



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: October 5, 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, Robert Gooyer, Peter Baltay

Absent:

Chair Lew: Can we have roll call please, Claire or Alicia? Great and we expect Board Member Baltay to be here soon.

**Oral Communications**

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

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Lew: Are there any agenda changes? No.

**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. 3001 El Camino Real [16PLN-00097 and 16PLN-00220]:** Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Site and Design Review to Allow for Construction of a Four-Story Mixed-Use Development With 19,800 Square Feet of Retail and 30 Residential Units in the CS Zone as Well as a Three-Story Multi-Family Residential Building With 20 Units in the RM-30 Zone. The Project Also Includes a Request for a Preliminary Parcel Map for a Lot Merger to Allow for the Proposed Development, a Design Enhancement Exception, and a Parking Adjustment for Shared Parking. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Review from July 3, 2017 to August 2, 2017. Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial), RM-30 (Multi-family Residential), and R-1 (Single-family Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at [claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org)

Chair Lew: Then we can move onto the first item which is number two, a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item for 3001 El Camino Real. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a Site and Design Review to allow for construction of a four-story mixed-use development with 19,800-square feet

of retail, 30 residential units in the CS zone, as well as a three-story multi-family residential building with 20 units in the RM-30 zone. The project also includes a request for a Preliminary Parcel Map for a lot merger to allow for the proposed development, a Design Enhancement Exception, and a parking adjustment for shared parking. The environmental assessment is a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for public review from July 3, 2017, to August 2, 2017. The zone district is Service Commercial, RM-30, and R-1. Our Project Planner is Claire Hodgkins, welcome.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Thank you, good morning Board Members; Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner. The proposed project is located at 3001 El Camino Real and just a brief overview, 19,800-square feet of commercial retail and 50 residential rental units. It includes two separate building, one in the CS zone that's mixed-use and one in the RM-30 that's multi-family residential. The site is located on three parcels so it would be merged into one as part of Preliminary Parcel Map. It includes split zoning so it's partially CS, partially RM-30 and partially R-1 and it also has split land use designations. It's currently developed with 9,100-square feet of retail commercial surrounded by surface parking. This is just a brief overview of the project site with the zoning. Key project changes, I won't go into detail on these I know the applicant will in their presentation but the applicant further defined the base, body and roof of the CS building, lowered the elevation of the RM-30 building, added more bike parking at grade, added indigenous plants and increased the planting on El Camino Real, added details as requested for balconies and awnings and provided an improved materials board that's located over here. Then key considerations, the project provides multi-family residential rental housing on a housing inventory site which fulfills a need for the City. It's also close to office and transit and this use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan vision for this area. There are two requested exceptions, one for a parking adjustment and one for a Design Enhancement Exception to allow the garage ramp to encroach into the rear set back. Just briefly on the process, the PTC recommended approval of the project on July 12<sup>th</sup>. We're going for ARB recommendations and this is a Site and Design Review so Council will make the ultimate decision on the project. 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 Site and Design Applications, parking adjustment and Design Enhancement Exception to City Council based on findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in the record of land use action and that's all for me.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Claire, and now we have 10-minutes for the applicant's presentation.

Mr. Rob Steinberg: Good morning. Good morning, I'm Rob Steinberg and it's good to be back with you again. Last time we met there were six items in the motion that you asked us to go back and look at and we can kind of go through those one by one. I think the most important was to try to lower the CM building so that the first finish floor was no more than 6-feet above grade. We were asked to look at the parapet detail on the El Camino building. There was – even though it's not required, we were asked to see if we could have relocated some of the bicycle long-term parking above grade. We were asked to enhance and bring a little bit better material board to you. We were asked to see if we could add a little bit more landscaping on El Camino and widen the planters a little bit and then lastly, there was a request to see some of the details and to study those a little bit further. We have done all of that and I hope you like what you see. Let's start with number one which is we have shown the grades around the building. This is Acacia and you can see that the lowest grade on Acacia is 31.6-feet and our finish floor is 37.5 so we have basically lowered the building another approximately 18-inches to respond to the request so that's number one. Number two on the expression of the top of the building, there is sort of two responses here, one is we've modified the elevations a little bit. When we started studying the details we realized that we needed a solid panel to separate one balcony from the other balcony. So, what – first observation is there's a base to the building, there is a middle which is sort of capped out here where there's the solid panel, the railings that go across and then drop off on the top which gives a top to the building. Then in addition to that, we've developed a detail where the parapet stops and it steps back so we get an extra shadow line and an extra horizontal – a little bit of detail, a little bit of expression at the parapet so there's a two-step response to item number two. The third item was, is it possible to put some of the long-term bicycle parking above grade? We've shown you an illustration of the long-term bike and we have been able to do that. We've been able to locate one on Olive, one near the retail and

the vertical axis and we've been able to locate two lockers along Acacia. Each of the lockers accommodates two bikes so we have been able to respond to that request as well. We have – next, to Jonathan we have our color board and we are using a fairly simple pallet and materials. We are keeping the continuity between the two building which we think is important. The only comment that I would make about this is that the metal will be a darker grey then we're showing. We're showing you a mill finish and that's only because it's very hard to get a custom color for a little sample so I think that actually will be part of this sort of more subtle refined, quite elegant palette so that's number four, our color and materials. Number five, there were two things, there was the request to see if we could increase the native planting as compared to the ornamental planting. We have been able to revise that proportion and increase the native planting by thirty percent and the green is the non-native and the -- or olive or brown color is the other and you can see those proportions. We basically have changed the proportions of about thirty percent to respond to that request. Then I just wanted to tell you that we also added the width to the planters in the front of the building and increased the amount of planting on El Camino. This was actually – sounded like a little thing but it turned out to be fairly complicated because we had to look at the parking and where the car doors open and how people got out and where the existing trees where. Then the additional width of the planting – the planters that you did ask us to increase a little and the City likes 8-feet through (inaudible). So, we had to work with the City to kind of get this meandering 8-feet in order to make all of these pieces work but we have been able to accomplish that as well. Then lastly you asked about some of the details and to just look at those a little bit more carefully so there are several sheets here. We can look at first the storefront and you can see that we're alternating between the planters, which are widened to 2-feet and some – introducing the wood-like material and the benches so that we're not obscuring the view into the retail. We've looked at the balcony railings and how they're being fastened and trying to get a common vocabulary between all of the details. We're trying to balance the water penetration to the decks so they're being fastened on the verticals compared to the horizontal. We're letting the rail sort of float and it all has one common vocabulary and then a similar sort of strategy on the balcony framing and details for the building further back on Acacia. The privacy wall and opening it up; if you remember, there was some cross bracing that we've altered a little bit so that everything is one family. We've applied that same strategy both to the canopies at the motor court over here where we've got sort of free-standing columns and overhang to give a sense of arrival and finally to the stairs as well. Those are the six items that you asked for and we have been through a lot of back and forth together. This is our third time visiting with you and we are pleased what we have to present to you. I feel good about putting my name on it and I hope you will support us so we can move forward today, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Mr. Steinberg. Now we do want to open this up for public comment but I don't have any speaker cards at the moment so are there any Board Member questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, good morning and for the architect, I just want to be clear that the metal mesh, you mentioned if I understood correctly that it will be dark metal finish and not the shiny metal that we see in front of us?

