



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: October 19, 2017
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent:

Chair Lew: Can we have a roll call, please? Great, all members are present.

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications for items that are not on the agenda. My understanding is we do have some speakers for item number three who aren't able to wait until we get down to the item and they would like to speak to the item now. So, if you could come up now and also fill out a speaker card maybe after you finish your presentation you can do that or if you have it now, I'll take it and you have 5-minutes and welcome.

[Board moved to item number three to hear public comment]

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Regarding agenda changes, additions and deletions I don't think there are any. I do want to mention to everybody that we normally have an earthquake drill on this day – this is ShakeOut Earthquake Day. I think my understanding is from Staff that there's – we don't have any advance warning of it. Usually, it's – ah, excellent.

Male: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Great.

Male: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Excellent and you have business here too so this is good.

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. 2120 Staunton Court [16PLN-00419]:

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of Two Existing Dwelling Units and Construction of a new 3,124 Square Foot Duplex. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: RMD(NP). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Adam Petersen at apetersen@m-group.us. Continued from September 21, 2017.

Chair Lew: We can go onto – move onto item – the first item which is number two which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, 2120 Staunton Court. Recommendation on applicant's request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow demolition of two existing dwelling units and construction of a new 3,124-square foot duplex. The environmental assessment is that it's exempt from the provisions of CEQA in accordance with Guideline Section 15301 for existing facilities and the zone district is RMD (NP). Our project planner is Adam Petersen, welcome.

Mr. Adam Petersen, Project Planner: Welcome, good morning Chair Lew and Members of the ARB. I'm Adam Petersen from the Planning and Community Environment Department. Really quick I want to walk you through the project. This project, you've seen it before as the September 21st, 2017, ARB meeting. The Board had some comments regarding the project and the project has come back for you today. I want to run through the comments and the applicant's response really quick. The first comment was the project didn't have the color and materials board and that color and material board is submitted to you, it's on the dais, for your review. Number two, there were some comments regarding roof pitches and the materials on the roofs of the project. The applicants redesigned the project to make dormer roofs and the top roof the same pitch. The middle roof separating the first and second floor has remained at the same pitch as what you saw in the first meeting. The reason for this is that it would change the window elevations and profiles. The applicant reevaluated the Staunton Court elevation so instead of a window, they added French doors. They also popped out a bay window on the second floor and put a little shed window over that. They've also enclosed that front yard area along the Staunton Court with a 4-foot redwood fence. Next, there's a comment regarding mirror image architecture. The mirror image architecture is carried over, it's still continued through to this meeting. The reason for that is that design eliminates the need for a curb cut along Staunton Court but the applicant did add some articulation along Oxford Avenue and that articulation is found in the eaves. The eaves were increased from 12-inches to 18-inches. The board and baton siding are also retained to minimize the busyness of the building. Again, this is the location of the project. It's located on the corner of Staunton Court and Oxford Avenue. Really quick I want to walk you through the changes that are that are (inaudible) in this slide. The top left, that is the design that was evaluated on the September 21st project and the composition roof on the top, the standing seam metal roof on that middle floor and this is the elevation. Down below we have the changes to the elevation, you can that they popped out the bay window and there's a little shed roof. This is the French door that they've added. They've enclosed that with a 4-foot redwood fence and again the roof and materials are the same between the top and sort of the bottom roof. This is the Oxford Avenue elevation. This window again on the top is – which you're reviewed previously, the bottom in the revised project. They have added the French door here to replace this window. Again, just comparing the elevations, the top is what you previously and again, the bottom is the pop out with the bay window on the second floor, the French door and then the 4-foot redwood fence in the front yard. This is again, facing Staunton Court. This is along Oxford Avenue and again, you can see the change in the roof pitch. The bottom elevation here is the new proposed where there's a consistent pitch between the second-floor roof and the dormers and the same materials on both roofs proposed. These changes are consistent with the development standard and these are the Im placable Development Standards in the Palo Alto Municipal Code. It's also consistent with the IR Guidelines and Architectural Review Findings. Based on this information, Staff's recommendation is that the ARB review the project and recommend approval to the Planning and Community Environment Director. Thank you and I'm available for any questions that the Board may have.

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

Ms. Natalie Hyland: Good morning, I am Natalie Hyland of Hyland Design Group. I want to thank you for putting on this agenda. I know it's full and I will make this quick. Adam already mentioned a lot of the things that are also in my presentation so I'm not going to waste your time by repeating too much. I basically did a before and after. This was the color rendering before and this is the new proposed and I just want to point out a couple little details that I think make a big difference in breaking up the linear comment that was made. We've extended the roof over the upper floor windows and added brackets. We also extended the roof at the entry as far as we could although we hit our front setback then so it was just extended another 6-inches or so but at least it breaks it up. Looking back at the metal roof, I felt like that metal roof really added to the linearity of the design so we went with composition throughout for more consistency and I think it matches the single-family residences around as well. Before, after and Adam had the same one and then I just quick numbered. Before we had a 5 and 12 pitch and now we have a consistent 7 and 12, I think it made a nice difference here. We did take the consulting architect's advice and we designed this bay almost exactly how he proposed. The overhangs were 12-inches and now they are 18. We added this fence that breaks up the Oxford elevation and French doors. This basically is the same pitch as overhang. There was a little bit of confusion of is this a Craftsman, is this a farmhouse, what style is this? I think now that we have a 7 and 12 and I don't have a Craftsman-style front door so we're trying to make it more, obviously farmhouse. The last thing that I wanted to point out where that there were two windows eliminated at the staircase. Looking closer at the stringers it would have hit the windows so it wasn't even feasible and we reduced the upper windows as well. That's it and if you have any questions I'm free to answer.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much. So now is the time for public comment on this item and we do have a speaker from – one speaker for – which is [Priya Graves] and you will have 5-minutes.

[Ms. Priya Graves:] Good morning and thank you. I am [Priya Graves] and I live at 230 Yale so I am literally around the corner from this project. Apart from the objection that we have been under construction in our area with the 2100 El Camino and pre-seeded by all the construction along Stanford Avenue etc. etc. etc. I'm not really happy to see more construction in my neighborhood. That said, my only real concern with the proposed project is regarding the health and safety of the redwood tree. It is a massive great tree, it blocks my unfortunate view that I would have of the backside of 2100 El Camino if something should happen to that tree. I have watched projects before where they took great care to protect trees and yet they suffered greatly. There was an oak tree along Yale Street down from me that nearly died when the basement was being excavated, even though they were excavating vertically and being very careful and with supplemental watering, it was saved but it basically lost all of its leaves in about 2-weeks in September which is not normal for a valley oak. I am really concerned and Adam and I have talked back and forth about this and with Dave Doctor and we have made – got the applicant to make some changes as to how they are planning to do the excavation and to use shotcrete rather than a formed basement footing. I am pleased with that but I still retain this concern and I hope that we will be incredibly vigilant going forward because a tree can die very quickly if it loses too much root mass and perhaps we have warm weather event or something and it stresses the tree. So, whatever the City can do to stay on top of this I would be most grateful. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for coming. Are there any Board Member questions on this item? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Could I ask the Staff please to explain what we're doing about the tree to protect it and then over the course of construction what's done to make sure that the protections are put into place?

Mr. Petersen: So, I guess number one regarding what's being done to protect the tree. So, Urban Forestry has reviewed the project and they've issued conditions of approval for the project. Again, the Urban Forestry Department works with the project arborist. Urban Forestry has also noted that during building permit plan review, they are going to verify that the landscape plans protect roots from any impacts from the design of the project, the understory plantings, the irrigation lines and either landscape – other landscaping drainage elements. What's also being done during actual construction is that Urban Forestry requires a monthly tree and contractor activity report to be sent to Urban Forestry to monitor

compliance with these provisions. Again, the City recognized the importance of this protocol and has taken measures to preserve that tree.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Am I right that this project has trees planted around the edges in order to provide a certain amount of screening as part of the project?

Mr. Petersen: That is correct.

Board Member Furth: So, when we have a big commercial project or a big residential project we have continuity, essentially jurisdiction with the ARB approval. For a project like this, how – what do you do to ensure that those trees stay in place?

Mr. Petersen: We would inspect the project to make sure that it's constructed consistent with the approved plans and that includes counting the trees that are planted on site.

Board Member Furth: So, if I come back 5-years later and the trees are all gone and I come to the City, is there a remedy?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, we have code enforcement so we rely on people seeing out there (inaudible) because we don't get out every day so to send into Palo Alto 311 and we will respond with that.

Board Member Furth: So, there's continuing – these don't just expire with the map or anything, they just keep going? These conditions of approval.

Ms. French: Yes, we would enforce our conditions upon (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: Right, take a look at the Bank of America on Lytton, thanks.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? I have a question and I don't – maybe it's for the architect or possibly for Staff but is basement waterproofing. That's normally not an ARB issue concern but I mean the boiler – like a boilerplate waterproofing recommendation in the soils report is usually taking a foot out of – like from the face of the foundation, it's a foot of drainage rock and I was wondering if that – if you were planning on that and if that had been considered with regard to the redwood tree roots?

Ms. Hyland: I don't know and that's a very good question. The structural engineer does usually provide that detail and he does usually need that extra excavation for that. I don't know what the...

Mr. Zach Trailer: I can answer that.

Ms. Hyland: Oh, ok.

Mr. Trailer: Hey, Zach. That's why we're doing shotcrete because you don't – we've been told it's the most effective and least invasive route for the tree. For us, it apparently cost quite a bit more money but we have to make sure that tree is protected so that is the reason we are using that method.

Chair Lew: That's for the concrete itself.

Mr. Trailer: That's right.

Chair Lew: Then the water – I've never done a shotcrete before so I have not – I just wasn't sure what happens with the waterproofing.

Mr. Trailer: Neither have we. We actually don't often even think about it but in this case, that's basically the route – the only route we feel is appropriate so we can best protect the tree but we hadn't thought that through so thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. I have one more question for the architect and it seems like the gas meters and the electrical meters are all on the corner of the building; like the Staunton Court outside corner of that. I was wondering if there was any consideration of maybe recessing the panel. I mean it's an isolated wall obviously but I mean if there was a way of doing it, it makes it a little bit less – low – it makes it a little bit low profile.

Ms. Hyland: Sure, of course.

Chair Lew: Who are we going to start with? Robert, start us off, please.

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. Well, I had some concerns about this project the last time we talked. One of them was the whole mirror images and it's still exactly the same way and the response I got on this was because of the curb cut and that's not really to me, the driving factor of a design shouldn't be the curb cut or lack of a curb cut. I'm also not a big fan of board and baton for both floors and this building doesn't really seem to have a basement, middle and top that especially for something like this, I think is prevalent. I'll make it real short, I wasn't a big fan last time and I am still not.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Robert. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Well, I can support the project the way it is with the change that the bay window you're proposing on the corner Oxford and Staunton I think is out of scale and just doesn't look right at all to me. So, I would like to see that come back to subcommittee. Other than that, I think it meets our standards. I am disappointed that you chose to do a mirror design. It's unfortunate that you basically took the easy way out on the design as far as I can tell because there are many other ways to do a building on a corner than that but just holding to what the findings are – that we have to make, I can make them. I would like to add that regarding the excavation and the redwood tree, it is possible to do what's called a blindside construction where you just cut the dirt to the exact amount where the new concrete wall has to go. Then you actually pin the waterproofing membrane to the dirt and place the concrete with shotcrete or other methods so there's just no extra excavation. I'm going through this not because I want to verify the applicant but because I want Staff to understand that it is possible to build the wall without over excavating to hurt the tree further. It does require an extra cost on shoring the soil and usually, they have to drill and put (inaudible) in there but it is possible. It's done all the time and that's the method used to minimize the impact on the tree and in this case, it seems that it's important to do that. Lastly, on the findings, I have some questions with the verbiage maybe when we get to making motions, thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I'm also able to make the findings to recommend approval of the project. I think these minor changes again, go a long way and I appreciate you making those revisions. I just had a couple very minor comments that don't necessarily affect my recommendation of approval but like the board and baton siding was missing on one of the elevation sheets, A-4.0. Then in the conditions of approval, I found that number 12 and 20 both refer to street trees and I think those could probably be combined. Then I was hoping that you would actually go the route of the metal roof and I'm a little bit disappointed. I understand that you're making the comment that it's matching the surrounding composite shingle but I don't think that's necessarily a high-quality material to necessarily match but that doesn't – again, that doesn't affect my recommendation of approval. I agree with Board Member Baltay that the bay window

that you're proposing is a little bit out of scale. I almost prefer the previous iteration of that but perhaps the bay window can just be modified a little bit to appease more people. The – oh ok, that's been addressed so I think it's a good-looking project I think. It's very difficult and I understand that some of the Board Members maybe have some opinions that because it's on a corner site maybe the mirroring of the floor plan isn't necessarily the best way to go about it but I think there's been a lot of thought put into it. I think it would definitely be an improvement to the neighborhood and I look forward to doing motions in the future.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you, I was not here for your previous meeting so I watched the tape and read the minutes and then I walked the neighborhood and looked at your site and admired Ms. Grave's house again. This is a key parcel as you know because this sort of starts the residential phase of the neighborhood. It's a mix of multiple family and single-family and I think in general a very successful mix. It makes it a very attractive neighborhood, people are obviously devoted to it, they spend a lot of care on their gardens and their homes. It seems to have a house from just about every fashion in California since the founding of Sunset Magazine and I think one of the characteristics of it is that the buildings look like they were built when they were built. So, if an Italian egg was in fashion, that's what they've got. I understand that farmhouse is not in fashion. I agree with Kyu that – I was – I'd hoped this change would happen after watching the minutes that if standing seam metal roof that was called? If standing seam metal roofs are typical design elements of that style, I think it would be good to use it. One of the things that struck me is if this is a site that needs to be somewhat well defended in the sense that it's not far from El Camino, it's near very large buildings and near different uses. I hope that in landscaping you think about that. It probably needs soundproofing on its windows but that's a matter of City standards. So, I would be in favor of approving it and probably referring it to subcommittee for those small details.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you.

Board Member Furth: I think it will greatly strengthen the neighborhood and that corner.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I can also support the project. I did want to also mention about the mirror image and I think I was opposed to Robert's criticism before because it seems like there's nothing in the City codes that says that you can't do a symmetrical building. Then I thought about it on some of the other projects that I've worked on, on corner sites and it's actually much better to have two separate entrances on each street façade. It's way better and I would still recommend this project going forward and I think the changes that you've made on the Staunton Court side and adding the French doors goes a long way to that. Yeah, it's just much better for the neighborhood and I think it's actually better for the residents too. It's like basically having two fronts and people don't even know that it's a duplex. I have some that are duplexes in my neighborhood and people don't even know. They don't – it doesn't even register to them that this house has two front doors on different streets. I can support that and I think the – I think my only other recommendation would be to consider recessing the electrical panel. Then I think Peter, you also had additional comments on the findings so why don't we review that now.

Board Member Baltay: If I could I'd like to be more clear also about the second-floor bay window just so they have any idea of at least what I am thinking. If I look at the primary elevation of the corner on sheet A-0.1, the issue I have with the new bay window is that it's A, wider than the element below it and further out. B, it's flush with the front façade of the building so all of those which serve to make it not an integrated feature on the building but rather just a means to gaining a larger room upstairs and unbalancing the façade. I think it needs to be probably made smaller and somehow aligned with the element below it. Assuming there's support for that, I'd like that an item that comes back to subcommittee. Then on the findings it's on items but three and four so if I look in the verbiage supporting our finding number three, this is on page 20 of the Staff report. Let's see the first sentence is the design is compatible, individual entries and then the forms are informal. Finally, it gets too – let's see, one, two, three, four, five, six lines down on the far-right hand corner. It says the design is compatible with the sidewalks, roadways, utilities and other existing improvements. I just don't see how that

supports findings we need to make and I think it should be struck all together. Then further down in that same paragraph, let's see the third line up from the bottom. Represented by the board and batten siding, this is saying the project includes high quality materials represented by the board and baton siding. I'll by that board and baton but illuminated garage doors and entries and rafter tails. I just don't think rafter tails make a project high quality as do an illuminated garage door and I think those should be struck from the findings as well with the support of the Board. So, two sentences or two phrases are removed. Then on finding number four, the project is consistent with finding number four because the design is functional, allowing for ease and safety of pedestrian and cyclist traffic. That's an argument for why it's consistent, I mean it's a house so of course it's functional for safety (inaudible). The project includes parking in the driveway for the units. Again, I don't know what to say but this stuff goes in to public record and people look at this in the future and use this as a precedent for what's going to support other projects. I don't know how to rewrite it necessarily but I'd look for support from my colleagues but when I read it I find that it's hard to use that verbiage. So, if anybody else can chime in?

Board Member Furth: I mean – I think the problem is that these findings are written primarily with the projects that we normally look at in mind, which are not two-unit, residential developments in a built-up neighborhood. If this were in some of our neighborhoods, we wouldn't allow it because it has back up parking. You know you have to back up onto the street across a pedestrian sidewalk but I think they think in this neighborhood with very little parking and good visibility it's ok. If we prefer we could say it doesn't interfere with safe bicycle and pedestrian traffic. I think the other stuff – the basic problem is we have to find every element of that sentence; that it's functional, that it doesn't interfere with the safe – easy and safe pedestrian bicycle traffic, and it has the elements that support the building's (inaudible) operations like a place for the garbage can. I think we can make all of those findings and I agree that the writing it unfortunate. I have problems with calling composition roofing a high-quality material but you guys might want to enlighten me on that.

?: (Inaudible)

Board Member Furth: Well, maybe it is and maybe it isn't. Does it avoid heat islands, does it...

Chair Lew: The black does not.

Board Member Furth: Well then, I don't want it.

Chair Lew: It's fire resistant.

Board Member Furth: Good.

Board Member Baltay: So, Chair?

Chair Lew: Yeah?

Board Member Baltay: Well, to the last point about the high composition roofing. I'll put it the opposite way when we built many high-quality houses in Palo Alto whereby we use composition roofing so it sorts of seems to fit the big definition of what's a high-quality construction. A lot of it depends on which composition roofing but I think we're splitting hair. Back to the point about finding number four and rereading it again, maybe it's best to just leave it in. I don't see there's a problem and I don't want to weigh too far into this but can I make a motion then Alex so we can move forward?

Chair Lew: Yes.

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: I move that we recommend approval based on the findings, specified with the two deletions in the text finding number three that I had previously mentioned and that we recommend the

project come back to the subcommittee for final approval of the second story bay window protuberance and make a strong recommendation that the electrical panels be recessed.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor? Opposed?

Board Member Gooyer: No.

Chair Lew: That passed four to one.

MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 4-1.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Chair, excuse me Chair?

Chair Lew: Yes?

Mr. Lait: We – I don't know if we've been consistent on this but typically when we have a dissenting vote, we give the person who dissenting an opportunity to make a comment.

Chair Lew: Robert, do you think...

Board Member Gooyer: I think I've made my comments. I mean sitting here trying to modify the conditions to fit the project that I don't think is really as good as it could be. I mean we have all these various comments that are addressing well, it should be this, it should be that. This type of design to me doesn't work at all with a composition – as you said I think it works much better with a metal roof. Nobody said why don't we change it to a metal roof. We keep the composition so it's going to be – in my opinion it's going to be mediocre at best so that's why I voted against it. I don't really need to justify myself but ok.

Chair Lew: Thank you. We'll take – do you want to take a 2-minute break until we get the next item set up?

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 250 and 350 Sherman Avenue [17PLN-00256]:**
Consideration of a Major Architectural Review of (1) a New Three-Story Public Safety Building With Attached Emergency Telecommunications Facility at 255 Sherman Avenue, and (2) a New Four-Story Parking Structure to Provide 636 Public Parking Spaces above and below grade. Planning and Transportation Commission Review and Council Action Requested for Modification to Public Facilities Development Standards. Environmental Assessment: An Environmental Impact Report is Being Prepared and Publications is Anticipated in Mid-October. Zone District: PF; Public Facilities. For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Ms. Jessica Roth: I just need a few seconds. I am a long-time merchant on California Avenue.

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

Ms. Roth: My name is Jessica Roth...

Chair Lew: Thank you.

Ms. Roth: ...and thank you for your time this morning. I am here because I'm getting very, very excited about this project. It's been a long time coming and I'm happy that the Public Safety building is going to be in its new location. I feel like it's a very good choice. The parking garage, very happy with the size and space that the City has directed. I just want to make sure that today there are few things covered. One is

that the Ash Street side of the parking garage is designed and as much thought put into as the new Public Safety side of the parking garage. I just don't them to look at this as one big project and they think oh, well we'll make this one really nice area where the Public Safety building and the garage will be together. I would like consideration for both sides of the parking lot and the other is that has been some express from some of the other merchants and community that we just really want to make that that arcade covered pathway is well thought out. We don't want to make it an overly desirable location for long-term residents. So, those are just my two thoughts today, thank you very much for your time.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Also, I think we have – I have a speaker card for Pierre Graves.

[Ms. Priya Graves:] That was for item one.

Chair Lew: For item one, got it, excellent, thank you.

[Board moved back up to agenda changes, additions, and deletions]

Chair Lew: Ready for item number three which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, 250 and 350 Sherman Avenue. Consideration of a Major Architectural Review of (1) a new three-story Public Safety Building with attached Emergency Telecommunications Facility at 255 Sherman Avenue, and (2) a new four-story parking structure to provide 636 public parking spaces above and below grade. The Planning and Transportation Commission review and Council action are requested for modification to Public Facilities Development Standards. The environmental assessment is an Environmental Impact Report is being prepared and publications is anticipated in mid-October. I think that's coming later and the zone district public facilities. We have our Chief Planning Official Ms. Amy French who is here. Welcome, Amy.

