footprint so they have to be located in specific locations.

We don't have a whole lot of wiggle room in placing these locations from the target that the RFD must provide. The second requirement pertains to the California Public Utilities Commission and also the City of Palo Alto Utility Engineering requirements. We also call this the utility requirement and that pertains to the constructability and the safety requirements of the pole. For example, there is a limited amount of vertical space on each pole where you can mount the equipment. Most of the pole candidates in an area have actually failed this particular requirement due to the existing infrastructure already on the poles. The third requirement pertains to planning and other siting concerns. We walked several sites with the City Staff from the Planning Department, Urban Forestry, and also from the Utility group and they provided us some valuable information and feedback on the design. As an example, placing a pole in the corner of a street verses in the middle of the street. What are our three different design configurations? We have three right here on the screen. The first one shows what we call the vertical lineup of equipment. Each of these sites – configurations have an antenna on the top. Then you can see the radios in the middle here in a vertical line up. We feel that this is the most seamless and most aesthetically pleasing configuration. In addition to that, we have the cabinet on the ground for the backup battery. The second configuration is instead of the backup battery on the ground, we have it mounted on the pole. Because of the limited amount of vertical space on the pole, we have to put the radios in a horizontal configuration so this is what's called the horizontal line up. Then configuration three is very similar to configuration one except that there's no battery backup. Most of our sites in this application are under configuration three. In the past 6-months, we have conducted several community outreach initiatives to educate the residents in the community to answer some of their questions and also to seek design feedback from the community. We established a website for the project, we had a text campaign and we've had two community meeting thus far. We've had significant positive feedback and support from the public. What we – we didn't receive any preference from the public as far as the configuration. We've been asking their preference on the configuration and the lineup and we haven't really received any preference either way or the other from the public. Which leads us to the questions that we have for the ARB Members. Pertaining to the design, we'd like to seek your feedback and recommendation on the following. From the design component, do you prefer the horizontal or vertical line up of the radios? Do you prefer a ground mounted cabinet or a pole mounted cabinet for the battery backup and also for the paint of the equipment, we provided three samples of brown? We feel that the color brown would be good for the equipment because it's the color of the pole so it blends in better. On the ground cabinet design, we provided two samples of green for the ARB Members as well. We provided street furniture options and also an (inaudible) option for the cabinet. In summary, we've provided an overview of the project objective, deciding criteria and design configurations. We'd like to again, receive your recommendation on the design concepts so we can implement them in the design and finalize it and hopefully move forward with the project. In addition to that, I would also like to thank the Staff for all of your support that you provided thus far for this project. That concludes our presentation. I would like to open it up for questions.

Chair Lew: Are there any questions from the Board? Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I have a basic question. Having seen the drawings you have and I went out to the mock-up that you have on Newell, which is a little bit deceiving because you've got nothing but trees as a backdrop. They have a tendency to disappear in the trees but having something like that put behind a beige colored building makes it a lot different. I guess my basic question is, in the 21st Century, based on what you can do, you've got to be able to come up with something that looks better than any of these. I mean, to me these are just pug ugly no matter what and that's basically it. I can imagine that there isn't a design – I mean if you look at these things. There's wiring hanging down from the bottom of it. It looks like an afterthought and that's my main problem with it. I got to figure that – I've seen others that seemed like they were much more thought out than these. This is – rather than—I'm guessing based on the way you have the three radios and that sort of thing, that this is a set design using those three radios and that sort of thing. Yet it looks like it's a piecemeal approach to doing this. I mean it wasn't like well, usually, we have two but we had to squeeze in a third radio in this particular design so that's why it looks the way that it does. I got to figure that there's another way to do it. Right now, I'm just really disappointed from a visual standpoint. I mean I'm an architect and I look at it. I know everybody wants their cell phone to work better and so everybody goes yeah, we love the project but mainly because what

it does for their cell phone and not what it looks like. It's our job to sit there and critic what it looks like and right now, I'm not a happy camper.