Mr. Steinberg: Yes, that's correct.

Board Member Baltay: I just want to really be clear that this metal finish is going to be dark metal like a mill finish? The mesh itself?

Mr. Steinberg: It is – it's going to be a medium grey and right now it's a little – I can't quite see what you've got but I believe it's a mill finish. Currently, it's a little shiny and a little unfinished and it will be darkened up a little bit.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne, do you have any questions?

Board Member Furth: Yeah, just a minor one, (inaudible)...

Chair Lew: Microphone, please.

Board Member Furth: Looking at, I guess it's sheet 3.2, the sketched labeled one, there's a tree up there. Is there really a tree up there in the staircase element? At least there's something pink and green with stems.

Mr. Steinberg: (Inaudible- off mic) come on up and -- we'll have our landscape architect to address that.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Mr. Steinberg: Thank you.

Mr. Nick Samuelson: You're looking at -- that's some planting that's on the second level terrace in the back so there's a planter up there that has a row of trees.

Board Member Furth: Ok, thank you. I would see them on the plan...

Mr. Samuelson: Yeah, the plan -- I don't know if you have the plan to plant...

Board Member Furth: I don't think we have a second level...

Mr. Samuelson: Oh, that's really the second-page rendering -- I think -- is that in there? I don't think that's in this set.

Board Member Furth: I don't know that if we have a second level architect -- landscape plan.

Mr. Samuelson: It's in the submittal drawing but...

Chair Lew: We do.

Board Member Furth: I have looked at it if you have it.

Mr. Samuelson: If it's the full set that was submitted it's on 4.2.

Board Member Furth: L-102?

Mr. Samuelson: 4.2.

Chair Lew: We do have the landscape -- the second-floor landscape up at the podium. (crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) landscaping on this building.

Ms. Hodgkins: So, L-4.2 has the landscape plan for the upper podium and then on the second sheet of the one that we were just looking on A-3.2, you can see the opposite side which would be looking at it from the parking lot, essentially looking at the podium.

Board Member Furth: Got it. I'm looking at it from Olive, got it. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? I have a question for Staff. I think the Staff report asks us to comment on the Mitigated Negative Declaration or just the mitigation measures for that and I think, if I understand it correctly, that the PTC did that. Then I don't think that we have the attachment for that. I was looking for it yesterday and I didn't see it.

Ms. Hodgkins: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: With the mitigation measures or are they incorporated – are they completely incorporated into the conditions of approval?

Ms. Hodgkins: They are – so they will be incorporated as conditions of approval but the (inaudible -mic off).

Chair Lew: Ok and then is that – so in our condition of approval it mentions Exhibit A but we haven't – I just want to – I haven't seen – I haven't read an Exhibit A and I don't see it in here. I just wanted to make sure – just clarify that. It seems to me that it's being reviewed else – by...

Ms. Hodgkins: I – say that one more time?

Chair Lew: If we go to the conditions of approval which is page 26 and so like number five.

Ms. Hodgkins: I'm not finding it.

Chair Lew: It mentions the mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah. Oh...

Chair Lew: It says its attached here as Exhibit A and I just want to clarify that I haven't seen it. I don't see it in here and I might have missed it.

Ms. Hodgkins: I apologize.

Chair Lew: I just wanted to clarify that.

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you, yeah it should have been attached as Exhibit A. We also did include it as a separate attachment with links to it, along with the mitigation monitor or sorry, along with the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The final – I think as we were preparing this in draft form Council...

Chair Lew: Sure.

Ms. Hodgkins: ...and we'll be attaching it to the record of Land Use Action. Thank you

Board Member Furth: What does CEQA require that as an advisory body do with respect to the environmental review?

Ms. Hodgkins: Consider the environmental document.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? No, ok, comments? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you for the modifications and I think it's a really handsome building. I'd like to focus on just two items that I think maybe we could consider a small adjustment. One is the modification to the parapet cap as the architect called it along El Camino and I don't think that's very successful. I think what we had before was a cleaner design and I know I was the source of requiring something or requesting some sort of base, middle and top. However, I think that particular detail will just cause water to run down the façade a little bit and stain things and it just looks fussy to me. I'm happy when I look at the corner elevation in the rendering to consider that the heavy roof form on the corner at least is clearly the top element. I would prefer just to not have that detail on the middle pieces; that's easy enough. The second thing is really sort of a concern with these stair tower features at the corner. I'm looking at the corner rendering on A-4.1 which can also be seen on aerial view on sheet A-3.8, drawing number one. I have to say that looking at this new rendering it doesn't look very residential

or very welcoming. It looks sort of like a parking garage or a prison honestly; a staircase inside a metal mesh. I think the colors are fine and I think that the balconies with the same treatment will be quite successful but as I understand it, you have three different places with this stair tower enclosed in a wire mesh like this. Maybe I'll just say to my fellow Board Members that I would be very interested to see what everybody else thinks about that. I definitely don't want that to slow down the project but it's just something that catches my eye. Aside from that, I'd like to see what everybody else has to say, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I think it's a nice building but I guess the biggest concern having sat up in – up here for a while and in other municipalities also, is that I'm really getting tired of seeing flat roof buildings. I mean I understand that that's become sort of the way we have to deal with things because you can only go up a certain amount of distance and so you're trying to get the full capacity that you can. So, you end up with a flat roof and that's very understandable but the problem is that after a while that's all you ever see is a flat roof building. They change slightly and this one, although well done, is really no different than a lot of other ones or at least similar to a lot of other ones coming in. It – I'm not blaming the architect for doing that but he has to do it within the set of perimeters that he has. I'm just tired of seeing it and after a while, every new building that comes in is almost the same sort of shape, it's got the – what I call the sort of mirror architecture where you take various sections, you plop them next to each other and there you go, you've got another new building. It's – in itself I think you've done a nice job and I do agree the mesh makes it look a little prison looking. There's also – not that I'm – it really needs to have a strong bottom, middle and top but I think here the middle and the top aren't that much different. I don't think that's really as successful but I'm really sort of on the fence with this one. Again, nothing based on what you've done, you followed the instructions that you had too and based on the requirements that the City has but like I said, I'm just tired of seeing these buildings.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for sticking through the process and coming back to us for the third time. I think I was pleased with the last iteration and I know that we asked for some minor reconsiderations. I thank you for clearly laying that out and explaining to us the new changes that have been made. I also agree that the recessed parapet detail is a little too much. I think I was one that I said I was fine with the base, middle and top as it was. The recessed parapet really, to me doesn't look right and I agree with Board Member Baltay that perhaps we could just go back to the previous design. I also felt that the auto court area and the stairs for the bar building on the right and then I guess also for the building on the left, it being that dark grey with a lot of the wire mesh just doesn't feel quite as welcoming. I agree that we don't want to hold up the process but I don't know if there's something that can be done to reconsider either the amount of wire mesh material or if maybe the color can be changed. I think we want this to have more a residential feel and the way that the stairs look right now, I don't think it looks like too much of a place where you'd want to take the stairs. I think we want to encourage people to take the stairs wherever possible so perhaps there can be just a little bit of re-looking at that and maybe that can come back to us as a subcommittee item. Overall, I'm very pleased with the changes that you've made and that little bit of 18-inches that you've dropped the bar building, to me makes a huge difference. I know maybe to some it seems only like a foot and a half but I think it will make a really big difference in the long run; especially as the building gets built. I do have kind of one thing that I noticed which doesn't bother me but I did just want to put it out there is that it looks like on the original renderings for the main entrance to the bar building along Acacia that the portion of the lobby with the glass and the upper railing I think to use to be glass. At least that's what it looked like in the renderings and I know that it's changed to the wire mesh. I know that it ties in with the wire mesh of the stair tower but perhaps it can be re-looked at, especially if we're looking at the amount of wire mesh. Maybe the glass does enough to make it feel a little bit more refined and less standoffish but thank you for providing the aerial renderings. I think that's also something that I asked for previously and also, I noticed some other modifications to the below-grade parking in the main building. I think overall, I know it goes to Council but I don't have any hesitation of recommending approval for the project, thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: A question for Staff, what's the bicycle parking requirement for a residential unit?

Ms. Hodgkins: Hold on one second. I think it's – I want to say it's one per unit but let me just verify that. Let's see, yeah, it's one per unit and then...

Board Member Furth: That's long-term?

Ms. Hodgkins: Then one per every ten units for guest parking as well.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so 1.1.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Thanks for the well designed and informative materials. I was really impressed with the information that you provided about landscaping, even if I had trouble reading one of the plans. I think this – it looks like the project is going to work really well on El Camino. I agree with Robert that we're losing a really – we're losing a sense of place along El Camino when I think of the series of projects that we've approved and how many of them have similar rhythms in materials. I wonder how we're going to figure out which block we're on. We probably don't want the extreme sense of place provided by some of our more eccentric motels but this is going to be interesting. This does, however, look like something that's going to work well on the street. I appreciate how hard it is to design street furniture that works around that 8-foot clearance and the swinging doors and the trees and I'm grateful that you made the effort because I think it makes a huge difference. It comes up with every single project we look at and of course, it has nothing to do with us but it's the Council and the applicant but the use you're proposing seems to be one that's a great benefit to the City as a whole. I don't think the change to the top is particularly useful. I am concerned about the stairwells or the stair towers and you come up the stairs and you go outside on the third level and go back inside, is that right? There's a balcony that then takes you around to the corridor that links the units.

Ms. Hodgkins: You can go outside, you don't have to go outside but yeah, at the second level you can go outside.

Board Member Furth: So, there is a balcony space there?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: I don't think it works as it stands. Actually, when I saw your shiny metal I thought oh, that will make it a little less forbidding but I understand that's not what you intend. I think those stairwells need more work. I don't know if you can take advantage of the fact that you have that outdoor space adjacent to one. I'm particularly concerned about the one on the residential building. It does not seem to me to be particularly well integrated into the rest of the building and it's a surprisingly big element. So, if anybody has any thoughts about how to make that work better, by which I mean more attractive and more welcoming and lighter, I would be interested but with that exception, I think the project is a good one.

Ms. Hodgkins: Just to clarify, when you say one on the RM-30 building, are you referencing the staircase or the outdoor area or ...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Ms. Hodgkins: Ok, thank you for clarifying.

Chair Lew: I think it's a little confusing because the plans show it as the deck area is being open to the lobby below, am I reading that correctly?

Vice Chair Kim: I think that's the first floor because it's kind of a split level. (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) ok, so it's just – it's on the upper -- ok, thank you for that. Thank you, Wynne. I can support the project. I think it's very handsome and I think it's what you can do on this particular site given the way the height limit – within 150-feet of a residential – single-family residential zone and that makes you step down the height. So, I think you are forced into having the large mass on El Camino. I think to Robert's point about the flat roofs, I think we've talked about this before on other projects or maybe actually on this one, is that the – there is a height limit but there's also the El Camino Design Guidelines that actually recommend flat roofs and discourage – yeah, but I think that if – in the past at some of our retreats I've shown images of boulevards – beautiful boulevards in other Cities and they do have pitched roofs and false – there are a whole bunch of what we call fake decorative elements and to me they work. I think that we should have a separate discussion that if there's something – if we think that there is something wrong or it those – all the buildings are looking to similar, which I would think that I probably agree with, then we should go ahead and work on...

Board Member Gooyer: You see I'm fine with that. I wasn't going to pick out just this one particular one, I just...

Chair Lew: Right, that's why I'm saying...

Board Member Gooyer: ...when you drive down or pass any building these days, you can almost -- without even looking at it say we'll it's going to have a flat roof and it does.

Chair Lew: I think we should continue the discussion and we've had it before but have not really ever recommended making a change to the guidelines. On the – on the plans – thank you for all the changes, I think it looks good. I think you've been very responsive to the Board's comments and I think the project has gotten better. I just have a couple comments, that I think last time the Staff had asked us to comment on the DEE for – at least for the garage ramp and the screening required for the – to the adjacent house and I didn't comment on it last time. I do want to say that I support the substantial sizes pittosporum hedge being proposed and the setbacks and there's aren't that many windows looking directly down into the house so that I can – I can support that. On the findings I did have some comments for Staff, on page 20, the second to last sentence of the paragraph it says that the project has been designed to highlight natural materials which is wood and the colors are subdued in accordance with the El Camino Design Guidelines. I think I might just rephrase that and I think the El Camino Design Guidelines discourage having – was it more like having three bright colors but I wouldn't say black or dark grey and white is subdued. I would just sort of say that it's not – there are no bright colors on there. On the next page, on page 21 under finding three which is about the design quality. You do have a sentence in there that says the design (inaudible) setbacks substantially provide space between the proposed buildings and nearby single-family residential uses. I think that you actually already have that in the – under finding two so I think it's just a – it may be a – I think it's just not needed there because I think it's already covered before there.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Just to be clear, are you striking – you are suggesting (crosstalk)(inaudible)...

Chair Lew: I was just saying striking it because it's – yeah, because the setback isn't really about materials, right? The setback is about finding two and making transitions.

Mr. Lait: Ok, we may want to add a little bit more if we're going to be replacing that sentence.

Chair Lew: Then on the next page, page 22, on the very first – on the very top of the page it says that the project would not impact the existing bike path along El Camino and I don't know what that is. So,



we don't let bike lanes – are we just saying that existing bicycle uses or was that maybe referencing Park Boulevard/Bicycle Boulevard?

Ms. Hodgkins: It's actually two things and I mean I guess it's saying that it wouldn't impact the ability to use the bike lane but more importantly, it doesn't impact the potential for a larger bike lane to be built – a class two bike lane along that road. That's something that Cal Transit is looking at in the future; I'll clarify that.

Chair Lew: So, you're saying – right, so you're sort of saying no bulb-outs that would sort of protrude into the right of way?

Ms. Hodgkins: There are going to be bulb-outs but we're designing them to be only 4-feet so it would allow that space.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: I agree with you that there is no existing bike path.

Chair Lew: Well, but there are – I would say there are bicyclists that use it.

Board Member Furth: Yeah but that's not a bike path. It seems to be misleading to talk about an existing bike path.

Mr. Lait: So, we'll strike the existing and replace it with a future.

Chair Lew: Great. Then under finding five which is about plants, it says the plant species proposed are primarily indigenous, approximately seventy percent indigenous as shown on sheet L-4.11 and I don't think that's quite – I think that could be read incorrectly. I think it would say – if you look at the plant list and it does have (inaudible) which ones are native and which ones are not native. If you're just looking by species type, it's in the minority but if you're looking at plant quantities, it could be in the majority so I would just make that distinction under there. Then I think also I had mentioned previously under the mitigation monitoring, which is a condition of approval five, is that I think the Board has not seen Exhibit A. My understanding is that this went to the planning – this got approved by the Planning and Transportation Commission and they reviewed all of the environmental documents. So, that's all that I have on this one and I would support if the Board wants to modify the parapet cap and the stair towers. I would be willing to go along with that. On exterior stair towers, I think that – the thing that I've noticed on the buildings that I've worked on is that the -- it may – it could look good at – in the daytime and then at night time all of the exit lighting shows and it can look completely different. I think the interior colors of the stair tower and just any design that happens in there is actually important in how they look. I don't necessarily think that the building has to look residential. I think in this area it all use to be railroad warehouses and it has kind of an industrial look; the neighboring Equinox building and the Fry's Maximart site. All of those are fairly industrial looking and I think it's ok to tie into some of that.

Board Member Gooyer: Now, do you want to bring that back to...

Chair Lew: Subcommittee? I don't think the Board – I think the Board is pretty clear. (Crosstalk) (inaudible). I think there's a majority – I think – it sounds like we're on the same page about that. Any other follow up comments? Does somebody want to try to make a motion?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Furth: If you'll coach me, I would move that the Board recommend approval of this project based on the findings and with the conditions set forth in the Staff report, with the following changes. On page 22, the project would not impact a future bike path in line one and then down in

finding number three, last paragraph, rather than the plant species proposed, are the planting proposed is primarily indigenous. What was your first one?

Mr. Lait: There were two other changes to the findings. Finding one had a change to replace subdued colors with not bright colors and finding number three striking the...

Board Member Furth: Redundant.

Mr. Lait: ...third sentence in that paragraph.

Board Member Furth: Exactly and adding a condition that the design of the – did you call those stair towers and the cornice? The upper – the roof element? Roof parapet is referred to a subcommittee for further review and approval – recommendation.

Chair Lew: I just want to clarify that it's a recommendation to Council and not the Planning Director; at least not this time.

Board Member Furth: Included in that is our recommendation of approval to the Design Enhancement Exception and our review of the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Board Member Baltay: I can second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None and that passes 5-0.

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

Chair Lew: Thank you and congratulations and we'll see you at the Council. Ok and then we're ready for the next item. We'll take a 2-minute break for them to get set up.

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 Hamilton Avenue (17PLN-00171):**  
Consideration of a Minor Architectural Review to Allow for Exterior Improvements to an Existing Hotel. The Proposed Changes Include: Replacing the Ground Floor Store Fronts Along the Hamilton Avenue and Emerson Street Entries, Replacing the Existing Awning at the Emerson Street Entry, New Façade Finishes on the First Floor and Part of the Second Floor. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CD-C(GF)(P) (Downtown Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Lew: We're ready for the next item and it's a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item; 180 Hamilton Avenue. Consideration of a Minor Architectural Review to allow for exterior improvements to an existing hotel. The proposed changes include replacing the ground floor storefronts along the Hamilton Avenue and Emerson Street entries, replacing the existing awning at the Emerson Street entry, new façade finishes on the first floor, and part of the second floor. The environmental assessment is that it's exempt from the provisions of CEQA per guideline Section 15301 and the zone district is CD-C(GF)(P). Our project planner is Samuel Gutierrez, welcome.

Mr. Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning to the Board and thank you. My name is Samuel Gutierrez and I'm the project planner for this project. It is located here in downtown at 180 Hamilton; just a few blocks from where we sit right now. I'm going to go into a little history of the building before we go into the project overview. It is one of the more prominent buildings in downtown and has gone before the Board for review previously. It is currently a hotel use with an auxiliary restaurant on the ground floor and per today's code, it is legally not conforming for FAR and its height. Although, there are no proposed changes to that so we're not increasing or decreasing any degree of the non-conformity. It's purely an application for exterior changes to the building. Moving forward, the exterior changes include

changes to the ground floor as mentioned and the projecting second-floor balcony area and a new awning that goes along Emerson entrance and it projects over the sidewalk and the planters along the Hamilton Avenue face (inaudible) propose a change. The new colors and finishes are also going to change on the building. This would include the doors, the moldings, the trims, the railing, and the new entry pavers along the Hamilton side of the building. That will match the new textured stone façade that is more prominently show along the Emerson side of the building on the first floor and wrap around to that entrance around the corner of Hamilton there. The existing conditions of the building, I have some images shown and you can see that the more prominent change that would be most noticeable would be the changes to the ground floor there. Where you can see a daytime view of the perforated panel, which during the day it's not as discernable what that perforation truly is but in the evening, you start to notice oh, it forms a tree mosaic which actually connects to the large mosaic that's long standing on the side of the building of El Palo Alto, which of course, is our namesake in the City. The building is even more prominent because of the surrounding area. You'll see much smaller buildings directly across the street, you'll see the Creamery building that's a single-story building, on the other corner directly across from that we'll see a historic two-story office building and then directly across from the subject site we see a newer building; it is mixed-use office, retail and ground floor. I do want to mention that the adjacent at 620 Emerson will also mirror some of these proposed changes at the 180 Hamilton site. There's currently an active application to propose a new building there at 620, which will tie the ground floor restaurant in the hotel at 180 Hamilton and expanding it into the 620 Emerson space. Since we do have an application, I did want to mention that because that will come from the – before the Board in the coming months. The proposed changes that are shown here and I won't go into too much greater detail because I'm sure the applicant will fill you in on the fine details but you can see the differences here on the ground floor façade in particular. The textured stone finish on the ground floor does change what had previously been reviewed and approved by the Architectural Review Board back in 2012. That was the – kind of (inaudible) of the Staff's review in saying that perhaps this should go before the Board again, amongst other things. We saw some conflicts possibly with the Comp. Plan where we would have some Comprehensive Plan and goal conflicts potentially. The pedestrian overlay was another thing because the zoning does state that you need to avoid blank walls and that's where Staff felt potentially this design change could form a new blank wall. Then the ARB findings for the compatibility with the project design for the site in particular and the surrounding areas, these are some of the key considerations that Staff is seeking the Boards feedback and comments on. The recommendation that Staff has is to review and provide formal comments for this application or possible continue to an uncertain date. Thank you and that concludes the presentation.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and so now is the time for the applicant presentation. Yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: I need to say that when I was looking at this site on one of the several times that I went to look at it, somebody on Staff graciously took me through the building and also through 620 Emerson to see what those spaces looked like and what the current use where. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Are there any other disclosures? No. Ok, welcome.

Mr. Greg Stutheit: Thank you and good morning. My name is Greg Stutheit and I'm with Montalba Architects and I'm just here to give you a brief presentation this morning about our little project down the street here. This is at the corner of Hamilton and Emerson and it's currently or actually until a few days ago, was formerly the Epiphany Hotel. It's not being transformed into Nobu Hotel. The intent is to keep the hotel open while we're doing this so we're going to be working on some of the interiors and a little bit of exterior here as we'll get into. You can see here, this is the building as it exists right now. There's currently an eight-story building with rooms facing north and south and we have kind of a strong belt course that runs around the building and divides the ground floor from the rest of the levels up above. There's a canopy right here that demarcates the pedestrian entrance off of Emerson and then the interior of that, as you mentioned, is the lobby. Then a small lounge on the second floor and some office spaces, as well as a couple of rooms. Then the bottom over here is the new Nobu restaurant and you can see here on the next image is the restaurant is actually finished and operating currently. The majority of our efforts is – are on the ground floor. We're going to be replacing wall finishes as Samuel mentioned,

refinishing the existing belt course, a new canopy here at the entry and it's intended to be a little bit lighter than the canopy that's there now. Then above, the only real thing that we're doing is replacing this screen so that it separates the balconies at the upper levels. We're not proposing main changes to the upper portion of the building; the massing stays the same. Then, of course, the El Palo Alto mosaic on the corner remains as is. I just wanted to touch briefly on the lobby revisions that are planned. Here you can see a few images of the interior and we think this is important because it kind of – it shows that we'll be updating our design with traditional materials that are used in a very kind of clean and modern way. It's also interesting to note that these materials are all much lighter in color than the existing. The existing lobby, I don't have photos of it but it's very dark and what that does is it actually kind of turns the entrances into mirrors at night. So, you really don't get much of a sense of the inside of the building. The other thing that's on this image is the new Nobu restaurant that will remain as is and stay in operation again while we're doing this effort. The next slide here you can see the Nobu restaurant with the doors open and the lights on inside and you can actually see how it draws the eye in and really kind of connects to the street in a very powerful way. That's one of the things that we'll be looking to hopefully accomplish with the lobby as well. If I move to the next image here, we've got the corner of Hamilton and Emerson. We're going to be replacing some of the plantings down at the bottom here. Not – actually, the planting basically remains as is but we'll be replacing the planters. There's a little planter on the second floor but that's not very visible from the street but connects more directly to the second floor. If I move onto what we're proposing for the ground floor, this is a textured stone wall that kind of creates a base to the building below the belt course. We're proposing the texture to kind of give it some interest as you're walking by on the pedestrian level. Then if I flip to the next page here, the proposal is to light this at a very slight angle from above which calls attention in the evening and at night to the texture and it sort of washes the surface with light that plays across the surface. The other thing that this does is provide a sort of soft backlight for the pedestrians that are walking by on the street. Kind of turning them into the activity as opposed to perhaps the building so much. The next image here just shows our proposal for the canopy which is much thinner and lighter than the existing. Again, you can see here the lighter colors interiors drawing your focus into the building a bit more; people silhouetted against the wall and the background. This slide just focuses briefly on the upgrades to the balconies between the – these screens between the rooms. They're just being basically changed out to give them a bit more of a sort of Japanese aesthetic. The intent is to color them similar to the way that they are colored now so that they work with the dark colored window frames and railings but also tie into the new bronze elements that the canopy and the new entry doors. A quick overview of the materials here so these are our existing materials that we're playing off of. We have this kind of faux wood wrapping up and around the building. Again, that is all proposed to remain and then this sort of black paint colors here. The rest of the materials are not really anything we're playing off of so we didn't mention them here. Then the new materials, in rebuilding the belt course we're – in order to put lighting in and we're suggesting to finish it in an actual wood material that would play with the surrounding faux wood facing on the sides and up around the top. The dark-colored metals and oil rubbed bronze and then we have our textured stone and as Samuel mentioned, this lighter stone flooring that sort of spills out here – out of the entry onto Hamilton. As you can see, it's – our proposal is fairly simpler, we're not doing a whole lot. We thank you for your time and we look forward to working with you to make this a successful project. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Are there any – oh, I should open it up to the public on any public comments but I don't have any speaker cards. Are there any questions from the Board? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Sure, some technical questions for the architect I guess. Help me read your plans, the canopy that projects over the pedestrian entrance off of Emerson, is that being changed in scope or shape? Does it project further out along Emerson?

Mr. Stutheit: In overall scope, it does not project out any further. It is thinner than the existing canopy and the existing canopy, if I can go back a few here, is this kind of – the belt course wraps around and then actually wrap up and around the canopy which...

Board Member Baltay: That's exactly my questions. Where is steps out over at the entrance, does it extend the scope of the amount that steps out?

Mr. Stutheit: No, the actual footprint is the same. It's just the profile that's (crosstalk)(inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, I want to be clear about that. Secondly, how is the Teak detail – you're putting genuine Teak boards I see on that belt course as you call it. Which direction are the grain running and a little bit more detail? How big are the boards or how is it done?

Mr. Stutheit: Currently, we're proposing to run the boards in the same direction that we're showing here so they will be vertical boards. There are limitations to the size of Teak in an outdoor application, especially, so they will not be overly large but perhaps up to 8-inches or so but likely not much larger than that. The tone will be similar to the tone, especially the darker color you see here.

Board Member Baltay: Is there a detail of that parapet in this package? I'm just – how is the end grain exposed on the bottom and how do you weather protect it on the top and things like that. I don't mean to be overly detailed but it's just so critical that this work and Teak is really tough to work with on an exterior.

Mr. Stutheit: Let's see, the best place to see it in this package is probably on this detail here. I don't really have a page number but it's textured defuse luminosity at the top of the page. It will have a parapet cap that will kind of wrap over the top in a very minimal way and then the end grain will be exposed on the bottom and kind of forming a drip edge there at the bottom. To be honest, it's not entirely vetted through but that's the intent.

Board Member Baltay: Then the last question is this has to do with the Nobu and is what I would call an open restaurant because most of the time those doors are wide open to the street. Is there any change or any change proposed to the way that functions?

Mr. Stutheit: No, the only thing we're proposing currently in that area is changing out the planters and that's more just to get a little bit of a more refined material that works with the rest of our pallet at the planters themselves.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? I have a question for you. Has the – on the Teak awning, has that – have you reviewed that with the Building and Fire Departments because that's an issue often times because it's a combustible material in the egress path.

Mr. Stutheit: Well, this is all exterior.

Chair Lew: No, but that's what I'm – I'm actually saying that is a grey area in the code that pops up. I've been burned by that, so to speak on projects at Stanford. Usually, they will allow – sometimes they will allow it if it's heavy timber but not if it's little sticks.

Mr. Stutheit: Our intent would be to utilize it similar to the way that an interior finish would be done. So, it would be backed by a non-combustible material and held off in a limited fashion so that it – while it's combustible, it provides enough protection. To answer your question, I specifically have not talked to the Building Official about it but thank you for the suggestion.

Chair Lew: My recollection is that the faux wood that's on the building had an issue with the Building Department and that's not the first choice of materials. That was the one that was – that met the fire whatever – fire class – you know fire class rating and so I do want to encourage you to do that.

Mr. Stutheit: Yes, we will, thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for bringing this to the Board. I think it looks really nice. I think this kind of a (inaudible) to it where your kind of making things a little bit more defined for the minimalism and simplifying the materials. Also brightening up the spaces, which I think will make a big difference. I had some questions that have already been answered with your presentation but looking at the materials board, there was a smoother limestone that I think is supposed to go on the entry ramps. Could you just clarify which entry ramps you mean?

Mr. Stutheit: So, that's right here.

Vice Chair Kim: Oh, it's on the Emerson and Hamilton side?

Mr. Stutheit: Well, it comes out to the door at the Emerson side but the entry ramp that was really -- I think we're addressing this one here because it actually slips out through the door and then down to the sidewalk. So, it sorts of -- it's almost like a carpet that's extended out to bring people in.

Vice Chair Kim: My only concern with that would be, you know I love the material but of course, we don't get to much rain here but can it be a slippery hazard and that's something to consider.

Mr. Stutheit: Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Something I didn't notice until this morning was actually the change to the Emerson awning. I never really liked the way that the belts popped out like that I think the way that you're addressing it is much cleaner. Originally, I was thinking does it make sense to make the awning the same width as the middle panels coming down but I see that you're changing some things there. You're adding a new metal panel to where some of that tree metal is currently so I think it works pretty well the way you have it. I wouldn't make a change to that awning from the way that you have it proposed. The biggest concern that I have is the pedestrian overlay requirements and some of the other things in our code that ask for the building to be more open and transparent. I think it's tough because at least from the floor plans that we received and I don't know what's exactly there currently but I don't think it's possible or, maybe is it? Is it possible to add a couple more windows and make it a little bit more visible to the interior? I think the notion of Nobu having moved into this space and now it becoming Nobu Hotel, while it's great to some, it feels like a very expensive place where I can't go. I just don't want the Jerusalem stone and this heaviness to make it feel even more so like a place where it's only for people that can afford to go there. At the same time, I think that I really like the texture of the stone and while it, in a sense, may feel heavy because it is a stone. I think it also feels very light and the colors that you are using and the ways that you're lighting that surface so that you see the articulation. Again, I would ask to see if there can be a little bit more porosity between the lobby and the exterior. Overall, I think it looks great and I'm sure it will be well maintained but I'm looking forward from hearing from the rest of the Board and perhaps your responses to some of our comments. Thank you.

Chair Lew: And Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I had two areas where I needed more information. One was could you tell -- you were here, could you tell us a bit about the last round of discussions and how we got the project that we have now?

Chair Lew: You're referencing the previous ARB (inaudible)?

Board Member Furth: I am.

Chair Lew: The -- if you guys remember -- if you recall the original building, the Castle (inaudible) building, it had a garage entrance on Emerson Street so it was a huge change to get -- a big change there to improve the -- to put the lobby there and to close the garage. The Board still had concerns about

the corner and it use to be brick and it's a fire stair and elevator so you can't really add windows there. It was really a dark and dead corner, especially at night. In the daytime, you didn't really notice it so much but at night time it really seemed to kill the connectivity between the different sections of the Emerson Street restaurant row. The illuminated perforated panels were the designer's idea and that came after the preliminary review and the Board really liked it. If you've seen the inside of the building, it ties into the interior design or at least the previously interior design of some of the rooms. Did that help?

Board Member Furth: It does.

Chair Lew: The metal – the faux wood and the depth of the cornice and stuff, that was under debate. That was debated and some changes were made at the subcommittee level and not everybody was happy with the results of the change – with the changes.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Then for Staff and maybe the applicant, can you explain more about the proposal for 620 Emerson? I understand there's a proposal for a party space or social space on the second story that ties into the hotel. My real question is how does this integrate into the hotel and what's proposed? If this was a CEQA project, we'd be saying don't project split but here we've got a somewhat different issue which is we know that step two is going to be more of this frontage along Emerson and we'll have a better idea of what we need in the hotel section if we know a bit about what might be going next door.

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure, the proposal for 620 Emerson building which is more commonly known as the flower shop.

Board Member Furth: Stanford Florist.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah, it's been a flower shop for several years and it was purchased and is currently proposed to be demolished essentially and rebuilt roughly at the – pretty much at the same footprint in size but it would have...

Board Member Furth: But they've already maxed out their footprint, right?

Mr. Gutierrez: Right, they are pretty much maxed out but the other thing is that they are mainly seeking to expand the Nobu restaurant into that space. Currently, it's limited to the side of Hamilton Avenue that you can see from the street and that's pretty much the entire restaurant.

Board Member Furth: Would there be internal connections between the two buildings?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, they are proposing an internal connection.

Board Member Furth: So, it's going to be an integrated project?

Mr. Gutierrez: Right.

Board Member Furth: Sort of like the Masons but more so. That's a reference to another project down the street. Thank you. Ok, well I often go by this building because it's on my way to the grocery store and it's also on my way to dinner or to visit friends. I went and looked at it again and I must say, everything looks beautiful in the early morning light but this looked particularly nice. I think the two frontages are very different in terms of their success, in terms of the pedestrian overlay and in terms of finding number four that we have to make about the pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the area. I'm going to give up on the bicycle issue here. On Hamilton, there are a lot of things going for it and the restaurant makes an interesting thing to look at, to see, and to hear. The fact that you have essentially elbow height landscaping, that's not going to change? It's very nice for pedestrians and I think that's all good. It isn't particularly welcoming because it's quite a specialized use but it's an attractive thing to walk by. I don't think it discourages pedestrians. There is no seating anywhere along that frontage and there could

possibly a bench over by the service section of the building. It is all a great improvement over the garages that use to be there. There did use to be in fact a storefront there; there was a beauty shop. When we come around to Hamilton, that sidewalk doesn't work and I was trying to figure out why and I had this memory of being pushed into the dirt there and I thought how can that be? There's not dirt but there is and back in the era when double-wide strollers were more common, I frequently found myself being urged into the dirt. As it is, that is the side where there are valet parkers, where people check in, those people aren't – the Staff is unfailingly polite but that takes up space on a very busy sidewalk. There's nowhere to get out and there is a lot of dirt – City owned dirt on that sidewalk with one lone podocarpus that really isn't very successful in that spot. I mean it interferes with the base of the mosaic and for me is not a very successful street tree. So, I think for this frontage to work, we need to readdress that sidewalk and I mean I would be in favor of digging up the tree and planting a new one or replanting it. Whatever you need to do to change the grade so that we can get either with metal grading – the usual street furniture approach. So, that we get a full usable work with the sidewalk there because as it stands now, it doesn't work. The idea of having this extremely elegant and exclusive hotel fronting on that is really inappropriate and I think it would add to the sense of peons in the dirt. It just isn't a good transition between the sidewalk and the people in the dirt is what I mean so I would like to see that figured out. It's a matter of using the building the space and the City space to have a functional sidewalk. I'd prefer in many ways the design and materials that are being proposed. There is an existing sort of window vitrine to the left of the entrance on Emerson and I don't think it works at all. It's darks, you can't see anything, it's not inviting and it's not interesting at least in the daytime so I think that needs to be rethought. I'm also concerned that this is not meeting out pedestrian overlay standards no matter how beautiful the stone, it's a long stretch of uninterrupted wall. Me, I would settle for a bench and there are a few places where the façade goes in and out and I would even probably settle for a bench next door. I think as it stands, it doesn't meet our standards.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne and Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I pretty much have to agree with what my fellow Board Members have said. I've never been a real fan of the mosaic or (inaudible) call them, mosaic. I mean it works well at night but in the daytime, unless you really carefully – you don't even really understand what it is. So, I'm not too worried about that aspect of it...

Chair Lew: (Inaudible), I mean the perforated metal because there is a mosaic as well; the tree.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

Chair Lew: Let's make sure it's (crosstalk) (inaudible).

Board Member Gooyer: I'm talking about at the ground floor and not the tree. That's what I'm talking about, the perforated metal if you want to call it. It – so, I mean I like the treatment with the brick but I also agree that it doesn't fit the criteria of the interest on the sidewalk type situation. Although, it's not really making it any worse than it is now, not that that's a good thing. I think it lightens it up and it's one of the interesting things that – this picture that you have on the screen right now, also I have a bit of a problem and I know it's probably – my wife would be the type to say that only you would notice things like that. You've got a cool white or off-white color above the awning and a warm white below the awning and to me, those two just really clash. I know that's probably a minor point but to me that – those two don't work together. I think if you're going – they ought to be at least – the materials don't need to be the same but at least the color ought to be the same pallet. I agree with Wynne, probably something like some seating or whatever would help greatly. I don't think you need to put windows everywhere to make it more interesting for – while someone is walking by. I also agree I think the sidewalk needs to be part of that whole project on Emerson as far as – in the sense of cleaning that area up. I like the canopy, it's a definite improvement. I also agree that I've had the same thing and not to mention the pun of being burned but the wood on the exterior, the fire marshal will probably say something about it. I mean there are enough faux products out there and I think you could probably get a pretty close copy of what your intent is. All in all, I think it's definitely an improvement.



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

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Yes, I find everybody's comments pertinent and important and interesting. To me it sorts of summarizes up, the issue is we have a pedestrian overlay requiring, especially corners, to be open and visible and this is clearly not and it never has been. I think as Alex has pointed out, it's not really capable of having windows put in there. What I see is in the past the Architecture Board also struggled with this and they came up with this perforated metal screening and I agree, during the day it just looks muted but I find at night it to be extremely vibrant. I find combining that vibrant, extremely brightly lit façade with the incredibly busy activity going on in the restaurant next to it easily overwhelms – overweighs the – meets the requirements for pedestrian-friendly activity on the street and the corner. It's one of the most pedestrian-friendly corners in town at night and it's just always buzzing. I was really trying to sort of look at why is that the case? Why is it so friendly and buzzing and busy and I think there are two things, one is the active restaurant. Even more so with Nobu and everybody wants to see who's eating there tonight. You drive right by and you can see in and the second thing is this tree lighting quasi-sculpture is really interesting at night or different or captures your attention. That's what makes it work, I think. I'm saying that because to me when I look at this project, clearly the materials are of high quality, the design is high quality, the use is appropriate and everything else is fine. So, what I am trying to do is find ways that we can – what changes are reasonable that still meet the past Architecture Board efforts and the guidelines of the town. I've come up with what I think are perhaps four ideas of how to meet that goal. One of them would be to take the new stone and perhaps put two kinds of lighting on it. If you have it recessed in the ground and very bright up lights with the texture of the stone at night, that would really make it bounce and be powerful on the corner. I think the stone – just down the street is another stone building, Roxy Rapp building, with bright uplighting on the stone and it has that same effect. It really struck me walking by there yesterday – I think it was yesterday night and how strong that is. Something like that is just a slight design enhancement to the stone to make it punch and be strong. Combined with the softer downlight the architect was talking about might be enough to get – replicate some of the efforts of the tree design that's there now. Secondly, I think the sidewalk could certainly be improved and seating and public areas and do something to offset Kyu's comments that this is a very expensive and elite restaurant and hotel now. It is important that everybody in town feel comfortable on that corner and I understand what he's talking about when I joke that we all want to see who's dining there now. I don't want to feel like I have to cross the street because I'm with the Creamery crowd and not the Nobu crowd. So, if you put on that corner nicer landscaping, maybe a different paving on the sidewalks, some benches or seats or something to just make it feel more friendly to the whole town; as a public jester. I think it would also just make it a nicer entrance to your hotel but it could be very minimalist style benches or bike racks or something but some improvements; that would help a lot. Thirdly, I just want to reiterate that it's really important that the restaurant remain functioning the way it is now where it really opens to the street. It's really what allows the rest of that to be closed and if that restaurant where for some reason to decide they wanted to close it off and quiet fine dining, that would really change the whole block for the worse. That would affect the thinking we have going, at least for me, around the corner so I know that's functioning right now the way I'm proposing but I'm just putting it for the record that that's an important function. Lastly, around the corner at 620 Emerson, I think Wynne points out some good things about. It would be nice to see what that façade is going to look like as well. Certainly, these are a combined project with the same organization doing it and it seems to me that we should see that whole length of the façade to be confident with it. That's my comments and I think we could make those changes to it. Probably have to have the project come back through to see that. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Peter. I have one question for the architect, is the – what are you planning to do with the existing exit door from the staircase?

Mr. Stutheit: The intent with the exit door is to do essentially similarly what's been done now, which is to cover the exit door in a way that from the outside you really don't see anything. It's only an exit and it goes away as much as possible and so the intent right at this point is to face it with a honeycombed

backed stone so that it's still light enough to operate as it needs to but goes away essentially in the façade as much as we can make it – have it.

Chair Lew: Tricky – yeah, tricky to do, ok, thank you. I think that I can support the project. The – my take on it is that the – going back to the original building design, it's just that it was dark – I mean it was blank but it was also dark and it seems like – I think with the lighter color and lighting and if there are sidewalk improvements, that – I think it could work. I like the existing perforated metal at night. I think that looks great but I don't think that this is – yeah, I don't think that the proposed design is – I think that would – what do I want to say? I think that could meet our findings. I think that I'm on board with that. I do worry about the wood that's being proposed and so I do want that to be reviewed by the Building Department and the Fire Department. Then I think I had – the last comment is on the uplighting. I think we do have some – I think we have some conditions in our performance requirements of the code about discouraging up lighting. I don't know if they are trick – if they are necessarily triggered in this particular situation because I don't think there's any residential use next door but I would just have to look at the exact language of that of that code.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Right and if it's angled too, I think that could help. Anyway, so I'm in support of the project. If I read the Staff correctly, I think you're recommending continuing it – this project if we – it seems like the Board is on the same page. If we recommend this coming back to subcommittee, would Staff be ok with that or do you think it's better for this to come back?

Mr. Gutierrez: We would differ that to the Board if you feel that it would come back to subcommittee.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, so I'm done so any motions?

Board Member Furth: Do you have a date in mind for us to continue this?

Mr. Lait: It sounds like there is some additional work that needs to be done.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Furth: We're hoping to – so moved that the matter is continued to a later date to be determined by Staff.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None. Ok, so we will see you in the future at a date uncertain, thank you.

## **MOTION PASSED 5-0**

### **Approval of Minutes:**

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

Chair Lew: We have one last item which is the meeting minutes for September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017. Are there any comments from the Board? I had one so it was a subcommittee item there for Avenidas and the subcommittee approved those items. It was just paint color, trellis detail, lighting fixtures so if that could just be added into the minutes.

Board Member Furth: I have a couple of typos – transcript typos that I'll give to Staff.

Vice Chair Kim: I think this was a meeting where Board Member Baltay has a recuse – possibly recused himself in the middle of a garage discussion, which turned out to be not the case but I don't know if that effects the voting on the minutes. I guess it doesn't.

Mr. Lait: No, you can vote on the minutes to the extent that you were able to participate – to the parts that you were here for you can certainly vote (inaudible) for that.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, just be...

Mr. Lait: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: It triggers my memory that I, at Staff's request, wrote up a bunch of comments that I was prepared to make and does that become part of the minutes or is that part of the record?

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) had the opportunity to read them because you didn't have to leave yet, the way I remember it.

Mr. Lait: So, the answer to your question, as part of the administrative record that we have it in our records and we've communicated it to the applicant. It is not a part of your minutes because it was – did not take place here at this meeting.

Board Member Baltay: But it's not something communicated to my fellow Board Members as...

Mr. Lait: That is true and it will be communicated when the item returns and we can include that information.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I'll leave it up to however you think is the proper way to do that.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, let me give it some thought; maybe we can get it in advance.

Board Member Furth: That would be good for the applicant to have, surely,...

Mr. Lait: The applicant does have the...

Board Member Furth: ...which is you.

Board Member Baltay: Board Member Lew pointed out to me that it is important and I had emailed them to him (inaudible) as the Chair and he said I shouldn't be doing that because it (inaudible) constitutes a Brown Act violation meeting or potentially does. So, I'm referring to Staff for some guidance on that but I felt strongly about those comments and wanted to be sure that the Board got to hear them one way or another.

Mr. Lait: Sure, (crosstalk)(inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: At least at the Staff – thank you.

Chair Lew: Then for the Brown Act, you can send me something but then I can't talk to somebody else about the project and that causes – yeah, that causes some problems. All in favor? (crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: I am going to abstain from that.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I don't even know – do we even have a motion? Can somebody make a motion?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Furth: It was an implied motion to approve the minutes but there's no second.

Chair Lew: All in fav -- Yes.

Mr. Lait: Who seconded it? I heard...

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second it.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None.

Board Member Baltay: I abstain.

**MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSTAINING**

Chair Lew: We are adjourned, thank you.

**Subcommittee Item**

**Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements**

**Adjournment**