Ms. French: Thanks for the introduction. The last the Architectural Review Board saw this project was as a preliminary review on June 1st of this year. We have on the screen the site context. The order of processing on this is a little complex and that is because it involves a change to the regulations in the Public Facilities Zone District to enable these important projects to go forward. The Staff report noted that we would request a continuance to enable the publication of the Environment Impact Report. There's been a delay in the publication and that will not be published until November. As it terms out we are reviewing the administrative draft currently so when you do continue this, which we are asking you to do, it can be to a date uncertain. That will enable us to re-advertise once we are ready. The Planning and Transportation – likewise, the Planning and Transportation Commission – this is for the public, we did advertise that we were going to have a meeting next Wednesday, October 25th to talk about the Public Facilities Zone regulation changes. That is – that meeting is not going to take place and again, related to the delay in the release of the Environmental Impact Report. The architect provided a summary of the June 1st ARB comments on the preliminary design. The dynamic massing concept was brought forward and now has much more articulation to a level of a Formal Application which we received. Excuse me, just to note that the HRB did have a look at this as a prelim. in a study session format. They will not be reviewing it in the formal capacity because there are no historic resources on the site. The sites are surface parking lots. On the screen, we have what was seen for the public parking structure on the upper left and the now modified lower right formal site plan. Some of the changes include relocation of the elevator -- trying to make this – yeah, the elevator bank is nowhere which allowed the opening of this arcade – this public passageway from the parking garage to the of muse area that gets pedestrians to California Avenue retail. The Public Safety Building site plan changed similarly from the June 1st presentation to today's site plan. Some of the changes that are – to take place in the next set include a reintroduction of another driveway and this is to accommodate large vehicles that were having a difficult time through the alley coming and going. There are some large vehicles for police operations that need access to this opertations yard so you'll see that in the next set, a driveway in this location. Oh, and the other item is in the current set this wall is shown in this placement and in the next set, the wall will be shown coming towards Jacaranda Lane for reasons that our applicant will explain. We received this yesterday from our Utilities Department telling us that there are some issues here with existing sewer and water mains along Birch Street. These trees that are shown here may be deleted from the next set and we will work out some of these issues in the coming month. There's an issue also with a prevision of

root barriers to make that the trees will not conflict with water mains in these areas. There is a deletion of another tree here, again due to proposed water main locations so to (inaudible) say these landscape plans might be altered prior to next reviewing of this project. With the garage, we have the prior design that was the dynamic massing approach and now we have this articulated drawing for the Sherman Avenue elevation. As you see here, there are now photovoltaic rooftop shade structures so those parking spaces will be shaded and will provide green infrastructure. Here's the Public Safety Building facing Sherman Avenue. This is what you saw back on June 1st as a concept and here is it flushed out with windows and quality materials etc. There's been a ramp cover added here and this is the ramp that leads to the employee parking for the police Public Safety Building. Here they've added a canopy over the plaza as civic gesture and here show the alley elevations before and after. So, we've had some progress there with – sorry, I think – yes, this is the parking garage and this is the Public Safety Building. My apologies, this upper image is the current proposal for the parking garage and this is the current proposal for the Public Safety Building. We have before and after here for the Birch elevation of the Public Safety Building and you can see it's come along way as well with articulation. Then here are the end elevations of the Public Safety Building and the garage. We have this grand gesture that the architect will explain here on the parking garage. One item that is to be noted is that we have a proposed tower for emergency communications and there will be attachments to that tower. It will not be a slim mono-pole with anything on it. These are images of one on top of a building here in San Mateo and another, I think this might be Sunny Vale, showing the types of attachments that would go onto an emergency communications pole. The ARB is charged with reviewing projects for the ARB findings – Architectural Review findings and just to note, the one about preserving landscaping, those trees in those parking lots are to be removed and that's addressed in the Environmental Impact Report. So, that finding will not be made for this project. Ok, I am going to load the applicant's presentation and if you have questions.

Mr. Matt Raschke, Senior Engineer for Public Works: Thank you, Amy. I'm Matt Raschke and I'm Senior Engineer with Public Works and I'm the overall project manager for these two structures and I'm very excited. This is not only my biggest project to date but it's the – I think it's the biggest project for the City since the building we're sitting in; City Hall. In terms of timing, this is looked at one project and we're looking to build the garage first and get that fully operational so that the parking impact to the Cal. Ave. Business District is minimized. Just to give you a little update on the public art process, a panel of – a panel has selected Ball-Nogues Studio to be the public artist for the parking garage and that's scheduled to be approved by the Public Art Commission tonight. There's currently a call for an artist in progress for the Public Safety Building and those are due November 8th and then a panel will be convened and they'll select a finalist to present to the Public Art Commission for that building. Today we're really looking for guidance on any necessary changes so that we can get your recommendation of approval at our next formal meeting. Escalation – construction escalation is a big concern for us but the overall project cost is significant and it's growing every day with the escalation that we're seeing in the construction field. So, I'd like to introduce Patty Lum, Acting Assistant Police Chief, to give you a little overview of the need and uniqueness of this building.

Ms. Patty Lum: Good morning Chair Lew and Members of the Board. My name is Patty Lum, I am obviously a police officer if you haven't guessed. I'm not an architect and I'm not a planner. I wanted to share with you a police perspective if I may just for a few moments. I've been a police officer with the City of Palo Alto for 25-years. I'm currently as Matt mentioned, the Acting Assistant Police Chief and I've been doing that since December. I've been involved in this project throughout a few different Chiefs, dating back to 1998 when we completed the third needs assessment for a building. I've been actively involved in this project ever since. In 2011, I had the opportunity to work with a gentleman named Ray Bacchetti and what a wonderful man who gave so freely of his time as the Co-Chair of IBRC Committee. Ray sent me the following email, Patty, using my detective skills, I've been on the trail of a person who is 2010 said was very intelligent things to [John Northway] and his colleagues who were studying the option to rebuild a PSB on the current site. That trail lead today to you. If was a police administrator who recalled that you had framed a concept of a PSB as different from an inert structure that people actually use. Rather he reported your ideas that the building and the people who use it have a working relationship with each other and that the building serves and not just houses police officers and therefore the community at large. As we know, we lost our dear friend Ray in 2015 but not before he and Co-Chair

Leland Levy authored the final IBRC report which urged us to build a Public Safety Building as soon as possible on a new site. With these thoughts in mind, I am asking that you review this project not only through your normal criteria but also through a slightly different lens. The City has not built a police facility in over five decades. This is our greatest project and infrastructure need. It is not a typical project as you've already read and you've seen terms such as monopole, operational yard, two ramps on two different streets, ballistic glazing, hardening, setbacks and so many more unusual but absolutely necessary public safety criteria. There's an absolute flow to a PSB and I for one consider the building a partner in providing exceptional public safety services to the community. The operational aspects of everything we do has a distinct flow and are already built into these plans. As my colleague [Charles Cullin] pointed out yesterday, a PSB without a monopole is simply a \$75 million warehouse. There is no operational survivability to the core functions. The PSB must be constructed to function alone, not dependent on other sources, and imagine if you will a PSB post-natural disaster that does not have the ability to dispatch fire, police and utility personnel to local sites. Our community expects more from us and will look to us to pick up the pieces when times are tough. The monopole is not only a critical element of modern-day PSB, it is also a lifeline to continued operations. You may also question why there are two vehicle ramps leading underground, one on Sherman and one on Birch. While the primary ramp exists on Sherman, it is absolutely necessary to have a backup ramp on Birch. In the event that the first ramp becomes blocked, unusable or impassable, we need those fire, police and [OES] vehicles to be able to exit on an alternate ramp. Lastly, you may wonder what in the world is an operational yard? I can tell you this is a critical component of the PSB. Not only do we intend to house back up power in this area but it's also a critical secured component of common public safety functions. We've never had secured storage for large-sized vehicles and the yard will provide that. This yard is not a highly populated hub of activity but rather it allows flexibility to make operational work possible. Lastly, you will hear terms such as setbacks, security, high ground, glazing, hardening and other unique characteristics to this building. Of course, we certainly would have enjoyed the luxury of owning a very large piece of property which would have allowed for the federal standard of 50 to 100-foot building setbacks. We simply don't have the land and as a tradeoff, we will be asking for other considerations such as possibly limiting traffic on Jacaranda, allowing us to build the Jacaranda security wall to the property line, eliminating the Jacaranda sidewalk improvement in order to keep pedestrian traffic away from the perimeter, and other alternatives. There really is a method to our madness and our goal is to create a building that is inviting and attractive to the community yet resilient and secure. I would like to finish with an introduction of our core Public Safety Staff who have been working diligently on this project; Deputy Fire Chief G.O Blackshire, Office of Emergency Services Director Ken Dueker, Police Deputy Director of Technical Services Charles Koen, and Police Senior Management Analyst Mike Dority. We are available to you today to answer any operational questions you may have that would impact the building. The entire purpose of the PSB is to plan, design, construct and occupy a secure essential services facility designed to support and protect the critical operations that occur inside. The PSB includes facility resilience, redundancy, and hardening strategies which enable it to remain operational both during and after a major disaster. No one knows this better than our Sonoma based architectural firm Ross Druilis Cusenbery, who for the last week and a half have undergone the evacuations and serious threats in Northern California. We would all like to think that it could never happen here but any of these recent disasters, whether they be Las Vegas or Santa Rosa, certainly could happen in Palo Alto. I urge all of us not to delay. I would like to thank you for your time and unless you have questions for Staff, I would like to introduce Mallory Cusenbery of RDC Architecture.

Mr. Mallory Cusenbery: Thank you so much. Thank you to the Board, City Staff, thank you to the Police Department and the Fire Department to the public – members of the public who have come out here for this. As you recall when we last spoke to you back in June, we had presented three schemes that we called conversation starters and it really worked. We have wonderful conversations with the community, with stakeholders, and with you. We processed those comments and have distilled them down – synthesized them down into the current single design concept that we're presenting to you now; around fifty percent schematic design. As we were going through those conversations, there were two quotes that came from this Board that really rose to the top in our thinking and one of those was having to do with the civic – the importance of the civic presences and the quote was to create memorable forms that communicate public function. The second quote was – has to do with context and the quote was, create the most wonderful expression of this area we can achieve.' Those definitely have become some guiding

principles as we move forward and I'll elaborate on that shortly. However, it's not always that simple as the Police Department as wonderfully expressed, there are unique things to this kind of a Public Safety Building that are non-negotiable items. The security, the standoff distances, the ballistic resistance, the multiple vehicle access and these are unique to the project and they have to be part of it. At the same as we enter in and talk about civic community pride, scale, massing, contextual response and things like that, do so in balance. So, this – a lot of our conversation, a lot of design process is a back and forth process to understand the operational imperatives and being respectful and a visionary toward the community goals. Then there's a lot of – then there are some of the observations that we bring to it as well. Just very briefly, as we've had these conversations, the role of the landscape within the community is – we found it to be a very profound element both physically in the canopy of this area and you can see the site in orange down below but also in the perception of how this community should feel. The second component is when we looked at civic precedents, the role of terracotta is profoundly continuous as a civic element all the way from Leland Stanford through Edward Durell Stone up till the lower right have a building which is a building that was built I think within the last year in town. Then the third for this area is this idea of the diversity of scale. This area is not one scale, it's not one identity. The California Avenue area is very rich and diverse and can be addressed as such. Briefly, in summary, the project you're looking at is on the right. The – again, north is up on the eastern lot C6, the Public Safety Building is 48,000-square feet plus or minus, three-stories above grade and four-stories below grade and the below grade is parking. There's one-story outbuildings to the east with the operation courtyard in between and significant setbacks all the way around for security and pedestrian amenity reasons. The garage on the left on the west side is approximately 150,000-square feet, four-stories above grade, three-stories below grade, and photovoltaic panels on the top. It does not have significant setbacks because the goal was to maximize the quantity of parking but it does have a few pedestrian amenities that mitigate that scale that we will talk about shortly and it has the photovoltaics on the top. Technically there are a few things that we – how we approached this site. The first was to kind of organize the two properties with this grid – this structure and this framework, which in this case is the structure of the cast in place concrete frame for the building. It's also the organizational structure that we use integrate – architecturally integrate the monopole tower. Then onto that framework, we hung what we call our civic points of contact. These are the memorable forms that we see as the opportunity to communicate public function and they are archetypal. They are grand entry portal, large protective canopy, they are pedestrian arcades, grand staircase, and other pedestrian amenities. Very archetypal civic components that are easy to understand and are very legible in the scheme. Then we overlaid that with the influence of the sun, all sorts of variations; absorbing the sunlight, diffusing the sunlight, generating power from it, screening it, blocking it in various forms, and elaborate the material development. Then enveloping that in this oasis of greening and utilizing the security setbacks as a pedestrian amenity and creating a real environment here, at least to a scheme that from an urban design standpoint physically fits into the fabric of the California Avenue neighborhood. Nested within this green structure but then also at a very intricate level at the pedestrian scale. It's stress mitigating, it offers a variety of uses, shade, seating, you can come have lunch here, it's a generous and kind introduction to those who have to come under stressful conditions to this project. Then you can see in color the points of contact – civic points of contact with this idea of bringing the large scale of the project down to these more intimate signposts that help direct you through the project. I might remind you just on that previous slide that a lot of those pedestrian amenities are in fact vehicles barriers so again we have that duality between civic opportunity and operational imperative. That expands to the material as well. We've chosen pre-cast concrete and cast in place concrete because of its ballistic resistance. We have a lot of the screens on the windows because it helps restrict views, however we don't stop there. The idea is that there's a whole pallet of ways of dealing with the sun, specularly, translucent, shading and those are on the upper left. We've introduced the terracotta as a key civic element that is the point of contact and then the concrete, we're leveraging that with these very stone-like and organic textures so that it weaves into this idea of greeny and organic and landscape presence on the site so again, the duality, operational imperative but vision. Then from a – briefly and I know you've seen this multiple time so this will go quickly. The parking garage on the left, the main pedestrian arcade is here on the left on Ash and it was addressed from the public opinion at the beginning to importance of treating Ash as part of the urban design vision and then there's an arcade that connects to a paseo here. There's the grand staircase here and the vehicle entry is on the Sherman Street here. From the Public Safety side, the entrance to the Public Safety Building is off a plaza, the

plaza is here – the public plaza. Patrol garage entry is here, the operational yard is here and then Staff entry and exit to the parking structure and backup patrol entry/exit is in this location here. So, let's dive into that for a moment, the Police Department very eloquently said – explained the need for the two ramps and I want to expand on that. It's actually more than just having two ramps, it's actually exiting on two independent streets because if one street is disabled like if it's flooded, the building has collapsed, there's civil unrest; if you cannot use that street, you want the vehicles to be able to exit to a different street. We assumed Park Boulevard would not be a good idea because it's your bicycle infrastructure and Jacaranda was just not physically possible because of spacing so the compromise in this case is to take it on Birch but mitigate the comments that you had. It included the roof that Amy referred to, it also – we actually segue into the flow of Jacaranda so when you actually leave the block, you're leaving in line with the alignment of the existing Jacaranda so there's no new curb cut, no cut to the center island. Again, just to reiterate, patrol vehicles day to day will be leaving here. This is a right in, right out Staff vehicle ramp that has backup possibilities for patrol vehicles. The secure outdoor area is here for the larger vehicles and as Amy mentioned, in conversations with the Police Department we determined that it's going to be very important that this will be subsequent submittal to you to have a large vehicle exit onto Sherman Street. However, because it's only intermittently used, we can actually treat that exit with cobblestones and treat it like a pedestrian environment in that it will actually signal when a vehicle is coming out; it's not going to be coming up frequently. Looking then at the site plan for the parking structure, we have the arcade on Ash Street and again, these ideas – we have a lot of cars, 636 cars right so 150,000-square feet of bulky garage. We find that the few pedestrian gestures that we make are going to be very important to mitigate that scale and presence. We observe in this area at lunchtime that people are coming from the office areas toward California Avenue in groups of – lunch – maybe three, four, five across. So, providing some width that's not even currently there so people don't have to walk single file as they go through this area. This inspired these ideas of these arcades here and clearing there is a connection to the existing paseo respecting the existing fabric and then the grand staircase that runs down the side here. Those are key amenities within a very large building. Then there's the part of the plaza and there was a lot of discussion and we received comments from you about the plaza. Our goal in this go around is to increase the perceived size of the plaza by putting it on both sides of Birch Street and architecturally reinforcing that presences. The plaza has different characters on the east side of Birch. It has many qualities to it, sitting, table areas, it does have the vehicle barriers but they are integrated materially, landscaping and there's a variety of active and passive uses here. The west side of Birch Street is primarily passive uses but the architectural reinforcement you can see through this section here. The idea is to have canopies overhead that jester and create and I think there was a lot of discussion last time about the gateway quality of Birch and there's a great opportunity for that. This reinforces that with the park on both sides of the street. These are few views, this is looking from the Nut House back toward the entrance to the PSB on the left. You can see the grand staircase and this grand staircase we see as a huge amenity to the California Avenue merchants in that you can actually walk directly towards Cal. Avenue. This is looking from the opposite side and a view of the entrance of the building from the parking structure. Then the scale and fabric of the neighborhood is critical for us as well. You can see the Public Safety Building on the left, parking garage on the right, the scale comparison to the existing buildings in the context and that informed a lot of our elevations. So, when you look at the elevation – the Birch Street elevation of the Public Safety Building, the portal – the terracotta piece is the same height as the neighboring building here. The top of the building is shorter than the Court House and the one-story element on Sherman scales down as we go towards the residential areas. This is the foreground on the top elevation. This is the foreground -- the rest of the building in the background you can see the foreground building are the same scale as the adjacent there. This is the Jacaranda view here and that was all elevations of the Public Safety Building and I'll just show a few close-ups just for your reference. As we move around the site this is the Sherman side. We do have recessed areas for the outdoor deck and things like that and providing recesses where we can. Again, focusing our effort on – and our emphasis on the smaller scale civic components throughout. Sherman Street side and there was a lot of discussion about the view to the operational courtyard and how that might be? This is a rendering taken from what we would think is probably the most sensitive condominium across the street that would look out onto it. It would have the best view possible and we have added a canopy structure here to screen the vehicles and some landscaping with the idea – I think this rendering shows that you won't have direct view of that big paved area. Similarly, for the garage elevations, a lot of it was about civic

presence so this is the grand staircase on Birch Street that heads towards California Avenue on the right. This is the Sherman Street side with the arcade down here that leads to the paseo but we (inaudible) integrated the photovoltaics. Part of the idea on the photovoltaics was to actually make them architectural and then turn them into an architectural element. So, when you see from Birch Street – again, looking – this is looking toward the southeast – southwest, these are the photovoltaic panels. They actually create a language that then becomes the canopy over the garage which is over the public staircase in this location too. So, it is not just – as one of our critics of a lot of photovoltaics installations, they just look like an add-on and this integral architectural. Sherman Street side breaking down and again, relative to some of the comments. Even the arcade, the idea is to create an immersive landscaped oriented environment and in this case with the possibility for glass tile mosaics evoking an immersive landscape environment. Breeze through because my time is limited. In closing I just want to say that a lot of the site plans and a lot of these jesters are about connection. So, you can see the entrance here toward the – it picks up the angle of the Court House. The Court House helps form this plaza and then the pedestrian entrance and the walkway toward Cal. Avenue. In closing, again, a lot of this project is about this balance between civic identity, community identity, civic presence but also creating a resilient and secure Public Safety Building. Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for your presentation. I have two speaker cards, one from Jack Morton and another one from – I'm not sure if I can read it. Is it Phillip or Phillis? You will have 5-minutes each.

Mr. Jack Morton: I'm going to ask that the second slide that was shown – oh, thank you. My name is Jack Morton, former Vice Mayor and current Chair of the California Avenue Business Association. You know as professionals we have an expertise that those we serve expect us to share with them. Sometimes that expertise prevents us from hearing the reaction of those that depend on that expertise and that's the case here with one element of this plan. What's called an arcade in the architectural delivery, to be frank in the local language if you want, the vernacular is called a covered pee-pee area. So, let me tell you why the merchants unanimously voted against having that covered setback. When you see the – first of all, it takes away parking and our first measure – when you see the revised thing, it takes away about six parking spaces. We want every possible space to go to parking, particularly when -- the way the presentation is – if you go back one. Go – right there. So, if you look along the left there's parking all along the Sherman side and then there's this insert that doesn't – for what sounds like a walkway into what the boulevard – a boulevard in Paris. It's a short street and that arcade goes to a blank wall and if you have ever been there at noon, there is nothing but parked cars on either side and there are cars traveling around and traveling around looking for parking. When you talk about people walking, they don't walk down Ash because it's just a half a block. They walk down Birch and then go down California Avenue so all the justifications that architecturally have been given for that covered parkway don't really exist. What we want is parking there and we don't want an area that will be – we think will be used for desperate housing and desperate sheltering. Apparently when we had our – this meeting, I think we had it in the middle of tax season but I can't remember, and apparently, Brad sent me an email saying that we had to get a written response from the merchants but we went to the public hearing. The public hearing almost unanimously rejected such an inset so what's the point of a public hearing if once all of the merchants who at that point, gave up their business time to come to talk and don't get heard. I have to be real frank with you in the language of the street and that we're looking for your help in redesigning that area for the six or eight parking places that will be used instead of a covered area that's not going to be used by any of the residents, any of the businesses, and we don't think any of the customers that come to that area. So, it's an element that can -- without a lot of design changes can be more functional than the covered area will be. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you Mr. Morton and next speaker is Phillip. I can't read your last name, is it [phonetics][Lahog]?

[Mr. Phillip Lahog:] Good morning, my name is Phillip [Lahog], you don't pronounce the 'g' and I'm an (inaudible), not an idiot; French spelling. Well, I'm here to represent three coffee restaurants at the corner of – well, Jonny's Café, [La Boyum], [Spalty]. I also represent a bunch of residents who live at the corner there and I'm one of them. Also, a bunch of small business offices in the basement and I've

known the area for well over 30-years. I represent them and to tell you that just like you already heard, we need parking and we don't think much of this arcade or whatever you want to call it. We need more parking and this is very expensive and that thing, as far as we are concerned, would attract homeless maybe. If you know the area, you know that you find homeless by the Bank of the West. You know there is a nice protection there and you find homeless on the bench by the corner of Ash Street and California Avenue. So, our general feeling – we—I don't have one of us that I represent who is in favor of that arcade thing. You heard Jack Morton and I thank him for being eloquent. My knowledge of English is not his – not as good as his. That said, try to maximize the parking. It's expensive and we need it very badly. Thirty years ago, we had a crowd at lunch and we'd refuse people. Today there's no parking, our customers tell us they can't afford to wait for 20-minutes to try to find a parking spot so I don't need to tell you that the Café and restaurants are hurting badly for lunch. For dinner it's another story, it's working fine but that's it. Thanks a lot for your attention.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Are there any Board Member questions? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Could Staff just show us on one of the appropriate slides where the nearest residences are on all frontages or all sides of this project? We have a number of letters and comments from residents, I didn't follow all of them. I followed the comments but not always the letters.

Ms. French: Yes, Amy French here. We have this housing – multi-residential housing here. Similarly, this is now a mixed-use building and I'm not sure what the date of this Google Docs – Google Earth, sorry. It's – Visa is the occupant but there are also housing units in this building.

Board Member Furth: So those are adjacent to the parking structure?

Ms. French: The parking structure is here on this parking lot. Yes, and so that is the proximity, right here, to those homes.

Board Member Furth: Is there then also housing across Park?

Ms. French: There's housing back here as well and there's a little park down below this here; a little pocket park.

Board Member Furth: But at the top of the slide, adjacent to the Public Safety Building, is that housing as well?

Ms. French: This is the County Court House and then over back behind off of Park and Grant here, this is housing back here.

Board Member Furth: About how many feet is it from the nearest point of the parking structure to the residences at the corner right there, Sherman and whatever? I keep forgetting.

Ms. French: Well, the width of the roadway here so 60 or so feet because of – that is why there's 150-foot line that's drawn with the zoning code for height restriction within that area. So, the Public Safety Building here is back far enough away from that, 150-feet, but the parking garage here will be within that 150-foot radius of this piece here.

Board Member Furth: Thanks, and then are we maintaining that 150-foot radius or are we eliminating it?

Ms. French: The radius doesn't disappear but the height within that radius is asked to be exceeded.

Board Member Furth: So, we would eliminate that protection? That usual protection in order to construct the building?

Ms. French: As far as height limitation, yes.