Mr. Yergovich: Board Member Gooyer, we respect your concerns. You mentioned several factors and I think that those factors can be addressed on a site by site basis. Starting this the color as it matches the background scenario. Depending on the surrounding foliage and depending on the exact location, we can paint the equipment to match perhaps the background if there is a particular foliage around a utility pole. Perhaps we could look at some of the shades of green for the equipment to better conceal that equipment. With regard to the cable management -- you had mentioned the cable management is an issue. We have currently painted the cables to match the pole; painted brown. There are some other alternatives that we could do as well to conceal the cables, our current proposal is consistent with section 18.42.1.10-I criteria one of the Development Standards, which sets forth that we shall use the smallest footprint possible. However, in deviating from that standard, we could also deploy an equipment shroud. We like the idea that less is more -- less equipment is more and that seems consistent with the standards but an equipment shroud would be possible. In the packet that I provided to you, the third to last page and also on the presentation -- let's see if I can -- yeah. So, this configuration here involves an equipment shroud and I've worked on some limited selected deployments where the equipment shroud has been utilized. The dimensions are approximately a foot and a half wide but a foot and a half deep by about nine feet long to fully shroud the cables you mentioned and the attachments. The difficulty obviously, is the that it's a much bigger appearance on the pole, whereas the proposing individual boxes tend to fit within the silhouette of the pole and have less of an appearance. The individual boxes are also constant with these being utility poles but the equipment shroud is feasible. We found that often times in deploying the equipment shroud that the public tends to prefer the individual units, rather than the singular shroud but it is a possible design alternative.

Chair Lew: Ok, I do -- if you -- the women in the back. If you want to speak, we're going to do the public comment next so I do -- I would like you to fill out a speaker card, which is right up here in the front. Up here near the lectern and I do have two speakers who will speak before you. We have [phonetic] [Herk Quan] and Wolfgang [Himobower]. You each will have 5-minutes. So yes, we'll do it now [Mr. Quan.]

[Mr. Herk Quan:] Hi, my name is [Herk Quan] and I actually sent an email to Rebecca about -- several days -- two days before I guess. I mean, I don't have a prepared speech but then I actually -- my house is actually right there on the second one; 2490 Lewis Road. (Inaudible) reviewing my address but the fact is that I'm very concerned about this project and then because I have two young kids going to school here. Then we -- our house is actually being remodeled right now and then I actually found that this project -- it sounds like it's in stealth mode. I did not find this out until I actually saw a notice right outside my -- there's a pole outside my house and then also I got this notice and I told Rebecca that there's actually (inaudible) -- that the public hearing today is actually on March 18th. Yeah, I think this is actually done -- not appropriate at all because nobody -- I mean, I don't know how many residents are here today to listen to this project. Then -- I just lost my dad too -- he actually just died of cancer last year in October at Stanford Hospital and it's not due to that but it's just that I'm a son of someone who actually got cancer. I have heard about -- a lot of stuff about emission from RF and all that and then -- I mean if -- I just noticed that there are so many supporting letters here to that say I like this project. If that's the case, please move those -- that antenna to someone who wrote these letters. I mean not in my backyard. I really don't -- I mean I don't know anything about the health factor and all that. I mean if someone actually is informed -- well informed and know exactly what the health effect is, maybe we can consider it but then, look at the turnout today. There are not many residents that came here to listen to this hearing. I suggested to Rebecca that we should move this hearing to anything date so that more residents can attend. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. That's ok and Wolfgang [Himobower].

[Mr. Wolfgang Himobower:] Good morning. My name is [Wolfgang Himobower] and I am a Palo Alto resident and I have a long-term question. If you look at the history of these antennas, it was At&t a few years ago, right? Now it's Verizon. We can probably guess who is next so every carry who comes in here,

it setting up close to 100 antennas. We are going to be clouded with antennas all over and going forward, there will be less and less antennas to choose from. The concern that I have is – so the ARB has set forth criteria on how to select poles and which ones to exclude. As more and more carriers come into the neighborhood and set up these antennas, will these criteria be weakened or perhaps ineffective because there are simply not enough poles to choose from? That's my question. Do the City have a long-term strategy to address that? Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. We have the last speaker and I don't – Rebecca, do you have the card? We have one last speaker. Great, thank you. This is Barbra and I can't read the last name.

[Ms. Barbra Cryner:] I'm Barbra [Cryner] and the only reason I am here is because I exercise in this building, usually every day, by walking up and down the stairs. I got the notice too that the speaker was talking about; the first one and I thought why in the hell are they sending me something that was for a meeting in March, which I received last Saturday. I presume that everyone else got their notices with the same date and I wouldn't have been here if I hadn't just walked through just at the very moment and I heard them say something about this that made me sit down instead of taking the stairs. My other concern – and they spoke about those earlier meetings to inform the neighborhood. I never got any kind of notification of any meeting so I don't know who sent them or how people got to them. I do have to say that I don't use a computer so if you were notified by any of those methods, rather than regular US mail, then perhaps that's how they got the information but I certainly didn't get any. This was my first notification that said March.

Chair Lew: Yes, great. Thank you. Ok, and we have two more. Ok, so we have two more speakers.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) stop?

Chair Lew: There we go. Got it? Well, it's an old and crotchety timer. There we go. Ok, so we have Michael Murry and – or Michael [phonetic][Madvae] and [Carl Darling].

[Mr. Michael Madvae:] Good morning. My name is [Michael Madvae]. I actually live in Barron Park, not in this target area but I think it's probably just a matter of time before the project – in fulfilling it's 92 cells site locations is going to enter out the neighborhood. I have serious concerns about the aesthetics. The poles in our neighborhood, in particular, are loaded with wires and it's growing. At&t is rolling out their fiber network with copper on the poles extending from the fiber cabinets and so on. We're already growing and I have a special concern about having read the package that there's a co-location automatic approval that if some cell company puts in equipment at a location, that automatically approves presumably a competitor from coming in and adding to that location. The fact that's automatic if I am interpreting that correctly, suggests to me that we've got limited control to this process. If we don't exercise the control now, we're locked into automatic features going forward. Speaking for myself as a homeowner, the pole across the street from me stands alone. There are no trees to mitigate the view. It's been a mess for decades. At&t's telecommunications wires are rat's nests until recently. There's a power transformer on the pole. Palo Alto utilities came by the other day and added some expenditures to the pole as part of a program that I'm sure what that was but they left a mess. There are coaxial cables dangling and so on. I am concerned about being backed into a corner where now, in addition to all that, there's going to be a cell site and then on top of that, because of approval of that cell site – pardon me, a sight is going to have automatic approval. Again, it's mostly aesthetic. There is one thing that I have not seen in any of the documentation and that relates to the noise. I know when At&t went through the neighborhood, there were complaints about the humming noise and I saw a reference in the package to an interest in passive cooling, which suggests that the cooling fans were creating the noise. I don't—I've not seen where that's been addressed at all. I bring that up as a secondary concern to the visual aesthetic concern. Thank you very much for your time. Sorry about the mic.

Chair Lew: Thank you. No, that's fine, thank you. Ok, and our last speaker is [Carl Darling].

[Mr. Carl Darling:] Thank you for listening to me. I'm a 20-year resident of Palo Alto and I live in St. Claire Gardens in Mid-Town so I am in the jurisdiction of this project. As a project manager on many Bay Area jobs, I appreciate the work – the hard work that this group has to put into to study these proposals. I do really appreciate it and I appreciated being invited by Rebecca to this meeting. To – the work that has to be done to improve this cell phone reception in this area. Many people do business out of their homes in Palo Alto and the cell phone reception is a huge issue. I realize that certain people will have esthetic problems with some of these poles being added and I do appreciate that. I also feel that something needs to be done sooner and that to improve this cell phone reception; which is terrible in Mid-Town. It's a major problem for people who do business, which is becoming more of an issue as time goes on. My wife does a lot of business out of her house. She works for Hewlett Packer and she is a director there. I'm kind of speaking for her in a way and that I appreciate that whatever is being done on this project. If there are shrouds that need to improve the look of it, that it would happen because it's a definite need for the people of our community. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. I'm going to close the public portion of the hearing today and thank you for speaking. Thank you also for all the people who have sent emails to us. Staff, do you want to comment on the public notification?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Planner: Thank you. We just – we do regret that there was a mix up with the noticing. There was an incorrect date as residents have mentioned on the notice. Staff did realize that and has sent out another round of notices but more importantly, this is a preliminary review application. No decisions are being made at this time and so the Municipal Code does not actually require notification. We do try and do that notification to bring these issues forward as soon as possible. We also have in these 19 locations, there is the on-site notification so we do hope that, especially neighbors in the immediate area, would have seen those on-site boards and would have been able to gain information from that.

Chair Lew: Was there – the newspaper—was the newspaper notification...

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Lew: ...did that have the correct date?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. As always, our ARB meetings are posted in the weekly and it does have this project description there.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Ok, so I'm going to bring it back to the Board for comments. I just want to mention before – mention that we have – we only have purview over esthetic issues here today. We don't have any purview over health – potential health impacts. I think we don't have – it's not our decision whether or not to do an emergency backup but we can comment on the aesthetics of it. I don't think we have any say over the technology that they are using—that they are proposing; say like macro-site versus these distributed micro-sites. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I've already pretty much mentioned that I'm just not really a fan of any of these. I guess they have to be taken on a one to one basis. The whole idea about do you put it on the pole or do you put it in the container? A lot of it depends on, obviously, the sidewalk and everything else that's there. Some of the questions – I think I'd rather just have a stealth painted box rather than – I mean let's face it, I guess in our society we've just gotten used to those things. I just assume a sort of have it be out of sight, out of mind rather than making them a colorful art statement because that just brings them to the foreground. I mean if I had to have a choice of those three, I think I'd pick the one – I guess it's the – what? The first one that has the actual unit on the ground as much as possible. I would also like to see that if you do have a shrouding situation possibly on your mock up, put either a partial shroud so you can get the sense of here's what the shroud looks like and that sort of thing because I'd like to see that. I have a hard time believing and I'm not arguing the point but I have a hard time believing that other than guys like me or in my profession would even care about what's up there. I have

a hard time thinking that somebody would go gosh, I really don't like that shroud on there. I like the – but be that as it may, sometimes it's the busyness of 18 different items up there and with wires up there that draw your attention to it more than a single box that is totally enclosed or painted to match the pole. I'd rather have an option to see something like that. Other than that, it's just – I can't imagine still, based on all the technology that we have, we can't do something a little bit more sophisticated than what's there. Ok, that's it for me.

Chair Lew: Any comments on colors?

Board Member Gooyer: Colors? I mean, colors are basically if the pole is brown then if you make it brown, that's probably the best solution to match the pole that's there.

Chair Lew: Sure, and then they had cabinet colors. They actually have...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I mean the cabinet is sort of the idea that if it's against a beige wall or near a beige wall, you paint it beige to make it disappear. I think that's what you meant when you used the term stealth. You sort of match what's around it. If you've got a lime green building, you paint the thing lime green. Even though you would never do that anywhere else but it matches – it blends into the surroundings.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I think this is an interesting issue for us to comment on because there is so much federal preemption. Some of it appropriate given the nature -- sort of semi-public utility nature of this and some of it perhaps, unfortunate. Was the City required to enter into a Master Lease Agreement or was that just a City commercial decision since we own these poles?

Ms. Atkinson: I'd like to forward your question to Jim Fleming.

Board Member Furth: Sure.

Mr. Jim Fleming: Board Members, my name is Jim Fleming and I'm with City of Palo Alto Utilities. I'm a senior management analysis. The question is was the City required ...

Board Member Furth: Essentially, do we have to make our poles available for this kind of technology or was this a choice that we made?

Mr. Fleming: The applicant has the right to build in the right-of-way and they have a Master License agreement for use of City controlled space on those poles.

Board Member Furth: They have a Master License agreement because the City granted that license or because State and Federal Law grant them that license and all we do is the details?

Mr. Fleming: Both. The Council approved the Master License agreement on June 27 of last year.

Board Member Furth: Right. Thank you. Oh, one other question since you are here. Utility poles as we've heard are not necessarily presented as objects of beauty. That's not what they are designed for or often what they achieve but sometimes our straight lighting poles are intended to be design elements on a streetscape and they do have rather a clean design. Does this Master License agreement also require that we permit this equipment on light poles that are pearly light poles in undergrounded districts?

Mr. Fleming: Yes, it does because they are in the right-of-way.

Board Member Furth: That's unfortunate. Thank you. Maybe very fortunate from the point of view of receiving cell phone service. It seems to me with respect to the aesthetic questions that are asked by the

applicant or by the – by Verizon and its agents, that these are site specific questions that can't be usefully answered on a blanket basis. The color that you should use, the design that you should use all depends on where you are putting it. In the – across from the Art Center, I did go look at your mock-up. It's heavily wooded and at first glance, it looks like there...

Board Member Gooyer: It looks fine.

Board Member Furth: ...purple Martin houses and it looks fine. I mean there's a lot of stuff going on there. It's not particularly close to a residential property so it would be good to see a mock up in a more exposed and difficult location. I think in some cases, shrouding will feel much better and safer and more attractive to people. I think the same is true of colors. As to whether – as to where batteries go, again I think we – in my neighborhood, which is downtown north, we're losing a lot of landscaping to pedestals; to utility and communication pedestals. The rose bushes go out and they go in and so, of course, I'm in favor of underground vaults whenever we're permitted to require them but as I recall, that's not very often. So, my first preference is underground and my second preference is sight specific and certainly, with as much accommodation to residents as possible. I mean we walk by parks, we walk by businesses but if we have a home, that's where we are all the time. That would be my first concern with the aesthetic and installation. I saw commentary about how the installation of these facilities might interfere with undergrounding and I don't know if that's correct, Mr. Fleming? Future undergrounding, that it would make it more expensive or less possible?

Mr. Fleming: There is a number of underground utility conversation project that will occur over the next several years. Within the Master License Agreement, if a district is converted from aerial to the underground, then the – whatever is on that pole would have to go underground also.

Board Member Furth: At who's expense?

Mr. Fleming: It would be at the applicant's expense.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. It does seem to me that we're not really going to successfully address the esthetic issue of aerial clutter until we underground utility poles. In the meantime, it seems to me that the answer to these questions is site specific at best. I really – oh, I do agree that there was some discussion of noise and that would be a major issue because it's easier to close the door or look elsewhere. It's not easy to abate noise so that needs to be done by sitting.

Chair Lew: Ok, so great. Thank you for the – for your submittal and doing the mock up. I did look at the mock up yesterday and I did look at the three – I did look at three of the sites. The ones that are highlighted in the Staff report, I did look at all of those yesterday. There was something interesting that we haven't seen before which is the art proposed – there's a possibility of an art project and I did do some research on that. I don't know if you wanted to comment on that at the moment but I did look at that. In Campbell and San Jose, they've done like 100.

Mr. Yergovich: Yes, we provided some photos of art wraps, is the term of art. They're vinyl wraps that wrap around the ground equipment. The photos that we provided were from Walnut Creek and that's an interesting option that the City might want to consider. However, keep in mind that with the ground cabinets, those provide battery backup so for example, of the 18 facilities that we're talking about here, only three involve ground cabinet. Very few ground cabinets are being proposed. Also, I want to mention that the radio units themselves emit zero noise. This is state of the art equipment. There's no acoustical implication from the radio equipment. Only the battery backup units that again, are very infrequently deployed, emit any noise at all. Those are well within the City's acoustical standards. Back to the art wrap, if I can answer any other questions about that.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I have a couple questions about that. So, the ones in San Jose, some of them have – a few of them have been vandalized and so how do you handle graffiti?

Mr. Yergovich: The good news with an art wrap is that the goal with an art wrap is to prevent graffiti and in fact, they often times do prevent graffiti. The graffiti artists are less inclined to impact other folk's art so that's the good news. Otherwise, Verizon maintains a network operation center, 24-hour knock, that promptly responds to graffiti removal requests.

Chair Lew: The situation that I've – that I understand down in San Jose was that these were individual artist painting boxes and the vandalism was actually not – it wasn't really tagging per say. It was actually somebody repainting them gray. Then some of the artists didn't want – the artist was donating their time. I think they got materials or what not but you know, if you are an artist and are spending three weeks painting this thing. You don't necessarily want to repaint it so I was just wondering how you propose – how you've been thinking about that?

Mr. Yergovich: That's a good question. I would say there are several different ways to address that. The art wrap companies can deploy their own designs. It's a vinyl wrap and those designs can be pre-approved for example or there could be a more collaborative effort with the art community to design specific items.

Chair Lew: If you – the ones in – the ones that I am aware of in San Jose and Campbell are on – they are typically on corners of more major streets. Then what I think you are proposing here, which is really more -- seems like more in people's front yards. I was wondering if you could speak to the Walnut Creek art wrap?

Mr. Yergovich: With regard to the ground battery backup unit deployments, we've selected locations as tactfully as possible to avoid the heavy residential areas. For example, with the mock up, you can see that the unit is not directly in front of a house. It's behind a bus stop bench and that's a good example. So, avoiding those sensitive, highly visible locations altogether is our primary goal. Secondly, the art itself could be tailored to the particular site depending on what are the goal is there.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. On the – on some of your alternates, I think you're – there's one alternate for like a concert bench. I was wondering – I've never seen that before. I was wondering if you could speak to the – how that – if you've used it before and whether it works? I'm looking at and the dimensions seem – for the cabinet and that's not for a person.

Mr. Yergovich: Yes, we did site several concealment options. Actually, two different types of benches; there was a concrete bench and also a metal bench. You're absolutely right, the – specifically the concrete bench looks a little big. Difficult – I hope no one is sticking their baggage below the bench or putting their feet under there. That might be impossible to do but there are some different design options. Also, the mailbox option was another one. That I might add, that I believe is utilized just outside here – the window. There are some other design options with regard to the battery backup ground units.

Board Member Furth: Well, I was – yeah, I was curious to whether this stealth garbage can option actually functions as a garbage can. It could lead to like a disappointment.

Board Member Gooyer: That's what I was afraid of. People are going to throw garbage toward it and go, oh. Oh well.

Mr. Yergovich: That could be a problem, yes.

Board Member Furth: In the right place, the metal bench could work.

Chair Lew: Ok, so let me back up for a second. One is the criteria the ARB setup and that you've been trying to follow where ever possible. That was sort of written at the same time that the At&t DAS project went through. At the time we wrote it, we were assuming that it was the dual antennas on each one—on each pole. At the very last minute, At&t agreed to do a – the single antenna per pole. I think that project has, I think, turned out pretty well. There were times after it was installed and I went to look at some of the poles and I looked at them – I was looking at some of them thinking oh, they haven't installed them

yet. I'm too early and then I looked again and realized that oh, it's actually – it was installed and I just didn't even really notice it. I think there are ways of addressing the design to make it look better. It seems to me that the criteria that we had didn't also anticipate mailboxes, benches or an art project. I think that we could look at – I think that the Board could consider reviewing the criteria for – to allow for more options. For example, as I mentioned before, the art project seems to be better for more prominent locations. If it's on a corner near – close to the corner on a more – say like on Middlefield or something. That – I think that we should be open for a discussion because I think the art piece could be an interesting project. I don't think it makes sense on this particular – in this particular situation but again -- yeah, the Board never really considered any of these; like the benches or trash cans or the mailboxes. The art project, at least the ones that I've seen in San Jose, it seems to me that they are – those are only public boxes – publicly owned cabinets and not privately owned so that's a little different. Then they also relied on donations and sponsors so again, those are a little bit different than this particular situation so we would have to address that if we do want to do that. I think some of your locations, the bench could be appropriate. You have one – let me see. Let me get the address. It was number 135, which is next to the creek. For example, -- and that's on Ross Road. For example, just on Lewis Road, one block away, there is actually a regular bench; presumably, City owned or what not. In that kind of situation, I think that a bench could work there.

Mr. Yergovich: To clarify that proposal 135...

Chair Lew: It doesn't...

Mr. Yergovich: ...we are proposing a pole mounted battery backup unit. Two of the 18 originally had designed have pole mounted battery backup units. Would the ARB prefer to see a ground mounted cabinet instead of the...

Chair Lew: No, I don't want to get into to specifics. Yeah, because you have a lot of locations and I think we're just trying to give you general comments. I'm saying that there are situations where a bench could work and I would say that's one of them but you have other ones. Say for example 139, on Colorado, where there just isn't space. It's somebody's front yard and they've got a fence there and they've got all new landscaping so obviously, you wouldn't put it there. You guys understand that and you're trying to put everything on the pole in that situation.

Mr. Yergovich: Actually, with 139, we're not proposing any battery backup so again...

Chair Lew: Right. Yeah, so...

Mr. Yergovich: ...respectfully to that situation. Yeah.

Chair Lew: Then say for example on location 143, which is – I forgot the name of the street.

Mr. Yergovich: El Verano I believe.

Chair Lew: Verano, yes. Thank you. That's the back corner – it's sort of like the back corner of somebody's property – near the back corner of somebody's property. It's mostly hedges and fences and like in that case, it seems to me that just the most stealth options make sense. There's no reason to call attention to it like with a bench or an artwork. In that case, I would be fine with a – if there's a pad mounted box, I think that would be ok. With regard to the boxes, I actually like the mailboxes but I think – the mailboxes work down here downtown where there in an urban location and they are on the sidewalk. It seems like your regular cabinet kind of makes more sense out in the residential districts because there are other telephone boxes that sort of look like that out there. The – I think you were showing two green colors and I think we only have one maybe here. I think there's a dark green in the packet, possibly. This color, I think we have used something like this for the cable boxes that were installed a long time ago in the City. These – I think this – I don't have – I don't necessarily have an objection to this. This doesn't – these seem to – like over time, I'm saying like 30-years, they look pretty

faded and I would say that there are situations where a darker color is better; like if it's in a hedge. The darker color picks up the shadow of the leaves better than the lighter color. I would say also that the darker color – like a dark color green would be more similar to other things that we have in the right-of-way. We have backflow preventers and sometimes the backflow preventers have a cage around that and those are all typically dark green. That's what I am thinking of with regard to the greens. On the brown colors that you have on the poles, I think on the mockup it looks pretty good. I'm happy with the color with that. I think I agree with Robert that I think there are places where shrouds would be better. Maybe not everywhere but like the one – on site number 139, which is on Colorado Avenue, which is – yeah, near Colorado Avenue. It's close to a corner, I don't think there are any street trees there or I don't remember anything—nothing large. There are no large evergreen trees. It's right near somebody's front door. It seems to me like a shroud would be more appropriate there, even though it's bigger but to me, it's cleaner. On the mock-up site, I wouldn't think a shroud would be necessary. There's enough – there are redwood trees all around there. Yeah, and it makes the visual size of its smaller. Let's see if I had any other comments. I think that may be all the comments that I have. Robert, did you have something else that you wanted to add?

Board Member Gooyer: No, no. Like I said, it's just – it is based on a lot of one by one basis.

Chair Lew: I would just say on the – maybe Staff can correct me if I am wrong but on the at&t project and this was before your time. I think the Board got every – I could be wrong. I think we got every location for the first phase but then I'm not sure that we actually reviewed all the future locations in other future phases of the project. We reviewed it but then, the thing is – but when we actually had the hearing, we didn't comment on every location because we would have been here for days to do it. It was useful in just – for the ARB to sort of see if the project was headed in the general – in the right direction and give direction to Staff if they thought there was a larger problem that needed to be addressed. We could do it that way if you want. Yes?

Board Member Furth: My experience with the City and new utilities is back in the very late 90's, the City had on Staff an architect whose job – consulting architect actually, whose job was to go out with Public Works and the Utilities Department and increasingly with other communications companies and look at sight by sight location of all these facilities. Looking at setting and landscaping and all these variables to try to minimize the adverse impacts. I suspect we don't do that any longer or do we still do that?

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have a consulting architect on Staff but that person is mainly used in the review of our two-story houses through the IR process.

Board Member Furth: This was about what happened in the public right-of-way and it was a deliberate response to concern about how we sighted our utilities. That kind of Staff level review is probably the most effective way to get to the fact that these facilities need to go in, there is a certain drive toward uniformity by the installers and maintainers but site-specific adaptations can make things a lot better in a particular block or household. I will say with respect to these locations here, most of them would not, to me, be appropriate for art; though a few might. Also, what is the color coding on this cover sheet? I couldn't figure out what the colors – differently colored dots meant? I couldn't find a key.

Mr. Yergovich: Oh, I'm sorry.

Board Member Furth: There's pink and blue and green and black.

Mr. Yergovich: Which sheet?

Board Member Furth: Top...

Board Member Gooyer: This cover sheet right here.

Mr. Yergovich: Oh.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Mr. Yergovich: It's just to distinguish that they are different...

Mr. Angeles: That map shows the different configurations types for each of the poles so configuration one is one color, two is the other color and three is the majority of the poles. This signifies where we have ground based cabinets or a pole mounted cabinet and where there are no cabinets.

Board Member Furth: Where is the key that would explain to me which is which? Right in front of my nose, I'm sure.

Mr. Yergovich: Yeah, there is a...

Ms. Atkinson: There is a list of all the nearest, adjacent private addresses and all the different pole—sorry all the different pole numbers and also the different node number. In that list – it's Attachment F in the applicant's project description. It has all the different configuration listed.

Chair Lew: It's not in the drawings. It's in the ...(crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: It would be helpful in the drawings to know what we're trying to look at.

Mr. Yergovich: We can make that more conspicuous on the title sheet.

Chair Lew: Page 193 of the packet.

Board Member Furth: That's a lot of cross referencing.

Chair Lew: Yeah but the – yeah.

Board Member Furth: It's good to know that noise will not in fact, as far as we know, be a problem. That's a relief.

Chair Lew: Ok, I did want to address one of the public speakers about the co-location. I understand that there is a – this came up on the Little Leagues site before the – I think At&t as well with regards to co-location. I think the speaker is correct. They do have – there are – other carriers have rights to co-location and minimize or reduces the approval process. That is an issue. I don't know if we have any say over that.

Ms. Atkinson: As part of the formal application, the applicant will be required to show the full build out scenario associated with each of these nodes. I would suspect that you have an opportunity to review the implications of siting and note any one particular location. It's not an automatic approval in later stages because they – any carrier would have to show compliance with FCC standards and so forth. If there was a particular type of stealth requirement or something, we would maintain existing screening and things like that. That would be a tier one wireless project and then tier two would be a project that exceeded some other prior stealth or some – or exceeded some other limit but wasn't actually a new site so that would be a tier two project. There are different review time frames, shock clock deadlines and different ways of reviewing the different type of forthcoming applications.

Chair Lew: I forgot about the shock clock. When this – if this – if and when this comes through for a formal application, could you mention the time schedule in the Staff report because it's different than our regular ARB timetable? The public isn't always aware of that so if you could do that for the next report that would be good. I have a question for Staff, are there other similar projects coming from other carriers?

Ms. Atkinson: Yes, actually we have at least three other applicants that are in discussions with Staff about submitting either formal applications or Preliminary Architectural Review application. Staff has strongly encouraged all applicants to submit Preliminary Architectural Review applications.

Chair Lew: Thank you for that. I think that's all the comments or do we have any follow-up? Do you have any – yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Some of these are probably relatively non-controversial and they can be done fairly easily. I think the Newell is an example of something where you could do almost any of these things and everybody would be fine with it except the few people who noticed it. There are others clearly, which are not in that way. They're either very distressing to people who are living near the proposed project or they're otherwise visually difficult so if it's possible for Staff and the applicant to sort those out so we put our energy and thought into the difficult problems, that would be helpful. I don't know how you do that but that would be very helpful.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I think that's a good idea.

[Mr. Paul Albrit:] Paul [Albrit], outside counsel for Verizon Wireless and perhaps you remember me from the At&t projects a couple of years ago and (inaudible) Middlefield Palo Alto Little League project that we also worked on. I just wanted to say on your specific question about, what's now called the Spectrum Act and the administrative approval of additional facilities on an existing facility. That you have an additional layer of control here because it's a Master License Agreement. There has to be a site license agree from Palo Alto to go onto each pole and so there's an ability to direct carriers to other poles as opposed to co-locating on a similar pole. Of course, it would depend on the kind of design. I just wanted to quickly add that we did learn a lot from you, the ARB, several years ago and those esthetic criteria were all taken into account in locating these poles. Not located on corners where they could be seen in two different directions. Not placing in front of people windows but between property lines and driveways to avoid views. Locating whenever possible, adjacent to trees like the mock location; wherever we can do that. We're putting the radios within the trees; the antenna sticking up above so all of those esthetic criteria that you asked us to look into before is being done in this project as well. Lastly, I just want to say that as a telephone corporation, Verizon Wireless has the right to use the right-of-way. We can even put our own poles in the right-of-way but we're doing everything we can do use existing infrastructure. These really are telephone boxes on a telephone pole but because of Public Utility Commission general order 95 requirements for linemen to be able to climb the poles and all sorts of things, we have a lot of constraints about any kind of camouflaging or – because the poles are supposed to be used by multiple utility companies for utility purposes. We do what we can to minimize the equipment, streamline the boxes so that they are with verticality and so forth and we have some shrouding options. There are these federal and State laws that affect how we use these telephone poles. We're working as closely as we can with the City to do that. Every pole is walked with the Utility Department, the Planning Department, and our people. We're following a similar process to At&t where we're bringing forward four clusters, which is what we did with At&t. You will see each of the poles and each of the clusters before it comes to you. I know that some of the Members walked those poles before each of those meetings and then if you have individual poles that you want to call out during that meeting then you can do that. As you know, the public will also have the ability to come and express their concerns about a specific pole, which may also allow us to modify the design for that specific pole. Verizon Wireless is very conscious of these concerns and we're working with the community and we'll continue to do that throughout the process. We really appreciate the comments today.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. This is a preliminary so there's no action that is being taken today. We will see you again in the future once you submit an application. Any last comments? No.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, so I think that it on this one and I think we still have minutes to review so thank you.

Approval of Minutes:

5. Draft Architectural Review Minutes of May 4, 2017

Chair Lew: So, we have the last item on the agenda and that is to review the draft Architectural Review minutes from May 4th, 2017. Those came – they are not in the packet. They came by email. I had a couple comments. Did – Wynne, did you have anything?

Board Member Furth: I have some minor corrections for Staff. Again, my favorite was that we don't have implacable ordinances, we have applicable ordinances. Generally, I thought it was a good job.

Chair Lew: Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: No.

Chair Lew: Ok, so I just had a couple comments and so on page 12, this was on the bridge – on the bicycle bridge. There was a woman mentioned as Claudia and that was Claudia Guadagne from FMG Architects from the – that's G-u-a-d-a-g-n-e from the Architects; Project Architect's Office. Then also on page 20 and 21, the minutes cited a male speaker and I think that was Roy Schnabel from Biggs Cardosa from the bridge ANE firm.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Move approval as amended.

Chair Lew: Ok, second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Lew: Thank you. All in favor? Opposed? No, so that's a 3-0 with two Members absent. Great and Wynne, I think you had one last comment?

MOTION PASSED 3-0-0-2 WITH BALTAY AND KIM ABSENT

Board Member Furth: Oh, I have one general comment which was (inaudible) came from the comment by either Staff or I guess the applicant that we were going to be seeing more underground garages and perhaps more mixed-use projects. I suspect that's true and I hope that when we look at these in the future, we think about security and sense of security from the beginning because this was a very constrained site and probably very difficult to address but in my view, an expensive operating system is much less desirable than a design that works on its own.

Chair Lew: Yeah, it's a tricky one. I like the recent grocery – the multi-story grocery stores and they do all glass stair enclosures and glass elevators. It seems to me to make it – it's the transparency that makes it seem much more – seems much safer and I think Board Member Baltay in the past has argued for natural light. Say like the Kepler's bookstore in Menlo Park does make those – the light wells do make a difference. There are ways that the design can be addressed.

Board Member Furth: I think it's a design problem worth addressing early because – very early because once you get very far, it's too late.

Chair Lew: Ok, we are adjourned. Thank you.

Subcommittee Item

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment