



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: September 21, 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 Robert Gooyer, Peter Baltay

Absent: Board Member Wynne Furth

Chair Lew: [Video started mid-sentence] ...2017. Can we have a roll call, please?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Related to that, Board Member Gooyer said that he would attend the subcommittee with the Vice Chair Kim to help out in that regard, thank you.

### Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications. The public may speak to any item that's not on the agenda. I don't have any speaker cards for but I do have lots of speaker cards for the cell tower item.

### Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Are there any agenda changes today?

Ms. Gerhardt: I just wanted to note that the – we have now started to include a tentative future agenda in your packet. Unfortunately, the one that got printed in the packet wasn't the final version so we have placed a final version At Places.

Chair Lew: Great and we have that, thank you.

### City Official Reports

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

### Study Session

- 2. Various Sites (250 Hamilton Avenue in database) [17PLN-00193]:** Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of Location and Siting Criteria, Design Criteria, and Design Options for the Deployment of 16 Small Cell Wireless Communication Nodes on Utility Poles and Street Lights in the Public Right of way. Nodes are Proposed for Downtown North, University South, and Near Town & Country. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review. Zoning District: Varies. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Rebecca Atkinson at [rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Lew: Let's move onto the first item which is number two which is a study session for various sites. Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of location and siting criteria, design criteria, and design options for the deployment of 16 small cell wireless communication nodes on utility poles and street lights in the public right of way. Nodes are proposed for Downtown North, University South, and near Town & Country. The Environmental Assessment is it's not a project. A Formal Application will be subject to CEQA review and the zoning district varies. We have out project planner Rebecca Atkinson, welcome.

Ms. Rebecca Atkinson, Project Planner: Good morning and thank you Chair and Board Members. The proposed project is as stated but I'd like to clarify that Preliminary Architectural View Applications are not required but highly recommended for all major architectural review applications. I'd like to take a moment to just acknowledge that the applicant did submit this application and promote that kind of public – early public comment and transparency. While this application does have Verizon as the proposed wireless carrier, this project has a different applicant with a different business model and different Master License Agreement so it's Crown Castle. The proposed – oh, excuse me. The proposed design apparently doesn't have the opportunity for an additional carrier at this time but Crown Castle does typically have the business model of offering co-location opportunities so that's one difference. The location of this project are as you mentioned; Downtown North, University South and adjacent to Town and Country. Again, this is a project that's different than the vinculum of Verizon's small cell project in other neighborhoods. Generally, this project proposed three different configurations and I'll show what those locations – what those configurations are in just a second. Generally, here's a – the general distribution of the proposed nodes. The first configuration is for wood utility poles and generally, the antenna would be approximately 48-inches and would have a bayonet that would extend from the top of the wood utility pole unless a wood utility pole was proposed for replacement. The second configuration would have the antenna on top of a street light and the associated equipment would be in a ground mounted cabinet; similar to what you've seen in some other projects here Downtown. The third configuration which is proposed for Town and – adjacent to Town and Country would have a 24-inch antenna and all the equipment would be mounted to the pole. Formal Applications need to show compliance with FCC (inaudible) Standards and again, wireless carriers appear to have different designs. Formal Applications need to be reviewed for a wide variety of consistency items and code requirements including the Comprehensive Plan policies which are outlined in one of your attachments to the Staff report. Wireless Development Standards in our municipal code and our regular architectural review findings and conditional use permit findings. The purpose of this meeting here today is to receive early feedback from the Architectural Review Board and hear some comments from the members of the public. Crown Castle does have some key questions on the last page of the project description that they'd like to discuss. It's also – the purpose is also to discuss early City feedback on all of the preliminary design criteria and siting options and so forth. The guidance that Staff provided is summarized at a high level on pages nine through ten of the Staff report and a particular note, this application debuts a new typography for the City. It proposes a new pole in the right of way as opposed to utilization of an existing structure. This node also has some sensitivity as written in the Staff report on page ten under the historic comments. It's my understanding that the applicant may also be interested in debuting an alternative location to one node shown in the project plans that you received last week. Staff has not yet seen these plans but they should be At Places here. Public comments were posted online and so they are sighted as Attachment E in the Staff report. Staff has subsequently received two public comments and exhibits are here At Places and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Rebecca, and also just to – just to – I just want to mention that because it's a study session that no action is being taken by the Board today. We'll hear from the applicant and you'll have 10-minutes. Then we'll hear from the public speakers and I have three -- I think I have three speaker cards so each person will have 5-minutes to speak and then we'll bring it back to the Board for comments. Welcome.

Ms. Rochelle Swanson: Thank you and good morning. I genuinely appreciate the opportunity to be able to get feedback from you this morning. I'm Rochelle Swanson and I'm with [Sure Sight]. I've been – our company has been hired by Crown to do the government relations and to work with the community, to work with Staff and to work with the City, in general, to be able to do the siting and to be able to do the

rollout. I also have with me other folks from Crown Castle, I have Ernesto Figueroa who's our RF engineer and I have Greg Day from Coastal Communication to help answer questions about drawings and anything specific. Then John Griffith who is our Construction Manager and Sharon James our government relations are on her way here; she's in traffic. I just want to do over – background and Rebecca talked on it that Crown Castle is a CLEC or also known as a competitive local exchange character which always us to be in the right of way and to be able to deployment in small cells and be able to erect poles at attachments. To go further than that, this is not the first piece of this project. That was approved before and – with 19 nodes and this is an additional 16 to be able to lay out the RF design and to be able to have a consistent network throughout Palo Alto. That is what the goal is to be able to provide ubiquities coverage and to be able to have a backbone that makes it predictable. I – as Rebecca also mentioned, Verizon – Crown is not a carrier. We would be the landlord to the tenant Verizon. We actually build the system and have the backbone and then rent out space and also as Rebecca has mentioned, not just to Verizon. This is particular to them, they have asked to be tenants on and to build up the system but it is not exclusive to Verizon. It is true that it is possible for co-locations on these sites and going forward, that's not something that would be automatic. That is something that would come back to the City in an application. Just to touch a little bit, there's sometimes confusion between coverage and capacity so coverage is just a blanket coverage that – where sites are built out to be able to meet up and to provide that coverage and going back when wireless started, that was good. We could get coverage, we could have macros, and as more and more people have cell phones and do data, capacity has become a real issue. That's why you're seeing more small cells and they need to be closer and small to actually be able to hold that traffic. Especially as we have far more data now than a voice, whether it's text messaging or screening movies or it depends on who's using the technology; I won't read it to you. Just a few quick graphics, the one in the corner up there says forty-seven percent and that just shows what the growth in changes as we're going through and picking up through 2019, and they expect it to get quite a bit quicker. This graphic on the bottom at forty-eight percent was from 2015 to show how quickly things are changing and now that's at fifty percent through a study that just came out in (inaudible) that I have on the next page. It's from 2017 so that's a two percent National wide growth so it is possible that it's going to go even faster. As you can see for communication accessibility fifty-three percent of people have indicated from the one study that they will go out (inaudible) and that their phone was available and of course there's public safety requirements and accommodations that have been helped. We do try to work closely as possible with public safety and that's industry, I can't just say that's just for Crown. So, stating before, over fifty percent of homes are there and they are anticipating that to continue to growing. Especially as wireless is really becoming the utility backbone for most of the communications. The feedback that – (inaudible) that I wanted to ask you in the back, I wanted to be able to just get into specifics rather than give you an overview. I know small cells is – this isn't the first time that you're seeing this so on node 26, we'd originally placed it in front of the building there near Gilman and during the design review and Development Review Committee, we got feedback from the historic that the viewpoint there coming into the landscaping, they felt that that was going to be an impact. That locating at that site is something that was not going to work within those guidelines so there was a concern of the impact. Sometimes we can look and try to move nodes, I mean our design is pretty tight but on this one, the RF engineer when out along with our ANE and looked at the different areas again to see if we could do something different. One thing that I want to note, these were first walked in November of last year after they had already been designed by RF; doing a desktop. We did go pole to pole and be very cognizant in the areas that we were being in. How can we accommodate the needs of this design and deployment but also be very sensitive to the environment that we're being in? So, we went and looked at the different corners and different poles and what was available to keep it viable within the network. This is where the location that was decided. Now, this is not an existing street light so it would be an addition of a street light or it could be an addition of just a single slimline pole only. That is completely – that's one of the things I'm here to ask if with this solution, if – what would you prefer? What would make more sense for this neighborhood and this part of Palo Alto and looking for that same feedback as well to the ground furniture. The mailbox is shown just because it was already in the first 19 and throughout downtown for consistency but each area – each neighborhood is unique. I think that's important and we want to be able to recognize that and get that specific feedback. Another pole that didn't make it into the packet because we wanted to consider alternatives but it wasn't part of the formal resubmission because the drawings weren't ready yet. It is node 22 and as you can see here is here's where it's proposed

currently. Right there by 386 Everett and like I say, typically it's tight to move them around these corners in particular. That's a way to be able to get signal going both up and down both streets and get the surround area and it provides us the ability to do less nodes. That's where the corners often – I know that those are disfavored from your last ARB hearing but that's why we kept them in, is to have an opportunity to explain that that's how we keep the number of nodes small. This would be the alternative which is across the street. It's very similar, it's still the pole top extension that you see there which is – Staff was wonderful, they come out in March and they walked all the sites with us and said we'd really would prefer rather than having stand out arms in what's known as GO95 in com-space, General Order 95 from the PUC, would please do pole top extensions. I think it was great direction because it just shows a consistent plan throughout the neighborhood where it's at and a consistent visual look and those will be painted brown. We can't go all the way to touch the pole just because of requirements from the PUC and just from the utility needing to be able to see those connections. If you have a question more about that, you can ask construction. Here are some street furniture options that I wanted to share with you. Again, looking for your direction, I could certainly suggest what I would want in my community but this is your community and I think each neighborhood can have something specific. The first one is an art wrap and I apologize, they did such a good job on that one blending it in that it's kind of hard to see but that is in fact an art wrapped utility box. Those, I was kind of thinking about down on Ramona and Hoover and in those neighborhoods, there that maybe that would be something that makes sense and on Waverley. The middle one is the trash can and I know before, when it was raised in May, that there was concern that maybe there would be confusion or they wouldn't be well utilized. There's actually new and better technology and options coming out all the time and on this one, that is a real working trash can or recycle receptacle. The antennas are next to it and there's any number of options, it can have any kind of art wrap, pictures, it be plain like an extra utility box and that can be placed near the pole. So, for those ones where I know there's concerns about the pedestrian walk through and especially more in that – the commercial area district that this could be a good alternative. Maybe to get some of trash cans so we're not adding more, actually just replacing or providing better receptacle for trash and recycling. Then of course the last one is the mail which we've already used on our last build out and I think for some location it's appropriate because it just shows a continuing look of the pole next to the mailbox. The other options that I wanted to get a request on or feedback is at Town and Country there on Embarcadero and on El Camino Real. We're really looking at – there are many options that can be done. Those were suggested by Staff to put them on the pole because there's not a lot of ground space there so perhaps adding a banner or something similar would be a nice way to have it blend in, especially with Town and Country being right there. That's a very critical area just because you can imagine between the traffic, the pedestrian, as well as the shopping center there's a high, high demand there. I went through the community comments, there were 13 correspondents. The RF concerns, I already did the reports and those ranges between one and eleven percent of the Public's Safety Standards. For noise, there will be no noise because these are passive cooling and for the siting, as I said we went out in November, we went out in March with the Staff and then we've also went out and reexamined different sites when concerns have been raised. I did want to give a quick example – sorry, I guess I'm done. I'm going to wrap up but this just shows one node of where it is approached on that particular spot in the community and how the RF opens to see (inaudible) we can power of small cell. It's really contained and clear to the pole. Then I just request general feedback from you of how is the best way to really have this fit in with your community and go through the specifics, answers questions, and really look to you for guidance. So, thank you again, for your time and giving me a few minutes to wrap up.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for your presentation. Let's go on – move onto the speakers – public speakers and I have [Steve Likin] and then followed by Elena Campagna and Mike [phonics][Mendolo] and each of you will have 5-minutes.

[Mr. Steve Likin]: Well, thank you for having us. My name is [Steve Likin] and I'm actually at the node 22, the tall building and we're on the top floor. Our building is 52-feet tall, the pole is 49-feet so our building – and it's only 25-feet from our deck and about 30-feet up. That antenna would be about where that skylight is and 25-feet over and about 19-feet up; a 4-foot antenna. So, we asked Rochelle to come out and take a look and she did take a look and unfortunate – we're appreciative that she came up with an alternative because nowhere else in Palo Alto, of the 56 poles that are wood poles, is anywhere next to a

three-story building but ours. We feel that this is obviously not the norm and this would have a big impact on us. The pole – we have a deck outside the building so we're actually sitting looking at the pole as we look to the park. The alternative pole is actually on the same line of sight and probably about 5-foot shorter so it's actually also right here. While we appreciate having an alternative, we would much prefer one that's not directly in the line of sight and almost at the same level as us. Up and down the street we have poles in both directions and the pole across the street is about 21 steps and there's another pole – or 17 steps and there is another pole 42 steps down the street on Waverley as well that we would prefer. That's not next to anything other than one-story homes so our concern is that having such a pole so close is not only going to ruin our view but it's going to have a big impact on property value. I don't know if we could sell our house with a 4-foot antenna so close. People are going to have their own concerns and the view – the view of the park is going to be a big impact on us. I think there are alternatives, there are many poles in the area. I know that constraints are tight on I guess, the goals of Crown Castle. I'm sure there are tradeoffs in terms of meeting their plan one hundred percent to the ideal location and what the alternatives would be but we do need an alternative to this pole. It's just grossly unfair to have that particular pole be part of this plan.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and Elena Campagna.

Ms. Elena Campagna: Hi, I'm Elena Campagna with Steocker Northway Architects and I'm actually the architect for 362 Channing. There's a remodel going on there and the owners have asked me to speak on their behalf to talk to the aesthetics of this node. Proposed site number 28 is located in front of their property and we think it's a poor choice of the cell node and respectfully request a nearby alternative pole be considered instead. I put together a quick little visual aide packet to help illustrate my points which I believe are At Places. My client's house was built in 1904, it's the purple one, well before any zoning ordinance. Their tiny lot is only 35-feet wide and 50-feet deep so their existing two-story house is – their front setback is only a little less than 8-feet to the kitchen bay window and less than 10-feet to the two-story portion of the house. The existing street light pole was put there during SOFA I and it's already a nuance and shines light directly into their second-floor windows because there's no screening there. Adding the unaesthetically – the aesthetically unappealing cell node would be one hundred percent visible from their windows, which are only about 15-feet away from this pole. There are two underground utility vaults directly next to the pole on the southwest side which prevents any trees from being planted within about 15-feet of that pole. Crown Castle states in our location and site criteria that they are trying to avoid proposed undergrounding districts, this site is in one. Utilities were undergrounded back in 1993 or 1994. They are also trying to avoid sites adjacent to first and second-stories windows and ours are 15-feet away from this. They also say they are trying to avoid sites without screening. There is zero screening around this particular pole and because of the utility vaults, you can't add one on the side that would benefit 362 Channing or from the direction of all the traffic that goes down Channing. They also said they favor poles with little or no underground utilities and this one has underground vaults right next to it. We are suggesting two alternate pole locations instead. The intersection at Waverley and Channing has two existing poles that are just about 100 -150- feet away from number 28 and still seemed to work very well with the spacing on their map. They're – I have a little map where I put some red dots. While Crown Castle stated they wanted to avoid choosing poles at intersections for visibility reasons, one of the alternate poles is next to a parking lot, not an occupied house, and is already surrounded by very tall trees. It's taller than the poles that there and would provide screening in its existing condition. Channing is very busy street, just as busy as the intersection at Waverley so choosing site number 28, a highly visible pole that you can't screen because of the utility vaults, over an alternate pole at the intersection which is next to a parking lot with existing tall trees doesn't make any sense to us. Intersections already have poles, signs, utility boxes and it makes more sense to add cell nodes there than directly in front of people's houses. We would like Crown Castle to please relocate cell node number 28 to a pole at the intersection of Channing and Waverley. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and the last speaker is Mike [phonetics][Mendolo].

[Mr. Mike Mendolo]: Good morning Members of the ARB. My name is Michael [Mendolo] and out home is located at 362 Channing Avenue. I've been a Palo Alto resident for over 22-years and we are completing

the remodel of our home that has taken 2-years to remodel and has been in planning since late 2013. We are a substandard lot, 35 by 50 and our setback in the front and in the back of our home is only 10-feet, from the second-story only 8-feet from the first-floor kitchen. The distance between the two ends of the tables where you are seated today is greater than the distance from the proposed cell site tower site 28. Our kitchen on the ground floor and our bedroom on the second floor of the home, 10-feet. How comfortable would be having an RF energy source that close to where you eat and sleep, 10-feet? As has already been pointed out, energy from a cellular phone tower antenna radiates outward toward the horizon parallel to the ground and that amount of energy decreases as the distance from the antenna increases thus the level of exposure ratings for RF energy at ground level is going to be very low compared to the level close to the antenna. In the siting criteria for small nodes as indicated, you are disfavored – the applicant is supposed to disfavor the poles that are in a proposed undergrounding district. We are an underground district and utilities in the area where undergrounded in 1993 or 1994 as part of the overhead utility conversion. An underground utility junction box was located in front of our home where none existed. That left us with an underground box next to light pole which was relocated from the opposite side of the street and placed in front of our home. It's supposed to encourage poles with significant tree screening in order to reduce (inaudible) and that would be an impossibility here. There will never be a tree because it cannot go through a metal underground utility junction box. We experience visual and light intrusion in our home from the light pole already. That light literally shines up into the front of our house. The locations are not appropriate because it has inadequate screening. The other criteria are to favor poles away from the first and second story windows in order to reduce the visibility of the project. That again, would not be obtainable with this particular location because it is only 10-feet from the bedroom and kitchen windows of our home at 8-feet. There are two locations at Waverley and Channing with street lights within a 150-feet of our home, which or with light poles and tree canopies that can effectively shield the tower that has been proposed for site 28. Although the City prefers that cell sites be located (inaudible), the applicant prefers cell sites to be located – not be located at intersections as indicated in siting criteria number four and nine. This does not take into account that the underlying reason to minimize aesthetic impact – is to minimize aesthetic impact. However, in this case, the aesthetic impact is much worse and much more dramatic at site 28 where it is left mid-block as indicated right between our home 362 Channing and the neighboring property at 370 Channing and we will never have the possibility of the tree canopy. In looking at the planned locations each of the sites is about a block apart with the exception of site number 28. I would refer to the packet that was submitted by architect Elena Campagna and also compare with the package submitted by Crown Castle. So, if you look at that, you'll see that the distance required is generally a block. However, the one exception is the one in front of our home. For some reason, they've indicated that at half a block. Our attorney has already contacted the applicant Crown Castle, but the applicant has shown little interest in looking at the obvious reasons why site number 28 is inappropriate and why this particular site should be either eliminated or positioned at either of the two alternate locations which would be available under 150-feet away near the corner of Channing and Waverley. Where adequate tree screening exists and which is also within the range of service that was indicated by the rest of their service map on this application. I'd like to thank you for your time and I'd like to emphasize – I can't emphasize enough how much light intrusion we already have into our home. What a dramatic impact this has and one of the other speakers did also note the effect on values. As you all know as Palo Alto homeowners, our properties in this area are multi-million-dollar homes and any kind of remodel does, of course, have a significant impact as well. That means that we have a significant financial investment, as well as of course the effect on our daily lives because none of us want to leave Palo Alto. This is, I think, a reasonable request to have this pole located in an area that's only 150-feet away and there's no reason that this node should only be half a block away from all of the other ones when there's a full block range between all the other sites located here. I appreciate your time, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much. I'll bring it back to the Board, are there any questions? No? Ok. Kyu, will you start us off on comments?

Vice Chair Kim: Once again, thank you for bringing this forward as a preliminary review. I think I'll pick up from the end of the applicant's presentation with respect to some of the immediate feedback that they were asking for. The thing about these cell towers is that whenever I'm found with the task of refocusing

on the design of these and looking at them specifically, they're not very pretty. The more I look at them, the more I question are there any other ways that we can go about designing cell towers that are a little bit more aesthetically pleasing. At the same time, once some of these previous installations have been made, you hardly notice them. I think I'm caught between what is the best way to go about this. With respect to – excuse me – some of the equipment at ground level, I think more and more I'm less of a fan of the fake mailboxes. It's something that disguises it to look like something that is almost askew more for – we like to think that people still walk in their neighborhoods and drop off their mail but you can't even drop off your mail because it's not a real mailbox. I almost prefer a utility box and perhaps it has an art wrap or perhaps it's an opportunity for local artists rather than just covering it up with some kind of vinyl from an unknown artist. Then I think I'm open to the trash can or the trash or recycling bins solution, also where perhaps it's a way that we can encourage people not litter on the streets. At the same time, create something that's a little bit more functional than a fake mailbox or just a utility box. For node 26 I prefer – if it has to stay in that location, I would prefer that it become a streetlight or something that gives back a little bit to the community and add a little bit to safety. Rather than create a pole that isn't there, to begin with. For node 22 I do like the newer design and new location that's been proposed at our At Places this morning. Then at the end of our – at the end of the project description, I think that there are a couple things you had also asked for feedback and I think I've covered some of them. For the Town and Country site, it's – there was little talk in the presentation with regards to that and I know that there were no public speakers but because you've asked for specific feedback. I agree that even though there's only currently one tenant that there will be – that we should be open to the notion of co-location and that the additional boxes will have to be thought about. I don't think – correct me if I am wrong but I don't think there were box locations proposed so that would be something to look at and something that should be thought through earlier than later. I think overall in the packet there where – I know that the packet is submitted and I know the City asks for certain things but I think overall for us, not all of the pages apply and there was just a lot of information there. I don't know if it's a hindrance to ask for perhaps a summarized package for the ARB Members so that we're looking at specifically what we're supposed to look at. There were a couple labeling things and just a couple minor things that I noted while looking through the package. I think for preliminary comments, I'll leave it at that.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree. It's one of these things that everybody likes the idea of having their cell phone work well but nobody wants one of these poles near them. You're right, it is – you think after a while we would be able to make these things a little bit nicer looking but if I have to have my (inaudible), I'd prefer to have the ones that you show on the light pole. I mean if the – I don't want to have one where it's just the pole for the sake of the unit itself. Also, the – I'm not really a big fan of the – I don't know how we can change it but the – for instance for site 20, the ones on the telephone poles. Those just seem to be exceptionally large and just really stand up there. I'd like to see something a little bit more throughout rather than – I mean that think really just looks like an afterthought that was planted on the top. As far as the – I don't really want to see the equipment hanging from the pole, I just assume to just get rid of it. I agree that having a phony mailbox is probably not the way to do it. I mean we might as well just call it what it is and have a utility box or obviously underground it; one of the other. I'm guessing obviously, utility boxes are a whole lot cheaper so I'd rather see either a wrap or something with that. If you don't need to make it look like something else, we may be able to get a smaller utility box. I think that's it for now.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to start by thank you for a clear application and maybe a guideline back to Staff, having good quality photos side by side of a before and after with a map on each sheet is really helpful to me and to the public; all applications should be like this. So, like my colleagues have said, it's a balancing act here. I've gone back to the codes we have to enforce because I'm trying to understand where the architecture part comes in so I'm going to base my comments on us needing to make architectural findings number two and three. Particularly regarding screening antennas and then I think

number four applies to the ground equipment. I go back to the City code itself on these wireless facilities they call them and base station and antennas need to be concealed. I'm just going to read it because I want to be very clear that we're coming from the code on this; between – according to 18.42.10 section I-6. It's requiring that these things be concealed so I want to take my analysis based out of the code and looking at this, then I say to myself are these antennas concealed – concealed adequately from an architectural point of view? I do not believe that the antennas on top of the utility poles are well concealed. In my opinion for an antenna on top of a wooden utility pole to be concealed, it would need to have a shroud of the same color, texture, and diameter as the pole for the full height of the antenna and the mounting bracket. Once I applied that standard with the poles – the antennas proposed on poles 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 32 do not meet that standard and I couldn't support having them positioned that way. Taking the same logic, I look at the antennas mounted on top of the light poles, for example, number 25 and I find that they are somehow concealed. Even though they are not the same size and shape in material perhaps but something about that design, about the integration with the arm of the light fixture makes it look ok; it seems to just fit right in. In my opinion, the poles – the antennas mounted on top of light poles are well concealed and are therefore appropriate. That said, I caution the applicant that there are two different finishes on these poles. A newer brushed metal finish and your antenna seem to go well with that style. Your photos don't show it quite as well but walking around there's a number of older green faceted poles with a little bit more decoration and putting a rust metal antenna on top with the same design as the other one would not be well concealed. Again, coming back to the code, the standard is that they seem to be well concealed and that would mean that the design needs to be integrated to somehow match the design of that pole. What would that lighting pole designer had made if they had to put this element up there? I think that's what my fellow Board Members are saying and I'd like to be crystal clear that's coming out of the requirement in the ordinance that they need to be better concealed. Then I stepped to the ground equipment and you're asking us whether – which form of a box is appropriate? I do not find any surface mounted equipment on the ground to be appropriate. I think all of these do not meet finding number four and that they are a hindrance to the public. They are not concealed or appropriate. I think they all should be underground. I say this secondarily because we're required to allow other wireless carriers to co-locate and yes, they have to go through an approval process but if you look carefully at the terms of how that process goes. It's a much more expedited process, the shot clock goes very quickly. The City really doesn't have much time and the only thing they can – we can really do at that point is approve what's already been approved. So, I say to my colleagues, what we're doing is setting a president. It seems to me a good president for Palo Alto, for us, in general, is to say that the equipment should be in a vault underground. That's done with other equipment for utilities and telephones. I've designed many houses in town where my clients are extremely vocal about having all their equipment – for example, cable TV use to have a green metal box about 10-inches in diameter and 3-feet high. There's no technical reason that couldn't be mounted underground. It wasn't done at the time and many, many times we've pushed back with those companies and get it underground. In this case yes, you would be investing in the infrastructure to create a vault underground, which could then be used for future co-location. It would give you the freedom to put whatever you like in there, how you like to do it, and in the long run, it will be a much better investment as a company investing in this infrastructure. From the point of the City, having an additional grouping of metal boxes on the sidewalk as shown in these photos, is not concealed, I find inappropriate and will not be able to make the findings to approve the boxes unless they are underground. On node number 26 where it's a pole only, I find that's obviously not concealed. It's a brand-new pole where there was no pole before. That's hardly concealed and I think it needs to either be a light fixture, which really should be a light fixture that's needed by the City. The City will have to maintain that light or you'll just have to find another way to do it. The idea of putting new poles with antennas around town, we're setting president here. Once one of these people does it, the next application that comes in the City has 60-days to decide on that. It means they are going to be approved every time. We can't establish that president of putting a pole with an antenna downtown even if it looks like a light fixture. Then my last comment is really regarding non-architectural but I can't resist to add because it seems to me that it's good public policy to try to get electric utilities undergrounded. Everybody I've spoken to around the town seems to follow that logic. Somehow putting cell phone antennas on top of utilities poles is going to make that really hard to accomplish, whether or not it's in a future district. It just seems to me that's not the right way to go about it so I put it out there. I could not make any architectural findings to support that but it



seems to me from a point of the public policy, mounting them on things that we have to have anyway light street lights makes a lot more sense. Those are my comments, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Peter. Thank you for the presentation and I do think that this – the packet was organized well in terms of the three groupings of light poles, utility poles and then Town and Country. I just had one comment on the packet itself is that some of the simulations – some of the photo simulation photos were taken at twilight or sunset and they are really much too dark. I think what they do is it deemphasizes the cabinet mounted equipment that is only 8 or 10-feet above the sidewalk. So, I think for those – some of them are fine but there are certain – some of the photos I think are too dark and that they should be redone. Otherwise, I think the packet was well put together. The – I did walk all the sites yesterday or on Tuesday. I generally had a favorable impression of the ones that are mounted on the light poles on the corners, say like on Channing and Homer. I generally had a favorable review that and it seemed to me – I think my comment was similar to Peter's. It somehow seems more integrated and then in those locations, I think you are proposing vaults for a lot of the equipment. I did have a comment on those and I think that the light poles are – the street lights are at a 45-degree angle into the intersection. I think your drawings are all showing them perpendicular with the intersection so I would just like you to double check all of that. I had – generally – oh, I think I would – also in that vicinity, I think I also did have a similar reaction to the owners of 362 Channing and number 28. I actually went to the corner of Channing and Waverley expecting it to be there and then I was looking through the packet and realized that I had to backtrack and go to the middle of the block. The owners of 362 Channing are proposing it to be moved to Channing and Waverley and I do want to caution the applicant that that corner lot with the parking lot and the trees is – has an approved – two approved houses going there. So, it's going to change probably within the year and there again, a small setback or a small lot – two small lots with single-family houses. I think we're going to face the same issue there but they are mature trees there at that site. On the number – which one is it? 26? Right, this is the new pole location. I just – I did have a question for you is that the – that apartment building has a very strong axial relationship and a front walkway going out there. I would just want to say – make sure I that whatever is new there works within that sort of entry piece out there. In a way, I think we had discouraged the bench prototype on one of our other cell phone proposals but in this case, if there were a bench on axis with the entrance, it actually could be nice. I mean I always try to think out of the box sometimes and make it site specifically if the neighboring property owner is amenable to it. It could be better and I think again, probably the light is better than just a pole only. Then on the Downtown North sites, I did have more concerns about those. I think some of those existing utility poles are really ugly. Some of them are dual poles, which are really even worse than the standard utility pole. There are a couple locations there that didn't seem to have any trees what so ever, like very exposed corners. It seems like – yeah, the equipment would be very visible to those I think. Also, I noticed that some of those areas have very narrow planting strips so it may not be possible to put vaults in all of those locations. There's one on High Street and Hawthorne and it seems like there might be some problems on some of our smaller streets. Also, I think the one on High Street had houses that are very close to the sidewalk with very small setbacks. There were a couple of locations in Downtown North that did have mature oak trees within – it seemed like a good location for that. I could not quite tell -- on the pole mounted equipment, I couldn't quite tell where you were located them. Sometimes on the drawings, you are saying you've located it in the 9 o'clock position but I wasn't always sure if that was street facing or building facing. If you could make it – if it's possible to make it more clear. It seemed like there were different things happening on different locations so I would have to go back. I mean I think you have the information there but I – there was a lot of information for me to process just on one site visit. I think we had – my – when we did the AT&T DAS thing, I think we had – my recollection is that our preference was to put them – any pole mounted equipment facing the street so that if somebody is looking out their window, that they wouldn't see it. It would be more visible from the street sort of than from the house side. I think that was our logic at the time. I think also our logic at the time is to try to get them as high up as possible. I know you have – there are restrictions on that but it seems like the pole mounted equipment is really low. I have a utility pole in my front yard and I would see it at an 8-foot height – mounting height, I would see it but I have a tree blocking most of the utility pole so anything above 14-feet, I won't see. Anyway, if there's a way of getting it higher, I think I would prefer higher. I think also on the AT&T project we did require landscaping where there was no landscaping. I do understand that

we have vaults and utilities and things that make that more complicated but I think that was part of the application. I don't know if we – I don't recall if the Board actually saw the actual landscaping plans but I think at least maybe Staff reviewed the landscaping. Also, I think we prefer to have – if there are pole mounted equipment, I think we prefer not to see any wires. I think my understanding is that on some of those brackets, the wires can be concealed in – within the bracket and I couldn't quite tell if that's what was happening on your proposed brackets. Then on Town and Country, it seemed those three locations are fairly well screened by the existing London plane trees and I think – I guess the question is if you do co-location and then you have a ground mounted cabinet then is that blocking the sidewalk. Then I guess my question for Staff is at Town and Country right on Embarcadero, we don't have bike lanes so people use the sidewalk for bicycling. We also have stadium days, football games and everything and there's a lot of people coming in from Caltrain right there. They use Embarcadero – that special Embarcadero station and there's a lot of people. That only happens a few times a year but it is a major event and so I would be – I would just caution Staff that we should think about the – any impact if – is if we have a cabinet – ground mounted cabinets at that location. Then I guess the question is, if you do co-location there, does that mean three mailboxes or is that like one or two? It seems to me one would be more acceptable than having three of them lined up like ducks in that particular location. On the art wraps, when I was looking at the sites on Tuesday, none of the sites really struck me as being a place for an art wrap. I didn't really think – nothing really popped out at me. It seemed to me that a lot of these locations were just to try to make it as minimal as possible; that was my take on it. I think unlike the rest of the Board Members, I'm actually ok with the faux mailboxes. I'm ok with the faux trash can or semi-functional trash cans. If it was in front of my house, I think I would prefer the mailbox to a trashcan, that's my take on it. As it is now, people just – if they have trash they just leave it at the curb and I still – I have to pick it up. Then I think on Peter's comment on colors, I think I'm in agreement with that. I think that's all the comments that I have, let me see. Brackets – yeah, and I think I do agree with the location on 21, is that right? Which ones the one with the three stories? Yeah, 22, I think that's an issue with somebody having a deck looking out to a utility pole with the – with that directly outside their balcony; I think that's an issue. So, do you have any – do you want to have any follow-up comments for us?

Ms. Swanson: Thank you, I do. Those were really great thorough comments. That's exactly what we were looking for. I appreciate that you guys are good with node 22 moving across the street as requested by the Likins so if you feel that's some you'll support, we'll put that in our formal application. So that will be the node location instead, across the street.

Chair Lew: I have – we got the alternates but I have not looked at it yet.

Ms. Swanson: That's fine.

Chair Lew: I think I understand where – I – generally what you're trying to do.

Ms. Swanson: Ok, great. Then I wanted to, I believe it was Ms. Campanga with public comment, I just wanted to clarify because I wasn't quite sure. I think the siting criteria wasn't something that we hadn't proposed. It was within the Staff report and I didn't want it to appear that we had said that's what we are going to do and then we didn't at that location. Yes, we're aware of 362 Channing and that was a tough site. There – when we went out there, there was no quick alternative. There's some that worked at that time and we'll certainly go back but yeah, it's a beautiful home. It's beautiful and you're right, with the vault unites in the ground and there is still some construction at that time. Well when we walked it definitely in November, that was there so it's not really a place there. I have spoken with Mrs. Price who is one of the representatives and talked about the fact that we would like to talk with them and see what all of their alternatives. Whether it's a landscaping there or maybe that's where the equipment is, that it would be covered that could be there. As we were talking -- I'm happy to have the project manager John Griffith come up but we were sitting back here talking as we're getting this feedback that we will go out there and look. It's this balance if we're – we're dissuaded from corners though it allows us to have fewer nodes. So, if that's the case, I don't know if at the corner would work but certainly, we could go out there and maybe even moving the pole that's there a little further east may be an option. Is that something

you believe could be supported if – I mean obviously we have to talk to Mr. Fleming and see if that also works as well. So, that's something to consider that we would like feedback on if possible. The quick questions just were great and I really like –like I said, I appreciate the feedback. For the wood poles, I wanted to address a little bit of that as far as the shrouding and how that works. There are limitations that happen we're shrouding equipment on utility poles and so we do have some limits within them. I do like your comment about wouldn't it be great if it was all one piece and it was made to look more like a wood kind of grain. John, do you want to come up and talk about that a little bit and he can explain what some of the restrictions are on making some of those changes and maybe talk about where we can find some compromise.

Mr. John Griffith: Hi, John Griffith, Crown Castle. What we've – in working with utilities and with PGNE, they require us not to be able to cover any of the wood structure for inspection purposes. So those shrouds, if we do put a shroud below that antenna, unfortunately it can only go to the level of the actual metal mount because they need to allow their inspectors per GO95 to be able to inspect that pole from the ground level and see where the wood attachments are in case of rot or something down the road. We had proposed in the past in other areas a full shroud down and that was denied from PGNE from that standpoint. That's just on the wood poles so that's why on the metal poles, we were able to do that full shroud down and taper it into the pole.

Board Member Baltay: Let me respond to that. I think if it were half an inch from the top of the wood pole, that would be acceptable. What you're showing is 4-feet above the pole. You can't see half an inch from the ground. We're looking for it to look like a wood pole all the way up.

Mr. Griffith: Yeah and again, that pole top extension is a wood – there are two metal brackets on either side and that's wood in between so even that cannot be covered.

Board Member Baltay: Let me a response once more to my Board Members especially. There's 150-days shot clock on this process. If we don't give real clear instructions, we're going to get – if they are coming back to us again with something, if we still don't find it acceptable, it's either yes or it's approved. I want to be clear with you that there's got to be a way to create a shroud that conceals these antennas all the way down.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I mean unless I'm wrong, doesn't the City own those poles?

Chair Lew: We don't have PGNE here, we have our own utilities.

Male: Correct.

Board Member Gooyer: If the City owns...

Ms. Gerhardt: The City...

Board Member Gooyer: ...them, we ought to be able to determine what we put on them or what...

Ms. Gerhardt: The City does own the poles and we do have a Master Lease Agreement with different cellular companies for the addition of these antennas but there are certainly some limitations. Crown Castle is and cellular is looked at like a utility and that they have the right to go on these poles. We're just talking about the design of how it would go on the poles.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I understand that.

Ms. Gerhardt: I would like to ask the applicant that there is that bayonet that I think Mr. Baltay is talking about. It's currently proposed to be wood but if it was a metal material all the way through, potentially utilities would look at it differently and wouldn't have to be inspecting it as often.

Mr. Griffith: It's definitely something that we can circle back with your Utility Department and find out what their preferences are and what they'll allow.

Board Member Gooyer: I'd be happy with a metal – something metal that was painted to match the color of the wood rather than wood.

Board Member Baltay: I didn't realize it was wood, yes but what I'm after is to be super clear with these people. To me at least, the standard is the same diameter, color, and texture, that's pretty clear. You guys can figure out how to accomplish that but that's what we're looking for or at least that's what I'm looking for.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm not – I wouldn't accept that.

Board Member Baltay: That's not the same diameter.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm sorry, it's just not even close.

Ms. Atkins: In the case of pole replacement...

Board Member Gooyer: Is that...

Ms. Atkins: In the case of pole replacements, it's my understanding that a bayonet is not necessary and the antenna could be mounted directly to the top of the pole.

Board Member Baltay: That would also be acceptable.

Mr. Swanson: May I ask a clarifying question? You had mentioned the equipment facing 9 o'clock versus 3 versus 12, I was hoping that we could have an opportunity to address that as well of how that equipment has to orientate with climbing space and in other, sometimes particular (inaudible) that pole.

Mr. Griffith: We walk these sites with your Utilities Department, they're the ones who specified in what quadrant that they needed to be mounted in per that climbing space. So, we took their direction as far as what – 9 o'clock, 12 o'clock; 12 o'clock meaning towards the sidewalk.

Board Member Gooyer: Could I respond to that? Basically, I don't want to see anything on the pole so I don't care which way it's rotated, I don't want it there. I mean to me that's a mute question. I want it underground.

Mr. Griffith: Again, this was based upon a pole mount...

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, I understand that but I meant I don't really care if we argue about which way it's going to go if I don't want it up there in the first place.

Board Member Baltay: I'd like you to understand that I also support that position strongly.

Chair Lew: I think also the Staff – I mean Staff – yeah, I mean we have a pre-meeting before the ARB meeting and I think I – my understanding is that utilities have their own concerns about undergrounding and maintenance and what not. Is that correct? So, there are also other concerns. I mean besides – we have our aesthetic concerns and that's fine and I think there are other concerns as well elsewhere in the City.

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, ok if that's case and I'm not saying – I'm still not going to push for undergrounding but hanging them on the poles is going to fly with me at all.

Chair Lew: Yes, I think that's fine.

Board Member Gooyer: That's about as (inaudible) as I get.

Ms. Gerhardt: I would like to maybe ask the applicant – so as we discussed, utilities – our City utilities do have concerns about maintenance of underground equipment but this is a small cell equipment that would be underground. So, maybe the applicant can speak to how the maintenance on such a thing might happen.

Mr. Griffith: In regards to maintenance as it pertains to underground vaults or to pole mounted. Again, we have our operational folks that do preventive maintenance as well as responding to any type of outage. They would obviously need to have access if it were underground, access next to the curb on that to be able to gain access. Our pole mounted, generally, they are either bi-lateral or they have bucket trucks. They are able to maintain much like a Comcast or cable tv.

Chair Lew: Also, for the Board Member I would say that some of the locations – there's one location in particular that I saw where the homeowner had roses all throughout the curb planting strip. So, if we have a – so if we're saying that everything has to be underground in vaults, then they are going to lose all of their plants. So, I just want to give everybody a little bit of flexibility and don't give an ultimatum. I think we understand that you have a strong preference but there may be a situation where underground is not feasible. I have one question for you guys too since you are here, that – at the microphone. Is there – I was looking on the internet, is there a way to hide pole mounted equipment behind signs? I was looking and they were saying that if there's an existing directional sign and you just put it behind there. Does that...

Mr. Griffith: We can and we have...

Chair Lew: Is that considered effective?

Mr. Griffith: It can. Again, with the equipment we're mounting, it wouldn't cover all but we have used that in different applications. Again, you're getting that camouflage from one angle but you won't be getting it obviously from the other.

Board Member Gooyer: Can I just back up one more time to this whole thing with the undergrounding? Having lived in San Francisco for years where there aren't tree pockets or whatever, everybody just walks on the box in the sidewalk. If the roses are there, you put it in the sidewalk adjacent to it.

Chair Lew: Yes, and I think in this application there is one – I think the location near Gilman, I think that has it. I think there's a vault.

Board Member Gooyer: All I'm saying is this thing about... (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Let's not – yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: ... (inaudible) roses all the way across there. I agree, absolutely keep the roses and put it in the sidewalk adjacent to it.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I think we're getting too nitpicky. I think we're just trying to give them general...

Board Member Gooyer: No, we're talking about that that's not a possibility, it is a possibility.

Chair Lew: Nobody said it wasn't possible.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: I think...

Ms. Swanson: May I ask one more clarifying questions, please?

Chair Lew: Yes.

Ms. Swanson: I'm glad that you raised the bench because I was looking for something that would be appropriate and that was perfect feedback and that's what I was looking for. Is – you're suggesting working with the neighbors that are there regarding the bench and what would work or not work or just coming and proposing a couple of different options? What would you say suggest?

Chair Lew: The thing with benches in downtown areas, a lot of times there's opposition of benches because it attracts people who loiter. There are also issues – sometimes benches are – public benches are designed to that people can't lay down on them. Then I think previously we had mentioned concerns about these wireless benches and that they are high and they really big and they are not – they are not real benches. They are not designed for comfort or people, right?

Ms. Swanson: No, you said that in May and that's why I was hesitant like, oh, I don't know if I want to bring up the bench.

Chair Lew: In that particular location I was thinking that it might be possible. I'm not (crosstalk) recommending it, I'm just saying that it – that could be an option in that particular location and it could make sense.

Ms. Swanson: Thank you for that clarification, really appreciate.

Chair Lew: I don't know anything about that particular property owner or what's going on there but it seems to me it's a better option than putting it in front of the landing chateau building. How are we doing on time? I think we should – we were allowing an hour for this one so we look forward...

Ms. Swanson: Thank you again.

Chair Lew: ... to a formal application.

Mr. Swanson: Really wonderful feedback.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much.

### **Action Item**

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL: 1451 Middlefield Road [17PLN-00147]:**  
Consideration of an Application for Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of the Junior Museum and Zoo Building and Construction of a New 15,033 Square Foot, One-Story Museum and Education Building, Outdoor Zoo With Netted Enclosure, and Reconfiguration of and Improvements to the Existing Parking Lots. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study has been Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act. Zone District: PF (Public Facilities). For More Information Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Lew: Item number three which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter, 1451 Middlefield Road. Consideration of an application for architectural review to allow the demolition of the Junior Museum and Zoo Building and construction of a new 15,033-square foot, one-story Museum and education building, outdoor zoo with netted enclosure, and reconfiguration of and improvements to the existing parking lots. The environmental assessment is an initial study has been prepared in accordance

with the CEQA and the zone district is public facilities. We have our – Amy French, our City Planning Official here.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Good morning.

Chair Lew: Do we need a minute to set up the presentation?

Ms. French: I believe that's happening as we speak. We have a presentation from the applicant, 1451 – Again, good morning. We've got our PowerPoint set up now and I wanted to call your attention to an email that came on Tuesday. I – that's a little confusing but they're referring to another issue on the Palo Alto online, there is – I don't know where this – these numbers are coming from. I just wanted to give an overview on that, there's no loss of 85 parking spaces on this site; that is incorrect. There's no proposal to do anything at the school site, etc. So, we do – I should mention we will have our transportation engineering Staff member in for this project if there are further questions about that. Just the traffic note, the peak periods are morning and evening peak commute periods. They are not affected by this project because this project is the attendance at the zoo is not during those times. Just to cut to the chase, this is our second hearing for this project in a Formal Application. We've had several over the years for preliminary review and they've refined it to a point where we're pleased to make the recommendation for approval. This will be going to Council hopefully in November and we're asking that you recommend the project today. We have some follow-up opportunities for tweaks to the landscape plan that we've noted in the conditions of approval. As always, the ARB can have an ARB subcommittee to look at any resulting drawings. I'll just go ahead and turn this over to the applicant to make the presentation now, thanks.

Mr. Brent McClure: Thanks, Amy.

Chair Lew: Quick – Brent, you have 10-minutes.

Mr. McClure: Sure. We put together a short PowerPoint. I want to kind of touch on – we focused this basically on, I think some of the major comments that we heard the last time that we were before you. Number one big comment, the architecture of its place and how do we move away from this agricultural aesthetic on some of the ways the finishes were being presented. The second item was modulation, again on Middlefield. The third bridges, we talked about that briefly and then lastly was one of the maintenance questions that relate to metal siding and we're going to close with some of the wind façade pieces. Talking about the architecture of its place, this is what we showed you last time. As you recall we had the metal standing seam roof that wrapped and became wall siding as this sort of continuous extruded form out at the front of the main museum building with some additional metal siding in over here. We had a different colored metal roof that kind of came around and we had lots of wood siding. It was the other material that wrapped the entire finish. The comments that we heard where can we consider breaking the eave as a possibility? Can we look at a different type of material (inaudible) position but not really lose the concept of the building and think carefully also about the wood siding as well. We went back to our diagram that we showed you early in a study session at the beginning of the year and kind of started to think about how does this translate with that extruded piece? Instead of just extruding the whole form out, we thought what if the roof extrudes out and the building mass kind of sits somewhat separately. This is a diagram of what we've come back with and that is a different way of looking at some of the materials. We interjected cement plaster as a way to further break up some of the mass and bring a little more playfulness and not just sort of have this monochromatic large amount of wood siding and then also kind of break of the metal. We're proposing to still have standing seam roof which is this kind of charchoaly greyish material in through here but then as you get down below, we pulled back – the wood now becomes an accent. The wood is an accent sort of back in only the recessed areas of the building and then we have an off-white color cement plaster that becomes more of the dominant color and material on the building. We've inserted some more playful windows to sort of break up this elevation and to still kind of have a modern aesthetic to try to attempt to echo parts of Lucie Stern in mass and form and have a bit of an eave. Have an eave projects out so it no longer reads as the – we believe is the building, that it had read as a sort of once before or with what we had presented

before you. Here's a sectional elevation looking at that larger volume and that nice entrance point where the wood and then looking into the dawn redwood courtyard and that elevation on that side. The second point to touch on briefly is the Middlefield elevation. We had presented – this was the last elevation we had shown you. We had kind of broken the elevational façade into different sections but the roof was kind of running long and sleek and the feedback we got from several of the Board Members was let's try to break this up a little bit more. Can we use something to modulate that and be more sensitive to – we were attempting to do that with I think sort of how this break is here with windows and wall. When we went back and looked at was – we did a few things, one was we took where that break happened and we shifted it closer to our entrance portal. So, if you go back to this, there's – the piece that's over here kind of slides over a bit and we have some pop-up clearstory windows that come over into this zone here that then align with this wood accent wall material here. Then by interjecting different – the cement plaster against the wood and some additional window placement back over into here, we think that this starts to achieve that. You start to read this elevation into a series of smaller sections as opposed to one long sleek run. The last couple comments would be on the bridges. We've gone back to the clients and they are looking to get some grant funding and so we are putting bridges at least back into the project at this moment funding permitting. Then here are the images that we showed you last time. Further development of the dawn redwood courtyard that we're also looking at grant funding. They are looking at actually having a dinosaur sculpture out amongst the dawn redwood tree. Then the last couple comments on maintenance questions, the metal roof – we pulled back the metal material significantly from what we had before. It – we didn't touch on this last time but it will have an intricate color Kynar 500 finish that will be pre-applied so there are no plans to paint any metal roofing. We're going with this medium – there's a finished board going around but sort of this medium tone kind of charcoal grey. The idea is that it's – it will be compatible with – if there's a potential for future photovoltaics. It will kind of fall away in the sky to some degree and just be there as opposed to this really kind of reddish color that we were talking about before. We've removed it completely from any wall services. As far as the wood siding, it's a cedar that we would then apply a clear finish too and that was another one of the comments that we had before that we'd noted. This is just a picture of the finished board that should be passed around in front of you. Then lastly the wind façade, we're really excited to be working with the Arts Commission. They have selected an artist to provide a public art piece; (inaudible) Charles Sowers. He's got some really exciting science-based exhibits and art installations at the Exploratorium and he's a local artist; we've met with him. We really excited about how to beautifully articulate wind onto the site so we are still looking at this front face elevation into here, signage off to the side like we touched on before. So, that concludes the high points and we'll turn it over to questions and comment.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Brent. I don't have any speaker cards for this item so we can move onto Board Member comments and questions. Any questions? Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: That's great to hear that the artist is on board. I'm just wondering if that whole front gable façade becomes the art piece, has there been any thought given to where the Museum's signage will go then?

Ms. French: I'm just going to jump in, Amy French, because we're not interested in having this signage go with the art and so I'll just say that and let the applicant talk about where signage might go.

Ms. Sarah Vaccaro: Hi, Sarah Vaccaro here with CAW Architects. We're partnering with Charles Sowers, the public artist. He – we've given him a handful of locations to look at for his art installation, one is on this main façade of the entry portico. We've given him a lot of our inspirational images about wind and other science nature-based exhibitory. He is developing his ideas right now, it's just the beginning of this process so we don't know exactly how his art piece will manifest but we're working closely with him to integrate it in this front entrance plaza. Once we have a little more direction then we can further design how that signage will be integrated.

Vice Chair Kim: So, correct me if I am wrong but it sounds like the art piece is still in flux, which is fine but I think as I've been reviewing the project through the process, I've always assumed that the front was going to have this piece there so it sounds like it may not end up being there. Is that correct?



Ms. Vaccaro: If he does something differently, we will work to put something that's close to this – the look that we've been presenting.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Ms. Vaccaro: It's inter -- rolled into the design.

Mr. McClure: We've been strongly urging and moving in this direction as (inaudible).

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Just so it's clear, the sign that's shown in the drawings – I mean there's – is not part of the ARB...

Ms. French: That is correct.

Chair Lew: ... and it's typically a Staff review level.

Ms. French: It's a concept at this point. It's not -- they'll have to come back with a sign application for that wall signage. The existing sign is moved, the sculptural one out front is ok but this other one needs...

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you very much for coming back and I'm right on the edge when I think we can push this along. I agree with the applicant's outline of five different issues that we're looking at so I'd like to address each one of them starting with the Middlefield Road elevation. I think that's a big improvement and I think that fits in well now with the residential neighborhood. Of course, it's great if you can those bridge back and I appreciate the effort that you are making and let's see where that gets us. As far as it being an architecture of its place, it's really close. To me, it still has a vague reminiscence of some agricultural/industrial building but certainly, it's moved in the right direction sufficiently. I'm right on the edge of being able to say I think it's ok. Same thing on the materials, the metal siding and the wood slats and stuff. Obviously, it's great that you removed the vertical standing steam finish on the side of the building. You do have a lot of those cedar slats and stuff and when I look at the sample board you sent here, I can't think of the last time we got a clear finish to stay on wood for more than a year and I've been doing this 30-years now. There's a lot of people doing a lot of maintenance on wood buildings I've built. I just don't see the City out there every year brushing those slats. Again, it's at the level where we've made that point clear over and over again. The look is great but I think overall, you've – you can – the findings can be made to support the changes to materials and I think the logic for what you've done is right. I pick up on Kyu's questions about that gable and façade, several times through this review process he's been thinking that's sort of an artistic element and I think it should be. When I see on this elevation here, I don't think it's quite there yet. It looks just too much – first (inaudible) to face of a Target store or something and I think it needs more revision. I would like to see that come back to a subcommittee perhaps and I would like to see that really be a place where we incorporate some sort of public art or sort of an interesting whimsical design on what you call the gable and the windscreen. That said, I'm eager to hear what my colleagues have to say, thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Yeah, I agree, I think it's come a long way. The Middlefield elevation I think is a big improvement. I also agree that this is still a little weak but then if the public artist is going to be a part of that, that would make a big difference and probably coming back to the subcommittee would be a good idea on that. The one piece that is the off-white color of the stucco, I think is a bit bland. It – I'd like to see something maybe a little richer in color rather than the off-white. It almost

seems like it's gone from one extreme to the other to compensate for it. I would prefer to see – it's not like there aren't residences or whatever the area that isn't a richer color than off-white. I agree the wood is going to be a maintenance nightmare probably. I mean unless it's done properly or even different types of finishes on it or something because I agree that a clear finish is really tough to keep it looking good for more than a year or so. Other than that, I -- like I said yeah, I'm probably close enough that we could approve it or I can approve it at this point with a few minor modifications.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Robert. Kyu.

Board Member Makinen: Thanks for hanging in there and going through the process. I think it's come along way and I think even at the previous hearing I was pretty much on board. I felt that I could make the findings even then so I appreciate you taking the extra step and bringing it back one more time. Just very minor comments, some of them echoing previous comments that were made but I also agree that the – I'm probably the least experienced person of architecture profession on this Board and you know having said that, I agree that the clear finish is just terribly difficult. I think some kind of a semi-solid or maybe even if you go with a solid stain on that. I don't think you're going to have a lot of people observing it up close to make sure that they see the wood grain and whatnot; that's one thing. I also agree that the Middlefield elevation is – I feel it's actually greatly improved. I think your attempt at breaking that up is successful. I like the way that you've approached that. I like the clearstory windows that have been added. I am somewhat questioning if that makes the building feel a little bit too high in that central portion. I don't know if there is a way of bringing the clearstory down so that maybe it doesn't start at the ridge but it's not a deal breaker to me and I think overall, it's looking great. I think that's it, I can make the findings. Again, I applaud your efforts and sticking through the process and coming with a solution that, to me doesn't feel compromised. I think you've really done a great job of instilling your own design efforts and also working with the City and I'd be happy to recommend approval of the project, thank you.

Chair Lew: I can support the project as well. I do want to thank the members of the public who submitted comments by email. We've had several over the past two months and I thank Staff for responding to our questions. I think I had a question previously about parking and I think that's been answered. I think we just – I just want to acknowledge that there is – like the existing traffic, which is highlighted in the initial study is that the traffic is bad on El Camino – is acceptable at level D but it's headed down toward – the accumulative impacts are going to push it down lower so I think it should just be on the City's radar that we're going to have an issue at Embarcadero and Middlefield in the future. Then my only nitpicky thing is the landscape so you have kind of the zigzag wood fence along the park edge. Yeah, their' sort of – yeah, so I just wanted to – if maybe that could come back to Staff for review. It's really how does the existing – are you – is the existing irrigation for the lawn being retained and if it's – I don't know even know what it is if it's rotors or whatnot but you're going to get spray on the wood. Generally, you get this whitewashed effect on the wood and you're not showing any new landscaping there so I presume it's – there's some – I just presume its trees and lawn there but I just want to make sure that we just address that when you – in the future. I think typically irrigation plans come before building permit, right?

Ms. French: Just a note on that, the Rinconada Park long-range plan doesn't have specificity at this point, it's looked at programmatically. Peter Jenson, our in-house landscape architect, I will be meeting with him following this meeting and make sure that he is aware of this concern of the wrecking the fence basically, with irrigation and we want to not have that happen to a brand-new fence. So, we'll make sure we touch base.

Chair Lew: Yeah, presumably you have to change the irrigation because you're changing the boundary between the Junior Museum and the park. It's going to -- so...

Ms. French: We'll make sure that's in the to-do list before...

Chair Lew: Then it's not – at the moment there's no – that area is not part of the landscape plans of the Junior Museum, right? That's still part of the...

Ms. French: That's correct, that's why I was kind of taking over this comment because it will be – not in the purview of our architect here. I should say Elizabeth Aims is here as well with the Rinconada long-range project so thanks.

Chair Lew: Then for Staff on the findings, I just had one comment. A little tiny comment is on finding – this is number – finding number three which is page 63 of the packet and this is just about pedestrian and bicycle safety. That I would just – I think I would recommend adding that one of the curb cuts along -- one of the existing curb cuts along Middlefield is being removed so that's actually a benefit to all the pedestrian traffic going to Walter Hayes.

Ms. French: Thank you, will do.

Chair Lew: I am willing to entrain motions now. Kyu.

### **MOTION**

Vice Chair Kim: I'll move that we recommend approval of the project and trust that the City project and any other minor material things will be taken care of the planning level. So, I don't even think there's a need for anything to come back at subcommittee level.

Board Member Gooyer: How about the whole idea of the art piece that – or artwork?

Vice Chair Kim: I'm not too concerned.

Chair Lew: I didn't...

Vice Chair Kim: Is that something that has to be approved at the ARB level of some sort?

Chair Lew: Can I – I didn't comment on the art piece. I do want to caution that sometimes the mounting of the art piece on the building can be an issue. We've had one of the – we had a low-income housing project and the art piece was nice but the bracket that attached it onto the building weren't really well thought out. So, I mean something like that could come back to the Board for review if the Board is interested.

Board Member Gooyer: I'd like to see that come back to subcommittee.

Vice Chair Kim: So, I will accept the...

Chair Lew: You have to present it as a...

### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**

Board Member Gooyer: I propose that the art piece or however that's worked out – especially because we are talking about that it may affect the front entrance or the appearance of the front entry obviously, considerably. I'd like it to come back to the subcommittee.

Ms. Gerhardt: We have a motion but no second at this point.

Board Member Baltay: I'll second the motion.

Ms. Gerhardt: Then do we want to offer a friendly amendment?

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, ok, alright. Fine, then I'll make that...

Ms. Gerhardt: Microphone.

Board Member Gooyer: ...I'll make that my friendly amendment.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll accept the friendly amendment.

Board Member Baltay: I'll accept the second to the friendly amendment.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Ms. French: Can I ask a clarifying question? This amendment is to review the attachment of the art to the façade if it's proposed to be on that façade? If it's not proposed to go there as artwork, you would like to see what is going to be showing on that façade – on that gable end?

Board Member Gooyer: I think so, yeah.

Chair Lew: This would also go – this is going to go to the public or Art Commission as well?

Ms. French: Yes, they're looking at the content of the art, as well as the installation. I think it's more if the artwork doesn't go up on that gable end, what is the gable end going to look like?

Board Member Gooyer: Ok but the artwork – I mean I sit on an Art Committee for another City and we look at the art piece and don't always go into depth as to how it relates to the building adjacent to it or behind it or whatever the case is and I think we should.

Ms. French: That – I tried to clarify just – I think the ARB subcommittee – if the art is going on that gable end, you're very interested in what that's going to look like if it's not an art piece. I think that's what I am picking up on, is that...

Board Member Baltay: That's correct.

Ms. French: ...and if it is an art piece, just to see what it looks like in the end.

Board Member Baltay: And how it's mounted.

Ms. French: Mounting of it.

Chair Lew: Just to clarify the motion, it is a recommendation to Council because this is going to the Council. It's a Director's decision and so all in favor? Opposed? None. So that's 4-0 with Board Member Furth absent.

#### **MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT**

Chair Lew: Congratulations, we can't wait to see this one under construction. It's going to be very exciting.

#### **4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2120 Staunton Ct [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](mailto:APetersen@m-group.us)

Chair Lew: We're going to take a 5-minute break and then we will hear item number four which is 2120 Staunton Ct. [Commission took a short break] Ok, we're ready for item number four that is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, 2120 Staunton Ct. 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 with a NP overlay. We have our project planner Adam Petersen, welcome.

Mr. Adam Petersen, Project Planner: Alright, good morning Chair Lew and Members of the Architectural Review Board. I'm Adam Petersen from the Planning Community Environment Department. I'm here today to present a Major Architectural Review for 2120 Staunton Ct. The project before you today proposed to demolish the two existing single-family homes and shed at 2120 Staunton Ct. and construct a new duplex and associated site improvements. This is the first review of the project by the Architectural Review Board and Staff is recommending approval of the Planning and Community Environment Director after your consideration of specific conditions of approval on the project. The project is located on the corner of Staunton Avenue and – excuse me Staunton Ct. and Oxford Avenue. The project is surrounded by a mixture of uses. There is a new mixed-use project going in more to the northeast of the project site. There is some single family uses located to the southeast and to the southwest. This is a two-story single-family use that you'll see and there are some multi-family uses surrounding the project site as well. This is the site plan for the project before you. The project has basically a 4-foot high wood fence along Staunton Ct. with paved access to the backyard. It would pull out three street trees along Oxford Avenue and replace those with three new street trees. There are two new driveway curb cuts that are being proposed for the project and the project would also include street – would also include trees on site. One located towards the corner of Oxford Avenue and Staunton Ct. and the other located towards the secondary driveway. The project also provides bike parking on the site as well. This slide shows you a rendering of the project. The project includes Benjamin Moore's Swiss Coffee colors, wood board and batton siding, rod iron gates that obscure the light wells to the basement from the street. It also includes a standing seam metal roof, composition black roof on top of the second story and then Anderson window with black trim. As noted the site is in the neighborhood preserving – neighborhood preservation overlay zone and what that does zone is it requires the ARB to evaluate the project for its scale, silhouette, façade articulation and materials relative to other buildings in the neighborhood. This shows the streetscape for the project. The top is the Staunton Ct. elevation and again, this is a single-story, single-family home located between multi-family and then the proposed duplex here. On the bottom, we have the duplex project from Oxford Avenue. This is the duplex single-family and then more sort of multi-family located further to the southwest of the project site. I want to just quickly walk through the elevations. Again, it's a two-story duplex, there is a basement that's proposed to it. The top elevation is the elevation from Staunton Court and the bottom elevation or the bottom image is the elevation from the driveway or from the backside of the site. This is again, the elevation from Oxford Avenue at the top and this is the elevation at the back or the rear yard that's obscured from public views. In terms of the key considerations for this project, it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning code. It did undergo individual review or IR review evaluation and there are conditions of approval that are incorporated to ensure better conformance with the IR Guidelines. These include specifically extending the roof edge along the front porch and then also extending the roof eaves and racks. There's a proposal to use alternative paving in the single car parking space, planting 15-gallon trees along the interior and side lot lines to better obscure any sort of views or better-concealed privacy. Then also widening the window on the second-floor bedroom of the Staunton Ct. elevation. Staff did receive public comment about this project initially or straight from the get-go. There's an adjacent neighbor who's concerned about a redwood tree that's located off-site from the project. The applicant came back and crafted a response with their arborist to the neighbor's response and the neighbor did say that they were very pleased by the applicant's response and by their redesign of the project. Yesterday we also did receive comments and email from the neighbor. This was forwarded to you and the neighbor was concerned about a Public Works condition of approval in an urban forestry condition. I followed up with the Public Works Department or the Engineering Department about their condition. Essentially the way that condition is written is that there are multiple ways to go about complying with the C-3 requirements. So,

it doesn't have to be the specific way that this neighbor articulated it. In regards to the tree conditions, we're going to make sure that all construction and anything that goes on with the project respects the tree protection zone. Based on this information, Staff recommendation is that the ARB recommend approval of the project to the Planning and Community Environment Director. Thank you and I'm free to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and so the applicant, you will have 10-minutes for your presentation.

Ms. Natalie Hyland: Thank you, Adam. Good morning, my name is Natalie Hyland. I'm actually very excited to be here because we've been looking forward to getting on this calendar for a while now. I am the building designer for this project. I'm also here with the property owner, Zach Trailer, and our arborist, Ray [Mornay]. I thought I would give you a quick introduction, a simple overview and then be available for any questions you might have. Zach Trailer is a Palo Alto native and he's been in real estate for over 15-years. He recognizes the need for decent housing in Palo Alto and saw this as an opportunity to bring units that are accommodating to Palo Alto. He loves his town, he loves the trees and he likes to keep things simple. Truly, just wanted a project that would fit in with the neighborhood. The project does conform with all of the planning ordinances. We're not asking for any variances or special exceptions. The first-person Zach did hire was Ray, our expert arborist, and initially the design – the plans were designed around the arborist report, of course, but during plan check, as Adam mentioned, we received a letter from a neighbor. It generated an onsite meeting with Dave Doctor your town arborist, Ray, Zach and myself. We scrutinized the design very, very carefully and making sure we're protecting – let me back up. There's a very large redwood tree in the southeast corner of the property so obviously, the arborist report is about saving this tree but there are also a lot of little trees around the area but the neighbor's concern was the redwood tree. We focused a lot on the protection tree zone and making sure – we took out the concrete. Making sure there was nothing structural or permanent in that area and then we also had some preliminary meetings with the structural engineer who's going to allow us to do a shot creek basement so that we're not protruding into the roots as much as possible. In summary, it did take several months, three updated arborist reports but we do have Ray and Dave and the neighbor, which Adam told me has full support which is great. It is an eclectic neighborhood. There's a big apartment unit on the left – towards the left, there's single-family towards the right, mix commercial, mix residential, and a lot of different architectural styles. We went with transitional farmhouse so something modern and something fresh and we believe that it does blend in well with the unit across the street. We are proposing a two-story, two-unit building and each has its own basement. Adequate parking, bicycle parking, there's some nice external circulation and I have this colored rendering. I'm sorry, I'm not familiar with – here's are color material board, I do have a bag of samples you're welcome to see, and we are proposing high-quality materials. What stands there today are just two cottages in pretty poor condition and they are quite frankly, an eyesore to the neighborhood. We believe this project will improve the town and bring in some decent housing as well. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Are there any – oh, I don't have any speaker cards from the member of the public. Are there any Board Member questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, very much so. I would like to see the materials and the colors. To Staff I guess, this is the first time I have seen an application come to use with so little description of how the building is going to look. There's not a single rendering, there's no colors, materials or anything presented and yet you're putting it to us. What am I missing here?

Mr. Petersen: When I reviewed the project and the plans, I was looking at the board and batton siding, I was seeing the standing seam metal roof, the composition roof, the colors yes, weren't there.

Board Member Baltay: The colors are not on the drawings what so ever.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do acknowledge that the elevations – we certainly should have had the colors and materials and gotten that on the elevations. We could certainly bring that back to a subcommittee to verify that that is done if that's necessary.

Board Member Baltay: No – ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for the architect, is – why is there a different roof on the second floor versus the first-floor porch?

Ms. Hyland: A couple reasons, it's part of that kind of transitional style where you kind of do a mix and match of industrial versus traditional; just kind of to keep the interest. I don't think you'll see as much of the composition roof from the perspective of the street as the standing seam but it was just more for cosmetic purposes.

Chair Lew: Great and then have you – are you in agreement with the conditions of approval but we have the individual review consulting architect who's asked to make some changes like the bay windows and the garage door and the eaves, like 2-foot eaves. Are in agreement with that or do you have any disagreements?

Ms. Hyland: No, no, we're in agreement with that.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you for that.

Vice Chair Kim: I have a quick question, on your section BB you're showing that you're proposing to use a roof truss as the second-floor roof structure and at the same time, on your floor plans for the second floor you're showing what seems to be a slightly raised ceiling at the center of those bedrooms. I'm wondering how you're going to do that with the truss being flat bottomed as you're showing in the section?

Ms. Hyland: To be honest, I'm not sure if this roof will be truss yet.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Ms. Hyland: It would probably go through that with the structural engineer so I think that was just a discrepancy but I think we will try to get as much height and volume in those rooms so most likely it will be stick frame.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I just have on quick question for Staff, the statement just sorts of surprises me a little bit. On page 268, the second paragraph from the bottom, at one point you're talking about the standing seam roof. It says the difference between that and the other roof – it says but it's also compatible with the composition roofing because it consists of a durable roof material. So, we're now using durability as an element of compatibility? Really? I think that's pushing it a bit.

Chair Lew: Then also for Staff, under finding number five on page 276 of the packet. I just wanted to point out it says the applicant has designed the project to respect natural features by designing a project that will adversely impact with the adjacent protected redwood tree. Yeah, I think there's something missing there. Then also in that same paragraph it says each of these proposed features creates a desirable habitat for plants and I think that's – I think what we're looking for is for wildlife. Who wants to go first, Robert?

Board Member Baltay: Can I ask first, is the color on the material board a tangible thing we can hold? This piece of paper here?

Chair Lew: This, should we do a walkthrough of (inaudible)?

Board Member Baltay: No, no, it's more of this Alex. If we're being asked to approve this and I think we are, how can we have any record of what these things are if it's not written down? All we have is Adam's presentation that these are black Andersen windows. This color and material board is typically at least one place where we'd put that.

Chair Lew: Right so we can...

Board Member Baltay: I'm just wondering, can you submit the color and material board that you're presenting digitally, do you, have it?

Ms. Hyland: Absolutely and I don't want to speak on behalf of Staff but it was originally submitted in the first submittal and went back and forth about four and I think it just got lost through the cracks. On the resubmittal, it wasn't resubmitted. It is just an 8 ½ by 11, it's very simple so is there something more you guys would prefer? This was my first time...

Board Member Baltay: No, no, I just want something for the record.

Ms. Hyland: Ok, so that would be fine if I just printed the color?

Board Member Baltay: Is it here now?

Ms. Hyland: I believe it might be in the original package that was submitted; it should be.

Board Member Gooyer: Do you want me to start? Let's see, a couple of things, I'm not a – just looking at the initial elevation, I'm really not a big fan of what I call mirror image architecture. Where you design half the building and then you do the mirror image on the other side, which is both the front and the back are exactly like that. This whole thing about having two different types of a roof system or I should say finishes, even if they are considered compatible, to me they are not. I just don't really like that look and I don't think it works. Also, I'm not a big fan of having board and baton for the entire structure. I just don't think this project lives up to the quality of what's expected in that neighborhood. I can't approve it the way it is.

Chair Lew: Nice and clear Robert, thank you. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: I preference my notes on – I study things and I said everything I'm going to say is subject to reviewing the colors and materials and I'm sorry but it's really hard to understand what's really being proposed. That said, I'm not quite as strong about it as Robert is but I feel that the Oxford Street façade is rather long and unbroken up and it – I would prefer to see a design that emphasizes perhaps that it's two buildings – two homes and not one and probably that's just the lower roof there. In the same vein, I think that the façade facing Staunton Ct. or really the corner that you see when you first approach is somehow not your strongest part of the design. It's like the building was designed to be in a row of buildings and you only had an Oxford Avenue façade. It's a corner of a building and that's a really important corner. Everybody who turns up Oxford Avenue is going to see that corner of your building and yet it looks like the side that's never been meant to be seen. I think it could be improved and I'm not quite sure whether the Board is going to want to take this whole thing. I was inclined not to push it too much but then I dug into the IR findings that Arnold made for us and I find them as usual, detailed and thorough. Almost too much so but then I looked at the conditions of approval with these findings and I found most of them seemed to make sense but they raised the question to me about the roof pitches. What you're showing on your drawings is a 5 and 12 pitch on both the upper and the lower floor except the dormers, which seem to be steeper. It's not too clear what they are but they are obviously steeper. The more I scratched my head on it the more I think that probable Arnold is right that the lower roof should be a slightly lower pitch. That's usually how you do it with the standing seam and the composition but the dormers probably should be the same as the pitch of the roof above it. It would look odd if they're not so listening to everybody speak right now, I'm starting to think that those roofs may need another go around of just thinking really hard as the designer, what's the appearance you're after with



these? Is the roof intended to be so long along Oxford and do you have these different pitches under control or are you just throwing it out there yet? The other comment I see from Staff about the garage doors shall be stained wood. I'm surprised you find that acceptable because what you're presenting on your color board is an aluminum frame with glass doors. There's no way to make that stained wood. I don't know any developer who would want to build a house with a stained wood door. That's a maintenance nightmare. Usually, it's only when somebody really spends the money on Mahogany or Teak that you do that. I don't think that's a good recommendation from Staff and I'm left with the feeling that nobody is really reading these things. You're just agreeing and you're just going to change it later or something. The same thing is there was a question here about extending the head trim from 4 to 6-inches beyond the jam and I'm just uncomfortable with that level of architectural detail from us. Those two conditions I would change, 17 and 15, otherwise I'm fine with them if you are. Then I'd like to take this chance to publicly address the Council really, through this project that this is exactly the kind of project in Palo Alto that really emphasizes how the zoning ordinance is a bit – showing its age. This is the kind of property that is very well suited to have four homes on it with four parking places rather than two. The developers being driven by the zoning code to only have two houses, they are making them larger, they are more expensive homes and the Council really needs to hear that this is the kind of place where a zoning amendment would allow different kinds of development. So, it's not an architectural issue, it's nothing to do with our findings here but I'd like to just make that statement that this is an example of where zoning could change. So, I'm eager to hear what everybody else has to say, thank you.

Mr. Zachary Trailer: Could I speak to that too, Peter? That last comment?

Chair Lew: Can we wait – we'll get back to you.

Mr. Trailer: Sure.

Chair Lew: We'll allow you to speak again. Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for the project. I'll start at the conditions of approval and then conditions that we've been recommended to reply about. I agree with Board Member Baltay that 17, I'm not in agreement with and I think it's going a little bit too far. With 16, changing all the overhangs to 4-inches, I don't think we should require that unless for some reason they feel strongly about doing that. I'm also against 13 and I don't quite understand the reasoning behind that but just kind of summarizing Board Member Baltay's comments. I think there are a lot of things here that have been kind of lost and I like the project. I mean don't get me wrong, I think I kind of understand where planning is coming from when they asked us to recommend approval because I kind of feel that way too. I think it's just a matter of just spending a little bit more time picking up the loose pieces here and making sure that everything's coordinated because I – we don't see a materials board and we don't know what this alternative paving is going to be like for the car parking spot. Then just in the package alone, it's always nice to get some 3-D images and perspective views so that we can see more of the massing and the ins and outs of the buildings and the further refinement of details that we typically look at. I already asked my question about the ceiling height. For the roofs, I don't see why this project shouldn't just all be standing seam metal roof. I don't agree with the statements that were made in the report as far as the composite shingle. I think if you're going with the board and baton look, you're obviously going after a look that's very sought after by the market these days. I think it just makes sense to make everything standing seam metal roof and also to change the pitch of those dormers down to 5 and 12. I think maybe the logic behind that was once you lower the pitches there, that those elements don't stick out as much but I think they can still work. I think you still have height left to play with, maybe everything should just be 6 and 12 rather than 5 and 12 but there are just a little bit of extra little details here and there throughout. I think overall, I very much like the project and that I want to approve it or want to recommend approval of it but the materials board is pretty vague. I don't think there's anything in addition to that, I think a lot of good comments have been made, thank you.

Chair Lew: I think of all the comments that have been made so far, I think I am – I'm somewhere in between Peter and Kyu on this one. I think the – some of the IR comments from our consulting architect

where to detailed and then in his comments he was allowing for some flexibility. Then somehow in the conditions of approval it just got sentenced down and I'm not comfortable with going as far as that on this one. If you start changing the overhang depth and the pitch, things happen. You – having a shallower pitch and steeper pitch, that affects the overhangs so I don't want to make it to strict. I think the designer should have some flexibility in there. Generally, with overhangs, more than 12-inch deep is considered better for water and environmental sustainability, shadowing of the façade so in general, I'm supportive of larger – I generally – larger – usually larger looks better. I also – on the garage door, I think I don't support that – the requirement for stained wood. I think that's too – I think that's really too detailed for this particular review. Again, I think on the head trim thing, that's too detailed. I was wondering about the redwood tree. I think my understanding with redwood trees is that I think the roots can go up to 100-feet out from the tree and I was wondering has there been any investigation about how – about the tree roots or are we just assuming the minimum 10-foot requirement, which is a standard requirement for this kind of tree in the City? Has there been anymore – ok.

Ms. Hyland: Extensive as an answer.

Chair Lew: Ok, so the City and then Dave Doctor are all on board with this particular approach...

Ms. Hyland: Oh, yes.

Chair Lew: ... and the shot creek of the foundation itself? Ok, that's fine. So, Mr. Trailer I think you had a comment on Peter Baltay's comments.

Mr. Trailer: Sure, just in general, thanks for much for the feedback. I think we're all mutually incentivized to create a great project for our City so that's what we're trying to do. You can see that we're pretty much willing to do whatever you recommend so thank you for your comments. Robert, all I would ask for you is rather than just say it doesn't meet the quality. Give us your feedback and ask us to do things that would meet the quality and we're happy to do it. We're here to comply with you all and make it a great project. To Peter's comment about the housing units, just a little color, and background on this project. The single-family home next door we also own and we through a series of processes with the City to try and make this a bigger development with more housing. The tricky part is the house next is zoned CN, we're zoned RMD which is a little bit out of its sorts for the location. RMD I don't think is an appropriate zoning for this property but – so to your point, we did try to make more units across both properties and we were denied before we even got too far. What we did was we said let's just give the town something that they can approve. Let's not fight them, let's not go through this battle, we want to create housing, that's what the City has asked us to do and we're excited to do it. We gave you a project we thought was compatible with the location without asking for any exceptions with regards to square footage, FAR, setbacks or anything. We're here to build what you guys think is great. Please give us your feedback, let's all work together and get this approved. I think we're at 2 1/2 -years on this now from this submittal, on this project we're at 10-months so we're excited to move forward. Please do let us know what we need to do to get it going, thank you very much.

Vice Chair Kim: Maybe I'll add a comment that I found this project to be a little bit more fascinating because of the zoning, the RMD zoning. Typically, if this lot were zoned, let's say R2 or even RM15 or 30, as long as it's a substandard lot and two unit – less than three units, it wouldn't have to come to the ARB. It's only because it's an RMD zoning that it comes to us. There are a lot of other things such as the basement, in RM15 and 30 it would count toward the FAR because it's RMD it doesn't count so there are a lot of things here and there that I think made it a little bit tricky. I certainly understand to a certain extent Ms. Trailer's process.

Mr. Trailer: Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: I agree with you, Kyu and I'm really torn. I'd love to just set these folks on their way. This is a simple project and the guts of it meet out requirements and findings and I'm very sympathetic, 10-months is an awfully long time for a simple project like this. It's frustrating, we're

frustrated, you're frustrated and I make my comments because City Council is frustrated. They also recognize that it's just not clicking somehow. We all want higher density housing and yet you guys can't do it since Staff can't approve it (crosstalk)...

Mr. Trailer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: ... because it's not in the code. I'm just putting it out there so the conversation is held. I'm not stating any personal opinion on it and the Architectural Board certainly doesn't, in my understanding, doesn't have an opinion on these things. We're here to enforce the code as they exist. Are we ready to put this along with some additions?

Chair Lew: I'm in support of the project and I will leave it to you two to make a motion.

Board Member Baltay: I absolutely share your comment's Alex. Changing these roof pitches changes the way it looks. Changing overhangs changes the way it looks and it's not for us or the Staff to make these kinds of flat-out statements. You have to do something with the design or it needs to go through with it and do it. Can we give it a quick feedback come back on a – continue this with a date certain, a couple a weeks and you guys do one pass at it. Will that work for you, you think?

Mr. Trailer: I think that's fine. Also, you could make a condition to approval that we're happy to comply with. We're literally willing to do whatever you tell us to do.

Ms. Hyland: Just to make a point against the pitches. The dormers are steeper pitched just to give it a more farmhouse look. Just to give that steep – but I do believe we do have the height limit so if you would like to us to have matching pitches, we can kind of find an in between and I think still accomplish that. All standing seam roof, no problem, no problem at all. The color and material board is very simple. It's white, black windows, high quality, metal.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to move that this project be continued to a date certain. Let it come back to us with a final design that incorporates all the comments we've made and the IR is made. None of them are required, all of them need to be considered in the design that you bring back to us. Can the Board support that concept?

Chair Lew: I can support that and I can also support subcommittee. Looking on the dates for Staff, it looks like October is fairly full. Especially the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting but November looks light, right? November 2<sup>nd</sup> there's one item, November 16<sup>th</sup> there's one item.

Mr. Trailer: I would just comment that that's two months away. We were talking about a few weeks, right.

Chair Lew: I think the issue is Staff has to – it's up to Staff. Staff has a turnaround time to...

Board Member Gooyer: I don't think they can do that.

Chair Lew: ...and they have to do – we have to do noticing, they have do – they have to turn around (inaudible) – there are other projects.

Board Member Baltay: If given Robert's strong feelings, I'm reluctant to think it's appropriate to send it to the subcommittee. I wish we could just do this really quickly. Are you sure there's no way to – it won't take long and put it on a very soon hearing.

Chair Lew: Well, it's already September 21<sup>st</sup> and you're thinking – you want it to go to one of the October meetings?

Board Member Baltay: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may? October 5<sup>th</sup> would only give a few days for revisions and there would be no Staff report possible for October 5<sup>th</sup>. October 19<sup>th</sup>, I mean usually when we bring things back to the ARB, a month between is really the quickest turnaround that we can usually do and have any meaningful revisions. The 19<sup>th</sup> is fairly packed with other items.

Chair Lew: Yeah and those are big items. Those are not – those are major – those are huge projects.

Ms. Gerhardt: They are and I do think the Park Boulevard project would be the one that would have to drop off. That is an office project that can't be approved until March and so delaying them a little bit wouldn't delay their ultimate approval.

Board Member Baltay: I don't want to get between you and the Chair scheduling the meetings.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: I guess I would say that if you're looking to continue it, it looks like November 2 is the date. I mean that's the date where we've got one other item on the agenda. The other – the October 19<sup>th</sup> has got four other pretty significant items. Even if one of those drops off, I still think you're here the whole morning. It sounds also though like the changes – I'll differ to the Board on this. I mean are these changes pretty straightforward to make and is this – if this is going to be a 5-minute conversation when it comes back, then I don't – we'll find a way to make it work on the 19<sup>th</sup> and just dispense with it if you've got confidence that that can be the case.

Board Member Baltay: I'm ok with that.

Vice Chair Kim: I'm also ok with that.

Chair Lew: Ok well then try to make – try a motion.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: Then the motion is to continue this to October 19<sup>th</sup> and the applicant is to come back to us with a design revised based on the comments from the IR review and our conversation today. None of the comments are binding but all of them should be considered and I would like to see a real color and material board and a rendering for how this fits into the community at that time.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Motion by Board Member Baltay and seconded by Kyu. All in favor? Opposed? Robert and Furth absent so that was 3-1, right?

Board Member Gooyer: No, I said aye.

Chair Lew: Oh, you said aye? Ok, sorry about that so that's 4-0-1. We will see you on October 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Trailer: Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you.

**MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT.**

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 392 California Avenue [17PLN-00088]:**  
Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Architectural Review to Allow Changes to the Façade of an Existing Commercial Building in the California Avenue Business District. The Façade Changes Include a new Storefront Window System, an Individually Illuminated Channel Letter Sign, and a New Custom Abstract Mural by Artist Victor Reyes. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) and 15311 (Accessory Structures). Zoning District: CC(2)(R)(P) (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Scott McKay at [Scott.McKay@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Scott.McKay@CityofPaloAlto.org)

Chair Lew: So, the last – yes, I think the last major item is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item, 392 California Avenue. Recommendation on applicant's request for Approval of a Minor Architectural Review to allow changes to the façade of an existing commercial building in the California Avenue Business District. The façade changes include a new storefront window system, an individually illuminated channel letter sign, and a new custom abstract mural by artist Peter or Victor Reyes. The Environmental Assessment is that it's exempt from the provisions of CEQA in accordance with Guideline Section 15301 for existing Facilities and 15311 for accessory structures. The zone district is CC(2)(R)(P) which is Community Commercial and we have Scott – project planner – excuse me, project planner Scott McKay, welcome.

Mr. Scott McKay, Project Planner: Thank you, Chair Lew, the Vice Chair Kim, and the Board Members. I have a brief PowerPoint presentation here for the project that I'd like to just run through. We have – this is basically the image of the proposed storefront showing the new signage, the window system, and the mural. We have the project overview here, it's basically – there are those three components; the storefront window system, the individually illuminated channel letters signage and the mural. I have a detail for the signage itself and it basically has, which translucent faces, it has black returns, internally illuminated LEDs. We have an existing and proposed elevation here also. The motion, we're recommending approval of the proposed project – well, recommending that you approve or propose that the project is approved by the Director Planning and Community Environment based on the findings and the conditions and the Staff report there. There are a couple other potential motions that can be made there. Also, I have some images here of other existing murals in the California Avenue Business District. A lot of the murals – the existing murals in the Business District were commissioned through the public art process and maintained by the City. There's – a lot of them went through that process and there are some murals that were done outside of that process but I just wanted to note that. That some of the murals in those images were commissioned through the City's public art process. I also – you should have at you places there, I had a comment that came in after the Staff report was prepared and it's – I mean there is basically two points in there. The first one just has to do with the overall size of the signage and I think the person who wrote this is considering the entire thing as signage, whereas we're looking at just the Summit Bicycles lettering as the actual sign. Then the mural is kind of a distinct and separate part of the project. The second comment was just that it's much larger than – speaking to whether it fits in with the neighborhood and so those are the comments that came in. We have Rebecca [Pollard] from Terry J. Martin Associates here, as well as Victor Reyes the artist for the mural. If you have any questions for Staff or for the applicant, we'd be happy to take those.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Scott. For the applicant, you have – do you have a presentation? You have 5-minutes if you want to make a presentation.

[Ms. Rebecca Pollard:] Good morning. My name is Rebecca [Tacard-Pollard] and I really don't have much to add to Scott's summary. I just wanted to put again, this is currently what the façade looks like and we're changing it with the mural and the signage and the new (inaudible) storefront system. Really, I'm just here with the artist to take any questions you may have.

Chair Lew: Great thank you. So, are there any questions from the Board? Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, has there been any consideration to the color? Does it have to be black and white? Has there been any thought of maybe using a color that is existing on the building?

Mr. Victor Reyes: This was a discussion between the owner and myself and I presented work – just a little background on me. I’m from San Francisco so it’s close by, I’ve done a lot of work there and I could name a few of my clients but I do a lot of this exterior/interior enhancement. So, this is a signature style that I’m kind of known for like Twitter has a bunch of paintings of mine in their office and goes on with those type of tech. companies that are not too unfamiliar to down here as well. I recently did something down in the peninsula on the Lincoln Campus. It’s similar motif to this but it’s in color and I think because of Ian, the owner, has several bike shops that the same motif, that’s why it’s a callback to those. It’s a bit of a branding but not heavy-handed. It’s more in the purview of the style I draw and this has some elements that also inform bicycling. You see the circular image which could be the chain or spoke of the tire. I don’t think we’re opposed to changing any colors but just if you wanted to know where the color originates, that’s the essence of it.

Chair Lew: Comments? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I’ll start. It’s certainly is a beautiful mural...

Mr. Reyes: Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: ...however I am opposed to putting it on the façade of the building. The first issue to me is the question, is this a sign or is an architectural façade treatment? I find it a very close call. Honestly, to me, this is a mural as an abstraction of bicycle wheels above a bicycle store and it comes very close to me whether this is a sign or not, to begin with. I’ll give you the benefit of the doubt, it’s not a sign, it’s an architectural façade treatment. Then I say it’s not a very suitable architectural façade treatment. You won’t see this on other buildings up and down California Avenue or throughout Palo Alto. We just don’t treat buildings with murals with canvases and I find that to be problematic. I extend a little bit further and I said if all store facades were murals, we would end up with a cacophony of architecture, which is not desirable. It’s that simple, I can’t support this part of your application. I can support approving this with the condition of the mural not be placed on the façade here. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean I had the same concept that is sure looks like a bit sign to me basically. I mean the lit portion which is supposable the sign is also black aluminum as you put with white letters and then on a black and white background. I mean I’m sorry, the average person who is going to look at that – I agree, it’s to me, an abstract bicycle pedal and part of a frame. I mean it – I have a real problem with that and you’re right, there is – it is a very overpowering – I mean there are murals all over Palo Alto. Some are cute, some are colorful or whatever but this is a very striking – I don’t know – edgy mural. I mean I like the mural itself, don’t get me wrong...(crosstalk)

Mr. Reyes: It’s a lot for Palo Alto.

Board Member Gooyer: ...I like the mural, it’s just I’m having a real hard time...

Mr. Reyes: I understand.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean it overpowers that building and overpowers the street. Part of it – I would be happier to see, for instance, the Summit Bicycles letters be put on, for instance, the overhang and then the mural itself be reduced by, let’s say twenty percent so it’s actually a smaller mural but then is wrapped by the building. Rather than coming to the outer edges of the building and overtaking the building.

Mr. Reyes: I see.

Board Member Gooyer: That way there's no distinction or I should say, there's a definite distinction between the murals on the wall, the sign on the overhang and California Avenue and other areas have the signage on the elevation so it – I'd be happier with a solution like that.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I like the mural. I think it's a beautiful piece of art and I have been on your website and have seen some the other artwork you've done.

Mr. Reyes: Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: I actually don't think it's too much for Palo Alto but I think it may be a little too much for the location and the elevation of the building it's being proposed on. There is a president on California Avenue for wall murals but I think typically they're on side walls or in alleys. I'd hate to lose the mural and I am wondering if there are ways that maybe it can be on the alley elevation instead or maybe a portion of the mural continues to the front so that I draw you into the alley. I think for it to be just this front elevation, especially facing California Avenue, is a little much. I think I can maybe get behind it a little bit more if they were to blend in with the building a little bit and that's why I asked about the colors. If it can be more of the existing color of the building and maybe that's a way that it blends a little bit more and doesn't have so much of a pop. The – nobody has commented about the storefront system change yet but I'll just make a quick comment that it looks like one of the mullions is being removed. So, the top mullion that currently goes across the top of the doors is being eliminated essentially, am I correct?

[Ms. Pollard:] That is correct and we were a brighter aluminum and now it's a darker color.

Vice Chair Kim: So, is the aluminum there this aluminum? Is the aluminum storefront represented somewhere here on the materials board? The oiled rubbed bronze metal frame?

[Ms. Pollard:] It was called out in an image but I don't believe we have material samples for it.

Vice Chair Kim: From just looking at it and my experience of other very similar materials, I don't think I have too much of a problem. I think maybe the oiled bronze is playing off of the mural which is black and white but I caution you because of that eave overhang, you never get a view where it really connects both above and below the overhang. Maybe – again, maybe there's something that can be done there that doesn't make it pop as much.

[Ms. Pollard:] If I may comment to that? Part of the reason for the change in the storefront system is that when the owner moved in as a new tenant, the existing system was damaged.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok. Yeah, I'll leave my comments at that, thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, I think the – I actually like the mural a lot. I like the graphics a lot and I would – then the part where I'm stuck is the black and white because you picked out – it seems like fairly high – you picked – of the choices in the range of whites and blacks and charcoals, I think you've picked about as dark as you can go. I think – in the back of my head I was thinking if it could be reduced, that was my main question. Black is kind of -- as an architect, black is unforgiving. It shows every flaw and if you make it – I think you're showing maybe flat paint but anything glossy, I mean any imperfection shows and white paint on stucco shows any speck of dirt. I was wondering – I guess my question is could it be reduced? Otherwise, I could support the project. I think – I had also I think – was it you? Who was it? Kyu, I think you were asking for the – no, Robert. On the sign on the overhang, that was sort of in the back of my head too.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, it gets it away from the – that its part of the – the other thing is like I said, I was thinking if let's say for sake of argument that the mural is yellow and then you keep the signage as black and white. Then it's obviously, ones a mural and ones the signage but – and it still doesn't distract from the quality of the mural. I'd rather see that – I think we're all having a problem with the black and white. It's very severe and it may – standing on its own, it might – that's one thing but incorporated like this, I'm having a problem with it.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Board Member Gooyer: So, I'd be willing to accept a – like I said a different color and keep the signage black and white and then to me there's – then it's obviously different and I wouldn't have a problem with it.

Chair Lew: I think I'm agreement.

Board Member Gooyer: He wanted to make a comment.

Chair Lew: Yes.

Mr. Reyes: Speaking to the black and white and the color and the composition scale, I think that's all good critic. I think we can take that and transform it into something more palatable for the environment without much struggle; a couple clicks on a computer. I do this a lot and again, I'm going to go back to my conversation with Ian. He wanted high impact and I think in some of my renderings I went low impact because I visited the site and I kind of – I didn't know how rigorous the review process would be but just kind of feeling the vibe of the street, excuse my language, I just didn't think black and white was the way to go. I think he wanted a higher impact so he was like no, let's go black and white and so we can always scale it back. I've done this is tan and white and it has a high impact as well but different. It's more nuanced, it's more nebulous, and this is like a real over the top. I understand you're...

Chair Lew: In my view, you can have more contrast than tan and white and let's just say like the neighboring building which is dark brown and white, right so there's room.

Mr. Reyes: I'd love to give you a range option; four or five, three or four if that is suitable for you.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. For the Board, do you want this to come back to everybody or I'm ok with the subcommittee. I think (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, are we in agreement then that the overall concept is ok, just the combination of colors is...

Board Member Baltay: No, I am not. I just don't think there should be a mural street facing façade.

Board Member Gooyer: Even in a different color.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, in any color. I think we're setting a president that if this were carried throughout the street and if this came to us as a new building, we certainly wouldn't look for a mural on the façade.

Chair Lew: I actually don't agree with that because we have murals on side facades but like Printers Ink and Antonio's Nut House, I mean those are – that's like – to me, that's as prominent as California Avenue. I mean those are large facades facing a major intersection so – and we have lots of art all over – and sculpture all up and down the street. I can support it on the front façade.

Vice Chair Kim: I could go either way. I think it's...



Board Member Baltay: You have to go one way or the other.

Vice Chair Kim: I think if the colors were perhaps a little bit more muted, I think I could be ok with it on the front façade.

Mr. McKay: Maybe just to clarify...

Chair Lew: Scott?

Mr. McKay: ... are we talking about the signage being kind of detached from the wall plane onto the awning still or are we just talking about the changes in colors on the mural or those...

Board Member Gooyer: I mean it's two-fold. Peter doesn't like the whole mural so that's one thing. I think right now when it's the black sign with the white lettering with the black and white mural, to me, it's one big sign. I would be much more amenable if you wanted to keep the black and white sign and then use a color on the mural or a couple white and something else or whatever, two colors, that are more amenable to the building or something that's toned down. Then also the distinction between the actual lit sign and the mural become much more obvious. I mean I'm willing to have that done at the subcommittee level.

Mr. Lait: Chair, if I may? I'm looking at the subcommittee schedule and one of our Board Members who's not present today is going to be on that subcommittee.

Chair Lew: Right.

Mr. Lait: I just wondered if it makes sense to – we have no idea where that particular individual is with respect to the application. It might just be better for this to come back to the Board and we...

Chair Lew: My take on it, especially since the Board sort of has a range – it seems like the Board has a range of opinions and it's not firmly clear on which direction – it's not completely set in stone which direction it should go. I'm thinking that – I think it should come back to the Board too. Any other – any motions?

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry, I feel like we need to give the applicant a little bit more direction. We have heard different ideas about whether the sign itself is attached to the façade or attached to the awning. I think that's a design change that – if that's direction that we're going, we need to communicate that.

Chair Lew: I would say I think we're looking for more separation between art and sign and that can be handled... (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) physically or by color. I think that's up to the applicant.

Chair Lew: (Inaudible), right? I think we're a little greater distinction there. Less contrast and possibly wrapping something around the corner or relocation to the side.

Board Member Gooyer: Now the other alternative is – as you said is to use the mural but it wraps around one of the corners and then on the other side of the front façade you just have – the separate signage. You know something like that so you still get the effect of the mural but it – if it wraps the corner, it begins to feel more like a mural than it does a sign, to begin with. It may also tone it down somewhat so I mean their various flexible – that's up to you as far as how you want to do it. It's just that this is awfully overpowering. So, what do you want to just bring it back to a date certain or uncertain?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think if we were going to bring it back to a date certain, which seems reasonable, November 2<sup>nd</sup> would be the appropriate date.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Gooyer: I move that we bring this project back to a date certain of October or not October, November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Chair Lew: Anybody seconding?

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second it.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor? Opposed? None. Ok, we will see you on November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

## **MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT**

Mr. Reyes: Thank you.

[Ms. Pollard:] Thank you for your time.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

- 6.** Draft Architectural Review Minutes of August 3, 2017, and September 7, 2017.

Chair Lew: Yes, we just have minutes and so (inaudible) – Ok, we have item number six which is draft Architectural Review Board minutes for August 3<sup>rd</sup> and September 7<sup>th</sup>. The ones for August 3<sup>rd</sup> were on a previous agenda but we didn't have a quorum at that time because one of the Board Members was absent for that meeting. Those came previously and I didn't have any comments for that one. Are there any comments? Then I didn't receive the ones for September 7<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, neither did I.

## **MOTION**

Chair Lew: So, maybe if we could push that to the next meeting. Did you have any comments on the minutes? No, ok. So, I make a motion that we approve the minutes for August 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None.

## **MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER FURTH ABSENT**

Chair Lew: Then we will put the September 7<sup>th</sup> ones for the next meeting. We have two subcommittee items, 1545 Alma Street and 567 Maybell Avenue. For subcommittee members, we – you could take – you're allowed to take a lunch or you may take a lunch break now or after the or in between the subcommittee items, ok?

### **Subcommittee Item**

- 7.** **1545 Alma Street [16PLN-00283]:** Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Driveway Surface Material, Open Space Seating, and Circulation Into the Unit B Garage From the Site Driveway. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: RM-15 (Low Density Multiple-Family Residence District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at [sahsing@m-group.us](mailto:sahsing@m-group.us)

8. **567 Maybell Avenue [15PLN-00248]:** Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Lot 2 Architecture, Lot 4 Shed Roof Pitches, Lot 9 Ceiling Height, and Lot 15 Porch Roof Overhang. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Consistent With the Previous Determination and no new Mitigation Measures are Necessary. Zoning District: R-2 and RM-15 (Two Family and Low-Density Multi-Family Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us

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

### **Adjournment**