Board Member Furth: Yes, you would, thanks. Then there was a discussion of reducing or illuminating traffic on Jacaranda next to the Public Safety Building. Could you tell us more about that? Also, somehow, I missed that and didn't focus on what backs up on Jacaranda from the California Side.

Ms. French: Here's Jacaranda Lane for the Public Safety Building and – so there are commercial buildings. There is an office building right here and they have their only access from Jacaranda so they currently walk –park here and walk to their office space. There's a little garden kind of entry for those and so originally Staff was looking at having them provide a sidewalk with this project so that those – Staff had a conversation with those office employees or the owner of that building and suggested that a sidewalk be included. With the security requirements for the operational yard, the applicant team is seeking to not have a sidewalk adjacent to the operations yard.

Board Member Furth: So, you'd have people walking in the street?

Ms. French: In the alley, Jacaranda Alley as they do now.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Ms. French: The alley – the elevation of the alley is the same as the sidewalk so coming from Park, they would walk on the alley to their business; that's how they go today.

Board Member Furth: So, do we propose to – does the City propose to cut off pedestrian and vehicular traffic in portions of Jacaranda or none of it? What's the thinking here?

Ms. French: I don't – I know that pedestrian access would not be cut off. I think there's an exploration of having those bollards that disappear and reappear perhaps but we clearly have an exploration there because there is parking space back here. So, the folks that have businesses on this street will need to get to those parking spaces and so there would become kind of access system for those – for the employees/business owners of those businesses.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne, just to clarify. On the Visa building, the mix-use component, the residential component faces the park so there isn't – it's all commercial facing...

Board Member Furth: So, it's all – right, on the Visa building.

Chair Lew: ... Sherman Avenue.

Board Member Furth: But the Visa building is not the corner building right or it is the corner building?

Chair Lew: It's on the corner.

Ms. French: It's this corner where the cursor is, this is the Visa building.

Board Member Furth: Right, I was looking at the other corner nearest to the Court House.

Ms. French: Yeah, this is...

Chair Lew: No, that's part of the...

Ms. French: ...all residential.

Board Member Furth: That's all residential.

Chair Lew: Right and that's part – that one little building is part of the larger complex of the housing.

Board Member Furth: I was just trying to figure out where people actually live with respect to these buildings. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, two questions, one for Staff or the applicant. What is the height of the parking garage as proposed right now? I just couldn't figure it out from the drawings so (inaudible).

Mr. Cusenbery: It will be – right now it is 44-feet to the top of the guardrail and then the additional height to the top of the photovoltaic panels for clearance so probably under 50-feet.

Board Member Baltay: That was my question really was to the top of the panels? That's what I see as the height of the building.

Mr. Cusenbery: To the top of the panels and so it would be under 50-feet.

Board Member Baltay: The intention is to keep that within 50-feet, the height limit it?

Mr. Cusenbery: Yes, it is.

Board Member Baltay: I guess to Staff, I just want to be clear that the panels are considered part of the height of the building, is that right?

Ms. French: That's correct because they are not just panels, they are the structure that supports the panels. If they were just panels on a roof, we would not count that as height; the solar panels themselves. The height limit on that corner is actually 35-feet, not 50, within that 150-foot radius, just to be clear.

Board Member Baltay: What I am trying to do is just be clear when City Council looks at this, what the actual limit is and what they are supposed to be approving? I don't think this can be done without going to 50-feet and that's not necessarily a design problem but I want it to be clear for the record that we're approving something that's considerably bigger.

Ms. French: Yeah and technically again, the Council is going to be asked to approve the zoning code changes for Public Safety Building and for public parking garages within the PF zone.

Board Member Baltay: The second question is for the Deputy Police Commissioner which is regarding the outdoor service yard and perhaps just enlighten me a little bit more what the function is there and why that's necessary? I'm just consistently finding that I have a problem with such a large outdoor functional space on this valuable land and why can't it be down in the garage?

Ms. Lum: Sure, Patty Lum again, so the operational yard is kind of like our catch-all. We have these large vehicles; we have a CSI vehicle which is rather large and it doesn't fit underground. We have a SWAT vehicle and it doesn't fit underground. We have other equipment and so and deliveries that need to come in hopefully at ground level so it's dropped in those areas there. We have an evidence processing area in there for vehicles which is a tow truck pulling in, dropping a vehicle and doing CSI work in one of those buildings there. So, there's – it's basically a storage, kind of operational component where we need street access and doesn't fit underground.

Board Member Baltay: Are you aware of any other Public Safety Facilities in the area that do have that sort of facility underground or some of it underground?

Ms. Lum: I have not seen those large vehicles go underground. Mallory?

Mr. Cusenbery: What I would say is the other factor to this plays the limitations of the site because if you can have an extensive ramp that gets you down with a slow slope over like say on a suburban site with lots of lands and an open ramp, it facilitates getting down a little bit easier. The headroom on some of these vehicles is almost 13-feet high and so the headroom issue, the ramping issue, the bottoming out issue several impacts the subterranean parking. In urban areas where it's tighter, it's more common for those to be at grade.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? None? Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I just have a very quick question. Is there a location for the flagpole?

Mr. Cusenbery: I'm getting shot a look. Yes, there is and that is our oversight and the location for the pole – if you could switch back to the – to our screen. The location for the flagpole which is not currently in the rendering is right here.

Vice Chair Kim: At that corner?

Mr. Cusenbery: At that corner so that it signals it as a public building and it has the – the flag poles will be spaced – several flag poles and there will be a significant flag presents.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: To be clear, that's the flagpole for the American flag, not the monopole, is that right?

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct, that's the flagpole, not the monopole. The monopole appears – it's the back of the site and you can see it – I'm trying to find the appropriate view, momentarily. So, you can see it – that wispy shape in the distance because we're not – we haven't rendered it with things on it but right there is the monopole. The height, I'm going to put the dot at the height and that's the height. That's 135-feet above the ground and yes, there will be things on it.

Vice Chair Kim: There was mention that they're going to – there's going to be a crown's nest or some other attachment to this monopole. Can that monopole really come to a needle end like that or will it have to be substantially thicker?

Mr. Cusenbery: Well, part of that is just the deception of the rendering. The monopole will have this kind of diameter and it will probably – it can taper. We have done them when they taper but a needle would not be the description. It still has a structural radius at the top.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Chair Lew: I have a question for you.

Mr. Cusenbery: Yes.

Chair Lew: On the materials, I was wondering if you could talk a little bit about the materials – a little bit more about the materials so I think there's concrete. I think the Staff report mentioned that you're going to color the concrete and also, I was curious about the textures that you're proposing. I think you are showing different colors in the renderings; like the darker color...

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct.

Chair Lew: ... on the – I think it was like on the alley and I was curious also about graffiti and that kind of thing on the building.

Mr. Cusenbery: The – as with any solid surface it can be vulnerable to graffiti. There is the opportunity to seal the concert with a graffiti resistant and we have done that. It changes the tonality of the concrete a bit but the intent on the ground level concrete is actually to have that darker. So, what it does it you're looking for that perfect museum smooth grey, that's what gets darkened but we would actually be starting with a rougher texture and a dark concrete, to begin with. To be clear, the board form is what's at the ground level on the left and then the deeper texture, which also comes in two tones, would be up high. Sorry, I'm not sure if I'm answering your question.

Chair Lew: No, I think that helps and the color (crosstalk) you are showing...

Mr. Cusenbery: So, you can see it there.

Chair Lew: Sure. In the drawing your showing mostly grey and then I think in the Staff report it mentions that it was going to be more earth – maybe like an earth tone color or where you thinking about a pigmented color?

Mr. Cusenbery: Yes, we can and I would say that's definitely an avenue of further design exploration. If we were consistent within the design concept, which is that it's kind of organic and earthy and rocky. There's a range of earth colors and tones that would be appropriate so absolutely.

Board Member Furth: I would note that it has a composition roof.

Chair Lew: Then the – on the canopy on your cornice.

Mr. Cusenbery: Yes, that is a polycarbonate.

Chair Lew: It's polycarbonate, ok, excellent.

Mr. Cusenbery: Translucent polycarbonate and that's – it is an essential facility so we can't put glass up there and we don't want to put anything solid up there yet we want the translucent so that's why we chose that.

Chair Lew: Ok and then... (crosstalk)

Mr. Cusenbery: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you for that. Then on the – I think I do like the terracotta screens and I think you are showing a second screen which is...

Mr. Cusenbery: Yeah, there's a lighter color and so...

Chair Lew: A lighter color and is that metal (crosstalk) and is that what's on the windows?

Mr. Cusenbery: No, they are both – they are two shades of terracotta.

Chair Lew: Two shades of terracotta.

Mr. Cusenbery: So, again that's the terracotta – color terracotta material that's on the left and is more prevalent on the parking structure and the terra – the beige colored terracotta material that's on the right, fourth from the left, that would be on the Public Safety Building.

Chair Lew: Got it, ok, thank you. Any other questions? No. Who wants to start? Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you very much. Thank you for the very eloquent presentation and all the Staff work from City Council Members, from police and Council Members and stuff. I'd like to start with the parking garage building. I think it's coming along nicely and it will be a large building that will look quite nice. I think the elevations along Ash and Sherman Street are interesting, there's a nice mix of open and solidness. I think it will be a handsome parking garage. I like – I think that the broad staircase coming up along Birch Street is a great idea. It's going to make it very nice for people as far as flowing in and out to California Avenue. It's great to have that on a parking garage. I'm concerned that the way it's rendered now or the way it's designed is it's just not quite there; it's too severe. If I reference the drawing on page 1.06 the concrete wall to the right of the stairs as you go up, it just feels too harsh.

Mr. Cusenbery: Is that the one you're talking about?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, that one there. As I understand it that's some sort of formed textured concrete and you're trying to say that that's got a textured friendly powerful presence. To me, it's just a 30-foot tall wall of concrete and it kind of goes against the idea of it being a warm welcoming area. The openings through it are just sort of big (inaudible) holes that you go through. I'm also concerned that the space underneath the stairs, as it's shown here, is really a great sleeping refuge for people and I think it needs to be just more thought through. The concept I'm finding very nice but the execution is not quite there. I think you're going to find out that a constant theme in my comments here. Your talk is great, you're saying the right words but I'm not seeing it in the design here so that staircase is one of those cases. So, softer detailing, more care at the doors, more care below the stairs, perhaps just more openings in the wall somehow so you can see where you're going in and out of it. In the same vein, the cut out along the side of the alley that the merchants seem to speak about, I guess I agree with their comments that you already have the alley for people to walk through so I don't see a need to cut the building out. I'm not sure the renderings are quite accurate to the plans but it seems to me you could reconsider that and it wouldn't be a big loss to the overall concept of what you're doing. If there's that much support from within the community not to have that, you ought to be listening to that. I had expressed concern earlier about the height of the parking garage and I just wanted to be clear to the City Council mostly that this is a large, massive building. It's to the height limit, it's to the setbacks and that's because they've asked to have 600 and something cars in this building. There's no way around it, you can't mince words on that. That's what the community wants and the Council needs to understand that crystal clear when they vote for it that's what they are doing and that's our job to tell them that. So, 50-feet, for example, is the height limit that goes to the top of the panels. It's not some mechanical feature and things like that. I had made an earlier comment about a second entry into the garage and I just wanted to clarify. I think your circulation works fine but many garages I've been in and out of having two ways to drive in and out and it just makes it a lot easier for vehicular circulation. I can see where you're not wanting to pursue that here given all the other constraints you have but that was the gist of that comment. Overall, the parking building I think is really – it's almost there in my opinion. The Public Safety Building I'm afraid I have serious reservations about. I'm not even sure where to start but all the words sound great. This is the least civic building I can imagine and it's just not attractive. If I could get you to pull up on the screen, there's a rendering you have from California Avenue. Let's see, it's shown on page 1.04 in the upper left corner.

Ms. Cusenbery: Is that the one?

Board Member Baltay: There's a close-up view of that same corner; a little bit further along in your presentation. That's it, right there. I think that word – the vision just speaks volumes for the problems here. This is not a civic building, it's not a friendly building, it's not attractive, it's downright scary. This mouth coming out with police cars shooting out from underneath is something out of Star Wars. I mean it's just not appropriate and it really isn't working. That large canopy hanging over the public plaza scares people. I just – I know that you have serious constraints about security, safety, ballistics, and setbacks. The Police Commissioner started her beautiful presentation with the words about wanting to welcome the public and make it everybody come together. Look at that image? Do you see that? I don't. We're

building a building for the next generations to come. Our grandkids will be walking by this and looking at it. We want them to look like they did at the old police station Birge Clark built for us. I just don't see it. I'm really sorry to be so strong about it but it's not there. That said, the parking entrance coming out on Birch, I think is just a non-starter. There must be some other way to do that. This image to me shows crystal clear how that just takes away from any chance of making this a public plaza. It's really a secret entrance for police vehicles, especially with the special barriers and the car coming out with lights flashing. I mean it couldn't do more to turn the community away. You just can't have it there. Anybody who works and lives and commutes in that area knows how important that stretch of Birch Street is and more so as time goes on with all the development there. We need to do everything we can to make this plaza more welcome, more open to people and not ugly and off-putting and scaring pedestrians away. My second issue had to do with my question about the open yard in the back and I fully appreciate the difficulties of finding ways to fit all these important functions in here. However, that open yard is what pushes the building to the front and makes the plaza so small and I think there it really is a tradeoff of how much we have to get the police functions really met versus how much we want to have a bigger plaza in the front. I'd like to be clear with my colleagues, with City Council and with everybody else who's a decision maker on this that by having that secure outdoor parking meeting the standards that the police have put forward, it makes the public plaza half the size it could be and half as nice as it could be. California Avenue doesn't have a big public plaza the way we have several downtowns. This is our chance to make that and we do that by planning and by compromising. In my opinion, we should be finding a way to minimize the outdoor parking yard for the police through other technical design means to make the plaza bigger. We only have one chance to make a real public plaza and that's at this stage of the design process. It's just the land is too valuable to not figure a way to make that work, it's just too small of the plaza. The elevation of the building, if you can go back to that rendering again. I'd like to leave that rendering up there as long as possible. That one, please; anyone of these. I mean it's just a big concrete box, it really is. I'm so sorry to be aggressive about it but I find it so unpleasant to look at. The thought of the textured concrete is nice, the terracotta is nice, all the words are good, all the pieces and the images of other projects have a potential but the concrete doesn't cut it. The roof cornice, that very large overhang like that but that's also 30-feet above the ground or something and I'm scared looking at that. I'm afraid it's going to topple over in an earthquake and I'm sure I won't be the only one who would say that to you. It's out of scale, it's not integrated, and it feels like an afterthought that some Architecture Board said put something on the box. Lastly, I'm concerned about the monopole. Initially, I thought this elegant spiral was going to look very nice but when you see images of what it looks like elsewhere and it becomes really a crow's nest of equipment and that changes all the time. We see that on the current issue with cell phone towers on how quickly engineers add and change and the next thing you know you have wires and antennas of every shape and color and size and mounted in every conceivable fashion. I suppose that's not so much an Architectural Board issue anymore but I'd like to be clear with the Council at least that they see what they are approving here. It's a very tall, very ugly looking pole and I'd love it if you could find some way to shroud it. Put it inside a different kind of tower, do something that other architects and generations of communities would do when you (inaudible). If you needed a clock tower, you made a real tower with a clock in it that looks attractive. We seem to be just governed by an engineering requirement here. We all agree we need this tower, we all agree – the police are telling us it has to be on this site. Granted, what do we generally do then when architects were proposed with a challenge like that? We just sort of say ok well, whatever, I guess we have to have it or can we go back and do what was done in Renaissance Italy? You made a tower that was an eloquent jester to the community. You do something else to make it work because right now – I mean this is again California Avenue. It's an important civic part of our town and we're putting this 135-foot tower draped with wires with every shape of antenna just because that's what Technical Security Engineering needs and we're not going to do anything else for it? I don't want to keep going on but we're missing something here. This is a building for our future generations and we're not connecting. Thank you.

Mr. Cusenbery: Thank you for your comments.

Chair Lew: Let's see, who next? Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, thank you for your presentation. I, unfortunately, wasn't at the preliminary hearing for this project but there's a lot to look at and I agree the presentation was quite nice. The words and descriptions that you put forth are very eloquent and elegant but I also have a problem with some of the actualities of the architecture. I guess I'll take it in a similar fashion and start with the parking garage. I agree that the parking garage is probably a little bit more there and closer to something that I could recommend for approval and recommend to Council but I do also completely understand the concerns brought forth by the neighboring people there and talking about that pedestrian arcade. While it is a great idea and it's something that was presented as something that could be a real feature to the parking garage. I just don't think that it's going to work the way that it's envisioned and perhaps there's a way to maybe make it a little bit less rectangular of an arcade but I think the overall use of that is – I can so easily imagine just vending machines being through up against that wall in the arcade and it being not very well maintained. The – I also agree that while the circulation inside the garage itself looks to function quite well, I am concerned of that the fact that there is only one in and out of the parking garage. Another thing that I noticed with these great stairs and I – you have that great stair on the Birch Street side. You also have a fairly nice stair coming down the arcade on the Ash Street side but my concern with both of those stairs is that if you're somebody that's parked on an upper story when you're coming back to the garage and you – I just don't see anybody taking those stairs. Especially when the stairs and the elevator entrances don't face one another. You're not really given an option and I think everybody is going to want to take the elevator and those stairs are going to be rarely used by anybody actually traveling up. I agree with the comment on the stairs on the Birch Street side but it's just too massive of a wall on the parking garage as you're going up or down and I realize that you're trying to make that a little bit more of a relief with any kind of an art installation. I still think just the scale of that wall is going to be quite daunting to anybody traversing the stairs. I think that's it for the parking – oh, one more thing for the parking garage is for the solar panels. While I really appreciate the fact that you're presenting these solar panels to us early as opposed to some of these other retrofit projects that we've seen. I think the vertical support structures of the solar panels themselves, because they are located at the very exterior of the parking garage, they add an element of extra bulkiness and mass that could perhaps be relieved if you're able to bring those columns inwards so that the building looks a little bit less tall than it actually is. Moving onto the Public Safety Building...

Mr. Cusenbery: I – just a brief question? There are a few items that I could add to this. Should I add it at the end?

Vice Chair Kim: I think at the end would probably be a little bit more appropriate.

Vice Chair Kim: For the Public Safety Building, I'm actually not so concerned about the monopole. That term really bothers me because if it's a pole, it's a single pole. Why do we have to call it a monopole? I've dealt with other pole related projects and I think while it is something that we need to look at and it shouldn't be overlooked. I think eventually it will kind of disappear and I'm not so concerned about the height or any kind of attachments made to it as long as the attachments are matching the color of the pole. The building itself, I think Board Member Baltay really hits those points that it just doesn't look like a very welcoming building to me. I was looking at that front plaza façade and just something about it is really not right in my mind quite yet. I appreciate the fact that you're trying to break out the mass and introduce the elements that are smaller and of different proportions but I don't know if it's the depth of the plaza versus the height of the building or what it is exactly. Maybe it's the entry portal that you're showing there being 2 ½ or maybe even 3-stories; I guess it's 2-stories. Just something there doesn't feel quite warm enough yet and I also think that the materials that you're proposing are just much too grey and too much of a cool grey. I think the only thing that you're doing to really warm up the building and the site is the use of landscaping and the terracotta and that similar redder shade but I don't know if it's just the combination of those two materials but there seems to be a very difficult balance of the warms versus the cools. Overall, I think it's just too blocky. Everything I see about the building is a rectangle. Each façade is – each elevation is a rectangle, the portal is a rectangle, and the only angle or diagonal I see is really out of that plaza which is kind of a nice jester relating to the true north orientation –northwest – cardinal axis orientation of the Court House and also that housing project also has that alley cut. That's a true north, south cut but I'm just wondering if maybe that portal could be rotated. Another

thing about that portal is that it makes it appear as if once you walk into the portal, you're walking into the building but the fact that you have to make a 90 degree turn to get into the building itself is also something that I don't see – feeling quite right. I said everything is a rectangle, everything is a block and even the canopies that you are proposing at the operations yard. Do they have to be so flat and so rectangular? Is there any way we can introduce some angles or even curves or something a little bit more organic that will make the building and sit feel a little bit more welcoming? I completely agree with Board Member Baltay's comments about the operations yard. While I definitely understand the need for it so if there is anything that can be done to maybe even make the operations yard a two-story structure so that we can begin to increase the plaza? It seems like such a large amount of space that we're dedicating to an on-grade facility that doesn't have anything above it, isn't really giving much to the community, and because of what's going on there, I can imagine that everything on even the Park Boulevard side as your passing the building, is going to be so guarded and so kind of turning its back on the rest of the neighborhood. Something that was said in the earlier presentation with memorable forms and trying to create something that is going to make Palo Alto's proud of this building but also people that visit California Avenue to have something to remember and I just don't think it's quite there yet. Having said that, I really applaud your presentation, the packet, and the renderings. Everything you've said, I think we're on the same page as far as trying to accomplish the right things but as far as getting there, I don't think we're quite there yet, especially with the Public Safety Building. Thank you.

Mr. Cusenbery: Thank you. A couple comments that I would just point out for...

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry, just for one second. Chair, I don't know if you want to continue to go through Board Member comments and then get comments from the applicant at the end or if you want to have the dialog or how you want to approach that?

Chair Lew: If it's quick. If you have just a quick thing.

Mr. Cusenbery: Two just quick points that I think will just elaborate the comments. One relative to the arcade and the openness and the concern that it would be someplace that would provide shelter and also might be a target of public urination. I just want to remind everybody that the entire garage is open 24-hours a day so the entire ground level of the garage provides shelter and provides opportunity if public urination. So, if there is that concern, the concern might be larger than just the arcade so that was one point. The second point that I was going to mention is that a lot of this you've heard there's push-pull between operational imperatives and the civic presence and civic identity. I'm trying to find a rendering as I speak here. The issue with the parking garage is that there is a vulnerability for the Public Safety Building from people being able to be on the parking structure and have sightlines to the Public Safety Building. So, it is a very specific security design intent to actually create as much as a wall as possible and that is an operational driver. So, in fact, sneaking in a couple openings are the compromises from that standpoint. So, that is – then the concrete that you are seeing is actually a concrete shear wall so its double use of the functionality of the concrete but expanded with the intent of minimizing the threat of an active shooter.

Chair Lew: Thank you.

Board Member Furth: Good morning. Thank you for the presentation and it gave us an enormous amount of information. Thank you all for that, it was very helpful and overwhelming. I mean I first worked as a layperson and not architect on a police station project in 1978 so before a number of you were born. We failed, we had big lead pollution problems on the firing range which we had to abandon. So, I know these are difficult projects but I also know that they can be better than we might think. I've been looking at our former police and fire Public Safety Building that's now Avenidas and when you look at that and its scale and it's landscaping and its design elements and its materials and you look at this, there is no evidence of civic progress in the last 100-years. In fact, it would seem we've gone considerably backward. I understand the reality of more high explosives, more vicious weapons, more elaborate telecommunications and I understand that we're building something that has many elements of a fortress. In the last few months, I've been spending a lot of time around fortresses in the Mediterranean

and they can be engaging as well while still keeping their essential secured aspect. I'm sorry to be so emotional about this but I thought it was just me but when I looked at that first cover illustration, I thought it looked like (inaudible) the entry, I thought that's how you get into the Death Star. That big, dark looming presence, very rectangular and that's what you fly your jet into and that's not what we want to do I don't think. Then I looked at the very high entryway, which as somebody points out doesn't really enter you into the building and I've spent so many hours listening to the Planning Commission and Staff of this City and the citizens talk about how they don't like double height entries and I'm thinking what are we doing? What civic jester are we making here? I want a civic jester that does not make me feel small, that makes it clear to me where I'm going, that invites me in, and I mean I'm happy if you put up – I guess they've got the – I mean I guess you're going to put the blindfolded justice across the street. I'm happy with big civic sculptures, I'm happy big landscaping, I'm happy with big useful plazas, I'm happy with clearly marked entries, I'm happy with lot so flags but this – I mean this is what we learned when I was in college was an element of something a little more authoritarian than I think we want here. We were taught that this was an element – a classic element of fascist architecture using the technical term, not the overall emotional one. Ok so having exposed my insecurities about the project. The garage, first of all, I think that the solar panels are the most important civic statement in the whole thing because to me they signal that the government is paying attention and trying to do something because none of this will matter if we don't get a handle on greenhouse gases. So, I like them, I like them being visible and I'm so happy you're showing them to us now. I like what I think the staircase is. I like the concept but I don't think that a 50-foot wall has to be awful but I know that depends on how wide the staircase is and how substantial the railings are. They look radically under designed here and I keep thinking of the beautiful railings I see in the Mission in San Francisco. I know that's completely different scale and I think about the railings in the San Francisco Civic Center. This is, as you point out, not a suburban building. It's not a suburban – you know we've built a lot suburban fire stations around here and they masquerade as slightly larger houses. In no way is this suburban, this is massively urban so that means it needs suitably urban levels of – what do we call these things? Railings, doorways, entries because we can't plan it out. I like the proposed landscaping. I am so happy – I mean I like the concept of the proposed landscaping. I'm not going to say that it's always there. I am so happy that we're hearing from utilities now because we have had the very sad experience of looking at the Charleston/Arastradero plan with fifty or six percent of the trees removed when we get down to actual construction drawings. So, I am looking forward to hearing how we're going to have the landscaping insignificant size anyway, which I do know is possible in most cases. I am going to – I guess the standard I'd like to meet is you get cert – we get certified by the Auto Bond Society's excellent backyard habitat. I mean not just messing around with semi-helpful landscaping for wildlife but serious support for the birds to hang out here. The Birch Street – not the Birch Street side, the Ash Street side, I think the neighborhood is right in saying that we haven't gotten there yet. I think we need a very generous sidewalk. I think you could make that attractive with properly – it going to be very dark but properly scaled landscaping. I tend to – as you may know I tend to favor the kind that sort of – plants are at head height so the planters are at elbow height. You can do that in a way that makes it welcoming for short-term stays or walking by but not as a habitat. We've certainly dealt with peeing, intoxicated affluent persons in the downtown garage so it's a good point that the whole garage is an issue. So, my question is, where's the nearest accessible public restroom? I mean if you don't want people peeing in the – some people you're never going to have any success but the other people, it would be nice to have one of the alternatives. What resources are we providing with people? These are people – we have bodies so how are we accommodating them? On the monopole I agree that we probably ought to call it a communication tower; its big. It saddens me, not that we can communicate that's going to be wonderful but that it's kind of a marker of a surveilled society and so I don't think it's going to disappear into the background. I think it's going to loom and I don't know what we can do. I mean there may be certain colors that make it recede into the clouds in certain weather conditions; I'll be interested in that. On the public plaza I agree that it's too small. It's needs to be bigger. One of my questions for you all -- I mean I was deeply influenced by White Studies in New York when I was young person so I want to know where do people sit? Where do they chat? Where do people who need backs on their seats sit? Where do people who need arms on their seats sit so that they can lean on them to get up? How are we accommodating a wide range of people here? We need to – I don't think we – having spent a lot of time enjoying other people's plazas recently and realizing we don't have the social structure to support them

here necessarily. I would love to see a plaza that really works. I understand in some Cities further south on the peninsula they are actually is a plaza life that some of our local communities do come out at sunset with grandparents and small children and circulate and eat and drink. We're not going to do that here and I understand that but we can get started and maybe we have coffee. I've certainly walked through very successful public plaza in Oakland by the Public Library next to the police station. That is not a particularly buffered area, there's lots of traffic, there's lots of people facing hard times but that plaza works. It takes a lot of landscape maintenance I am sure and it also takes good coffee. I have pages and pages of notes here but I think much of what I had in mind has been said by my colleagues.

Chair Lew: For everybody on the Board, I think we're trying – we're going to try to get this approved in two hearings so if you have a comment and you think it's important, let's just do it now and get it all addressed. Don't put it off thinking that we're going to do another...

Board Member Furth: I don't think the two-entry works, I don't think the – and by work, I mean it's not inviting and I agree, at least as it's drawn, that this building is scary which is not what I think the City wants or the department wants. I think the plaza is too shallow and I hope we can move it back further. I don't think that the proposal on Ash Street works and I think it probably needs to be rethought with the idea of having that perhaps be a showcase for plants, perhaps for tile art but not a lot of ground-level recess beyond the width of the sidewalk. I hope that we have short-term parking on the ground level of the garage because people – the first thing I was wondering when I looked at this police building was where do you park and then of course, across the street and eventually – you're going to build the parking lot first. So, I hope we have short-term parking for people coming in and out. That was a problem in the original design over on Hamilton as well. I want to know more about how Jacaranda is going to work and that it will work in a way that accommodates the Police Department's needs. I want to know about actual furniture and function on the plaza and I want it to function as a place where people can sit, whatever their state of physical health. I want that great big entry changed to something that invites me to feel an empowered citizen and not a small person with a big government use of force in front of me. To Staff, the comments from Pat Beatty about air quality and sunlight for their building at 2516 Birch Street. I want to know if you feel that we have addressed their concerns adequately to make the findings that this building isn't going to damage them and the way they live. I will be thrilled – I to have been following this Public Safety Building project since I got here in 1998 and I to will be thrilled when the police have – and the community has adequate facilities and I will be thrilled when California Avenue has the parking they want. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I think I'm in agreement with all – almost all of the comments...

Board Member Gooyer: Can I say a few things?

Chair Lew: Oh, sorry.

Board Member Gooyer: That's ok.

Chair Lew: We've been going on for so long. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I know this is getting long winded but it – and I have the same thing. I had a truckload of things but I'll just trim it down to a few initial comments and just some – an overview basically. I think one of the problems with this is that because they were both or they are both being built at the same time, it seems like there was some thought that needed – that these two needed to relate to each other quite a bit and actually look like one entity. I don't think that's really necessary. I mean we're talking about a civic building, not a civic garage. I don't really care if the garage is civic looking. It's right across from residences and I don't really think – I think it's going very well and it's coming along nicely but it could be softened up a little bit. One of those things, as you said was the big wall and then I see here on some of the sample board you have where it looks like you have a split face block and it's like that's – split-face block is sort of the most severe I've ever used. That's the kind of thing you use when you don't want people to stay near it or if you rub your hand across and you end up

with hamburger meat. So, that's not really a very inviting type situation so I really don't think we ought to use that all. Having said that, the whole idea about the plaza is that I keep hearing that the plaza needs to be larger. I think – let's face it, the reality of it is, is it is a police station. The police need to do what they need to do and with the design of these two structures, you could make that plaza the size of a football field and I would feel uncomfortable sitting in it with those buildings looking down on me. I mean there's -- when the concept of civic means severe and large and overpowering, that is not really my idea. I was involved about 4 or 5-years ago with a police station in another City in the peninsula larger than Palo Alto and one of the comments that were made there – I was on the Planning Commission at the time and one of the things that were made there, which I thought was absolutely spot on, is that if there's a little – if there is child running up to the police station because they are lost and they need some help from somebody. If they look at this building, they are going to turn around and run the other way. There is nothing inviting – I mean the Death Star is probably a bit much but there's nothing inviting about that building. Just because – it does look like – somebody made the comment if you look at our old police building versus this new one, society hasn't gone in the right direction. Its more severe and you would expect some machine guns to pop up from the turrets on the corners or something the way this thing is built. It's a massive concrete bunker with what I thought was rather strange for the comments – some of the written stuff was that it's a cast in place concrete building and the painted and steel overhangs reflect the civic elements. I mean to me civic elements aren't steel – painted steel elements that are added on to it and it's just – it doesn't work for me. When I first started reading this, I like – again, your presentation and the concept and the things that you – the Police Department need are all spot on and when I started reading the whole idea about Palo Alto presidencies of terracotta and the off-white, it gives you a softer feel of what you think. Now again, there's a difference between terracotta being the color or terracotta being the material but it still has a connotation of something softer. It can still be civic but it could be more user-friendly, more human scale, and that's the thing that missing with this. The first thing you see is those massive concrete walls. I'll let it go at that and I'm pretty much – I think most of us are in agreement that this is not – at least the building is not going in the right direction to make it -- for this group. I'll let it go at that.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Robert.

Mr. Cusenbery: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you for your excellent presentation. I am generally in agreement with the Board although I think I disagree with the Board on the operations yard and also, I may be – I may disagree on the size of the plaza. I sort of am a little undecided on that. I was wondering if you could – instead of just repeating everything that's already been said, I was wondering if maybe we could talk a little bit about – in more detail about some of the design elements and see if there are opportunities. One is the arcade and just the dimensions of the arcade. Second was the public – I guess it's like a community room facing the plaza and it's like a double height space but the second-floor equivalent face doesn't have windows. I was just wondering what the...

Mr. Cusenbery: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: I was just wondering what the constraints were on that – on the conference room? On the Public Safety Building, on the – Jacaranda, on the alley you have – there's a courtyard garden and there's a wall and you've got integrated benches and I was wondering if we could talk about the constraints happening there? Then I don't think we've talked about it in detail and that was the Park Boulevard façade and you have a setback and landscaping. I was just curious as to what happened there because we do have large groups of employees coming down Park and I think you've got a double row of trees and planters but I was just curious as to what else was happening along that wall? If there are maybe opportunities to get a social place so anyway.

Mr. Cusenbery: I'll tell you what, I'll take those one at a time and I'll do it cynically and if I miss something I can happily elaborate. The arcade first, the dimensions of the arcade is we have pushed it up as far as we can within the structural frame of the parking structure. I believe it's an 11-feet, I hope I

am accurate on that but I think it's very close to 11-feet. We don't have – need a beam or I mean a column – sorry beam in that location so it's actually the underside of the decking so we can go all the way up there. Then what we've done is within that, we've nested – again, using the codification of the civic elements, the arcade, and the color coding. The idea there would be a possible terracotta frame within that and then we also identified that as a potential public art site. So, in – of the public artists that we recently – the opportunities that we have with the various public artists, one of the artists that were – the one that was selected actually has a president for work within that kind of circulation arcade and is quite rich. So, the thought is that we would leave that arcade open-ended for further elaboration with the work of the public artist and see what kind of opportunities come out of that process. The short answer is 11-feet tall, the width of parking space so around 20-feet wide and the rationale for not having parking space in that area is that if you picture the City's sidewalk. The width which is relatively narrow in that location and directly to your right would be a series of parked cars, which is one experience versus to your right is a 20-foot arcade that has a staircase going straight up to the garage underneath it and a public art installation that elaborates it. Just from a professional standpoint, our experience is that areas that are invested in publicly have less likelihood of vandalism and/or nesting people. Those that are disinvested or afterthoughts or behind the scenes are the ones that are more likely to have people – attract people. So, when you compare the arcade, this is just from our approach, you compare the arcade which people use daily and will be visible versus just on the other side of it, which is the parking structure where's this whole ample place for things that – that hope was the arcade would actually reverse the concerns. So, that's the one...

Chair Lew: Can I...

Mr. Cusenbery: Sorry.

Chair Lew: Can I ask a question? Is the – so the wall between the arcade and the parking spaces or the parking isle?

Mr. Cusenbery: Yeah?

Chair Lew: Is that a solid shear wall or can that be semi-permeable or semi-open – partially open or it could be screen – yeah, it could be a screen wall.

Mr. Cusenbery: I apologize that I can't go over there, I – my – I had a failure on my laptop so I'm doing my back up the system but anyway, this is a view. The answer to your question is on that wall, I do not believe there's – certainly not the whole thing does not have to be shear wall. I mean that would be the safe answer but portions of it maybe or maybe not but certainly not the whole thing. What we're showing – there's a lot of flexibility on what this can become. This visualization is based on the idea of glass mosaic with some kind of photorealistic immersive environment. It does not necessarily become that – should this be selected as one of the public art sites, we put it out there as an opportunity but no, there's a flexibility on how that can have developed and how that can be elaborated and the openness or closedness of it can vary.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Ok and then on the community room?

Mr. Cusenbery: The community room, the thought on that – on the windows, the way that the – I'm going to – position yourself in the community room looking towards – like you just walked into the lobby and what you have in the community room is to your left, which is the plaza side, there's a header that where the windows only go up to, I think it's 10-feet. Basically, the idea is that it's playing up the retail datum of storefronts. Then in that same community room, in front of you, that lower area is opaque but above it is a high window and that high window is on both – you can see it there in the picture of the lobby on the right. The high window is on the entrance side and on the far end so that you have light coming in from various sides in that space but that's not a constraint. That is fixed, that is a design decision that has flexibility. I think this view shows it a little bit better. You can see the high windows to the left above the canopy over the entries to the parking structure. Those are high windows into that

same public – that same multi-purpose room actually – multi-purpose room. There you can see the kind of retail datum of those windows.

Chair Lew: Right and then does the – the access to the multi-purpose room has to be...

Mr. Cusenbery: Is through the lobby.

Chair Lew: ... through the lobby. (crosstalk) for security wise, does...

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct.

Chair Lew: ... it does not make sense to have it – is it not possible to have doors to the plaza?

Mr. Cusenbery: The way that it's – we actually entertaining doors to the plaza so yes, that's actually a hope but we have to make sure that it's acceptable for all parties. So, we put that out there as a possibility and we're going to discuss that further. The idea those is that the access to that multi-purpose room can happen after hours and the way security works is you have access to the bathroom, access to the lobby and access to that room so you could have community meetings there that don't need special escorts to use it.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you.

Mr. Cusenbery: That was the second one and then the third one was the...

Chair Lew: The alley – the Jacaranda Alley frontage with the wall and the courtyard and the benches?

Mr. Cusenbery: In that case, the wall is positioned to – for a couple of drivers. One of the drivers is providing the vehicles security distance so that you can't approach the vehicles – approach the building in a vehicle within a certain dimension. So, in that case, on the plaza side it's all done with furnishings – site furnishings but on the Jacaranda side, it doesn't with a wall. The wall is in part – it serves several functions, one is that garden area is intended to be a visual amenity for the offices that are on the inboard side. Customarily if you look at police stations, you'll see that the window heads on the ground floor are usually very high and it always feels very off-putting at street level; if you look at urban police stations in particular. The idea here is that you actually – for the insides you actually have generous windows onto this yard and then the wall is outboard so that there's still visual security. Then on the operations yard, the intent is to try to push the wall too as close to the property line as possible. Again, distance (inaudible) to pedestrians walking on that side from the police standpoint and also maximizing the space available on the operations yard. So, we looked at various configurations but in operational reality is you don't want to incentive people to hang out right at the edge there where it's difficult to monitor.

Chair Lew: Then you do have benches.

Mr. Cusenbery: We're trying to – it's about – we're trying to be responsive to the multiple comments (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: You're trying to break up the long wall.

Mr. Cusenbery: Yeah, we do appreciate the comments that we received from the Board here as well but there are people who work in those areas and providing some amenities.

Chair Lew: Then my last question was just on the Park Boulevard and that front – in that setback.

Mr. Cusenbery: That is preserved primarily as a passive zone – passive seating zone. There's raised – again, there's a parking structure under it so all the planters are raised, there are benches integrated with it and in terms of the width – yeah, it does have the double – there's flexibility on the width. So,

should it be determined that it's not providing enough side by side walking area, we can certainly adjust that. Those – that – those planting areas can become narrower and there's no constraint that requires it to be that way. The operational constraint doesn't start till white area where we actually have a program.

Chair Lew: Thank you so I think I am in agreement with the – generally with the Board's comments and I guess I would say – well, we'll see what happens we get to the next hearing but I guess the question could be is – yeah, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Kyu, does –I understand that these projects are coming to us together. The phasing of construction is parking lot – parking structure first and then the next one, right? So, that we don't basically touch that parking – that second parking lot until new parking available. So, that makes me feel a slightly different sense of urgency about the two buildings. I'm – not that everybody wouldn't have like them 10-years ago. If we're closer to thinking that we understand what garage we could approve would look like, is it helpful to focus our comments on that and see if we can give any clear direction? I mean do we have consensus on what should happen or enough to give direction as to what should happen on Ash Street and what – do we have consensus?

Chair Lew: Why don't we – ok, well why don't we work on that and so why don't we work on the garage first and I think there have been a number of comments about the arcade, as well as the wall. So, why don't we try to come to a consensus on the recommendation for those two areas? Could we – well on the wall, I think you were proposing etched concrete, which I've never seen before. I've seen architects propose it before but I've never seen it in person. I was wondering if there are examples.

Mr. Cusenbery: There are examples and in fact, we have some examples which may not be in your packet but we do have an example with a photo-realistic etching and that you – at some angles you actually don't see it and then from other angles, it really telegraphs. I will put a disclaimer in, we've shown a graphic and we have identified it as a potential public art site. So, I think what I have to say is that what happens to that wall is in part assuming that it maybe be selected as a public art site and then will be in the realm of the artist. We would want to leave that – some of that flexibility for that so I'm answering you only provisionally because some of the discussion was that well, the wall could be the art site but then there's the reentry corner. Maybe the reentry corner has something within and that becomes an art site so this is the first stake in the ground but I think what evolves with the public art component could inform it significantly. If we chose – sorry, just a -- we chose this end of the site as a public art site because it's visibility from the plaza and because there were concerns voice previously about the narrow Sherman side.

Chair Lew: Ok, let's bring it back the Board. On the wall, I think there have been a number of comments. What do you think is the best recommendation?

Board Member Gooyer: I was going to say that I guess maybe that's – I have a different opinion about some of this and that is that I don't want to sit there and design it. That's not our job here and we've given it some thought that it needs to be softened or whatever but – I know that – see I guess it's one of these things that the applicant wants us to give him as specific comments and everything else. Then if it turns out that they do it slightly different to what we want, they come back and say yeah, but you guys told me to do it this way. That's one of the things I don't like about that and now we're being told we're going to tell them exactly how it needs to be designed.

Chair Lew: No, it's a – just on the – the Board's recommendation.

Board Member Gooyer: I think most of us have already done that. We've said that the thing needs to be softer and all the other things. Now we're talking – like going into specific individual items and telling him how it needs to be done.

Chair Lew: No, I'm not saying that.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: If the Board is in agreement that it should be softer, I think that's fine.

Mr. Cusenbery: One the comments, just if I might, that I did hear that will be helpful to elaborate on is the request for more openness and that is one of those items that it's a direct contradiction to the operational imperative of maximum...

Board Member Gooyer: That's fine, we understand that. I mean there are certain criteria that you need and that's very logical and I understand that. I don't think any of us have mentioned that. I think you were the one that mentioned about the openness but it – more than the rest of us. It's just that that's a very severe looking element. It – something could be a whole lot softer and still be closed...

Mr. Lait: Chair?

Board Member Gooyer: ... of solid.

Mr. Cusenbery: Then I misheard, I though openness was...

Mr. Lait: I'm wondering if it might be appropriate to take a 5-minute break just to give the applicant team an opportunity to sort of regroup after hearing the comments and think about asking the Board for areas of specific clarification or area – I mean clearly there is going to be some work that needs to be done but it's going to be hard to do in on the fly right now. So, you can just take a little break and give people just a chance to regroup, I think that might be helpful.

Chair Lew: Ok, how long? Ten minutes or fifteen minutes?

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lait: Ten minutes.

Chair Lew: So, it is – I have 10:53 so we'll say 11 after – five after 11 or so. Ok, we'll take a break.

[Board took a short break]

Chair Lew: Reconvene and how do we want to start? Did you guys – do you have something...

Mr. Cusenbery: There's a couple thought and we're formulating on the fly so I'll do my best here. I thought it would be helpful for us to make a couple clarifications or just elaborate on a couple of minor points for – whether it's useful or not. Then I want to – we would like to ask a couple of fundamental questions as to what level these comments exist at so let me just start with the clarifications. Forgive me, we're working on the fly but there's been a lot of discussion about the – enlarging the size of the plaza and right now, I just to reinforce that this is a very, very small site for the scale of a Public Safety Building. That is, it's approximately 1 ½-acre site and if you go any communities in this area on the peninsula or anywhere and they usually start at least an acre or larger. They do all have operational yards outside them and so the building, in a way, barely fits. The building has been reduced in size over the periods of years from 56,000-square feet to about 48,000-square feet but at this point, if we were, for instance, shift the building, we'd eliminate the operational yard. That is a program and scope reduction and operational impact so I just want to say that as a clarification. Another clarification is the plaza itself, we just paced it off so it's not extremely accurate but basically the plaza is roughly the width of this room. So, from curb to building, this is the size of the plaza so that's a second clarification. The – another clarification I want to reiterate that though we rendered it with the police vehicle, that Birch Street ramp is, in fact, Staff parking so out bad. That was purely for dramatic effect but not to good result. I guess what I would do then is we're going to ask for – if we could reach closer on a couple things on the garage but I think what would also be helpful is – I completely agree with Board Member

Gooyer's opinion that it's not your job to give us design ideas and opinions. We're – I wanted to clarify that we're not looking for that at all but there – the comments tended to fall – can be maybe simplified into two categories of comments. One category of comment are ones that have a significant impact on the operations to configurations of the building, such as moving the building back and getting rid of the operational yard. Now we have a series of vehicles – fleet of vehicles that have nowhere to put them or for instance, there was a discussion of breaking it up and making it curvier or changing the massing in significant ways. Well, the volume of the building is the derivative of a lot of complex operational interaction. So, those types of changes, what I would call – let's call it for lack of a better term, kind of structural changes, definitely have operational – significant operational impacts so that would be one category of change. Another category of change though is one of treatment, again for lack of a better word, where I think I put softer in that category or friendlier or different scale. Where it's not attacking or dismantling the core organizational structure but it's looking at the resulting feel. For instance, this extruded box shape is really – and the treatment of it is derivative of operations but for instance, treatment might be, for instance, I think part of what is – I'm speculating that part of what might be – people may be experiencing is that this is a truly fortified building. It is ballistic resistant and it is screening views by design, by intent and that in and of itself has some connotations with it. However, treatment – if the material isn't concrete but it's unit bricks, right and it's a friendlier unit material or if it is more glass, which is tricky because of ballistics but none the less if there was more glass. Things like that would-be treatment that aren't structural. So, I guess what I'm – sorry, that was a little bit long winded but the idea is that it would be helpful to know if your comments are specifically saying yes, we have to structurally change this or it's just a matter of softening and treating it differently. Oh yeah, so then – thank you. Then there are just a few things if we could receive specific feedback on relative to the garage because that appears to be the easier one. It's arcades, do we provide them as a pedestrian amenity and a mitigation of the scale and mass and volume with a garage, yes or no, we see them as a hazard and would like them removed? So, that would be the arcade question. The wall question I'll leave that in your category but with some direction – not design direction but attitudinal direction on the large wall. Again, in the context of vulnerability for the Public Safety Building and feedback on that. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. I think that was well said. Let's bring it back to the Board and I think I will ask Board Member Baltay if you want to make a recommendation overall for the project?

Board Member Baltay: Let me address my fellow Board Members here. What's been going through my head over this break is that we ought to just say no to the design of the police station right now and send this back so that everybody, Staff and Council and police really hear that it's both items, the structural and the finishes are not close. They are not going in the right direction. We feel we gave you similar feedback at the first hearing. What we get back is a design that goes grossly in the wrong direction. We get a lot of words from you, from the Staff, from the police that camouflage and twist what our intent was and I have no confidence that this is going to do anything but the same thing next time around. You'll spend another \$30,000 bucks on design work, another beautiful package, another huge public hearing to hear the same thing again. I think the design is in the wrong direction and you heard that from every one of us. I don't know how to be more clear and what's worked for us in the past is just to say no. So, the question to Staff is can we separate this into two things and continue the garage. We can figure that out and next time around we can get it through and just say no to the fire – to the police building as it's designed.

Mr. Lait: I think at this point we're not a decision-making mode either in favor or against. We haven't agendaize it in that manner and it's been I think clear that there is going to become kind of continuation. I think your comments can certainly be expressed and when it returns to the Board the next time, we can probably agendaize it for an action, if that where the Board interest.

Board Member Baltay: Can the project be split into two?

Mr. Lait: They are two different projects and they are two different addresses. We're processing them concurrently because of their relationship to each other and the neighborhood and also, for the purposes of the environmental analysis.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me get – piggyback a little bit of what Peter said, is that I understand your comment about there's no action to be taken here but I agree that if we go along the same line or even slightly along the same line for the police station as we're doing now, I agree completely it's going in the wrong direction. So, even though we're not taking an action, I think we could be very blunt and say this is not the direction you're going and it needs to change. Now that's not a yes or no type situation but I think we need to be very bluntly – I don't know about the rest of the – but at least the two of us agree that this is not the right direction. If it comes back like this – I've been on Boards long enough that if you're not very firm about saying we do not like this, architects having been on both sides of the podium so to speak will say oh, well it wasn't too bad. Let me just tweak it a little bit and we'll keep going. I want to get that, at least in my opinion, that's not the right direction and I want to be very blunt about that like Peter was. That even though you say we're not doing any decision making here but I can guarantee if it keeps going in this direction, I'll vote against it. So, why waste the time and effort?

Chair Lew: I have a question for both of you, is that do you think the site is appropriate for a Public Safety Building? Given all the constraints that you've heard about like the two driveways and...

Board Member Baltay: Well, sure, what I see, and I'm very glad the Police Department is here, is that there needs to be a little more compromise. What happens – I'm an architect, practicing, and what happens is between the architect and the client, the architect wants to meet the client's requirements. What I think, with all respect, the police are missing is that this is a dense urban environment and you're putting some new beautiful, expensive police building in a very important downtown, urban retail area. I think there needs to be more compromise on the side of the police as to what really is a realistic accomplishment. For example, this concrete wall, what I heard the architect say is that it needs to be solid concrete to prevent an active shooter situation from somebody up there shooting at the police building and I say to you that that's not a realistic target to give the architect and the design team. When you do that, you set the standard – you set the bar so high that in the end, it's not going to happen. You're going to go through this Palo Alto process and you're not going to get the building built, which is what we've been going through for years. Really there needs to be more of a sense of understanding of what we mean by civic, understanding what we mean by a plaza and understanding what we mean by making it not scary. All while trying to do your responsibilities of being civic stewards of our security, which we all want as well but in this location, it's going to be taken a little more compromise and I don't think I'm hearing that from you quite the way it needs to be -- to succeed. So, yes, to answer Alex's question, I think it can be done but it's going to be a painful process unless you start to really listen. Not just the architect, the architect is getting dragged through all of this to a large degree because they are trying to meet the program.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me ask something then and this is probably going to go against everything that everybody is saying, at least from what I'm hearing. What if we reduce the size of the plaza? I mean the criteria of this is to build a police station, not a plaza. I know it would be nice to have a plaza there but if the Police Department needs additional square footage for some reason to make the building a lot more amenable and attractive for the next 50-years, I'm willing to give up part of the plaza so they can get some ins and outs in the building, rather than a big concrete block. Your comment about I need certain square footage and we both know a shoe box is the easiest thing to design to put as much functional square footage in it as possible.

Mr. Cusenbery: I might if I could just elaborate on that in relative to Board Member Baltay's comment about compromise? The plaza as it is right now actually represents a compromise on the part of the Police Department because from a security and safety standpoint, the preference is that you don't want invite mingling but I think it's been clear, double lay along, that there's a possibility of providing an amenity. So, that was an early compromise of the Police Department and they said ok, well let's be careful about how we stage it because we don't want people lingering around the building but we end up with a nice civic amenity. So, to your point yes, eliminating the plaza would be consistent with operational desires and wouldn't require a compromise on the Police Department (inaudible) and acknowledge the fact that it is urban and in fact...

Board Member Gooyer: I agree and the reality of it is, it – a plaza would be nice but we're building a police station, not a plaza that also happens to have a police station next to it.

Vice Chair Kim: If I could clarify my previous comments about the plaza size. I just meant that the other all size could change. Maybe it does grow, maybe it does shrink but right now, I think the plaza is trying to be forced with all these complicated angles but the reality of it is, is it's just a rectangular plaza with a rectangular three-story concrete building front. I think something there has to change.

Board Member Gooyer: So, the idea being if it was a nicer, smaller plaza you'd be just as happy with it than a larger, sort of mundane one.

Vice Chair Kim: As long as the relationship with – from the plaza to the building is much more amenable than it is right now and I understand that there's a program to the building but I just don't understand why the building has to be so flat. I mean is there a way to cantilever the second or third floor? Is there any other ins and outs that can be accomplished rather than -- I mean the only thing on the front of this building is this portal and it doesn't really even lead into the building, you have to turn.

Board Member Baltay: The Park Avenue side is only one-story and I mean that could be bigger to take some of the pressure off as well. There are other things you can do.

Board Member Furth: If part of the program is to repel Palo Alto's so that they don't linger around the building, I don't think I'm ever going to be approving that aspect of the design. That doesn't seem to me to be consistent with our Police Department's notion of their job and they're having fit into our community or our understanding of what they do? I mean they need to be safe, they need secure spaces, they need to be able to cope during fire and flood and famine and rising sea levels. I hope the sea level is good guys. They need to be able to deal with a lot of things but there must be a way to design a building that engages and encourages people to come it to it who do not have malevolent intent, while at the same time providing security against those who do.

Board Member Gooyer: I think that's one of the reasons that we've talked about. That's why you hire an architect as someone who has the training to be able to put a lot of maybe mundane functions in an attractive or at least inviting envelope.

Board Member Furth: Exactly and when you all talk about moving the – actually moving the building in and out. I mean there was this – I had a bunch of – a bunch of my notes are what does this mean, like dynamic massing? I kept looking for the dynamic massing and I could not figure out where the dynamic massing was or what it meant. Yes, buildings that go in and out are more engaging. Yes, a lot of our most successful building – you know we were looking at our parking structure across from our Birge Clark Post Office and one of the things that really struck me is that those – that building and the Wells Fargo building across the street both managed to – in the case of the Wells Fargo building in particular, be quite secure and yet have limited spaces that really invite you in with cuts in the building and second floor archways or whatever they are – trellises. Perhaps we should – perhaps it's helpful not to think of this as a plaza. Perhaps it's the front yard but it needs to be a front yard where I can sit down and chat with somebody if I run into them; in my view. I think your point about would a child be afraid of this building or to walk into it, that's an important test. I'm confident that you can design an entry that will satisfy the department's needs and also engage small children. I really don't think that's impossible and I've been in such places. I also imagine that it can be done on this site and I don't think now is the time to talk about materials and what not but I was not kidding about where does the public find a restroom and I think the answer is in this building, right? Twenty-four hours a day, right? So, signage is going to matter so that people know that. Anyway, that's enough for me.

Board Member Baltay: My comment earlier about just saying no to this is re-reflecting in me by Robert's questioning of one of the basic programming aspects of this plaza. That's for us at the Architectural

Board to decide if there's a plaza in front of the new police station. That needs to come from the powers that are really driving this project and yet, it's a very good question. Maybe we're being too ambitious asking for a plaza and for a modern Public Security Building on a 1 ½- acre site but again, that speaks to the Board Members on needing to send this back to the drawing board.

Mr. Cusenbery: If I could?

Board Member Baltay: It's just not – the piece is not there perhaps.

Board Member Furth: I'm not prepared to send it back to the drawing board until we put together findings of why it doesn't – negative findings, essentially why it doesn't make a finding. I'm not prepared to do it today.

Board Member Gooyer: Well yeah, but we're not at that situation of an up or down so do we need to have findings? We're giving guidance right now. Maybe the guidance goes back to the drawing board because it's not going in the right direction. We're not looking for an up or down, we were just told that so we don't need findings to make a judgment call.

Board Member Furth: You don't need findings to make a recommendation but if we propose to turn it down, then I think we do.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, but I think what we're telling them that if they keep going the way they are now, then there will probably be findings that turn it down so let's not go there. That's not doing any favor to anybody.

Ms. Lum: Chair Lew?

Chair Lew: Yes?

Ms. Lum: May I make a quick comment?

Chair Lew: Yes, please.

Ms. Lum: Patty Lum again. So, I appreciate all of your comments and we certainly take them to heart. I just wanted to address the issue of compromise. I think we have compromise throughout this program and what happens all along is that this is the site we were left with and our goal is to make it work. Several of you have said that you think it can work, which is great but along this process with the huge need in the community for parking. For better or for worse, the two projects were married and I think we have to remember that the number one infrastructure project here is the Public Safety Building. I think it's probably -- the parking structure, we can get there and are almost there from the comments I hear. I believe that in June I didn't hear as strong of comments from all of you and maybe that's our fault that we didn't take it the right direction but we certainly are hearing that now. So, I would encourage you not to just kill the project but perhaps we can focus on the garage and then come back to you with a different direction. Just one comment real quickly and Mallory is probably going to get mad me but when I first saw the rendering of the Staff underground, I – I'm a police officer and I said oh, we need to soften that. So, we are with you but we just didn't have all of the time – we're on a tight timeline here and we want to keep it moving and it's time and money and everything else for the City and the need for this building. So, I encourage you to please, please, just – we are asking for guidance and we are definitely hearing you but thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: The other way to look at it -- I understand and that's not unrealistic to say we need that but we also are realistic to know that this is a civic building and it's going to be there for 50-years or 75-years. So, you also want to get it pretty close to right the first time, even if it takes a little longer so 5-years from now, people won't go oh, geez they gave it a shot but it didn't really work out.

That's why I said -- let's go back then, are you the ones that wanted -- requested the plaza? By you meaning the Police Department.

Ms. Lum: Sure, I don't know that it was a specific request. We probably thought it was expected of us to have a building -- a civic building with this amount of money in it without a plaza would be -- we could go the Berkeley style. There really is...

Board Member Gooyer: Well so what you're thinking -- so, I don't mean to put words in your mouth but what you were thinking as a Police Department saying the powers that be at City Hall would like something like that. Then maybe the compromise is that City Hall has to also compromise and say look, we need a fully functioning Police Department that's going to be there for 75-years and we can't have as big of plaza we have. We need an extra, I don't know, 1,000-square feet to dedicated it too. You made the comment that you've been compromising and I get the feeling that you think all the compromising has been on your end, yours meaning the Police Department end. That may be the case, I don't know. I wasn't involved in all of that but you know compromise means everybody gets some and loses some. So, it's like I understand you wanting to do the right thing for the community but I -- to me, doing the right thing for the community is having a well-functioning Police Department, not the size of the plaza up front.

Ms. Lum: I think the only component -- there is a component of the plaza that we like, for sure. We want to entertain the community, we want to have a community multi-purpose room open up onto a plaza, there are good parts of that so I think we need to reevaluate and I completely understand where you're coming from. We certainly are not the only ones that have compromised, everyone in this process has compromised.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean that -- but I'm just saying that maybe there are something that you haven't looked at or that you felt we couldn't compromise on, whether that's plus or minus. That the multipurpose room becomes literally multipurpose where it serves your functions eighty-five percent of the time and is a communal room for fifteen percent of the time; that sort of thing. Whereas other than leaving it as a big empty Boardroom that almost never gets used or occasionally at night when a community group comes in, you know that sort of thing.

Chair Lew: So...

Ms. Cusenbery: I have a couple -- Chairmen?

Chair Lew: Sure.

Ms. Cusenbery: I have a couple of follow up questions that are just hyper-specific for the (inaudible) to try to focus the conversation a little bit. At the last presentation, we presented the background on the massing of the building. We show a number of perspectives and during the predesign phase we had creates a two-story building that was spread out over the site or a three-story building that was more compact. The reason we said was purely operational and also partly because we felt -- in fact, the massing of the three-story piece would be less conspicuous and it was my understanding that there was agreement from this Board that in fact the three-story massing and the tucked back and setbacks and the general configuration of the massing was approvable. Now, I'm not talking about the treatment, I'm talking about the massing. That's the dialog that I recall from the last one and so if that is a mistake in understanding, that would be good to address specifically.

Board Member Gooyer: I don't think so. I don't think anybody has a problem with a three-story aspect of it.

Ms. Cusenbery: Ok, thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean am I – that's not – let's face it, some of the preliminary sketches you – was – you said we're just throwing some ideas out just so that – we also didn't want to get to specific about I like this, I don't like this, when it was very early on. I think the massing part of it we agree that it makes more sense. I mean I've always been a fan of you make the building smaller and higher and you've got more of a footprint around to do things with.

Ms. Cusenbery: Correct.

Chair Lew: Ok, any other – Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I agree with Robert. I don't think that anybody thinks that a two-story solution is better than a three-story. We keep talking about how expensive this land is and that means we want underground parking and a three-story building that can move in and out and invite people in and provide light and air and private spaces for the people working in them. It does seem to me – I don't think we indicated that this particular building would be acceptable to us in this particular kind of volume. It also seems to me that the work that we think needs to be done isn't simply a matter of changing the color of the plaster or growing ivy over it. That it involves more rethinking than that and I think probably not that far away that there is some space to move back and forth when you think about the design facing Birch. The fact that there's a community room that would be accessible from a plaza to me seems to be an enormous upside. We have a huge shortage of space for people to meet and for non-profits to meet. I'm not worried about it not being used, particularly now that it will have parking, and that it's in the south part of town which is not an enough more serious deficit than other parts of town. It still does seem to me that the critical path is to get the EIR completed, we haven't even read it and we don't know what it says so that's working in the dark to a certain extent, and to try to get the design for the garage in a place where we can make the appropriate findings. That does not need to delay the beginning or completion of construction for the Public Safety Building. That there is time to do what we think is needed to be done without delaying occupancy.

Chair Lew: Yes, Jonathan?

Mr. Lait: I was going to try to get us to the next part which I think your heading too.

Chair Lew: Yes, and I just wanted to add one thing, just in general principles of design. I mean the way that I've been taught is that the first say like 5 to 10-feet is the architecture of the building. You have been putting some of that in the project so like you have the portal and the staircase on the corner and you have some recesses. I think what I am hearing from the Board is that those aren't working so I would say work on that first 10-feet of what you see. It may very well be that everything else in the (inaudible) is fine. It may be that you need more of those spaces and maybe the plaza gets smaller to do that. Then I would also say that in the back of my mind I was at – I've been actually wondering is this all just proportions? You know is the cornice too high on the building and would it be better at 30-feet instead of 50-feet? I haven't really come to a conclusion if that or if there's something wrong with the organization internally of the building but I think generally we're trying to downscale the buildings and so elements that are closer to what's already – closer to the existing buildings on California Avenue I think would help. I think that shows in the some of the perspectives where you have the two big 50-foot things, they sort of match the Court House but they are – I think they are overwhelming the buildings and you've been trying to do things like putting the photovoltaics on the garage. You're trying to break the scale down and I do want to encourage you to do that kind of move. I think that is working in the right direction. So, let's move on and I think our – the recommendation was just to continue it and we'll let them debate it and we'll see it again. As again, I just remind you that the recommendation was to continue it next month but we're putting it off beyond that because of the environmental review is taking longer. Yes?

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry, (inaudible) your earlier comment that now is the time to speak and not later. I do agree with those of you who have commented on – I think Robert in particular, on the colors. If I'm looking at terracotta, I expect terracotta as in creams and soft – things that look good with vines

and that neighborhood is full of those colors. This, to me, seems much to black, white and international orange. I mean I realize that is not international orange but black, white and terracotta.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Mr. Lait: Chair?

Board Member Furth: So, I'd be looking for a different...

Chair Lew: Yes?

Board Member Furth: ... pallet.

Mr. Lait: I understand the applicant team would also just want to get some clarifying guidance on the arcade alongside the garage.

Chair Lew: Aw, yes, ok.

Board Member Baltay: I think you should get rid of the arcade.

Board Member Gooyer: I think if they want more parking, yeah, I do too; emphasize the parking. It's a parking garage.

Chair Lew: Any other comments on the arcade?

Board Member Furth: I think its space 11-feet high and 20-feet deep, is that what it is? Not attractive for anybody. I would like to see the building moved out, leaving enough space for a generous sidewalk with some attractive landscaping to my...

Mr. Cusenbery: Sorry, I just...

Board Member Furth: ...(inaudible).

Mr. Cusenbery: ...want to say that I – just from our experience that those are mutually exclusive currently. That the – removing the arcade will just give us the City sidewalk because the...

Board Member Furth: How many feet in that particular place?

Mr. Cusenbery: I believe it's 8-feet and that includes where the trees are planted. I...

Board Member Furth: No, it's on the street.

Mr. Cusenbery: ...hope I have that right but they – that includes where the street tree so the walkway is about 5-feet clear.

Board Member Furth: What do you all think?

Chair Lew: Well, so on the arcade – you know like the famous arcades in Europe, the arcade is the sidewalk. There isn't a sidewalk beyond the arcade and they are often 20-feet wide and maybe even 20-feet high or more; like things like [phonetics] [Roota vel lee] or [Belonia] or [Burn] and there are countless examples of that. I was recently at the small scale one in Santa Fe and it was all – I think it's all lined with Native American selling jewelry and it's great. I guess the – my question here is what -- I mean say you have art and all of that but actually happens there? If it's only a passageway then I think it's too big and I think Wynne was sort of hinting that maybe it's planting there in part of it and I think that could work. I would say Ash Street is narrow right, the sidewalk is narrow and the street is narrow

as well or maybe not this particular block. I think it's some of the other blocks further down. On adding parking there, I actually have reservations about parking on the first floor of garages. There have been problems in – like Santana Row and also there's a garage in downtown San Jose near the library where they actually ended up removing parking spaces because it was causing too much backup. I think there have been a couple Board Members who were asking for maybe consideration of a second garage entrance so maybe that plays into those as well. Then I think I do want to acknowledge that we do have in recessed areas – even here in downtown we do have homeless people who will use those at night so that is a concern as well. I think it's still better to have – I don't know, my take on it would be it would be better to have it than to have parking there. That's my take so Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: I mean is there a possibility to do like two or three parallels spots and maybe decrease the depth of the arcade? I think it's really the proportions of it that disturb me more than anything else.

Board Member Gooyer: Maybe we just leave it at this, it can be redesigned and if that means a couple parking spaces and some modification like a wider sidewalk and that sort of thing.

Chair Lew: Then the other – I mean then consider if it's something more open – if it can be more open than the solid concrete wall. Again, that's going to depend on the artwork as well and that – I mean a great piece of artwork would go a long way in that space. Where there any other design issues that you wanted the Board to comment on?

Mr. Cusenbery: I believe we have what we can work with right now. I'll look to my team, anybody – ok, we're good. Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: Can I say a closing comment? While this was a beautiful package, I think we really need to be able to see the floor plans and more of the surrounding site on some of these floor plans and a little bit larger, especially when we are given the half size. I know that one of the Board Members received the full size and also some of the labeling on the floor plans was reversed on the top and bottom so just keep an eye on that.

Mr. Cusenbery: Noted.

Chair Lew: Well, this was quite an item. We are at 11:40 and I think we were...

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: Alex, can I make a motion that we continue this project...

Chair Lew: Oh, yes.

Board Member Baltay: ... to a date uncertain.

Chair Lew: Do we have a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.

Chair Lew: We are scheduled to have a lunch break 10-minutes ago and then we have – we still have three more items as I recall. We have three more items so should we take a – how long do you want to take a lunch break for? Till 12 o'clock? A half hour would be 12:10 and then we'll hear the next three items. Ok?

Board Member Gooyer: That's fine.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Overpass and Adobe Creek Reach Trail Project [17PLN-00212]:** Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Site and Design Review to Allow Construction of a MultiUse Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpass Structure Over Highway 101 Near San Antonio Road; Construction of the Adobe Creek Bridge and Adobe Creek Reach Trail; and, Reconfiguration of the Adjacent Parking Lot at 3600 West Bayshore Road. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Comment On September 1, 2017 and Ended on October 2, 2017. Zoning Districts: PF(D), PF, ROLM, and GM. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Ok, I think we've got the presentation up. This is item number four which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, Highway 101 pedestrian/bicycle overpass and Adobe Creek Reach Trail Project. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a Site and Design Review to allow construction of a multi-use pedestrian and bicycle overpass structure over Highway 101 near San Antonio Road; construction of the Adobe Creek Bridge and Adobe Creek Reach Trail; and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lot at 3600 West Bayshore Road. The environmental assessment is an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for public comment on September 1, 2017, and ended on October 2, 2017. The zone districts is PF(D), PF, ROLM, and GM. Our project planner today is Claire Hodgkins.

Board Member Furth: Chair Lew, before we start I have...

Chair Lew: Yes, disclosures?

Board Member Furth: ... a disclosure other than that I visited the site. I received a communication from and briefly discussed this matter with Asher [phonetics] [Wolfogal] who expressed the view that this was not a good design, that it seemed to be trying to be rural and actually it was connecting an urban area with open space and the urban elements should go all the way to the edge of the open space.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Any other disclosures? Ok.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good afternoon Board Members, Claire Hodgkins Project Planner. Today's project is the Highway 101 bicycles/pedestrian overpass and Adobe Creek Reach Trail. I'll be very brief in my presentation so the project crosses Highway 101 between East Oregon Expressway and San Antonio Road over crossings. It also includes the Adobe Creek Reach Trail connecting West Bay Shore Road out to East Meadow Drive. The purpose of the project is so that it provides year around pedestrian/bicycle connection between the commercial and residential uses West of Highway 101 and the walking/biking trails in the Bay Lands East of Highway 101. It completes the Adobe Creek Reach Trail and both of these projects are capital improvement projects. Briefly on the process, through previous meetings, the Council has already selected the alignment of the bridge, the type of structure and the budget for the structure. As all you all know, Staff conducted a study session with you, as well as with the PTC in May of this year. PTC recommended approval on September 13th for the project and today we're looking for a recommendation from the ARB. The current schedule is soon so the project would go to Council for a final decision in November. Key project changes, I'm just going to list these because I know Public Works Engineering is going to go through these in a little bit more detail for you. The bridge truss design, the trailhead and amenity refinements, lighting improvements, form liner wall finish and self-weathering truss finish. The recommended motion today is considering the Negative – Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan and recommend approval of the Site and Design Application to the City Council based on findings and subject to conditions of approval included in the draft Record of Land Use Action. With that, I'll turn it back to you and recommend that you hear from Public Works Engineering.

Ms. Elizabeth Ames, Project Manager: Good afternoon, hello, Elizabeth Ames Project Manager with Public Works Engineering. We have a design team here, Roy Schnabel from Biggs Cardosa Associates, we have

Claudia Guadagne from FMG Architects and we also have [Mega Bonsaul] our project engineer in the audience and Elise DeMarzo with Director of Art...

Ms. Elise DeMarzo: Public Art.

Ms. Ames: Public Art, thank you. With that, I just wanted to have Roy go into the design elements and I will wrap up with the schedule.

Mr. Roy Schnabel: I want to briefly highlight the major project elements and revisions that were made from the last time. I think it's clear from – for everybody on our challenges in balancing the community's, the Council's, the various Commission's and this Board's goals and desires to deliver expeditiously a thoughtfully designed project. We appreciate all of the feedback that we have gotten from the Commissions, especially this Board, from the last study session to help us improve the design narrative for this specific project. On the first slide, the red items are the major structural elements and the blue items are the ingress/egress gathering areas. Where's the – one of the most significant architectural elements is, of course, the principle truss which spans over both Bay Shores and US 101. For various reasons as discussed previously, we went with a long span steel structure to improve a number of characteristics. It draws from the vocabulary – design vocabulary of the existing truss that crosses Adobe Creek. Some of the previous comments were to attempt to reduce the overall height and mass of the structure and there was a lot of input on the discontinuity of the three truss – the individual truss, especially at the connections. So, we looked at reviewing that and made some considerable changes to the truss to address those issues. The major one is that we went from – instead of three individual trusses to a single truss which resolved the continuity issue. It also became a little more efficient structurally so it helped us reduce very slightly the height of the overall structure. Also, some of the members were reduced in size so we got it less massive looking. One of the disadvantages is that it creates a little bit more complicated erection process because now we have a longer truss system to have to erect, particularly over the freeway. The baseline fencing included a chain link fence and were – based on what we were recommended to do by Council, the baseline fencing is still consistent with what they recommended which was a vinyl clad chain link fence. We have looked at other alternatives and we also have painted the posts to more reflect sort of the design vocabulary that's being invoked by the main truss elements. Go to the next slide – the alternatives to the chain link as potential upgrades or add alternatives to be reviewed with Council include either woven or welded wire mesh which was one of the recommendations from this panel. We're looking at some of those as alternatives as upgrades or an added alternative. Another revision slightly is the overlook and based on input from a number of Commissions and Panels we expanded a couple of areas. One was the area for bike storage to allow for people to locate bikes and not just have them leaning against fences so this is a more active space. Then the other expanded area is basically an expanded lounge area for a placement of functional but very beautiful project art in the form of cast seating elements and there are some examples of the cast seating elements in your presentation. This is to basically provide for rest areas or reflection areas and areas to appreciate the Bay Lands. It's located farthest away from the freeway to mitigate some of the noise issues and then it's located in the area where the vistas are probably the best to view the Bay Lands and the adjacent riparian areas. There's also -- depending on project budgets and art budgets, there is potential to include artistic railing and so the artistic railing is also included in that rendering, which basically simulates the grass and the grasses that are prevalent in the Bay Lands area. The lighting, the lighting is fairly consistent with what we presented previously in terms of its overall look and characteristics and its basic elimination of light pollution and some of the reasons for that. One of the major changes was a change of the pole standard. We removed that anodized aluminum linear pole for a more traditional headed pole system and are recommending painting that pole to further be consistent with the design narrative with the vertical elements of the bridge. It also is a little bit more efficient than that other lighting system and so this sort of was one of the recommendations from the Board that we've added to the project. Landscaping so we have two areas where we're putting all the – where we're replacing a number of trees that are being affected by this project. One of them is on the west side in the Google parking lot and we are – this has a more urban, more industrial feel to it because it's basically adjacent to the existing landscaping at Google. So, it's very structured but we're planting, based on recommendations by City Staff, Park and Rec. Maintenance, the Urban Forester, where all the

landscaping is going to be native species. On the other side we couldn't fit all the replacement trees on this side so based on some additional recommendations, we've now located a number of trees on the West side which has a more organic feel. We've identified three zones, a woodland zone closer to the Adobe Creek area, a shrubland zone where we're locating shrubs which will act as refuge – upland refuge for the endangered mouse that's habitat is close to this site and then we'll have some transition zones between the shrubland and the Bay Lands areas. All of this is being worked with the City Staff and Park and Rec. Maintenance, a number of environmental stakeholders and with our project landscaper and restoration specialist. Another revision to this is we are no longer recommending hydroseeding which was the main baseline option. Based on those same conversations it was concluded that hydroseeding would not be effective over the long term and they – we are replacing hydroseeding with mulching, which was the recommended solution to that to create a better experience and long-term effect. Then I'll go briefly over the ingress/egress areas so the pedestrian access structure, this basically replaces the pedestrian funneling of pedestrians onto the street and creates a pedestrian access all the way across West Bay Shore. Then we would return the bicycle lane back to the bicyclist. It also provides secondary access for people coming south to access the pedestrian structure – pedestrian bike structure. The next area is a little further south of that, is the area that connects to the Adobe Creek Trail. We have implemented the Adobe Creek Trail and one of the things that occurred between the process of the time we met and now, is that the actual paving of the trail is now included in the project. We are now paving the trail and the funds for that have been allocated to support that. We've also had several meetings with regards to the Water District and a number of the amenities that were originally planned for this area have been eliminated for concern of issues with the Water District. Maintenance vehicles running into them and their fear for that so they've asked for those – a number of those amenities be removed. At the other end of the trail is the connection to Meadow Drive and we're implementing a raised sidewalk and chicanes, which is basically to stay a recommendation from transportation to create continuity with their Bike Safety Programs which is installing a number of these throughout the neighborhood. So, we're trying to stay consistent with that so we're following their design cues for both the raised sidewalk and the chicanes in this area. Then at the other end on the East Bay Shore side we have a roundabout which will help traffic calm, slow speeds and create an area for people and bicyclist to recognize that there is a potential confluence of different users at that point. We're imploring both textures and colors to signify that area so we're looking for the roundabout to be – to have colorized concrete. Then with regards to signage, a lot of the signage is concentrated in and around the areas of those points of connection and where decision making needs to happen. We're also taking our cues from the City's Transportation Staff. The one decision that made it through all the Commissions is that with regards to the signage, the one at the far left is the standard signage for the bike project. We've cut down a number of the -- we've cut down – we've taken out the durations from that sign to make it a little bit easier to understand and to apply to both bicyclists and pedestrian. So, the distance applies but the durations don't so we thought it would get to cluttered with information. Then one of the things that came out of that is some project specific signage for the multi-use path. That would signify that and that's an example of it. That's not the final and it's still has to go through graphics. The informational signage is being worked on Pay Back and Transportation and their developing some multi-use path signage and these are the samples they have given us. So, those will be sporadically located along the path to – as etiquette signage. Then the last is the amenities, the one major amenity change is the bike rack. The bike rack that we had was requested to be revised by City Staff to this which is being used in the City and other locations. They felt it was a little bit more effective and functional. Schedule, I'll turn that over to Elizabeth.

Ms. Ames: Thank you, Roy. What we're trying to do is expedite this after this milestone. Hopefully, this goes well today with your input and we are hoping to start our right of way phase soon after this when we get our environmental clearance with NEPA; Caltrans is helping us with that. Once we do this, hopefully, we can expedite the design and the right of way phase. Right now, we're saying we're going to start construction in 2019 but we're trying to go sooner than that pending the permits with Caltrans and the process we have to go through, which we're heavily relying on Biggs Cardosa Associates to help us with that. Hopefully, we can build it sooner than starting in 2019 but that's what we're going with right now. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Elizabeth. I don't have any speaker cards for this. Are there any Board Member questions?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I got a couple. On the core ten for the main structure, is that going to be or is going to be allowed to rust before it's installed or afterward? The only problem with afterward is that while it's going through the rusting process is if it rains, it leaks and every car driving underneath it is going to end up with rust stains all over it and you're going to have a lot of irritated people. I mean I've had experience with that for 30-years where we put the roofs on there like that and you make the dumb mistake of having a nice white wall next to it and after a while the nice white wall is stained. So, it has to either be done beforehand or something.

Mr. Schnabel: Ok, well we can specify that and there are ways to accelerate that so we could...

Board Member Gooyer: No, I am aware of that. I just wanted to make sure that you don't inadvertently do that and then like I said, have a lot of irritated people. The second question is on sheet 4.3-C on the – you show the main truss and then you have that interior chain link assembly. Then on 5.2, the chain link appears to be part of the main truss.

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah so originally, we were thinking of framing the chain link with individual elements and later enhancement to that to mitigate the number of...

Board Member Gooyer: So, the 5.2 is what you're going to go with?

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, that's we're recommending going with.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, any other questions? Wynne, no? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I forgot to look at what the Bay Lands plan has to say about signage so how is the signage consistent with it? I know it has a lot to say about it.

Ms. Hodgkins: So, I'm going to pull it up as we talk but I think just in terms of muted colors and – do you have – it sounds like she has additional information so I'll let...

Ms. Ames: Yes, I think what we're going to try to do is – well, there's an interpreted signage feature that we have not developed yet and that would be consistent with the guidelines. Most of the signage that we're proposing here is really consistent with the City's signage plan and it's not tying in with the Bay Lands Design Guidelines for the street – the street signage. So, we've got a lot of stenciling on the pavement but there's really not a lot of signage in the Bay Lands component other than the interpretive signage and Roy can elaborate on that.

Mr. Schnabel: We have three different – I mean four different classifications of signage. One is the traffic signage and that's going to follow the City's Transportation MUTCD requirements for those signs. So, those are going to be – follow those design standards as required by the Transportation Staff. We have information – etiquette signage and the etiquette signage is also going to follow some of those same guidelines with regards to the MUTCD requirements. With regards to informational signage, those we will – we have several areas and those haven't been coordinated yet. Those will include trail maps and information and things like that and we haven't defined what standard to follow with regards to that because we have basically two distinct areas. One is the Bay Lands area and the other one is at the Adobe Creek Trail. With regards to the educational signs which are the ones that are at the overlook, those will be – what we're sort of hoping that will be since that's not part of this contract, is very similar to what is being done over at the boardwalk to keep some continuity and connection to that area.

Board Member Furth: So, you're mindful of those standards not always – sometimes those are being subordinated to Citywide traffic conventions. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Board Member comments. Wynne, will you start us off?

Board Member Furth: I have no further comments.

Chair Lew: Ok, Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for the presentation and bringing this project back. I guess Staff is seeking some input on our preferences or recommendations for the fencing and...

Male: Guardrails, right?

Vice Chair Kim: The guardrail fencing, right? I'm looking at some of the samples that you've brought here. I think my personal preference is leaning towards that 1-inch woven wire mesh but I don't know that I feel so strongly about that, that I wouldn't recommend the project otherwise but that would be my preference. I think it provides the more constituency and it tends to blend better with the rest of the bridge and there's no need to worry about the vinyl coming off the other option or possibly somebody cutting a piece off of that and how do you replace it with the same vinyl coating so on and so forth. Even at the last presentation, I think I had a small issue with the roundabout over on the east side and I think I finally figure out what it was. I think – it's a very small thing to me but the roundabout seems to push the paths a little bit outwards. In other words, the circle is off-set so that it makes each path off-set except for that one on the left. So, you see how the path becomes tangent to the circle but it's not actually pushed out by the circle and I think that's what it is that's been bothering me about it. I don't know if that's such a huge issue but I would think that if it's for traffic calming, that maybe it would benefit from the circle shifting a little bit to the left such that each of the three sides of the path are bumped out a little bit. Other than that, I'm fine with the overall look. The – with the seating, maybe – depending on what kind of finish in on that seating, I would imagine early morning or in the winter that it may be a little bit too cold because it's aluminum. Then maybe in the hot summer sun that it could get too hot but those are relatively minor things and I think the seating itself is quite lovely. The final – I've very pleased with the way that it's been heading. I appreciate the fact that you've brought the whole trusses together and I understand that it will be a little bit more difficult during construction but I think it does seem to tie together a little bit better than it had previously. My – in closing my final question would be just some clarification on the lighting. As one where to cross over from the Bay to the Westside and connecting over to East Meadow, what kind of lighting is provided along Adobe Creek, if any?

Mr. Schnabel: Are you talking about within the Adobe Creek Trail itself?

Vice Chair Kim: Yes.

Mr. Schnabel: We're not allowed to light that.

Vice Chair Kim: So, there's no lighting at all?

Mr. Schnabel: No lighting.

Vice Chair Kim: Alright.

Mr. Schnabel: By the condition of the Water Districts requirements. What we want to do is in the areas where the trail heads begin we want to make sure there's adequate lighting, including the roundabout, to identify areas of confluence and areas where the points of connection are occurring. We're hoping to light those a little bit more robustly than in the standard areas just to signify them both from a visual standpoint in the lighting.

Chair Lew: Can I ask a follow-up question to that? Would the Adobe Creek Reach Trail be closed at night or have any hours restricted? I'm thinking like Stevens Creek Trail in Mountain View technically closes from dusk to dawn.

Mr. Schnabel: That will be dependent on you. There's not going to be a restriction with the Water District closing it so it will be open 24-hours a day every day until they maintain it. The only restriction they'll have is closer during maintenance hours.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: A couple things, I was also looking at that trail roundabout and the thing is for a car – I mean the whole idea is to slow people down but the reality of it is if you're cruising on a bicycle, you don't really have to slow down. That roundabout really isn't doing anything to make you slow down, go around the turn and then keep going. You can cut that thing straight through and not – so it's basically defeating the purpose of what it's there for, other than just putting more concrete down. Secondly, with the core ten in place, the only thing is that I don't know how attractive a chocolate brown barrier across the freeway is going to look. I understand core ten is great because you never have to touch it after you're done but I just don't like the final color. They have a bridge similar to this at Hospital Curb up in the City which is bright blue and I kind of like that. I mean it's just a bright color and I know the maintenance issue is probably a little bit more but if you do a powder coating or something like that, it – I'd rather see something like that than this sort of chocolate brown. I don't really think that's – again, I want you to make sure that whatever the finish that you put on this is done before you put it on their rather than – other than that like I said it's a shame based on the designs we saw what last year? That could have been built here than what we ended up getting but that's my own personal opinion.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Robert. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, I find it to be a well put together project. I commend you on a detailed presentation and I can make the findings to recommend approval.

Chair Lew: I also can recommend approval of the project. You had asked for comments on the railings and I actually think I – I think I actually prefer the coated chain link from what I've seen other bicycle bridges. Then I think the second choice would be the welded – I'm sorry, the woven wire and I'm generally not crazy about the welded wire which is over there. To me, I wouldn't want to spend more money for that versus the coated chain link. On the roundabout, I actually think it's better to have the roundabout because if you at some of the other bridges – bicycle bridges in Mountain View, the bicyclists can pick up a lot of speed – you can actually go very fast downhill. There's on bicycle bridge that crosses Moffet Boulevard and then there's the t-intersection at the bottom where all the – t-intersection at the bottom of the ramp and I think it's kind of issue. I think you do want the bicyclist to slow down a little bit but I think I agree with Kyu. I think there's – it seems a little circuitous at the moment the way you have it. I realize you have space constraints, right? I mean I think that's the problem there and I think I can – I can make all of the findings on here. Does anybody want to try to make a motion? Don't jump all at once. Wynne, will you give it a stab?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: I move approval – well, I move that we recommend approval of the Mitigated Negative Environmental Declaration and the proposed project subject to the findings and conditions contained in the Staff report.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Lew: Can I have a...

Board Member Furth: Is there any other things you want to add?

Chair Lew: It's just a typo so under finding five...

Board Member Furth: Yep.

Chair Lew: ...it says the landscape is being designed...

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry, could you give me a page number? I'm having trouble.

Chair Lew: It's just a little typo, it's 198.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Chair Lew: I think it should just say designed instead of design.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Chair Lew: I don't know if there are any others that you noticed?

Board Member Furth: Which line are you on? It's the landscape design, right? Oh, I see it, right. Has been designed.

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Chair Lew: Just a little nitpicky thing.

Board Member Baltay: I second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None. Thank you very much...

MOTION PASSES 6-0

Ms. Ames: Thank you very much. That was a big milestone for us so thank you so much.

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you.

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2775 Embarcadero Road [17PLN-00217]:**
Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Replacement of the Existing Baylands Boardwalk at the Lucy Evans Nature Interpretive Center. The Project Also Includes a Separate Request for a Park Improvement Ordinance. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Review from September 15, 2017 and Will end on October 16, 2017. Zoning District: Public Facilities, Site and Design Combining District (PF [D]). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Are you guys ready? The next item number five, a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, 2775 Embarcadero Road. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow replacement of the existing Baylands Boardwalk at the Lucy Evans Nature Interpretive Center. The project also includes a separate request for a Park Improvement Ordinance. The environmental assessment is a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for public review from September 15, 2017, and will end on October 16, 2017. The zone district is public facilities, site, and design combining district which is PF [D] and Claire, welcome again.

Ms. Hodgkins: Good afternoon, Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner. The proposed project is the Baylands Boardwalk replacement project. Again, I'll be very brief, the proposed Boardwalk would replace the existing boardwalk in the exact same location. The existing boardwalk which connects the Lucy Evans Nature Interpretive Center is currently closed due to safety concerns. A brief description of the project because I know Public Works Engineering will go into a little bit more detail on this but the new boardwalk would be 5-feet as opposed the current boardwalk which is 4-feet and that's to make it ADA compliant. It would be raised to about 5-foot 10-inches above the existing marsh and the new boardwalk would be supported by fewer piles than the existing boardwalk so there will be larger spans between those piles to reduce the impact on the wetlands. The boardwalk would be constructed using the existing deck for staging and from marsh mats. No heavy equipment would be used for construction. The process is a Major Architectural Review for this project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated on September 15th and circulation ended on October 16th and no comments related to the environmental document were received during that period. Following the ARB's recommendation, the Director would issue a decision on the project and adopt the CEQA. Public Works Engineering will go into a little bit more detail regarding other project milestones and permits that are required. Just some key considerations, environmental considerations are outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program. There's a number of mitigation measures related to potential impacts on the environment. Considering the boardwalk height and the perch deterrent rollers as outlined in the Staff report. These were some comments received by the Planning and – or Parks and Recreation Commission during their recommendation of approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance. Staff recommends that the ARB take the following actions, consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan and recommend approval of the Architectural Review Application based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval included in the Staff report. With that, I'll turn it back to you and recommend that you hear from Public Works Engineering.

Ms. Ames: Oh, thank you. Elizabeth Ames, Project Manager with Public Works Engineering. Thank you for so much for listening or hearing this item today. I also have our consultant Tony Notaro, he is with Biggs Cardosa Associates and our Project Engineer [Mega Bonsaul] within Public Works Engineering. With that, I guess I'll turn it over – I'll go over the schedule at the end but I'll turn it over to Tony.

Mr. Tony Notaro: I'll just give a very brief kind of overview of the project from our end. Project elements were briefly outlined by Claire. We're basically demolishing the existing boardwalk and the alignment of the new boardwalk will follow the exact same alignment of the old boardwalk. The height – excuse me, the width will be widened by an extra foot from 4-feet originally to 5-feet to provide a better experience for the patrons and allow better ADA access. One of the other constraints of the project has to do with the height of the replacement boardwalk due to requirements from the regulatory agencies. They are insisting that the boardwalk be raised to provide and maintain access throughout the life – the anticipated life of the structure, which puts us up to a level equal to the deck elevation of the existing nature center. It's also the same elevation as the existing observation platform at the bay end of the structure. Enhancements that we've looked at doing, the existing structure has two overlooks. The proposed structure is going to have four intermediate overlooks to allow more opportunities for interpretive features and interaction with the Baylands themselves. The railing is taking its cues from the existing interpretive center so it will be a timber railing and picketed, similar nature as what they have out there. Timber decking, similar style structure with piles and supports and there will be benches at each of the overlooks and all of the wood elements will be finished and I'll go into more detail on each of those. Actually, I guess I already went into -- a lot of detail here on the alignment and height. Again, these primarily were mandated by the height requirements for the Regulatory Agency. Jumping to overlooks and observation, the platforms – again, we will have an observation platform out at the end of the structure and similar size to what's existing. Then the four intermediate overlooks have been strategically located in coordination with the City and the Staff at the Interpretive Center to maximize interaction with the environment out there. They're at key locations where you can observe the existing channels that cross underneath the boardwalk, locations where the existing Ridgeway Rails are known to have a take, there are areas where there's flotsam and things build up. They want to have an area there to use so again, strategically located. The Interpretive Center Staff will be heavily involved in developing the elements that go in those locations and each overlook will have a bench as well. Again, the railings,

taking out cues from the nature center they are 3 ½-feet high to provide safety. To improve the experience of shorter patrons, most specifically a lot of the children that visit the nature center to – as part of their programs, there has been a request to incorporate observation windows. The Interpretive Center has glass panels that are used for that purpose so one of the options is to do the same thing out on the boardwalk. However, since the boardwalk is very long, linear and away from the Interpretive Center, there's more – and into the habitat of the rails, there's a concern that we reduce the size of the window to deter impacts from birds thinking that it's a clear opening. So, we have reduced those window openings in size and the other alternative is to in lieu of glass because there has been some concern whether that will be a maintenance issue or not. We could also use a welded wire fabric, typically a 4x4 grid, six gauges is what we're looking at this point. Another major concern, again with the Ridgeway Rail is its endangered status and as part of the environmental coordination, there's been a significant concern with the higher boardwalk that we would increase predation with raptures perching on the boardwalk rails. So, similar to what was done at El Viso, we're going to use a rapture deterrent roller system so basically if the bird tries to land on the railing, it will roll off and not be able to perch. I believe a material sample was provided to the Board for that and in general, the material for the railing is going to be made of redwood, which is what was done at the Interpretive Center. One change, we're not going to match exactly the Interpretive Center because we have so much more linear footage of railing so we have designed it to be in a panelized system which is going to help us with our erection schedule. Yep, there's the panel. Then the next page shows a couple of the railing examples for you. The boardwalk decking, the existing structure has a longitudinal – it's alright. So, the existing boardwalk has a longitudinal orientation of the planks. They are big 3 by 12s but they tend to – overtime as the gaps open up, they impose issues for users in wheelchairs or bicyclists or getting caught up in those gaps. So, the project has proposed to use a transverse deck planking which is very, very common on boardwalks and very common on a lot of the prefab. bridges around the City. That will – it's just the benefit of using smaller elements so those – each board will be cheaper overall per square foot and from a maintenance standpoint, a lot easier to replace should an individual board have an issue. Looking at the boardwalk typically section, as it was stated we're going to – based on the materials, we're proposing we are going to use a 12-foot spacing – typically spacing of the (inaudible) rather than the existing 10-feet. This allows us to reduce the amount of footprint area of physical impact to the Baylands itself as far as square footage of wood going in so that has had favorable results with the Regulatory Agencies. The Regional Water Quality Control Board did not want to see the use of pressure treated materials in the Baylands and in coordination with them, we have settled upon the use of Alaskan yellow cedar. It's a naturally durable wood and it comes from the Pacific Northwest Canada and Alaska. It's very good in marine environments where you get the wetting and drying cycles. So, basically the primary structural elements are all going to be Alaskan yellow cedar and then the decking and the railing will be of redwood. Again, benches will be incorporated and the plan is to include backs and armrests on each of the benches to facilitate folks getting up and down and be able to use them. What we show here is just some preliminary examples of benches that have been proposed by different folks at the City. We'll basically take the lead from the City on what benches get put in out there. Lastly on the wood finish, the Baylands Guidelines basically state that we use a wood stain, Olympic 911 Natural Grey for our wood elements and any metal elements we have out there would be painted with a Benjamin Moore Sandy Hook Grey. I believe this is the same that was used on the nature center and our metal components that we're proposing to use at this point, given that we're going to be painting them, we're proposing to have them galvanized. I think in the earlier document it may have said stainless steel but since they won't be exposed on the finished product and we can galvanize and paint, we will go with the galvanized fasteners. Lastly, as a follow-on project, the City will develop their interpretive signage and their interpretive features and these are just a few of the samples that have been worked up by the Interpretive Center Staff of things that they are leaning towards. With that I'll turn over schedule to Elizabeth.

Ms. Ames: Thank you, Tony. Yes, so again we're trying to expedite this project as well. We're getting a lot of comments from the community, you know to get the project done as soon as possible. With that, we submitted for the permit – for a permit with this proposed design and that might take several months. Tony can elaborate on this but hopefully, we can get the permit and finalize the design documents, the bid documents and we'd like to start next summer to order the materials if possible. That is a very aggressive schedule and it all is pending the permits. So, this is another milestone for us to be here today

to get your input so that we can proceed with the Agency, get their comments, get the permits and then go out to bid as soon as we can. We want to start ideally in the ground – you know construction on September 1st. That would be as soon as possible so possible next year. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Elizabeth. I don't have any speaker cards for this item. Are there any questions from the Board? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I just had one now that I understand the Ridgeways Rail was known as a Clapper Rail till 2014. The Alaskan – is it cedar? How do we make sure that is sustainably harvested or whatever?

Mr. Notaro: There are programs that we can implement in the project specifications if desired by the City that would ensure that the harvesting comes from sustainable sources. Alaskan yellow cedar, there is a large – what's the term? There's a lot of material available that they are starting to harvest. It is – studies have shown that areas that have – parts of the forest that have already died are still harvestable for up to 80-years and useable. So, the impacts of doing the sustainability and having it certified is you reduce the number of mills that can process it. You get down based upon the number that I had, you reduce yourself down to ten or twenty percent of the mills. So, you'll have of course (inaudible) price increase and it will take a little bit longer to get the materials from order out to the site so that will have to be accounted for in our – when the project is put out to bid to ensure that we have enough time to get the materials.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) point out that dead trees are still harvestable for another 8-years, is that to say this is non...

Mr. Notaro: Eighty.

Board Member Furth: ... non – 8-years, right?

Mr. Notaro: Eight-zero.

Board Member Furth: Oh, eighty.

Mr. Notaro: Yes.

Board Member Furth: That's a very long time. So, are you saying that group of trees and that batch of lumber is seen as sustainable, is in addition to sustainable or is just an interesting fact?

Mr. Notaro: Alaskan yellow cedar overall is sustainable though it is not listed any of the – I'm blanking on the various acronyms, of the agencies that basically decide on the sustainability or if they are endangered of use. The Alaskan yellow cedar is going to be sustainable for a long period of time-based upon the information that I have seen.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. We have to make a finding about environmental whatever for the project.

Chair Lew: Go ahead Elizabeth.

Ms. Ames: Thank you, I just wanted to say that we can also purchase this with FSC Certification, the Forest Stewardship Council I believe and if there is premium, there's like a fifteen percent – Tony had researched this and it's a little more expensive at fifteen percent but that will ensure that it's not going to be – you know the living trees would not be cut down so to speak.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, a question for Staff regarding the stained finish on these boards. The presentation said that that's the requirement of the Baylands Design Guidelines. Am I to understand that the Baylands Design Guidelines requires that wood to be stained or when would it be stained and what color is that?

Ms. Hodgkins: I believe it's when wood is stained it's that color.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for Staff. In the findings – in the draft findings on page 257 of the packet, under finding number three it says the project is designed to meet the – in Secretary of Interior Standards for historic rehabilitation, despite the fact that neither the boardwalk nor Lucy Evans Baylands Center has been identified as historic. So, I – where did that come from? Are we just trying to make it compatible with the Baylands – the existing Baylands Nature Center?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah so...

Chair Lew: It's a little – yeah. It seems a little crazy to me.

Ms. Hodgkins: Just for background on what – where that came from. As part of the CEQA – because the existing Baylands Nature Center is an older building, to avoid having to go through the process of figuring out whether it is historic and then analyzing it as such. We've done this analysis to make a determination that regardless of whether the building is historic or the boardwalk would be historic, it's being replaced in kind essentially and therefore there would be no impact on a historical resource. Even if it were to be considered historic.

Chair Lew: Ok, yeah, I see what you're saying. Then on the railings and also, I guess the decking, is there – they are made – the new railings are proposed to look similar to the existing ones but they are not exactly the same like the picket sizes and then the decking is different. I was wondering your thoughts on that. I mean it seems like the decking on the Nature Center is very expensive like it's really nice. It's turned 90 degrees and the pickets aren't square, they are rectangular on the building. So, I was just trying to figure out what the thinking was on – in the choices that you've made for the new boardwalk?

Mr. Notaro: As far as the decking goes, again we have a very long, linear element so we were taking our cues from the existing which had a flat orientation and like I had said, we're going to reorient it transversely to improve maintenance and reduce cost. Likewise, on the railing, since we have so much linear footage of it, we wanted to basically help control cost, and keep the element size to a minimum hence our reducing the picket sizes. We also wanted to make it a panelized system to help speed construction and we wanted to keep the sizes of everything down to help the transportability of that out onto the site because we're doing everything from – trying to work from the existing boardwalk so that we stay out of the Baylands itself during the construction. So, everything we bring out needs to be transportable by hand. So, those are kind of the two (crosstalk) (inaudible)...

Chair Lew: Gives you (inaudible) some of the sizes that you can put in, ok.

Mr. Notaro: Yes, we felt that we were still capturing the essence and the general look but were able to reduce cost by slimming down some of those sizes.

Chair Lew: Ok and one last question, is the decking proposed to be stained as well? I understand you've got the stain on the railings but what about – the decking is a higher maintenance item – I mean a higher wear item but you still want to stain the deck?

Mr. Notaro: Correct, that's the baseline that we propose, though the existing Nature Center deck is no so I few wanted to keep the look of a natural wood and if that still meets the guidelines because it sounds like if rather than always requirement then that's something we can do.

Chair Lew: Ok, I think we can just – I would just maybe if the deck is stained, that maybe it's darker – possibly a darker color. Generally, in my experience that if you stain a deck like this on a house, it starts wearing in 6-months to a year and this is a public facility so it's going to show a lot of wear. The existing Baylands deck is not stained, it's new, right? It's pretty new and it looks good. Anyway, any other questions?

Vice Chair Kim: I have...

Chair Lew: Kyu, yes.

Vice Chair Kim: ...a question. Currently, there's a JG & E catwalk that seems to be at about the same level as the existing boardwalk. Is there going to be any issue once we propose to raise the boardwalk with access to the catwalk for JG & E?

Mr. Notaro: We've started discussions with JG & E on how we're going to do that interface. The current proposal – since they don't have a public access issue, we're looking at putting stairs down onto the catwalk so we don't have to slope it down. That's the current proposal on the table but the project will absolutely maintain access to their facility. It will be similar connect with gates and again, that's the proposal we got.

Vice Chair Kim: The current connection is a small gate on each side?

Mr. Notaro: Yeah, the current connection is they are at the same level and there's a little small gate there.

Board Member Gooyer: I had I just sort of a question or comment. Seeing as though part of this thing is just to bring it up to ADA Standards and that sort of thing. What surprises me a little bit with these rapture rollers that you have on top, it surprises me that you don't have a handrail on the thing. It's a fairly long distance and you can't very well grab that roller if you need to hand onto something, which you can do on the existing one. You can just grab the top of the railing itself so I think we need something that either – it doesn't need to be on both sides but one side or whatever just a wooden handrail or something like that.

Mr. Notaro: Ok then, maybe mount it on the inside of the...

Board Member Gooyer: I don't care or just around one at every 4-feet or 8-feet looking onto the 4 by 4 or whatever you got there. I'm just saying if it's a little higher, it's not – obviously because there's no slope theoretically it's not required but the way it is now, someone can hang onto the top of the handrail. I wouldn't grab that thing. First of all, you're going to slip on that thing and somebody is going to be able to rear-end on that so I think that needs to be considered.

Ms. Hodgkins: The intent in our design was to have the rail – the roller up about an inch and a half as you can on this example so that you can still place your hand.

Board Member Gooyer: Sure, but if somebodies grabbing for that, they don't – they're not going to slide their hand underneath that – they are going to grab for it if they are slipping and falling.

Ms. Ames: Thank you for that comment. That did come up at the Park and Recreation Commission and we did have this mockup so you can see that it's possible to put your hand in there but if you felt that that's – it's not a code requirement but – yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: No, no, no but it's also the idea that yes, theoretically you could slide your hand in there but if you're grabbing for that thing because you're falling, you're not going to sit there and

channel your hand into that slot. You know I'm just saying that in the overall scheme of things, one person falls and you've got that handrail paid for.

Chair Lew: Board Member comments? Robert, do you want to start?

Board Member Gooyer: Actually, that was the only concern I had basically so I think the rest of it looks fine.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I think it looks good. I'm glad we're building something to adjust to sea level rise as well as this is a lovely community amenity and I've enjoyed it on many occasions. I would like to suggest if Staff can think of the right wording that adds we in finding number six at the penultimate line that we would use sustainably harvested – sustainable sourced or whatever you want to say Alaskan yellow cedar. Since building materials are among the elements that we're supposed to find, we're doing them in an environmentally ok fashion.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes, and it sounds like...

Board Member Furth: Sustainability.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, sorry, did you want to say something Elizabeth?

Ms. Ames: I just wanted to also point out that at the Park and Rec. Commission meeting that they – we did not get a unanimous vote which I think Claire outlined in her Staff report. I believe one issue was the handrail and the other issue was the height of the boardwalk. They wanted more interpretive, they wanted people to go down below to get closer to the habitat there but we had strong conversations with the Agencies and they insisted that we have – we maintain the site.

Board Member Gooyer: But I mean the 42-inches is a code issue.

Ms. Ames: Well, I meant the 13.5 deck elevation, sorry the deck elevation I'm talking about. The height of – the overall height of the boardwalk. So, we had met with or had conversations with the agencies and they had insisted it be at 13.5 to meet the sea level rise conditions. I just wanted to point that out, I know that Claire had put this in her Staff report but that was another concern the PRC had.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Elizabeth. Ok, Wynne are you done or had you just started? Ok, Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: So, for me, I agree that I really think the boardwalk should be lower and I understand there's conflict either way. You know some people want it lower, some people saying – the Agencies are saying it should be maintained at this higher level. Maybe a question is, has the boardwalk ever flooded in the past? It has?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes, it has.

Vice Chair Kim: Oh ok, alright then. From what I understand, the roller is also because it's an elevated level so I hoping that if it hadn't flooded, we really should build it closer to the Baylands level and maybe that would eliminate the need for the roller but with the history of the flooding, I guess it does make sense to keep it higher. In any case, I'm not a real big fan of the roller and I agree with Board Member Gooyer that the roller should be at least like 4 or 5-inches above the top rail if we're going to expect people to actually be able to stick their hand in there. Then I like the fact that there are more overlooks and I noticed that in the overlook plans that the pathway actually reduces by a foot and it goes down to 4-feet to go around those benches. I'm just wondering if – why we couldn't push those overlooks out another foot and just maintain that full 5-feet clear? I don't think it's going to make a huge issue because I don't foresee so much traffic that you're going to have two wheelchairs or two strollers passing by one

another but it just seems it could be a slightly clearer path of travel if we could maintain that 5-foot or maybe the bench doesn't have to be the full 24-inch deep. Other than that, I'm very much in favor of rebuilding this boardwalk and making it accessible and hope it happens quickly, thank you. Oh, I'm sorry, one other comment, I'm also against the glass windows. I really feel strongly that we should just eliminate those windows, even for those that are perhaps vertically challenged. The posts are vertical so I don't think it's going to really obstruct your view all that much and I just think it doesn't look very nice. Even the wire mesh panel I wouldn't be very much for, I'd just keep the posts running continually down the boardwalk.

Chair Lew: Ok, Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Thank you for the nice presentation. Overall, I think it looks great, it's wonderful to see it come together. I'll pick up where Kyu left off with that the glass panels don't really make sense. Just let kids look through the slates, save yourself some maintenance headache and a potential lawsuit when one of them breaks or falls on somebody and let it go. What I would like to do it throughout a number of details. If this came to my desk at my office, I'd be looking back at the people and saying you're a little bit too naïve and enthusiastic about what you're building here; for example, glass panels on a boardwalk. If you look at what the old one did, it doesn't take long and glass doesn't stay on that; little rubber gaskets so it doesn't work. It's real glass here with the rubber EPDM gasket and screw and then I look at some of the detailing of your construction. You have those pickets going into the bottom of the handrail and you have a wood screw coming into the end grain of a 2 by 2 picket. Any of us who've built decks and many architects I can say have done that, knows that when you put a wood screw into the end grain of a piece of wood that's out in a severe environment and this is second to being on a boat. This is as severe as it gets for a piece of wood and that piece of wood will dry, swell, shrink and split and in 6-months that screw is going to pop out and you're going to have enormous maintenance headache. When I look carefully at your detail you have a 1/8-inch groove at the underside of the gap and thinking this fits into that so that's what I mean by naïve. You don't put a 1/8 groove with a wood screw in the end on it on a boardwalk out in the marsh. You do that when you're building something around City Hall when you really want fine, tight craftsmanship. I look at this and I see that a number of small-scale specifications things so maybe you're still going to work through it but I caution you again when you say galvanized, you mean double hot dipped galvanized? This is really a severe environment and so many times you don't say that it comes back as a change order or the things rust out. When you specify the kinds of wood you're talking about, all redwood is not the same, especially these days. I never specify redwood for any of our projects anymore because you just can't get quality wood. It's all been farmed and harvested, especially when we want sustainably grown woods. The growth rings are so far apart and the wood warps and splits so quickly and then you guys don't really specify the grade, the type, all hard, you're just really asking for trouble. When you specify that the contractor can change to a PSL lumber, you need to have that pressure treated otherwise it will rot. PSL is just a Douglas fir that's glued together so another small detail but I see a lot of that in this package of drawings and I'm just cautioning you, folks, to don't be romantic about it. It's just a boardwalk so just build it to be as strong and durable as possible. To that, I'll address back to the issue of using Alaskan yellow cedar and redwood, those are expensive woods. Pressure treated lumber has been around for a long time, it's been developed for exactly this purpose and it rears nothing more durable than a piece of Douglas fir that's been soaked in these chemicals. I'm not going to go there that you have to do that or not but I'm putting out that to me, it looks the same, it's a lot more durable, it's a lot cheaper and it's stronger. Those are pretty strong arguments when I'm building a boardwalk in a marsh. I mean people make foundations with that stuff, it really good. The chemicals are inert once their solvent – the treatment process is finished so I'm certainly open to putting that in there as an option if your budget gets tight and you need to make a change. The Alaskan yellow cedar is going to be an expensive wood. It's not easy to come by and it's not common and you won't find that in any lumber yard up and down the peninsula, whereas everybody could fill the order of this boardwalk by tomorrow morning. It's all in stock, it's that easy and there's a variety of kinds of pressure treated lumber that are made for human skin contact. You could just do the deck boards out of something different and there are other choices than redwood as well. I'll also speak to the idea of putting a stain on this deck, it just seems crazy to me. I can't think of any place where you'd put a wood finish like that stain on a deck outside that lasts more than, like Alex said, 6-months to a year. That's real

and it really does weather out that fast. You're committing the City to a long-term maintenance project of thousands – tens of thousands of dollars each time this thing needs to be stained and that's once a year for a boardwalk in the marsh. Nobody stains boardwalks, just let it be. Pick a wood that will run for 30-years or something and go with it. Put your efforts onto specifying materials that are naturally going to be as durable as possible. Keeping your detailing as simple as possible, no glass panels, no clever (inaudible) for picket joints to come together. If you do those things instead of spending money on the other details I think you'll find it just a better long-term project. Just keep it simple, really keep it simple, it's just a boardwalk and make it as strong and robust as you can. For example, use stainless steel fasteners instead of galvanized. It's a little bit more money up front but they won't rust out. If you end up changing to pressure treated lumber, which I'll bet even odds that you're going to have to when you get the bids back on the Alaskan yellow cedar. You can't use galvanized metal against a piece of pressure treated lumber, you need stainless steel. Save yourself the trouble of an expensive change order. Stainless steel is what every boat owner uses so why would they do that if they didn't have a reason for it? The last comment is about the bird roller hand railings, I can't think of anything more dangerous than I'm walking with my grandmother and she stumbles and reaches out to grab the railing. She's going to grab that round thing that looks like a handrail, until it twists and her wrist goes and down she is. One lawsuit is more than the cost of all those railings so I understand that you've got all kinds of competing pressures about birds and things like that but keep it simple. Those railings, those bearings aren't going to last a year in the weather out there. This is on the end of a salt marsh next to the Bay next to – look at a boat. Bearings like that exposed to the elements, how long is it going to last? Ok, I can recommend approval, I'm just giving you my venting on it so you can hopefully take it what it's worth. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I have to make a comment. I think those are excellent points, absolutely, especially with the redwood. If you just specify redwood, as you said, you can get eight different varieties and you're going to get various people – they are all going to more than likely give you the cheapest one so they'll get the best number but that doesn't mean you're going to have a product that's really worth well.

Chair Lew: Great, so I think my comments are very much aligned with Peter. I would say just looking through your detailed drawings, I was actually going through those same questions in my mind. On other projects that I have done in Seattle, we went through every different decking possibility and we changed our minds a couple times during – you know mid-stream in the project and at the end of the day, it seemed like the best and cheapest solution was pressure treated deck. Now, since that time there are a lot of different pressure treated chemicals and what not and maybe you can't use it in the Bay. I don't – it seemed like there were issues but there are different chemicals out there and they are not necessarily the same copper chromium arsenic that we use to use. Sometimes I've used the Trex which is kind of like a composite and it's a downcycle material so it's not that great but it wears over time but has other issues like it – plastic sags and it expands lengthwise so it has other – there are – it's not a perfect material by any means, it has issues. I guess my take on it would be to allow your spec. when it goes – if you're out to bid, to have flexibility in it to see what options you have. I guess I would presume to assume the worst case which is that it doesn't get maintained well, which is what I would argue is the case out there. I mean the Nature Center is closed for a while, the boardwalk was closed for a few years and let's just assume the worst case and try – and again, do what Peter said, pick out the best material given the cost. I got this crazy echo here. For the Board, I think you guys are – it sounds like you're recommending approval. If your concerns about the materials, do you want it to come back or do you want Staff to review it or subcommittee?

Board Member Gooyer: When you say materials, what do you mean? As far as the...

Chair Lew: Stainless steel, pressure treated wood, the glass.

Board Member Gooyer: I think the reality of it is the – you're in – you have a set budget. I don't think you can afford what the – if you do the proper redwood, you're never going to be able to afford it and you're going to have to go to pressure treated. I don't think it's even a matter of having them come back

and it's not a design thing. I also think if you use Trex, I think the average purest is going to kill you for even suggesting that having – I mean come on, you're out there in nature and then...

Chair Lew: It actually looks – you know it fades so when you see it new, it looks awful. It fades really fast and then what I've seen...

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah and it looks like old...

Chair Lew: Yeah but I'm saying a weathered stained redwood that's in bad shape, that does not look better than Trex.

Board Member Gooyer: I have to agree.

Chair Lew: I would say stained wood deck when it looks new, nothing looks better.

Board Member Gooyer: I have to agree though, it's just I though think you should stain it because I think that's just asking for a whole lot of problems. I think it needs to be pressure treated and I think that's the only viable option you have just financially. I think they definitely need to be stainless steel and I don't think it – the nails and all that sort of stuff, I don't think you really have an option on that. Again, it's the same sort of thing as with the civic building, this thing is going to be around for a while. It's not something you're doing in your backyard that you can change next year. So, I think with those criteria, I think it's just the finance is going to put you in that direction or if nothing else, just the better guarantee of maintenance.

Chair Lew: Ok, then I think Wynne, did you have a comment?

Board Member Furth: I had a question so I am flipping through the Negative Dec. and the Mitigation measures and I didn't see using non-pressure treated wood as a mitigation measure. Is that because the project design specified that in the first place? What would happen if we change the project design to say that you could use pressure treated wood found to be suitable for use in a marsh environment?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, we...

Board Member Furth: Would that mess up your environmental review?

Ms. Hodgkins: We did note it as just a design feature of the project and not as a mitigation measure. Elizabeth may be able to add to this but my understanding is that the Agencies strongly prefer the Alaskan yellow cedar and that's why we went with it. I think that the pressure treated had traces of arsenic and something else in it. So, that's why we were trying to ensure that we used the most sustainable wood possible and that was a recommendation of Agencies as a wood that they use in the marine environments a lot.

Mr. Notaro: To elaborate on that, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, in particular, said they did not want any pressure treated Douglas fir and had suggested that we use the Alaskan yellow cedar as a durable alternative – naturally durable alternative.

Board Member Furth: And did...

Board Member Gooyer: Are they also willing to pay the difference in cost? If they are suggesting it, you should suggest that they pay for the difference.

Board Member Furth: I think Palo Alto is going to have a hard time pleading poverty to the rest of the country, even though we know we always have more things to do than money to pay for it. So, the Regional Water Quality Control Board have jurisdiction here? Can they say no or just strongly urge?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes, there is a discretionary permit, a 401 permit that we do need from the Regional Water Quality Control Board so they do have discretion to not approve the project.

Board Member Furth: Ok.

Vice Chair Kim: What if we shorten it? What if we shorten the boardwalk, is that an option?

Ms. Hodgkins: Just to make it cheaper you mean? (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: Reduce the amount of materials that are going into the boardwalk and just shorten the length of the boardwalk so make it $\frac{3}{4}$ -length or $\frac{1}{2}$ -length.

Board Member Furth: Well, I have a suggestion for an approval that we can make that would let them figure this out later. That in finding number six, that where it says the project would use sustainably harvested Alaskan yellow cedar, we add or pressure treated lumber found to be suitable for use in the marsh. Then they can wangle figurately approval, they can go with it and they don't have to come back to us.

Board Member Baltay: I'm all for just pushing these folks on and let them figure this out. We've given them our advice and it quickly verges away from the ARB findings that we have to make so I can support almost any motion.

Chair Lew: Ok, who's going to make a motion?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: I move approval of – after consideration of the Mitigated Negative Dec., as we just demonstrated, I move that we recommend approval of the Major Architectural Review to allow replacement of the existing Baylands Boardwalk as the Lucy Evans Nature Interpretive Center and the associated Park Improvement Ordinance subject to the findings and with the conditions included in the Staff report with the modification of finding number six with respect to wood as previously specified.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Lew: Ok, seconded by Baltay, all in favor? Opposed? None. Congratulations.

MOTION PASSES 6-0

Mrs. Ames: Wow, thank you very, very much and sorry to interrupt. Thank you. (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Thanks, guys.

6. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2747 Park Boulevard [17PLN-00122]:

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow a Master Sign Program. The Master Sign Program is for a Previously Approved 33,323 Square Foot Office Building Currently Under Construction. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15311 (Accessory Structures). Zoning District: GM (General Manufacturing). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Well, we're still not done, we have one more item and minutes after that. Oh, down, ok, crazy, ok number six. Number six is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, 27247 Park Boulevard. Recommendation on applicant's request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow a Master Sign Program. This Master Sign Program is for a previously approved 33,323-square foot office building currently under construction. The environmental assessment is it's exempt from the provisions of CEQA in

accordance with Guideline Section 15311 for accessory structures and the zone district is GM and project planner is Graham Owen, welcome.

Mr. Graham Owen, Project Planner: Thank you, Mr. Lew and like you said, my name is Graham Own and I'm working with the applicant on the project that's here before you today. This is the Master Sign Program for 2747 Park Boulevard. The project did come to you on August 3rd for the initial public hearing and there were a number of changes that were requested at the time by the Board. Those are summarized in the Staff report but I'll go over them very briefly. The project includes wall signs and address signs and free-standing monument signs. One of the first concerns that Staff had and that the Board reiterated was that the proposed free-standing monument signs were too tall. In response to that the applicant is proposing too – allow me to pull this up. They are proposing two different options, one of which would be 7-foot 6-inches in total height and the other would be 5-feet and 11-inches in total height. These – here are the two options before you, this one is showing you the 7-foot 6-inches and this one is showing 5-feet and 10-inches. One of the other comments was that the address sign, that the lettering or the numbers of the sign be centered one of the stones so they've done that as a relatively small change. One of the larger comments that were discussed in the hearing was the location of the wall sign that was previously proposed at the apex of the building. The building does follow a curve at Sheridan and Park Boulevard and so the comment was that the apex wasn't an appropriate location for this particular wall sign. So, in response to that, the applicant has proposed two options as a part of the Master Sign Program for future tenants. One of them would be Option A as shown here that are facing Sheridan and then other is facing Park Boulevard and is shown here as well. Both are located on flat sections of the wall. The third wall sign or excuse me, the second wall sign of Option A is basically an alternative to Option B; it's one or the other, not both. The second location would be facing the Caltrain right of way and the location of that sign has not changed. It wasn't a topic of discussion at the previous hearing. With that, the Staff recommends approval of the project with the conditions that are noted in the Staff report. Those are regarding the total heights of the wall sign letter, as well as the logos and the amount that they project off from the wall. I believe that the – I'll leave it at that and I believe the applicant has a presentation which is they would like to go over the plan set.

Chair Lew: Wynne, disclosures?

Board Member Furth: Yes, I – well I was not at the previous hearing but I did review the minutes.

Chair Lew: Ok, we'll do the applicants presentation.

Ms. Shawn Reese: Hi, my name is Shawn Reese and I'm representing KKA, Kate Keating Associates. Thank you so much and let me know if you are able or not to hear me? We're the environmental graphic design consultant on the project and we also have Casey Kraning here with JPC and also our primary contact with DES. So, approaching the revised MSP, our primary goal was to reflect upon the feedback that we were given to further refine our design intent based on some of your recommendations. Also, to tell the story of our design intent a little bit differently with great clarity and hope that that will answer or speak to some of the concerns expressed about architectural integration.

Mr. Owe: I apologize, it looks like we're having technical difficulties with the plan set, sorry.

Ms. Reese: No problem. Speaking, I would say first to skyline sign WS-1 for which we have two options being presented. There's an option presented at Sheridan and then there's an option being presented for the corner of Park. So, our original location was the intersection of Sheridan/Park and the recommendation from the ARB was that architecturally this may not be the most appropriate location and that perhaps we would consider – I think that the favorable feedback from the ARB was that perhaps the Park end made – seemed like a more desirable location. So, we did do a study of that location or sight lines and opportunities for architectural integration for that area of the façade. We also wanted to explore the Sheridan location because it was closer to the original apex that we had in mind so we did a study of the sight lines and we looked at what the mounting conditions would be at that location as well. The conclusion that we came to is that either of these locations, from a sight line point of view, would

potentially be desirable but that the available square footage of the mounting conditions would support – may be slightly different. So, what we're proposing is that a prospective tenant would be given the option of either A or B for WS- with the understanding that they would only be allowed one of those two locations. That's because the tenant sign that we have represented is hypothetical. We aren't sure of the tenant name, the full length of the tenant name, the personal preference of the tenant, and also maybe the recommendation of the sign fabricator that they are working with and what location they would recommend to best support engineering of the sign based on the length that they are looking for. We have requirements for the height of logo, the height the letters and we also have some prescriptive requirements on the length that we would accommodate at that location. That was how we addressed concerns about placement at the apex. With respect to the comment we received, generally the architectural integration we approached how we were representing our design intent differently with I think color and materiality expressed. As well as an example, reference for hypothetical tenant's sign and it speaks more clearly to how the sign, the raceway, and the cadence of the façade would lay. So, for our WS-3 sign location facing Caltrain, that location hasn't been changed but the way that we represented it did change. For the sign entry monument, if you are able to – Graham if you are able to bring that up, please? I've got it, thanks. Thank you. The recommendation from the City of Palo Alto and I think also the preferred comment at the close of our ARB meeting is that a monument not to exceed 6-feet is what was recommended for this context. I did recall some discussion from a couple Members on the Board about possibly being willing to split the difference between eh 9-foot monument that was proposed in our first MSP and this 6-foot monument that was requested. We did a study of both of a more vertically oriented monument that splits the difference at 7-feet 6 inches, as well as a more horizontally oriented monument that's closer to the 6-foot height that was requested. Of the two that we studied, this is on – we've got two examples of the more vertically oriented 7-feet 6-inches monument and then two examples of the more horizontally oriented 5-feet 10-inches monument. After studying both monuments our recommendation is the 7-feet 6-inches partly because it allows for a greater cap height for tenants which we think will be more desirable but also because allows for prominent placement of the site address. Both entries to the site are off of streets other than Park, they are off of Sheridan and off of Page Mill so we thought that it was really important for anybody that's looking for that location to know that there – that they've arrived at the right spot, even though they aren't going to be entering the office park from Park Boulevard itself. In addition to making the cap height more attractive to tenants, we really think that the site will be more accessible and easier to identify with the address prominently featured at the top, rather than side by side. So, I am ready to take any questions from there.

Chair Lew: Great and I don't have any public speakers on this item. Questions, anybody? No. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: How far back from the nearest edge of the sidewalk is the nearest part of the monument sign?

Ms. Reese: I'll reference the...

Board Member Furth: I'm looking at 2.03 but I don't have a ruler.

Ms. Reese: 2.03, we do have – if you're asking about the line of sight...

Board Member Furth: No, I'm asking about if I walk by on the sidewalk, how close to the sign am I?

Ms. Reese: I'm sorry it's 5-feet.

Board Member Furth: Really?

Mr. Reese: Would you like to speak more directly to because I can't quite hear you.

Board Member Furth: That's the edge of the sidewalk?

Vice Chair Kim: (Inaudible)

Board Member Furth: I think it's out of scale on this drawing.

Vice Chair Kim: I think (inaudible).

Mr. Kenny Hung: This is Kenny Hung with DES Architect and I'm working with Shaun on the signage. So, if you look at page 1.03 and it shows the right sign, essentially the – you can see between the property line reaches the back of the sidewalk and the parking, there's a 5-foot landscape setback and you can see the edge of the sign essentially aligned with that edge of the parking so it's a 5-foot setback from the sidewalk.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I was looking at 2.02 which showed something different, thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Ok, who wants to go first? Who was most critical last time? I think Peter or was it, Robert? Robert, right?

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) I'm fine – I agree, I think the 7-foot 6-inch sign looks better. The – as far as the elevation facing Park, I think the sign should be on the north elevation and on the back, I'm fine with it. Right, that's all you need is those three? Ok.

Ms. Reese: Just to make sure I understand so for the sign type WS-1, you prefer Option B on...

Board Member Gooyer: I don't know, it's (inaudible). You've got them marked, right? Which ...

Ms. Reese: Option B at Park?

Board Member Gooyer: No, I like that one so Option A.

Ms. Reese: You prefer Option A at Sheridan.

Board Member Gooyer: Yep. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Well, could I ask a clarify – a question for Staff. On the wall sign one, I think if I understood the presentation correctly, I think you guys are looking for both Options to be in the Sign Program and that the future tenant would pick one or the other. I think it's fine for the Board if you think that (crosstalk) (inaudible) and I think that's fine to say that but I just wanted to...

Board Member Gooyer: Then why give me an Option One or Two if you say it could go either way?

Ms. Reese: (Inaudible).

Board Member Gooyer: Then you just say it's going to be one of these two, yes or no?

Chair Lew: Yeah, I understand.

Board Member Gooyer: Rather than...

Chair Lew: I understand the issue but – I'm just clarifying the difference here.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: Let's see what the rest of the Board has to say about this. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thanks. I will start with the easy one, your alignment with the slate tile is beautiful, that's really nicely done.

Ms. Reese: Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: The monument sign, I think that the taller one – as much as we were talking about not having taller monument signs, this 7-foot 6-inches sign given that it's some distance back from Park really help have the building address up on the top.

Board Member Gooyer: Absolutely.

Board Member Baltay: I think – when I look at the sign again, it does pick up the design of the building somehow so I compliment you on that. Something about it is really quite attractive so that's good. With that said the signs on the building, the only one I can support is WS-1 Option A, that's where the sign is pretty much all across the glazing there. I find both of the other ones just feel like an overlarge sign plaster on the side of a building and that wasn't part of the design. Especially this Option B which is sort of seems – as I remember it – this one you see coming down I think it's Park or something and the thought of that up on a building like that is it's just no integrated.

Board Member Gooyer: See I look at it differently and I think we ought to say you can either do A or B, not both.

Chair Lew: No, that's...

Board Member Gooyer: Or either.

Chair Lew: That is what they are asking for, is either.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm saying I'll allow A but I don't want B.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I would like for us to allow this option.

Board Member Gooyer: But not the other one and not say you can do either or.

Board Member Baltay: This one I do not support having a sign there. I don't think that's well integrated with the architecture and I have the same issue with the sign on the back all together. I just don't think that's well integrated with the design. I think at the last hearing I also said it's not just on a flat piece of the building, it has to be well integrated. So, this is a series of (inaudible) solid and glazed pieces (crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) train tracks so I am not as worried about it but you're right, I agree.

Board Member Baltay: I think that – so, you're right but we're allowing these fairly large commercial looking buildings in town in these prominent locations and there's quite a bit of angst throughout Palo Alto about this building and buildings like this. These are not popular right now. It's a lot of offices uses going in here and it's something that causing the town a lot of trouble. The infrastructure demands are great. When you just come in and put on a fairly large lite sign that is not well integrated it just feels, even more, like we're letting (inaudible) overrun our lives. It's not carefully integrated, it's not – you know the Apply building doesn't have a big sign on the side of it, it's just across the windows. So, I think that's reasonable for us to say that the sign has to be well integrated and only one of these three, I feel is integrated and that's the one I can support. That where I think the other two I just don't think we should allow within this Sign Program. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I don't have much to add. I agree also that the freestanding signs, that the 7-foot 6-inches height would probably work better. Then with regards to the larger wall sign, I guess I would

strongly recommend that WS-1A be the preferred option but I don't think I'd be so strong to say that you can't do the B. That is all.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I agree with the previous comments on the monument sign. My – one of the things that I was thinking about was what does it feel like to walk by and I was a little unnerved when I thought it was going to be 3-feet away but this seems to be better. I agree that let me get this right, 1A seems to be the best design of these alternatives and if we only need to approve one, I would approve that. I had a question for Staff. This program is entitled Exterior Wayfinding Signage and this seems to be tenant identification signage. Does that – I mean when we see Stanford wayfinding signage, it's not this so am I confused about what those words mean?

Mr. Owen: No, I wouldn't say you're confused about it. I think this accomplishes a couple of objectives regardless of how the – how it's titled. It's wayfinding, it's also for visibility purposes for the tenants.

Board Member Furth: It's tenant publicity...

Mr. Owen: Sure.

Board Member Furth: ... and we all wayfind with our phones these days. I think of wayfinding as here's the front door or there's parking. It does bother me because as I think these words slide, they cease to be useful so those are my comments.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I think I don't really have anything to say on this that hasn't been said before. I'll just go wherever we have a majority and it sounds like it is the 7-foot 6-inch monument sign and you guys prefer 1A.

Ms. Reese: I do have – I'm sorry. I do have a response to the concern expressed about our architectural integration of one area of the façade versus in areas where the conditions of the façade are a little bit different. If you turn to page 3.04, you may have already had a chance to take a look at this. We have photo references of similar mounting conditions and in this particular instance, what we're showing are areas in which we've integrated as best as possible placement of the raceways with the mullions and lines of the building. We have also below that an elevation detail of WS-1A and B showing in greater detail how we anticipate the raceway would be camouflage or integrated into the lines of the façade. I think that these close-ups maybe highlight that in greater detail than the larger scale elevation. My understanding is that in terms of square footage, we are allowed at least two skyline signs at the facility. We anticipate that there may be at least two major tenants that will want to be able to identify their location at two different areas of the building. The AB location – yeah, I was definitely curious to hear your preference but there are a variety of reasons of why location A or B may be preferable and it isn't just the preference of the tenant or even the length of the logo name. The engineering conditions at one location versus another may or may not fully support the full length of a tenant name so it may be necessary, depending upon the recommendation of the signage fabricator that a tenant it working with, to place the length of their tenant logo at one location verse another because the mounting conditions are different. In one instance we're mounting to the building façade and in another instance, we're mounting to the expressed mullions and the length of the area that we've recommended or that's been made available partly anticipates that we're expecting the engineering conditions to be different. That's partly why we're wanting to allow for maximum flexibility so that's something that can be determined by the signing fabricator who will ultimately be responsible for engineering this particular sign.

Board Member Gooyer: The way I see it is that a confident sign person can put it anywhere. What we're determining here is what looks best in the relationship to the building and so that's different than what – you want to give yourself enough flexibility and I understand that. I am sure a tenant would love to be able to put it where ever they wanted to but that's not really what we're talking about here. We're talking about where we feel it's appropriate in the overall scheme of the entire project to put it.

Board Member Baltay: I agree with what Robert is saying and I find that if I look at your sheet 3.04, that's what convinced me to be honest with you. That the only location suitable was Option A. Both of the examples that you give are essentially signage on a wall full of glass with small aluminum mullions but mostly a wall of glass. Your Option B location goes across not just glazed pieces but solid stone clad chunks of the building. If I remember right the architect made quite a to-do about how this building had an interplay between glazed curved walls and solid chunks of the building and it seems to me the signage is just not integrated with that thought process. I don't support having the signage go across stone façade pieces and then glazing and then stone façade pieces again. That's not what your example shows either.

Chair Lew: I think the hard thing is you're reacting against this logo (inaudible) but a tenant could come in – like ABC, right? I mean it could be that the sign just is within the glassed area and like we don't know what the tenant is.

Board Member Baltay: Fair enough. If you want a Sign Program, you have got to make it work.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) something different that's fine but I don't want to (inaudible) to be able to put it where ever they want because I don't know too many people that are going to come up with a sign that's only 3-feet wide or something. They're going to come up with a sign that's 20-foot wide.

Chair Lew: Not necessarily, like if you – I forget, what's on the AOL building across the street? Is it AOL? I mean it's a very small sign and it's up on the parapet. It's not necessarily – I guess I'm just pushing back because I don't think it's necessary – it may not be this big and then I think the Board pre-conditioned it possibly. There's a...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) condition that if it's only – it can only have (inaudible) glazing behind it.

Board Member Baltay: Maybe it should just come back to us when they have a real proposal? I mean she's giving us a bunch of stuff about engineering, there's quite a bit of uncertainty it seems like where the sign can physically be located anyway and I agree completely with what you're saying Alex. It does depend on the size of the sign where it's located on the building. This is a particularly detailed building which doesn't have a big wall where the sign obviously goes. The architect chose not to anticipate that up front so your idea of a Sign Program is not going to work on the big building signs. These are two big signs you're just going to put up in (inaudible).

Board Member Gooyer: Or they can have the northern sign, have the monument sign at the 7.6 but if they want to put it anywhere else they'll have to come back on an individual basis with a sign that's what the tenant will be.

Chair Lew: Well, I think that's the way it works. If we have a Sign Program and if they wanted to part from the Sign Program, then it comes back to us so I guess I would put it...

Board Member Gooyer: Then I guess what Peter and I are talking about is narrowing the (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: Narrow the parameters and then when it comes – when there's actual tenants or tenant and they want to do something else then you can -- you'll have your say.

Mr. Owen: Chairmen Lew, if I can just speak to that real quick? Just to back up, the purpose of the Master Sign Program is so that the design parameters of the program for the building are established in one document. So, when a tenant is selected, they can apply for a building permit, our planners at the Development Center will check the sign application against the Master Sign Program and if conforms, the

building permit is issued but if there is a deviation then it wouldn't be approved and you'd have to amend the Master Sign Program. It would then come back to the Board for that.

Board Member Baltay: I think what we're saying is exactly that except that our Master Sign Program that we're approving allows the building skyline sign only in location of Option A. Other locations on the building would need to come back but we're just giving them an option for the skyline sign and the rest of it, we're all in support of. I think that's quite a fair action and that does let them have the option of moving forward expeditiously and I think if there is – certainly I wouldn't want to be misconstrued to think there's not any other place on the building where the sign could go, that's not true.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: So, it's very contingent maybe more on the size of the sign.

Board Member Furth: So which signs – maybe I'll get it in your motion as to which signs we – you are proposing that we approve today as part of the Master Sign Plan.

Board Member Gooyer: The monument sign at 7-feet 6-inches and location A.

Chair Lew: Well there – first of all there are two monument signs at both parking entrances. There are two monuments at both entrances.

Board Member Gooyer: Right, I'm talking about the type of monument sign, the 7-foot 6 monument sign. The two locations are fine, it's just the – as far as the wall sign, only A is acceptable.

Board Member Furth: So, if we're looking at this sheet then its Option A multi-tenant monument?

Board Member Gooyer: No, no, no, no, no.

Board Member Furth: Sorry, Option B?

Board Member Gooyer: This one. That one where it has it up here.

Board Member Furth: I'm looking at the monument signs.

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, the monument sign is the higher of the two.

Board Member Furth: Which is – I know you know, it's A or B?

Ms. Reese: It's A.

Board Member Furth: Option A.

Board Member Gooyer: Option A.

Ms. Reese: Option A on – shown on 2.03 (crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: So, it's Option A on both of them.

Ms. Reese: ...2.02 and 2.03, that's the 7-feet 6 one.

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, then obviously also the number – the street number.

Board Member Furth: Which is where?

Ms. Reese: The address sign...

Board Member Furth: Oh, it's 2.07 and 2.08?

Board Member Gooyer: 2747, yeah.

Ms. Reese: Yes.

Board Member Furth: 20.7 and 2.08.

Ms. Reese: Yes.

Board Member Furth: So, we're not approving 2.04 and 2.05. We are approving 2.06, the door tenant monument?

Ms. Reese: There were no objections (crosstalk) (inaudible)...

Board Member Furth: No comment on those right?

Ms. Reese: ...2.06 in our first ARB review.

Board Member Gooyer: I think we're approving 2.02, 2.0...

Female: 3.

Board Member Gooyer: ...6 and 2.08. What's 2.03? No – oh, I see, there's also this – oh, I don't care, yeah.

Board Member Furth: So, we're ok with 2.03A? I'm sorry, 2.02, 2.03...

Board Member Gooyer: That's fine, yeah. It's basically just the size of the stuff that's taking one or three small ones and turning them into one large one.

Board Member Furth: Then we're good with 2.06?

Board Member Gooyer: I'm fine with that one too.

Board Member Furth: And 2.07 which we think is eloquently done, to quote my...(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Furth: and 2.08 which is the detail in that and then down – the wall signs, we're approving 3.01?

Board Member Gooyer: (Crosstalk) I guess that's wayfinding, right?

Board Member Furth: Is that right, and then not the rest? (Crosstalk)

Chair Lew: 3.02, right?

Board Member Gooyer: (Crosstalk) Maybe it would have been easier to say which ones we didn't approve.

Board Member Furth: I got it all. So, to Staff, are we – have we been clear? Do you understand?

Mr. Owen: I got it.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: Alright, so we did not recommend – we’re recommending approval – move that we recommend – there’s not Mitigated Negative Dec., here right? We don’t have to think about that. Move we recommend approval of a Master Sign Program for 2747 Park Boulevard, which is exempted from CEQA review, based on the findings and conditions in the Staff report with the following modifications. The signs to be approved as part of the Master Sign Plan are those shown on 2.02, 2.03, 2.06, 2.07, 2.08 and 3.01 only.

Chair Lew: Ok, is there a second?

Board Member Baltay: I second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0

Chair Lew: Do you have any closing comments? Ok, thank you.

Ms. Reese: Thank you for your time.

Approval of Minutes:

7. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 5, 2017.

Chair Lew: We have one last item which is the minutes for October. Oh, do we not have – I don’t see it on the agenda. Oh, yeah, October 5th and those came by email. I don’t have any comments. Any comments? No. Motion?

MOTION

Board Member Gooyer: Move to accept.

Chair Lew: Is there a second?

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None so that’s 5-0.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.

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

Subcommittee Item

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment