



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 7707)

Report Type:

Meeting Date: 3/2/2017

Summary Title: Minutes for February 2, 2017

Title: February 2, 2017 Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

From: Hillary Gitelman

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Draft minutes from the February 2, 2017 Architectural Review Board meeting were made available to the Board members prior to the February 16, 2017 meeting date. The draft ARB minutes can be reviewed online at the City's website listed below

<http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/boards/arb/default.asp>

Hard copies of the minutes from the above referenced meeting will be available at the ARB meeting of February 16, 2017 being held at 8:30 am in the Council Chambers.

Attachments:

- February 2, 2017 Minutes (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: February 2, 2017
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent:

Chair Lew: Welcome to the Architectural Review Board meeting for February 2nd, 2017. I don't see the on-air light on yet. Just wanted to check to make sure. OK, great.

Chair Lew: Oh, Roll call. Silly me. Can we have a roll call, please?

[Meeting moved back to agenda changes, additions or deletions]

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications for items that are not on the agenda. I don't have any cards for that.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: We can move onto agenda changes. Are there any?

Vice Chair Kim: Attendance.

[Meeting moved back up to Roll call.]

Chair Lew: Do we have any changes on the agenda? Ok, thank you.

City Official Reports

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

None.

Study Session

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3181 Porter Drive [16PLN-00209]:**
Recommendation on Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Three Existing Office / R&D buildings at 3181, 3221, and 3215 Porter Drive and Construction of a new two-story 99,415 Square Foot Office Building. This is a Designated Project

Under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. Environmental Assessment: An Addendum to the Mayfield Development Agreement Environmental Impact Report has Been Prepared Pursuant to CEQA. Zoning District: RP. For more information, please contact Graham Owen at graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org. (CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 19, 2017)

Chair Lew: I think we can move onto action item number 2 which is a public hearing for 3181 Porter Drive. Recommendation on major architectural review to allow the demolition of Three existing office / R&D buildings at 3181, 3221, and 3215 Porter Drive and construction of a new two-story 99,415-square foot office Building. This is a designated project under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. An environmental assessment is an addendum has been -- to the Mayfield Development Agreement EIR has been prepared pursuant to CEQA. Zoning District is Research Park. So, Staff, welcome.

Mr. Graham Owen: Thank you. My name is Graham Owen. I've been working with the applicant on this project at 3181 Porter Drive. This is application has previously come before the Board on January 19th, where it was reviewed. At that time, we didn't have Draft Findings or Draft Conditions of Approval for the project. Just to restate what the application is for members of the public and just to also bring it back. This is a two-story office building which would encompass 99,415-square feet in the Research Park at 3181 Porter Drive. This is a Mayfield designated project and as such the allowable RAF on the site is .5 when normally the Research Park District allows for .4. At the Board hearing on January 19th, we were directed -- Staff was directed to return on to the -- to the 2nd, to this hearing with Draft Conditions of Approval and Draft Findings so we've have provided those in a Staff report for you today. Also, there was direction to provide additional material, additional detail on the exterior wall panels, in particular, the concrete and, so I believe the architect is here and will be able to have a brief presentation about the material board. At this point, Staff has recommended approval of this project with the Draft Findings and Conditions that you have in the Staff report.

Chair Lew: Great and you have 10 minutes.

Mr. Mark Roddy: Great. Thank you. Good morning. It's nice to see you all again. My name is Mark Roddy; I'm the design director of Smith Group JJR and I'm here representing the design team for 3181 Porter Drive. At our hearing on January 19th, you asked us to come back to you to provide some additional information on the detail of our wall panel design. You specifically asked about the following: 1. Was the dimensions of depth in regard to the windows and to the face of the GFRC. 2. Was the joints and vertical expression. 3. Additional information on the texture scale and detail of the board forming of the concrete. We're here today to address these issues and answer your questions. This image will look familiar from last time however, we added some more information to it. This image of the main entry to the lobby from the parking court shows the board from texture along with the joint lines to the left of the image. This actually represents the location of all the 3/4-inch joint lines, however, it is our intent to camouflage the vertical joints to give a consistent look across the surface of the wall panel. The horizontal joint that you can see will be visible. This is a 3/4-inch joint that will be consistent all the way around the building at that level. The following slides we're going to show you how we intend to accomplish this strategy. In this detail, wall section and elevation, you can see the strategic approach to the constructability to maximize the panel sizes that result in the location of the joints. Also, I'd like you to note the frames of the square openings, the textured panels and the smooth beveled surfaces where the windows are inset. In regards to the location of the joints; it has everything to do with how the panels are constructed and, so you can see all the verticals -- makes a lot of sense -- lines up where the windows are for movement etc. In this drawing, these are three details that show the different head and sill conditions of the windows. There's a lot of detail in here. These are almost a kind of construction document level but I think the point -- is at the top of the slide, I think it's worth you all understanding is that all the glazing conditions, the punch window openings, there's a 7-inch dimension from the face of glass to the face of the GFRC. In the key areas where we have the framed condition -- those square areas that I talked about before, those are 13-inches from the face of glass so you get a kind of secondary element that actually comes out past the face of the GFRC. Obviously, the intent of this, along with the previous page I showed with the design, is

to give a sense of variation of depth and shape within the façade as it moves around the building. In this 3-dimension view on the left, you can see that it shows all the components of the wall system. We've also indicated all the vertical lines and of course, the horizontal lines but as previously mentioned, we do not want to express the vertical joints. What we did was we worked with the subcontractor to create a mock-up to validate our intent. If you look at the bottom image – the bottom image in the middle of the slide, you can see our mock-up there with a dimension and you can't even hardly – I don't think you can see it but there's a 3/4-inch joint and then we've put our sealant material in there to match the coloration of the panel. Along, with the vertical expression, the color matching; you don't really even see that vertical line. The other images at the upper – on the right-hand side of the slide, demonstrate our mockups that we've created and really show how light is going to affect -- with the shade and shadow, create this dynamic texture. This will be a very dynamic surface. Then lastly, I wanted to show you – I'm sorry, let me back up. The top upper image in the middle was an image taken about 75 – 100-feet away and, so the interesting thing there is that even from a distance, the texture and the shadow will actually get picked up. The last image I want to talk about is the one in the middle and with all the dimensions (Inaudible) on it and that is an image of the sample that we've brought today to show you and this is exactly how the subcontractor is building this. There's a varying size of wood panels from 1-inch to 2-inches to 4-inches – varied along the mock-up. That is then standardized or replicated so there's a kind of a consistent – you know, you take that – your kind of make it consistent across it to create the pattern that we've created. Then, the dimension of the rib that comes from typical board formed concrete that comes out – that's 3/8-inch tall. So, that's how far that's coming out. Then, of course, as I mentioned before, the ribs are then broken with a rubber mallet which we replicated here; which we also did on-site at the factory to do that – which gives something that is actually factory made, all of sudden to have a very kind of handcrafted and custom quality to the panels. We guarantee there's not going to be any other wall panels quite like it which is pretty cool. Then quickly, this image we showed last time, I think this one is really great because it just gives you the sense of human scale. These are the folks that are building it here. With that, we hope to get your support today and thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Are there any questions? Sure.

Vice Chair Kim: Just a quick question on the last slide that we were looking at, A4.7. I did notice that it looks like the two pictures in the top right almost show a study of not breaking the ribs and then breaking the ribs. It looks like to the left of the panel the ribs are intact and then to the right of the panel they are more rough. It is your intent to make them rough, am I correct?

Mr. Roddy: Yeah, that was just a photograph of us in process of taking the original piece and then customizing it.

Vice Chair Kim: None of them will be smooth ribbed, not broken?

Mr. Roddy: They will all be broken to some degree, yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu, why don't you – I don't think we have any other questions so why don't you go ahead and start on any comments.

Vice Chair Kim: Alright. Thank you for coming back especially, in such a short time period. I think project looks great. I think I asked for some additional details that you've provided. I was not so much concerned with the detail itself but I just wanted to make sure that things such as the spacing of the ribs and the detail of how that's actually going to come together were thought out before we approve the project. I appreciate the detail that you've gone into and I think that it will be a stunning building and very unique in the way that you've gone about these panels. I don't have too many other comments. They are very minor. I was alerted to the fact that the area has changed a little bit because you're counting the cases in the first now and I noticed that an extra parking space was added to accommodate that change in area but overall, I'm very pleased with what I'm seeing and I think we can recommend

approval for the project. That vertical joint is pretty impressive. If I have any concerns regarding that, it would be that the joint compound as the building wears may begin to discolor differently than the concrete. I think you will be fine and thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: I can support this project. I find it's a beautiful and elegant design solution. I find your treatment that you showed us today is especially nice and easily supports findings #3. I can support the whole thing and easily make these findings now.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, me too, I can support the project as is.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I look forward to seeing it built. I had one question for Staff on finding #4. Unfortunately, I didn't print out the minutes from last time but I can make all the findings and support the project but finding 4 pertain (inaudible) among other things to pedestrian support. I was able to make that finding because the plan that was submitted includes pedestrian accessible seating in that front area. I wonder if we could add a sentence regarding that so that it doesn't disappear in some redesign.

Mr. Owen: I think that can be added, absolutely.

Chair Lew: Wynne is that all?

Board Member Furth: It is.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you.

Board Member Furth: As I said, I look forward to seeing it.

Chair Lew: Excellent. I can also support the project. I think the only things that I wanted to add to the Draft Findings was in #5 with regard to landscape design. I think I just wanted to add that the existing turf lawn is being removed and not replaced, in kind. That's huge – to me that's a huge design departure in the Research Park and I think that's something that is very important. Do we have a motion? Can we have a motion?

Board Member Furth: It's continued public hearing.

Chair Lew: I'm sorry, I thought this was on – I forgot we – at the last meeting we were talking about doing consent. We are actually – Staff did the – [phonetic] Cheryl Lowenstine. Welcome, and you have 5 minutes.

[Ms. Cheryl Lowenstine:] I don't need that. Thanks very much. I'm just concerned that the allowable FAR is .4 but this is .5. Can anyone explain that to me?

Chair Lew: I can. If the Staff wants to do it, that's fine. I'll start or Staff can start? We have the Stanford and Palo Alto came to the agreement – the Mayfield Agreement with regards to the playing fields on Stanford line that – Page Mill and El Comino and then, also they agreed – Stanford agreed to housing on the – there's an El Comino site; also, the one on California Avenue and the square footage of that commercial was – I guess we were able to transfer? Transferred into a separate pool and that Stanford can use that square footage elsewhere in the Research Park as however, they decided to allocate it. At the time of that agreement, an EIR was done for the project – for the whole thing and so that's – and

they have been using it on – I think the VMware site, is that correct? Then I’m not sure – there were maybe (crosstalk)...

[Ms. Lowenstine:] It’s more like a bank? Is it like there is a banked amount of square footage?

Chair Lew: It’s a banked amount and there is...

[Ms. Lowenstine:] Thank you.

Chair Lew: ...at the end. It’s towards the end of the – they are at the bottom of the bank.

[Ms. Lowenstine:] Thanks very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Are there any other public speakers? I think now would be the time. Did you want to speak to this project? Ok, thank you. I’ll close the public hearing on this portion and we can – the Board can make a motion.

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: Can I move that we approve this project – recommend approval of this project with the findings in the Staff report?

Board Member Gooyer: I’ll second.

Board Member Furth: Would you accept an inclusion of a reference to the seating? About the accessible seating – pedestrian seating?

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely.

Board Member Furth: Thanks.

Chair Lew: As well as to the reference to turf?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, yes. The reference to turf and seating that was mentioned during our discussion should be included.

Chair Lew: Yes, and is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah. I’d be fine with that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: That passes 5-0. Thank you.

MOTION PASSES 5-0

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 567 Maybell Avenue [15PLN-00248]:**
Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Four Single-family Residences and the Construction of 16 two-story single-family residences with basements. Environmental Assessment: Consistent with Previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project. Zoning Districts: R-2 and RM-15. For More Information, Please Contact Contract Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@mgroun.us.

Chair Lew: We will move onto item #3 which is a public hearing for 567 Maybell Avenue. Consideration of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of four single-family residences and the construction of 16 two-story single-family residences with basements. Environmental assessment is it is consistent with previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project. Zoning Districts: R-2 and RM-15. Just take a quick break for a minute or two while the presentation is set up. Should we have the Staff report Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing?

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing: Yes, thank you. Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner. I did have a PowerPoint presentation for you briefly, just to discuss the summary of the project and some of the issues that Staff has found and then the applicant also has a presentation. The project is a 2.44-acre site located at the intersection of Clemo and Maybell Avenue. It's surrounded by multiple of uses; single family, multifamily. There is a fire station and there's a park. There is also a couple of schools along Maybell. Maybell does have a lot of pedestrian traffic when the schools are in session. It's fairly close also to the El Camino Real Corridor. The project includes demolition of four existing single-family homes and the construction of 16 new single-family homes. The project – the last – went before a public hearing was in June with the City Council. That was for the tentative map for the subdivision request. Right now, we're just looking at the architectural review. The key issue would be the architectural design and the context. You can see the site plan where you have 5 single-family units along Maybell. Four of the units do share a driveway so that reduced the amount of curb cuts. There is no access from Clemo – vehicular access from Clemo to Maybell so there is a private street that was created on site for the 11-other unit's interior and those would go to Arastradero. From there, they can make a choice of where they would want to go. Each of these homes have – there are 8 different plan types but they each have a unique type of architecture. Spanning from your contemporary to your Spanish and they have a transitional type and the applicant can describe a little bit more about that program. Here's the elevations of them and those are in your plans and packet as well. They are two-stories and they also include a basement. They are about 2000-square feet or so roughly. The height is not greater than 28-feet and as I mentioned, each home does have a basement. Some of the issues that we did raise where there is some excessive pavement for the shared driveways. As well as there is a placement of a detached garage that we think could be in a better location. Then there are also some roof pitches on the Spanish architecture types that we think can be more consistent amongst themselves. That would be – we wanted to get some direction from the Board on that. Just in detail, the excessive driveway areas along Maybell – that has to do with the shared driveways. You can see – I think the idea there is they are trying to make it so there is the right turning movement but just in consultation with our transportation Staff, that there is an opportunity to reduce that area and they can still make the turning radius. There are actually two detached garages that are part of this project and that's at the hammerheads. There is lot 9 and then there is lot 14. Lot 9 is actually a good example that Staff found to be successful. The detached garage is actually opposite a rear yard so we think that is an appropriate location and that seems to work with the access to that site. The other – lot 14 which is on the opposite side, is a slightly smaller lot but again, you can see there is a detach garage but that detach garage is located opposite a front yard and that's just not very typical to see that in a new subdivision. We are recommending that that detach garage mirror lot 9's design and that is possible to do that. We also want to raise to the Boards attention roof pitch. Typically roof pitch on a Spanish is lower, not as steep. Actually, on these two levels, the roof pitch is different. The lower level has a lower pitch and then the upper level has a steeper pitch and, so we would like to see that more consistent and I think they can do that. The Environmental Review was already completed for the project back with the tentative map. The tentative map did contemplate these – the design including the basements and the 16 single-family units and they had the same site plan layout. That document was adopted and does cover this application. The motion is to recommend to conduct a public hearing and hearing the public comments and then continue to a date uncertain as there are no findings in the packet to consider. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions. The applicant is here with their presentation, thank you.

Chair Lew: The applicant, welcome. You have 10 minutes.

Mr. Ted O'Hanlon: Thank you, Board. Good morning. Thank you for seeing us. Let me introduce myself. My name is Ted O'Hanlon. I'm representing the owners, Golden Gate Homes. I have been working closely

with them for 3+ years now on this project and we're happy to finally be in front of you and get some feedback on what we're trying to build on this piece of land in South Palo Alto. I'm joined by our architects, Studio S Squared; they are based in San Jose. Sean Rinde is here and Eugene Sakai is making his way through the wet roads but should be here within the time of my chat. I want to keep mine short since I'm not actually an architect. I'm simply a Project Manager and I've been helping to manage the process and perhaps reserve some my time at the end to respond to some other comments we might here over this. Really high level here. We started with a 30-unit plan on the site. We know it zoned for a higher density and as we discovered as time went on that there just wasn't the appetite for 30-units. Then we discovered there wasn't an appetite for 23-units in the neighborhood and as we started to form those relationship, we just saw that there's time and there's also doing something that people would like to see. We ultimately decided to get along and find a way to make a 16-unit plan work which the neighborhood was supportive of. We worked very closely over the course of the end of 2015 and 2016 to come up and ultimately, get our tentative map approved for 16 single-family homes; about the size of your normal Palo Alto lot. What we detach from that process was the architecture. Over the course of our applications to the City, however, we also represented that we had this notion of a contemporary home design. Generally, in the 30-unit plan and the 23-unit plans that aren't part of this package but are out there, they were contemporary homes. As we got to know our neighbors as time went one, we also came to understand that as much as contemporary homes are enjoyed by some neighbors, some neighbors don't and there is a good mix of different types of homes in this neighborhood. We came up with a new plan and that's what you see before you; is 16 homes that are all individual in character. More than half of them not contemporary; seven of them are contemporary. Five of them are more of a Spanish/Mediterranean and traditional and four of them are transitional. I think it's representative of all the homes that we see being built nowadays in Palo Alto for the past 10 or so years. In that mix, contemporary, transitional and Spanish, it seems to be the predominate types that we have. We tasked the architects with a tough job. We said to come up with 16 unique homes. We don't want this to be a program such that you might have seen in other recent developments that have multiple units like at Red Wood Gate by Summerhill Homes, Sterling Park by Classic Communities and the Stanford faculty housing over by Escondido Elementary. Again, what you see is really 16 individual homes that actually fit cohesively well together. We have 8-floor plans so this isn't a small task. These are very sharp pencils being used here to make these homes work within the code and be code compliant to all aspects of it; whether it's site coverage, parking, building height, setbacks, etc. Four of these floor plans are one-offs. They are only used on one of the lots so that means that four of them are replicated with different types of elevations but we really feel like we have 16 different elevations which your job very hard and a lot of eyes to put on it. Since we do know our neighbors are conscientious of this project, one of the things that we did to accommodate them, aside from the density was to come up with this concept with the driveways on Maybell. Currently, there are four homes there with four curb cuts. It's a very highly traveled street by children going to Terman, Briones, Gun and we wanted to limit the number of curb cuts so we can up with this concept to have four of the homes share two driveways. In order to accommodate turn radius, those driveways might appear a bit larger but those homes still fit the criteria of site coverage and our storm water drainage is still be met as well. We will be using pavers on those which are quite appealing. This is not going to be an asphalt driveway. They are quite visually appealing. We also felt that it's beneficial for these homes to maybe provide some ancillary parking in addition to what's required. Aside from the garage space and the carport perhaps for a guest or if a family might have a third car and that's what those driveways accommodate and actually, all 16 of the homes do accommodate a third car parking. Rather than the service parking in the neighborhood which is sometimes challenged. Other neighborhood enhancements that I wanted to cover is we're giving 10-feet of this land to the City to help connect the pedestrian to access Briones Park; one of Briones Elementary School, whatever it might be where there isn't actually a sidewalk existing right now. We'll be – the City will be dedicated that land. It will be designed with a planter strip and then 5-foot wide sidewalk. One of the other improvements that maybe isn't met as quickly is the fact that the current homes on Maybell are 20-feet off of the curb. The new homes will be 20-feet from the dedicated land so they will actually be 30-feet from the curb. All the homes on Maybell will be further setback from they currently are. Another point to that is Clemo has these wonderful oak trees that will be preserved as part of this project. We've also been asked to plant 5 new oak trees along Maybell to extend that great tree canopy and we'll also be relocating some of – a few of the smaller trees that are feasible to relocate onto Maybell as well so we

will further beautiful that street. Actually, tuck our new subdivision so to say, behind all these trees as time goes on and those oak trees proliferate. Again, you guys have dug into this sketch of the 16 homes and all the elevation. There's quite a lot of variety and where does that variety born from? It's born from a term that used all over Palo Alto. It's used in Sheldon's report about the eclectic nooks of architecture, all over Palo Alto and Palo Alto is proud of that, having a mixture of architecture and that's something we've been seeing for the last 10-years, are these varieties. It already exists on Maybell Avenue. Whether it's a contemporary home or traditional. Whether it's your Arastradero Park Apartments which is adjacent to the site. Whether it's Barron Square which is townhome development in the 1980s or other homes that exist along Maybell. Whether it's the ones that were built before 1976 which are actually still in the greater number of homes along the street but as time goes on, those might perhaps be turned into new homes such as – let me go back – 551 Maybell which was approved in December which is another contemporary home. I don't know when they will get a building permit but it will add to the mix and the eclecticism of the neighborhood. Then there are other signals in the neighborhood that I like to call out that I think shows a variety here and that's some of the institutional; one at Briones Elementary school, the Zen Hotel, and the Tan Plaza which seems to sit atop Maybell Avenue. Actually, these homes and the oak trees to be put on Maybell will provide a little bit of deflection of that. That's my talk. I probably used my 10-minutes anyway but I thank you guys very much for your time. We look forward to your Q&A. I can either handle that or our architects can handle that. Again, thanks.

Chair Lew: Ok, so we normally just allow 10 minutes for the total presentation but I will defer to Staff. It seems we have a lot of interest in this particular project. Maybe it would make sense to allow more time for their presentation and then the other thing too is after – then we'll go to the public speakers and I'm thinking – we allow 5 minutes and I think we maybe have 6 speakers that will take – that might take 25 minutes and then we do allow a 10 minute – after the public speakers, we do allow a 10 minutes' rebuttal time. We could use some of your rebuttal time for the presentation as well. How much time do you think you need for the architectural presentation? Can you do it in 5 minutes?

Male (Applicant Team): We didn't have anything to present. I think a lot of what Ted said is in alignment with our own design philosophy, our own analysis of the neighborhood. We really didn't see a strong consistent style and I think in general, our own approach to new residential architecture is that it should be reflective of its time. I think that's why the project skews somewhat to the contemporary but we didn't want to go completely contemporary as you might have seen and other proposals for the site and probably before you and other sites around the City. Therefore, we did propose a mix to try to soften the overall stylistic approach. I think in general, we are in alignment with our client and feel this is an appropriate design approach to this site.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. We can move on now to the public speakers and we have 6. The first is Kenneth Schultz and the second is [Jennifer Fryling]. If you could come up to the microphone and you have 5 minutes.

[Ms. Jennifer Fryling]: Thanks. Thank you very much, gentleman and lady. I live a couple blocks from the Maybell development and I've spoken with many neighbors that live along Maybell Avenue and them that expressed a strong dislike for the contemporary designs. They are along the Maybell frontage because they believe it is out of scale and character with the rest of the single-family homes on Maybell. Maybell Avenue currently has only 1 contemporary home of the 46 that are on Maybell Avenue. I actually had informed Golden Gates rep. this past year that the Maybell neighbors would prefer that the contemporary designs either fall on Clemo or the interior part of the development because those streets have less visibility. Clemo is a dead-end street and then the interior portion is a cul-de-sac. Maybell has thousands of kids and people and drivers that go through it so it's a really high visibility area. The folks who live around there and actually live on Maybell – I live just a few blocks from there, would like to see less of the contemporary design because of just the fact that it's pretty much considered one of -- all the design element, it's generally considered one of the least popular and so it would just be more consistent with the neighborhood to go with what's existing there which is eclectic but only one is contemporary. Because of lot sized and dimensions are about the same, like 6,000-square feet, I ask the ARB to please recommend that Golden Gate Homes swap out some of the contemporary designs along the Maybell

frontage with some of the other designs that are in the rest of the development. I think that the high cluster of the contemporary on – in one central location on Maybell is overwhelming and overpowering relative to the other single family homes that are on Maybell Avenue. Also, I had informed the Golden Gate reps. this past year that some additional Maybell neighbor feedback and the neighbors would like to look at seeing if the garages could be more adjacent to each other; those that are sharing a common driveway so that there are less paved hardscape and more of the greenery that is up front. I think the garages closer would maximize those two things with having still a driveway but then having lots of greenery if the garages were a bit closer together. Thank you very much for considering the feed from the Maybell neighbors.

Chair Lew: Can I just clarify, your Jennifer? Great so then – I'm going to go back to the first speaker which would be Kenneth Schultz.

Mr. Kenneth Schultz: Good morning. It's an honor to be here. I'd really like to commend the developer for the level of effort and work that they've put into this. I think they came up with a very nice plan. I have a few reservations which I'll tell you about but I really think it is very good and I hope at the end of the day you approve this project. Regarding styles, I personally am happy with any style as long as it's well presented. When I look at the houses in this development, my feeling is that the contemporary house on lot 4 is a good example. Not necessarily because it is contemporary but because I think the design works. In contrast, a very similar floor plan, the same unit type on lot 2, I just don't think belongs there. It looks more like the side of a house than the front of a house. It's got broad, flat surfaces, tiny windows. It's not a very friendly looking house. I would not want to live across from it but those are the same houses before you do the surface work and I think that if the architect took another look at that house, they could improve it quite a bit. There's another – I think the only other contemporary on Maybell is lot #1. That's an interesting looking house but I think the white framing is too bold. Maybe just toning down that color would do the job but as I said, I applaud a mix of houses. I'm not offended by contemporary but I'm not offended by anything else either. In the end, although I go up and down Maybell probably 4 or 5 times a day, I would, in the end, differ people whose homes face this project directly because they have to look out their window at it. If we have a difference of opinion, that's ok. I defer to them. Regarding the driveways. I started out thinking that they should be smaller and there might be ways to do it but I actually spent some time with pencil and paper and pushing things around. I looked at the adjacent garage driveways and in the interior like buildings 10, 11 and 12, 13 and I actually concluded that I think that the Maybell driveways look better and that the portions of the driveways that curve to the left can be screened by fences or landscaping. The architectural designs or renderings actually suggest some of that. I – if – go ahead and take another look at those but be sure that you don't make it worse. There – ok, now in general, I see an example of this all-over Palo Alto. I think there's an overuse of heavy design elements that aren't necessary. I especially see this in the interior housing, lots 10-12. A lot of heavy stone, window framing on one of the Spanish style house – up on top of the second story which tends to make the houses look ponderous, top heavy. They are kind of imposing on the street and I think that if the architect could take another look at these, they could find ways to make them look lighter, airier. Actually, make them look smaller without physically being smaller and it might actually enhance the values of the homes. That's my own opinion but I think we see too many fake arches, heavy stone, all around town. I've seen really nice houses including some examples that were put up earlier, in different parts of town that work very well, of the same styles. I'd encourage them to go back and take another look. Make another pass at it. If they need to hire somebody that is really good at presentation or making a unified whole out of a bunch of design elements, then do that. I think it's worth it. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you. The next speaker is [Warren Kursh] and then after that, we'll have Margo and I can't read the last name. Maybe Davis, possibly. Great. Welcome, and you have 5-minutes.

[Mr. Warren Kursh:] Thank you, Members, of the Architectural Review Board. My name is [Warren Kursh]. I live just down the street, down Maybell, about two blocks away from the proposed development. I want to first thank Golden Gate Homes and Ted especially for the way they've worked with the neighborhood to come up with a design which really fits. Initially, it was 30, three-story homes

on substandard lots or under 6,000-square foot lots. The current design is a great compromise between the residents and the neighborhood and Golden Gate Homes. I think it – both sides win in this particular situation. There – you have a letter that I send to you earlier this week and there are only two elements that I think I would tweak a little bit in the design. As Jen and people have said, the homes on Maybell are the homes that experience most of the traffic. In the morning between 7:45 and 8:15, there is literally 1,000 kids on bicycles, cars, pedestrian, children walking, people out walking their dogs; that all converges on Maybell. It's a real zoo, ok? In the afternoon, it's not as bad. Just after schools let out. People from – students from Gun, students from (inaudible), people coming to pick up their children. On a rainy day, like yesterday or today, there is literally traffic backed up from El Comino all the way to the schools. I live on Donald Drive, just off of Maybell. One house off of Maybell and we have to park our car backward in so that we can drive safely out in the morning. I've very concerned about the curbs – the curb cuts. I also think that the amount of pavement is probably too much. If it could be softened with turf blocks or a combination of turf blocks and pavers, that would probably help. Lot #5, if the driveway could be moved onto Clemo – it would be inconvenient for the owners of that house to get out in the morning when there is traffic on Arastradero. They'd have to make a right turn and then go around the block if they want to go to El Comino. It would help with the safety on Maybell. The second point, which I brought up in my letter – probably it was my first point, was the contemporary look and feel. I don't personally oppose contemporary. I like some contemporary designs. There are some contemporary designs I don't like. I think probably lot #2 or lot #1 – I forget which one it is – with the bold white face is probably too bold contemporary and if it could be softened or if one of the two contemporaries could be changes a little bit, that would probably help – at least my feelings and perhaps others in the neighborhood who feel like me. I'm going to relinquish the rest of my time. I thank you for your time.

Chair Lew: Thank you. We have Margo Davis, is next. Got it, thank you. Cheryl [phonetic][Lulinstien] will be next.

[Ms. Cheryl Lulinstien:] I'll make it brief. I really appreciate what Golden Gate Homes has done. I really – it's been a long road and this is much better. We feel a lot more relaxed about the added amount of traffic on Maybell. That said, it's still – I understand there is a compromise to be made by allowing three cars to park in each home; one in the garage, one next to it and one behind it. That way a third car of say a visitor doesn't have to park in the neighborhood and in the street, which is also one of our concerns is that there are too many cars around altogether. Because of that, I'm just wondering if the house on lot #5, could have its driveway on Clemo? Same as the last speaker said and I also find that the lot #1, white face is too bold and just in your face. Lot #2 really does look like the side of the house. Other than that, I think that lot #4, the contemporary style looks really nice. Lot #3, it seems like it's somewhere between contemporary and transitional. I'm ok with the street face on Maybell except for lot #1 and lot #2. Thanks very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Margo Davis and the last speaker will be Bob Moss.

Ms. Margo Davis: Good morning. Thank you, Members, of the Board and Ted and his team. Thank you very much for working with our neighborhood. I represent – my name is Margo Davis and I thank all of my neighbors for paying attention to Maybell and Clemo and the traffic issues. All the practical logistical issues associated with 16 new homes. I have a rather unique perspective. I live in the Tan Plaza and even though -- as you know, it's not a condominium building. I've been there for 24-years, in an apartment on the 5th floor that overlooks the entire 2.4-acres that we're about to develop. I have a bird's eye view of one end to the other so my perspective is a little bit different although, it's the same as my neighbors because I walk in our neighborhood all the time but I live in a hovering helicopter view over this site. I have many concerns about – and I'm also a photographer, so I'm coming from a place of aesthetics here and not paying attention to all of the logistical things that this team is trying to balance. From the 5th floor, I'm concerned first of all, about all the contemporary – I love contemporary. Let me just say right now that I am much more into contemporary than I am into this heavy mission traditional style that looks like your building houses for the arctic. I mean we live in a semi-tropical place. We should have more lightness in these buildings. We should have more (inaudible). There's much too – if you look at these – a lot of the homes, they are just heavy. They are heavy in color. They are heavy in stone.

They are heavy in all ways. I am a contemporary because lighter, more minimalist, will end up being a more aesthetic look but on the other hand, I'm looking down on the site rather than horizontally into it. Contemporary houses all put along the fence that faces Tan Plaza means that all of us, me and my neighbors, who've I have talked to at the Tan Plaza are looking on flat roofs. Imagine looking down on a bunch of concrete, flat roofs. I think we would rather see some Spanish from that point of view. The tiles are a lot more aesthetic – Spanish style or what you call – what do you call this kind of roof? I'm just lacking the term for it. A roof with a slope to it. A pitched roof. A pitched roof, thank you. It would probably more aesthetic so I would be against clustering all the contemporaries with flat roofs right along the fence of Tan Plaza. I also interested in maintaining the trees that are functional and that can hide some of this new development from our view. I think that more or less says what I have to say. I am interested going forward, very much in what the construction hours are going to be like and what the control over the mess – the Clemo mess – the whole mess. We've lived there for 25-years and this is a very difficult transition. Thank you very much. Thank you. I've already invited the team to come and get this helicopter view anytime you want to get an idea of what it looks like from up there, not from down here.

Chair Lew: Thank you and our last speaker is Mr. Moss.

Mr. Bob Moss: Thank you. I think that Golden Gate Homes is a much better proposal than the others we had on this site previously but there still are a few things that I think need some improving. First of all, if it's possible, I'd like to see the driveway for the home on the corner, at Clemo rather than on Maybell. I don't know – there are no dimensions on any of these maps so I don't know if there is enough room to fit in but if there is, it would make it safer for people entering that property and accessing Maybell and would reduce the number of driveways from 5 to – from 3 to 2. You would have 2 driveways serving two of the homes – the other four homes. On the design, the contemporary style is not common in Barron Park. There is a few houses in that style. The one that really jumps out at you is on Amaranta about 3 doors down from Los Robles. It's a big cube and it looks totally incompatible with the rest of the neighborhood so rather than having 7 out of 16 in that style. I would rather have more of them in the transitional or the traditional Spanish, which is more consistent with the neighborhood. The developments are supposed to be consistent with existing structures and buildings and this many of the new homes – new style, contemporary, is not. I'm particularly concerned about the 3 of them along Maybell. Now, if they want to retain that design, they could switch some of those buildings with the ones that are on the interior of the site, which is more traditional. Then they would have the – let's call them contemporary, on the inside where it would be more consistent and you'd have better consistency within the development and by putting the Spanish style along Maybell, you'd be more consistent with the existing neighborhood. The other possibility is to reduce the number of contemporaries and put in more traditional or even transitional designs. I think the design of the homes along Maybell needs to be modified and we want to keep the area consistent with the existing structures and existing homes. This particular design is not so I think it has to be modified. It's not a big deal to switch buildings that are currently on the inside of this project which is more traditional, for the ones on Maybell, which are more modern. I'm not taking issue with the design basically, modern architecture. The Chairman of my Architecture Department when I was going to school was one of the creators of modern architecture. A fellow named Mies van der Rohe who I'm sure some of you have heard of and we had a lot of really interesting modern design buildings on campus and nearby. It's not a gee, modern design is terrible. It's fine in the right place and three of them along Maybell is not the right place.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you, Mr. Moss. We have no other public speakers. Oh, we do have one last speaker. You can come to the microphone and just state your name and then also, you can fill in a card after you speak.

Mr. Winston Wong: My name is Winston Wong. I own a house on Baker, which is a few blocks away from the development. I generally like the development. It's a great opportunity to enhance the neighborhood. 16 homes are a great development. I do have a few concerns about the homes on Maybell. As some of the previous other people mentioned, there's a lot of traffic from the schools and in the weather, it gets even worse. I'm assuming that there will be – the homes on Maybell will have a basement and if they do,

I'm concerned about the water that's maybe pumped out on the street and the hazard it may pose to some of the bicycles. Mitigating the dust as well as digging these huge holes for the basements too. I'm not sure if it depends on the time of the year when they excavate for the basements but I'm more concerned about the traffic going in and out along Maybell. Mostly because there are kids and I wish – the kids have a lot of good judgment on bicycles and stuff like that but they are just kids, so we have to compensate for that. I kind of reiterate the concerns with some of the other neighbors too about the contemporary designs on Maybell too. I have a concern about blending in with the neighborhood too. I'm not sure if it's appropriate but in the literature, does it say what they are going to market the homes for in terms of not changing the character of the neighborhood or who moves in and stuff like that? I'm not sure if that's addressed in here what they are planning to market the homes for? What they sell for is entirely different but that's all I had.

Chair Lew: Great.

Mr. Wong: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. I'm going to close the public portion of the meeting – of this item and for the applicant, you do have a 10-minute rebuttal period if you want.

Male (Applicant Team): Can we get a couple minutes to confer before we speak?

Chair Lew: Yeah, confer and I think we have some questions here so we'll – for Staff. We can get back to you in a couple minutes. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I had two questions. What is the present on street parking regulations on Clemo? Is it just on street parking on both sides permitted?

Chair Lew: No.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes, that – sorry yes there is a public park there and there's no restriction...

Board Member Furth: On either side of the street.

Mr. Ah Sing: ...currently. Right.

Board Member Furth: Then it's just blocked off with the emergency access and pedestrian and bicycle access around the corner.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes, the Clemo (inaudible)

Board Member Furth: I had some difficulty reading the tree maps and landscape designs. Right now, the predominate natural feature there, leaving aside the aging orchard, is quite impressive oak trees along both frontages. Could you tell me – when I look at those – let's start with Clemo. When I look at the trees along Clemo, will they all be saved? What's the proposal?

Chair Lew: Some of the trees – I think two of the trees are being removed to Maybell.

Board Member Furth: Two would be removed. What size?

Chair Lew: Moved.

Mr. Ah Sing: They would be moved, relocated.

Board Member Furth: Removed from my point of view. I'm thinking about the whole frontage.

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt: We do have sheets TM3.1.

Board Member Furth: Yeah, I've seen it.

Ms. Gerhardt: Certainly, the concept was to save the trees along Clemo and along the interior of the property line with the Tan Plaza as much as possible. You'll see here that some trees are being relocated.

Board Member Furth: I'm asking – I'm really trying to figure out – only one tree of the absolute corner would be removed and then one tree over on the right at lot #16, is, that, right? All the remaining trees would stay?

Ms. Gerhardt: There are a – four trees being relocated.

Board Member Furth: But not from the area I'm concerned with. There's an interior tree setback, you're right, on lot #6.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're asking about the – along Maybell?

Mr. Ah Sung: No, it was Clemo...

Board Member Furth: No, I'm looking at Clemo.

Mr. Ah Sung: ... I think that was a design consideration. You can tell by the driveways that they are not really symmetrical because they are trying to avoid the trees. They are being considerate to that. I think a lot of the questions raised today was regarding lot #5 whether they can take access off of Clemo. I think there is a possibility to look into that. I don't think there is a tree that would (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: I didn't have a good sense when I was looking at those trees, is to how many would have to be removed and your answer is very few on the Clemo frontage, right?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes.

Board Member Furth: Then I know for example, in my neighborhood, downtown North, we have developments in which multiple families – multiple single family dwelling developments like this one – what we use to call subdivisions – that have conventions in place to ensure the protections of oak trees after the individual lots are sold. Would you be thinking of something like that here?

Mr. Ah Sing: We haven't gotten those types of documents for review but if it's something that the Board wants us to include, we can include that provision.

Board Member Furth: One of our findings is preserving important natural features and it seems to me this is the important natural feature on this site. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I have a quick question for Staff. The lot coverage calculations, should those take into account light walls? I don't need an immediate answer but maybe you can look into that. Also, whether or not those light walls should be counted as an impervious area on the site.

Ms. Gerhardt: There certainly impervious area although the main criteria we have for the impervious area is the front setback.

Chair Lew: Any other questions?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I have a couple of questions and a discloser I suppose. I had several email correspondences with the Staff regarding two issues. One was a question about the ground water level and I was told that the ground level water is at least 20-feet below the surface and would preclude the need for any surface pumping – dewatering of the site, which I think is an important issue in the town right now. I'd like Staff to confirm that again for the record.

Mr. Ah Sing: Right, so as part of the Environmental Document, there was a Geotechnical Study that's an appendix and was reviewed to make those conclusions that there wouldn't be any physical significant impact. In 2015, when the study was conducted, the ground water level was at 39 ½-feet and it also mentioned in this study that historically, the highest level is about 20-feet.

Board Member Baltay: From my experience, that mean that you don't need to do dewatering.

Mr. Ah Sing: The basements are 10-feet – you have to put the footings so it's not going to impact that level.

Board Member Baltay: The second question I had to Staff had to do with rather arcane detail in the zoning code regarding the extent of the basement when it's not exactly following the footprint of the main floor above it. I have experienced in Palo Alto a fairly strict interpretation of that detail on the zoning code and it seems to me these houses make a fairly liberal use of extending under fairly large porches, adding a lot of square footage to the house. The question is more that do we have a clear guideline for all applicants in the town as to how that code item is dealt with?

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you for the question. There has been a lot of discussion about basements. There's been even more discussion about what is the definition of the footprint. We – and no one seems to quite agree what the definition of the footprint is and, so – and that's part of where the basements can be. Our conclusion that we've come to is that certainly, you're going to have a basement under the first-floor house but there's also been a long-standing Staff policy that you can have basement square footage under covered porches. We have tried to limit so that it doesn't get too crazy. We've limited that in two instances. It has to be under a covered porch. It has to be an entry porch. It usually ends up being a front door or back door situation and you're just allowed to complete the square and not have to follow the ins and outs that your first floor may have.

Board Member Baltay: I would request that – I'm practicing architect in town and designed several dozen houses a year here. It would be great if you could put that out so that everybody sees that policy. It's not clear and I've experienced it to be unenforced – enforced unevenly. That said, I don't think there is any issue as far the finding for architectural review. The third question I have is regarding when a tentative map was approved, was there any discussion regarding additional parking on the new street created off of Clemo for visitor/guest parking as far as a few on-street service delivery parking spots? Was that brought up at all during the tentative review process?

Mr. Ah Sing: There was a lot of discussion about the street. It does meet the private street regulation and requirements and also, the houses do have driveways that would accommodate the guest parking. In all, the street is consistent with the subdivision ordinance and the design is also consistent.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: I have – Robert, any questions? I have a couple questions for Staff. In the public speakers, Mr. Warren [Kursh] had said that he had sent a letter earlier this week and I didn't receive it. Did the other Staff members get it? So, the Board hasn't seen it. Normally, the – just one second – normally, when public sends an email to the ARB, it goes to Staff first and Staff forwards it. I do understand we had a medical issue with one of the Staff people so maybe that's why we didn't get it. We haven't reviewed any public letters that came in on this project. It happened before – the first time the Maybell project came through, that we didn't get a lot of the emails so I want to make sure the Board gets that at

the next hearing. We've closed the public testimony but if you had a quick clarification, I think that's ok, but you do need to come to the microphone.

[Ms. Fryling:] I was just going to mention that I also sent a letter and I know about 20-25 other people sent in letters. It's pretty much consistent with that you heard from the Maybell area. You may not have seen those letters but they are to the ARB; the email alias. Just so you know.

Chair Lew: Thank you very much. We have not seen any of them is my understanding. Then, I did want to follow up on...

Mr. Moss: I also sent a letter yesterday morning and I got a response saying, it's been received. I don't know.

Chair Lew: Yes, it's been received by Staff but it hasn't been forward to us.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair, as you stated, we do have medical issues but – with one of our Staff members but we will come back through that email and make sure we've gotten everything.

Chair Lew: We're not making any decision today. I think we are going to continue the hearing so we will factor in all those letters at the next time. Then, Ms. Margo Davis had mentioned the construction hours. I think -- and also, Mr. Wong had asked about some of the construction issues with dust and trucks. I know that that's standard – we typically put those in under conditions of approval but I wonder if Staff could explain the process for that and how the neighborhood – normally, that's done after ARB, before construction but there isn't normally a public meeting about that but I was wondering if there is a way for them to be informed about that construction logistic plan.

Ms. Gerhardt: As you said, the construction logistic plan is normally a Public Works engineering process. We do put conditions of approval in the approval letters to ensure that that happens. It's not normally a public process but...

Mr. Jonathan Lait: Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director with the Planning Department. The logistic plan is an administered task. It's something that we apply to all projects. There is no public review process of that logistic plan however, it is a public record and any member of the public could come forward and make a request of such document when it was available.

Chair Lew: Thank you very much. I think that's all the questions that I have. We'll go back to the applicant and you do have a 10-minute rebuttal period.

Board Member Baltay: Alex, one last quick motion. On the 3-D (inaudible) drawing, I'm showing the intersection of Maybell and Clemo not having the traffic bollards that are there right now. Are they intended to be removed?

Ms. Gerhardt: Absolutely not. The bollards on Clemo are to remain and we will make sure that gets back in the plan set.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. O'Hanlon: Thanks. Thank you. We're going to bifurcate our responses but there was something I wanted to say to Staff and to the Board and to all the folks in the neighborhood who came out with comments regarding lot #5 driveway being switched to Clemo. We spent a long time working with the folks on Arastradero about that working. Guys, to even suggest that would be 10 giant steps backward in our process. That was a compromise that Golden Gate Homes made, that the neighborhood Maybell side made and the neighborhood of Arastradero side all came together and pushes for that 16-unit subdivision. That's kind of why I am here to make sure we respond to things that aren't necessarily architectural related. It's – PCT was responsive to the plan that we made with that lot #5 driveway as

configured. Now, I am going to hand it over to Eugene, who is going to go through some of the architectural comments we heard both from Staff and from some of the neighbors.

Mr. Eugene Sakai: I know that you on the ARB – oops, breaking you IT here, sorry about that. I know that you on the ARB and especially the neighbors have a long history on this project. We as the architect are relatively new to the project and really just came on board for the 16-unit concept. I really appreciate hearing the comments from the neighbors Jennifer, Mr. Schultz, Mr. Kursh, Cheryl, Ms. Davis, Mr. Moss and Mr. Wong because we haven't really had the benefit of meeting you all and understanding, as you do, the neighborhood and the context and your feelings and thoughts about how your neighborhood wants to feel to you. For me to hear that today is very informative and very helpful. With that in mind, from all of those neighbors, I heard a lot of concerns about the feel and the atmosphere that we're creating with the houses along Maybell, specifically. I thought it might be beneficial for me to just go one by one along those – along Maybell, starting from lot #1 on the upper left corner and just go all the way down to lot #5 and just very briefly touch on some of the architectural things that we might be able to do to accommodate some of the concerns we've heard. As I mentioned, we're a firm that is very receptive to concerns from all parties especially, neighbors. We want to be a good neighbor with our project as does our client. Starting with lot #1 at the upper corner there, that is what we, in our mind, view as a pretty firmly contemporary project. We heard some concerns about the white frames being too bold and sometimes you take a fresh look at the project after having worked on it and setting it aside for a few months and now that I look at that, I can see where the neighbors are coming from. If you go down to lot #4, that has a very similar feel with some horizontal and vertical framing going on but that frame is done in sort of a warm grey or a charcoal grey and in talking to Ted, he and I both concur that we could – he would be open as would we to mitigate the boldness of those white forms on lot #1 by toning down the color to something more akin to what you see on lot #4. That was the concerns we heard on that particular parcel. On lot #2 there were some concerns from various parties about the nature of the fenestration on this building and that was something that we did intentionally. We wanted a -- because of the intersection – the 'T' intersection that is created by Abel Avenue as it dies into Maybell, that happens really right at lot #2 and, so for that reason we actually deliberately chose a traditionally style home that we felt would look good without a ponderous of glass on the elevation and then even push that a little bit further by looking to minimize the amount of windows and the size of those windows on that particular frontage because of the issue of headlights coming into that particular front elevation from cars on Abel. Now, I am not fully aware of the amount of traffic on Abel or how many instances in which this headlight to window impact would occur. I know having done a number of homes in situations like this, this is always something that we try to do when faced with a 'T' intersection. That lack of fenestration and that particular style home on that lot was a very deliberate choice. The parcel in the middle, lot #3, I think is in our mind a transitionally styled home. Again, looking at it with fresh eyes, I see that – I can fully understand by the neighbors feel that that parcel or that particular design is highly contemporary. In our mind, we were trying to make that the hinge of this entire frontage and sort of be the balance between two contemporaries and two traditional homes and have that be transitional but I see now that it does skew a bit more to the contemporary. Talking to Ted, we are willing and open to trying to tone that down. There is a sloped roof on this house already and I think that if perhaps, we change the material on that roof to something a little bit more neighbor compatible such as shingles – maybe asphalt comp. shingles and maybe also, eliminated the bold white horizontal band that people seem to find objectionable at the first-floor porch level. Perhaps making that another sloped roof with shingles on it. I think that would put this transitional home firmly in the direction of more traditional, more of a two-story ranch feel. I didn't hear a lot of concerns about the specific design of lot #4, which is the next one down, one away from the corner. I did hear concerns about the skewing of 3 of the 5 homes being contemporary and I feel that perhaps if we mitigated that by switching lot #3 to more of a traditional, that that would balance out that concern and we could leave lot #4 as it is. As far as lot #5 goes, we intentionally wanted the corner property to be a traditional home. That was the direction from the client. That's actually what we would have recommended also and so we're very happy with how that craftsman home sits there on the corner. Ted has already talked about the issue with garage and some of the constraints. We feel that lot #5 shares a driveway with lot #4 and therefore, in terms of the whole project, takes away one curb cut. There are a couple of oak trees on Clemo that would have to be removed if we flipped that garage around the corner so to speak and you would have one more driveway

net on the overall project. That's just my own little tour down Maybell for the benefit for you all to hear our thing and our points of flexibility and we certainly appreciate hearing from the neighbors and the (inaudible) Board today.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Sakai: I'm sorry. One last comment. Ms. Davis mentioned her concerns about looking down on flat roofs and it was never our intent to have those just be flat membrane roofs. We will clad those with decorative gravel to minimize the reflection off of those roofs and improve the appearance as seen from above.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you. We can now move to Board Member comments. Kyu, would you like to start us off, please?

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for your presentation. You said that you're fairly new to this, as am I, even though the board has heard previous Maybell projects. I was not on the Board at the time. I think it's a very daunting task and it's a very challenging site and project that you've been tasked with. I almost want to split my comments into two portions. Maybe we can start from a bigger site planning perspective and then go to more architectural comments. From a site planning perspective, I'm actually very pleased with what you've presented to us and I think it's a good layout and how you've tried to arrange the buildings such that you're minimizing curb cuts, you're having buildings that balance out the traditional and the contemporary. I do have a couple comments. I think in the previous Maybell proposals there was an intent to provide a path – a pedestrian path to the park. That looks like it is no longer there. I'm fine with that, I'm just making that as a comment. In addition to that, it appears that there's only a sidewalk on one portion of the new private street that's being presented. I think while the layout of the site and the properties and the homes are nice. It was a little bit hard for us to read the lot designations on some of the site plans so I would encourage you to maybe clear that up a little bit in the future. I think also in the future it would be nice to see not only the cars inside the garages but if we could see the cars parked in the driveways, that would be helpful. From an architectural standpoint, it was a lot to have to digest in the week that we've had these packets. I think your approach is admirable. The fact that you're trying to present this balance. I really appreciated your presentation and explain to us that you're trying to be more with the times but that you're being understanding of the public's concerns. I like the way that you've gone down Maybell in your rebuttal and kind of explained each home and its architectural elements. My architectural comments are a little bit all over the place but they mostly have to do with the way that the drawing has been presented. The roof plans on some of these colored renderings were very difficult to read. They are very dark and it's hard for me to see where those roof lines start and end. I do realize that you have somewhat of a unit roof plan but it would be nice to see the roof plan for each of the renditions of the units. Where we have maybe the same floor plan for a contemporary and a traditional – if we can see each of those roof plans that would be quite helpful. The floor plans also, I think would benefit from showing perhaps a dotted line of the outline of the other floors. For instance, on the basement floor plan, if you could show an outline of exactly where that first floor is and vice versa if we could see the basement outline on the first-floor plan. I forgot to mention one other comment for the site plan. I think it would be good to see a second-floor site plan. I do have a little bit of concern for privacy between some of the units. I think they would benefit from looking at second-floor site plan to see where the window is actually facing and the relationships between the individual homes. I also think this is kind of an interesting take because I know if each of these homes was presented separately, you would go through the individual review process, which is a very detailed process and looking at a lot of these architectural elements. While I know, you have these area calculations, if we could see more broken down are calculations in the traditional box with the 'X' through it and seeing some more dimensions, I would appreciate that in the future. I also want to through out there that it looks like some of the homes have some taller walls that may actually have to be included in the site coverage. I don't know what planning's interpretation of that would be but that's just something to look at. Architecturally on some of these unit plans, it looks like you have very differing plate heights. I know a lot of that is intentional but I'm just thinking if there was a way to maybe keep the whole second level at one finished floor plate. Would that help clean up some of the roof lines? It's just a question I had as I was studying

your plans. I'm sure a lot of the other comments will be covered but in closing, I just wanted to also thank the public for coming out and giving their comments. I was a little bit concerned that we didn't see more public testimony in our packets but I'm glad that you've come out and I also commend the applicant for working with the community and I'm confident we can come to a consensus. I very much look forward to the project being built. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Well, the conversion from agriculture to housing is never easy. I think there's been ample evidence of there here. I've enjoyed that helicopter view of the site from the social space on the top floor of Tan Plaza. I actually think Tan Plaza is one of the buildings that give definition and character to the neighborhood when I have been looking at it. The neighborhood – we're supposed to be thinking about context and this is a really complicated context. There is a tremendous number of public buildings, there's a public park, there's a high-rise apartment building of the kind we know longer see. There's a heavily burdened street at Maybell which has lots of pedestrian and bicycle and car traffic. You have two-story affordable – two-story apartment nearby and as I drive by or walk by, not knowing the neighborhood over time, it seems – two things. It seems to be rapidly transitioning. There seems to be a lot of houses built as the earlier houses were torn down. The first conversion to agriculture to housing there. Those houses seem to be fairly exuberant. Expressions of individual preferences which leads to some jawing (inaudible). When we think about what is the context, we're trying to be sensitive to and supportive of and make better – I'm confused. I'm perplexed at times. It does seem to me that the existing character of the site, which is going to change, is heavily wooded and I think it should be possible to maintain that along the street frontage and if it is, I think that would be important. I've also been struck in looking at these elevations at how much of view from Maybell includes houses that are located on the interior street. If that's the case, then I guess I would be looking for more landscaping that would make that view a bit greener. For Staff, are the driveways defined by subdivision map? Does it show curb cuts?

Mr. Ah Sing: I mean – so the (inaudible)...(crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: It doesn't, right?

Mr. Ah Sing: I'm sorry.

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry. It does not show curb cuts, right? The subdivision map.

Mr. Ah Sing: Right.

Board Member Furth: That's a matter to be determined?

Mr. Ah Sing: Right.

Board Member Furth: That's part of our responsibility in thinking about circulation. I spent a lot of time walking small children along blocks with a lot of driveways. I appreciate the advantages of fewer but I don't think the difference between one or two or three – one maybe but the difference here is enough to – by itself justify consolidating driveways. I'm more concerned about the ratio between green space – green frontage and paved frontage. I've very concerned about how functional these driveways are. I realize when we think about existing trees, that may make things even more complicated but at the moment, some of these driveways do not look practical to me. I'm not willing to sacrifice that kind of safety to a fewer – one or two fewer driveways. I'm also concerned about on-street parking. I'm sympathetic to the notions that these sites really should have a place for delivery trucks, visitors, domestic workers etc. to park off the street because these are heavily used, congested streets. I'm not sure what the solution is but I think that's a thing worth going for. I share Commissioner Kim's – Board Member Kim's concern about second story privacy between units. I think that's something we really need to think about when looking at two-story – a multiple single family developments. It was very helpful to

hear the neighbor's comments. There were, as always, well informed and interesting but even more well informed and interesting than usual. I'm not as concerned and this may partly be because I don't see – and I will go look again – the coherence and cohesiveness of the existing development in the immediate vicinity. I'm less concerned about whether something is called modern or Spanish or transitional or contemporary. I'm a lot – quite concerned about how it's carried out. I live in a neighborhood that dates back to the 1890s. We have houses dating from that era and we have houses dating from 2016 and in my experience, low-key contemporary, which typically seems to have a lot of wood siding and subtle windows and no particular heavy elements. It still can have dramatic and beautiful proportions – goes quite well with our 1920s and 30s and 40s houses and even my fake 1990s stucco. Which is part of a planned unit development? I'm less concerned about the ratio of modern to other styles but I'm quite concerned about the samples that we have. They do not, to me, appear to meet our standards for high-quality architecture. I think that too frequently, they have too much of the (inaudible). They have too much of design elements that seem to have been stuck on rather than to have been generated outward from the internal design of the houses and that bothers me a lot. It's particularly striking to me on the red tile roof house in the internal street. I just can't figure that out. One other concern I have that's really a site design concern is I'm concerned about having that private street, with that number of houses on it, with no on-street parking. I think you need to find a place somewhere – it's going to require an easement on a lot but you need to find a place where there can become parking. We can't have all that space and somebody driving in to deliver something, to drop something off, to visit and there is no off-street parking. That concerns me. Those are my thoughts at the moment.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Let me start with the layout first. I appreciate the fact that you've come down from 30 to 16 and I think the – I like the layout. Everything else – the biggest problem or the thing I thought was rather interesting, you have 8 units -- separate floor plan type units yet, you've got them distributed as – you've got 5 of one kind, 3 of another kind, and then 4 that are one of a kind. I'd rather see 2 of each kind over 8 units. The thing with this is, is that it's always difficult especially, with this size and – is that you're trying to create infill or my thought is that in 15-years or 10-years, the average person driving by or walking by doesn't really think oh, this was developed and put in mid-2-teens. The problem you end up – the way – especially when I look at the floor plans or I should say the site plan. It's reminiscent of a track situation or a subdivision in the fact that it almost – numerous of these cases you've got a book ending like the two residents that come off Clemo Avenue onto the driveway; they're mirror images of each other. The ones back on lots #9 and #14, same thing. Then you've got 4 exactly the same ones in the back that are just flipped or two bookended series and then again along the other one. What I'd rather see is a more random approach as to the units going next to each other. I think that would work better and it makes it look more – the rest of the neighborhood was built pretty much one unit at a time or two units at a time so they look totally different from their neighbors. I think you've done a good job -- like I said, I have to give you a lot of credit for coming up with 8 units and 7 or 8 varieties as far as that. I think it's a matter of just applying some of the styles to the different floor plans and that sort of thing. Let's see, I agree with some of the neighbors – again, with the – I can understand your concept of the driveways but when you're at ground level and you're walking by, it's a large area of hardscape like that, that is tough to make it look green and friendly. I think you're probably better off splitting those up somewhat or even putting maybe – I don't know, tree pockets or something in some of those hardscape areas to get some greenery in there. Let's see, as to the architecture elevations, I like the mix. It's come up with a lot of people as you said – unit – what is it – 1 on lot #1 is probably a little bold for the average person. If nothing else, that could be painted to tone it down initially. I appreciate the – you're concept or you're thought about the lot #2 type 4 as far as the lighting. I mean, I know that can be annoying. The problem with it is that just the way it's done, you get about 8 or 10 very small little windows and that's what makes it look – I think it probably why people think it's not the most desirable looking elevation. I agree with you that you make need to do something where you don't get the direct 8 by 10 window facing the street but I think that needs some variation. As far as the overall design, like I said I like the mix. Some I like better than others. I've always had a problem with units such as lot #3 unit 1 or lot #7 type 8. I don't like the big banding in the middle of the house. It has a tendency to split the second floor from the first floor and gives the second floor no

relationship to the ground. I think those two need to work better together rather than the one floating on top of the other one. Roof pitches, I've always been – I'm just not a big fan of having two or three different roof pitches on one house. Unless it's for some reason that you can't make it fit any other way or if it's some sort of a shed dormer; that's one thing but on some of these where it doesn't – I don't see any reason why you can't make the pitches of the first floor and the second floor the same. I don't see any window in the way or anything of that sort. I think that's probably it for right now.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Thank you for the presentation. Thank you to members of the public for coming out. Three sets of comments. The first one has to do with the overall presentation in itself. I appreciate you putting in so many 3-D views and the color drawings are helpful. However, I'd like to see a floor plan for each house with the rest of the house drawings. Unfortunately, I find that the houses actually do have different plans. Each one seems to have a different type of balcony and it's really impossible to figure out what the privacy impacts are without those floor plans. It's also just really difficult for us to review these. Trying to figure out these things. You guys have been thinking about it for a while but we haven't. If you could find a way to get one or two pages for each house and just really show up the guts of it. Including the floor plans please, for each house. Secondly, if you could find a way to get us a better landscaping and tree plan. I find it really unclear which trees are staying and which trees are going. Your tree relocation plan doesn't show the existing trees. It's really tough to put it together. Again, if you put yourself in our position, we haven't been doing this for a year. What's going on? Make it easy so that we can make it easy for you. Right now, it's not. It would really be nice to see one or two overall images looking down on Maybell. What would think look like in context? It's something we asked most applicants to do. With the computer systems, we have now, it's not that big of a deal to give us a rendering looking down Maybell. Looking in Clemo. Show us these houses in context with the neighborhood. I think you'd find that it actually supports your project but it would be really nice to see that. We're all guessing now what – we're not guessing, we're professionals looking at this and with a bunch of head scratching we can sort of figure it out. We really not just want to figure it out but really feel good about it. Take the effort to show us a couple of big images, money shots, sort of like this aerial one you've done but show it to us from the point of view of the person walking down the street as well. Regarding the site planning. I think we are moving with what the tentative map has been approved and there is no more discussion about that. My issue has to do with the parking and the arrangement of driveways. I see a few things that are bothersome to me. The interior street has no off-street parking for deliveries, visitors, guests, somebody coming along and every subdivision I've worked on, we've always tried hard to get a couple of spots somebody could just pull over. It does – in this case because the map has already been – the tentative map has already been set, you have to do something on private land with easements but it seems to me that you have 8 houses on that street and at least – if you had 4 spaces where somebody could just pull to the side of the curb or the road, get out and do what they are doing. Be it a housekeeper cleaning for a day, be a holiday party, be a FedEx or UPS truck. Right now, it's just going to be a bottleneck. It's just going to – and the curbs will all be red painted with no parking signs so it just doesn't make for a very good situation. I just think we need to do something for that for the interior street. The situation with the shared driveways I find very problematic. If I look carefully at both conditions where the driveways are shared, if you put some cars in there as Kyu asked you, you would see that it's really tough to back out. To get out of that house when your neighbors are parking in a couple of those situations. What it means is you're trying to get out bringing your kid to school and you're late already and you're trying to back around that neighbor who is parked their car inconsiderately or their RV and you're trying to do that while you curve and cross the sidewalk and there's people going up and down. You're creating a very difficult situation. I put it to you and to the neighbors, I think this coming from the community, you're better off with 10-foot wide individual driveways for each house coming off the street. That's the way Palo Alto has been developed. I think you'd find it makes your houses more marketable. I think you'll find it makes less paved area if you stick with the traditional narrow driveway up to the house and you focus on your remaining pavement just meeting that second parking space that is required and it will work better. What you have now, I think, in the two situations on Maybell, I find it doesn't work. It's just too tight for the parking to actually navigate in and out and it's compounded with the kids on the street makes for a very dangerous situation. It's always hard to back

up and turn at the same time. Regarding the two detached garages on the interior. I can see what Staff is saying about the garages being located in the front yard of somebody's house. However, I find that that's a – to me at least, a secondary concern to just allowing them to functional driveways that work and also, allowing them to have back yards. I think that a backyard is actually an important thing for a house and we handicap the developers not letting them have the option to work that type of arrangement themselves. They choose to have a detach garage if they want to do it with some shielding next to the neighbor's other property, I think that's ok. Then lot #6 has a driveway that I find doesn't work because you have a large oak tree you are trying to save right in front garage. Which I'll come to another point in a second but it just doesn't work the way it is. You can't – again, back out, do that curve like that. I think – you guys aren't going to like this but you really do a unique design for each lot. You're there but now take designs you have and tweak them and work with them. We've never managed -- Palo Alto to do a one-off, cookie cutter kind of thing. You're already changing the style of the house so much. It's not actually that much more work. On lot #6 for example, clearly, you're trying to fix a floor plan where you have a tree. If you were designing it as a one-off house, you'd start with that tree and put the driveway where you can fit it and then work. It just seems to me that we're looking for a high level of design. High level design means each house is really thoughtfully designed to fit its criteria. I'm afraid I think you should really go through each house once more and tweak it, change it, so that it fits. I also think you need individual designs because you have individual styles of houses. At least for me, when I design a modern house versus a traditional versus a Mediterranean, those styles are not just applied things. They are not just different kind of roof material. There's a difference in the way the plans layout, the style of the house at a deeper level and I find it just disturbing to think that you could just take the same plan and make such a radical change on how it looks without actually looking at the floor plan itself. If you want to do modern homes and want to follow the form follows function thing. Then the function is the floor plan and you're trying to do – you're treating modern homes as a style and it's not. Lastly, house number 5 on the street, I'll give you one more example of why I think you need individual designs. House number 6 has a tall, two-story element facing Maybell, which isn't really reflective in the floor plan and it's because it's a flat element; just sort of a change in materials really. When I look at it in detail and I think if we had a 3-D, you would notice that it ought to be projecting. It's a projecting element; it should stick out a couple of feet so the eaves tie together and it's not. It just architects trying to cut and paste with a computer. It doesn't work. It's awkward looking and it's because you're not designing the house uniquely. If you go back now and tweak that and give it the nook it needs, the extra window, it would be a little better. On the design of the houses I find that we are tasked to enforce the individual review guidelines and the zoning code which makes clear statements that we should not be specifying what style of house and I find myself very uncomfortable with us saying make more – fewer more modern houses or traditional style houses on the street. I think that's something Palo Alto has tried very hard over the years not to regulate. I'm sympathetic to the neighbors being concerned about not liking the look of a contemporary house however, that's one of things that made Palo Alto what it is. Is that we let people do that. We're not Belmont. We don't restrict those things and I'm afraid I feel every uncomfortable trying to judge it based on its architectural style. That said, I do feel that these houses have to be compatible with each other in the neighborhood and that's why I'd like to see some of these street view renderings where you really can see the point that where made about – for example, toning down the color of the trim on one contemporary house would go a long way towards making it fit better with the other houses and that kind of stuff will come out of these additional views and studies. I do support focusing on getting them to be more compatible. What I see on these houses however, is just too much and a number of scale and size things as well as the details. They're all – as far as I can tell, 10-foot first stories and 9-foot second story plate height. Most of the time in Palo Alto that's tough to accomplish. We have daylight planes. We have compatibility issues. You're pushing it here. You're trying to do it because you have 16 houses together. When you want to make a house that is that big at that broad shouldered, it's incumbent upon you to also work hard to downplay the outside to make it feel more modest almost and you're doing the opposite. Each house has – I counted it – 4 or 5 different primary materials. 3 different kinds of siding a lot of the cases, a dominant kind of roof, heavy trim band; that's too much. More than more houses have. Certainly, more than the neighborhood you're fitting into. It's a relatively modest neighborhood. Barron Park is not a flashy expensive part of Palo Alto and these houses are trying to be that fancy and it would really be helpful to just downplay. Cut back on material from each house. You'll find it looks better. It's easier to build. It fits better. Same thing goes with a lot of

the detailing you have. Some of your Mediterranean style houses seem to have everything in the book added. A little tile detail, it's the fancy windows, the chimney cap detail, it just goes on and on and on. Again, I wonder in the architect are (inaudible) a little bit. There's a real virtue when knowing when to stop and I think you stopped to late on a lot of these houses. I spoke about the height – the plates of the houses and I feel very strongly about that. I usually design 9-foot first floor, 8-foot second floor plates. I find that just fits in much better with the neighborhood. If you want to make it an extra 2-feet taller, you have to downplay the size of it from outside; these will look to big otherwise. I find that you have on most houses a very large covered porch on the main floor in the back. Seems to be 15' x 25', perhaps bigger than that. I find that very unusual. Very few of our clients in Palo Alto ever ask for that and I'm curious as to what it's there for and uncomfortable with it to be honest. It just creates large covered areas. It blocks a lot of light coming into the houses and honestly and frankly, what it does it is creates a place that gets closed in later. Just further increasing the bulk of these houses and it just seems very strange. Each house has glued onto the back of it – which not really incorporated into the architecture – a very large covered patio. Which will make the inside room extremely dark. It really makes it tougher to compose the elevations so I'm just not in favor of that. I had gone through each one of these and made numerous notes on the evaluations. I think however, it's not appropriate to drive through all of them now given the more general comments. I can say to you for example, when you are going to use an arched window, it should always be either a semi-circle per arch or a broken arch. Not both on the same house. When you are going to use a curved barrel vault type roof – a contemporary house, don't give us 4 different radiuses on it. That's just lazy architecture. That's not changing your floor plan to work with the style – what I was talking about. In the end, you'll be embarrassed to sell it that way. You put it on the market and it won't look good, it will look odd. It's just a matter of pushing the architects a little bit more to refine it. Barrel vault is beautiful, that is fine, but do it cleanly. Do it beautifully. Do it with the same radius on the second floor – in the upper floor so that it really works. The last item that I feel very strongly – I've pushed my other Board Members on that we have to follow is that the individual review guidelines have fairly strict privacy controls about what a second-floor balcony can see into its neighboring property. What the windows are seeing oriented that way and you have a lot of second floor balconies here and you have precious little documentation of how they work or where they're – the impact on each other. I'd like to say to you, please present to us what you're really thinking and please understand that, at least I feel, that we are tasked to be consistent with the standards that the City upholds on every other house in town. General speaking, a second-floor balcony that can look into somebodies back yard is just not permitted. It doesn't get through the IR process and I don't think the Architectural Review Board should treat it any differently. I'm 1 of 5 but it's something that I caution my fellow Board Members on. We need to be consistent about. The applicants need to be clear what they are proposing to begin with. Again, please, if you could improve the package of presentation just a little bit like I mentioned. Please give serious thought to some of the parking issues and then, less is more as Mies van der Rohe put it for us. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. I have a question for Staff to follow up on that – I was reading the – I was trying to understand the IR guidelines as they apply to this particular project. The R2 zoning has restrictions on the extent of the IR guidelines and I was wondering if maybe the Staff could just liberate on that?

Ms. Gerhardt: When we're looking at just a single house – Palo Alto doesn't do these types of subdivisions very often but when looking at a single house, we're paying attention to the edges that have single family homes. What you're saying in the R2 or the RM15, sometimes those properties will have to abide by the IR guidelines when adjacent to a single-family home.

Chair Lew: The IR guidelines do not apply to this project as I understand it because it's surrounded – it's not adjacent to...

Mr. Ah Sing: The...

Chair Lew: ...single family or – single or duplex – or two-family duplex.

Ms. Gerhardt: The edges of this property are higher density but I think the Board is bringing in that the houses themselves – out of the 16 houses are adjacent to another house and, so that's where the IR guidelines would come in.

Chair Lew: They do apply internally? Ok. Thank you. I have a question for the applicant. Do you have the Landscape Architect here today? Then, maybe next – possibly next time. I have a – we have a new finding that just started this year which is to use native plants to the greatest extent possible to create habitat and the plant list is predominately Asian and Australian plants. They're drought tolerant but they're not native. I think with regard to that findings, I think preserving – retaining onsite the oak trees is a huge positive on that side but with a lot of the front yard garden – the front yard landscaping, I think that there could be a number of changes to the shrubs that could be native. Then, if you have ornamental plants adjacent to the front walk or whatever, those can be something else and those will change over time with the owners. I think really for the main plantings we do want – I do want to encourage you to use native plants and to also use – you can use non-native plants that are beneficial to wildlife so a non-native plant that has berries is desirable. On the – if I can go back now to the site, I'm not crazy about the private street and the hammerhead and the parking or the limited parking due to the street width. It seems to me that the – if the subdivision is already gone through the public process then I can't really change that but I'm not crazy about the current layout. There are a couple other items on the site planning that I do want to caution you about is the Post Office – it's their discretion but often times they won't deliver to a private house anymore. It's their call. On a lot of our newer projects, there's a central mail box cluster or maybe two so we do want to see that in the landscape drawings. A lot of – like new Urban Projects, they use it as a community gathering point. It's a social space and so if there's a place for that, that would be great. Sometimes they're distributed within the project so there may be 3 or 4 so they're not really community gathering points so either way. It's their call is my understanding. Also, with the regard to landscape they're a -- I think you're showing 6-foot fences between units and I think a lot of times it's 7-feet is better for privacy. I don't know what your guys were thinking about that. Especially on small lots where you have less room for landscaping. On the – I think I agree with the Staff recommendations regarding the paving, the detached garages, and the roof pitches. I'm fine with that. I do like that you are dedicating 10-feet to the City for street planting stripes and sideways, that's great. On the architecture, when I was the IR guidelines just say a way of thinking about them and I found that I was not – I couldn't meet the findings or met their guidelines for the facades on a number of the units; maybe half of them. Also, for – maybe about 25% of the units about, I was having trouble with the roof forms. Some of them are a little too complicated and we do have a diagram in our IR guidelines and I think that a couple of your units would fall under the not acceptable category. I think I agree with Board Member Baltay, I think there are too many materials particularly, siding, on a number of your units. When I – just as a designer I'm looking at it, I look to see if my eye is bouncing around the page and trying to find where does it rest and I find on quite a number of the units especially, the contemporary ones, my eye is wandering all over the place on it. That's in our IR guidelines for trying to keep it simple and have a hierarchy of design elements and to tone down all the rest. I think you have a lot of metal siding in standing seam which seems to me to be uncharacteristic of the neighborhood. I'm fine to have some of it. It seems like you guys have more than – seems like there's an awful lot of it. It seems to be uncharacteristic of the neighborhood so I would like some consideration for that. I think that's all that I have. Again, I like Board Member Baltay, I have detailed comments on each one of the units but I'm not going to get into that today because I think you have the Board all over the place on this particular project and I think the Staff wants us to come to consensus on a number of points that's clear for you on how to move forward. I was wondering, if the Board Members are agreeable, I think maybe we do just a straw poll on several different items to make sure that we've weighed in. I haven't heard everybody weigh in on, for example, the detach garages. That way we can just get a sense for the main issues. Does that sound ok? (Crosstalk) (inaudible) from the big point of the unit mix or something and go down...

Board Member Baltay: I was thinking maybe the parking – car parking is an easy one for us to approach and it seems to me – what I've heard is, at least myself and Wynne felt about getting additional parking on the interior streets some place and I suggested 4 units but that's something we can give them guidelines on as a Board. Secondly was the two shared driveways off of Maybell. There's been a lot of

comments about that back and forth. Then the garage placement on the detached units. Maybe if we all just chimed in on how we feel about that.

Chair Lew: Why don't we work on – yeah, the list – let's work on the list and make sure everybody is happy with the list of items and then we'll – then we can proceed.

Board Member Furth; I have a couple items I didn't think about till you all talked that we can add later.

Chair Lew: You can do it now, that's fine.

Board Member Furth: I have additional comments on the utility of the IR and applying our standards but one of the things that concern me in looking at these designs is I can't see how they are designed to be environmental – how they are designed to be sustainable? How are they oriented to light and heat in ways that will reduce the need for power? I'm also very concerned – I think that communities like this can be wonderful to live in if you have well-designed windows. If you have well – privacy matters are a lot visually and acoustic. I mean I live in a tight, small development that works beautifully and if you have private, really private back door – I mean, outside – outdoor space so I'm going to be wanting to see that each unit has that.

Chair Lew: I think we should also maybe discuss the mix of units...(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I agree. I think there should be (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: ...because that seems to be an issue.

Board Member Furth: I don't think this is an appropriate place for George and Terrace's (inaudible) repeated designs. If anything, I think there's an access to different approaches. I find the whole – I find the streetscape chaotic in the drawings. I don't know if it is in real life.

Chair Lew: Let's do it...

Board Member Baltay: Maybe I was – there were those large porches in the back of the house. It's the kind of thing we just get pushed back and forth constantly. Maybe if we gave fairly clear direction on what we really think about that.

Chair Lew: Sure. I think – just in – we should do this in a hierarchy, right? I think we should – consider the parking on the private street as 1 because it's a big site planning issue. Then, we'll do -- two would be the detach garages because that's sort of related there. Three would be the unit mix. Four is the shared driveways. Is that the shared driveways on both the private street and Maybell or just Maybell, you were thinking?

Board Member Baltay: Just Maybell (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Maybell only. That's the main issue. Right. That's four – I would say five would be sustainable design or maybe passive solar design. Then I think six was just private open space and somewhat related would be seven is the rear porches. For number one...

Board Member Gooyer: We were talking about second story porches or balconies also.

Chair Lew: Let's lump that all together I think.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: Alright.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair, did you have privacy in there?

Chair Lew: Yeah, I have privacy or well I have private – I had private outdoor space which was Wynne's comment as number 6.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, but that would be the second story balcony would also fit into that.

Chair Lew: Ok, they're related.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)(Crosstalk).

Board Member Baltay: We are implying the IR guidelines. It's very well spelled out in those guidelines.

Chair Lew: One item number 1, I do have a question just for Staff, on visitor spaces. I know we do that for multi-family units and so what is the requirement for single family houses for visitor parking?

Ms. Gerhardt: The requirement for single family homes is two spaces. One must be covered and the other one does not have to be.

Chair Lew: That's for the unit – that's for the just – that's just a standard parking... (crosstalk)

Ms. Gerhardt: For a standard one house, yes.

Chair Lew: There's no differentiation between a visitor and the occupant? (crosstalk)

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: Don't forget as soon as they did the parcel map it becomes all types of separate properties.

Chair Lew: For the applicant, I think that my understanding is that the applicant is putting three spots per unit? Maybe not on everyone but on many of the units.

Mr. O'Hanlon: Yeah, approximately. (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: I'm sorry...

Chair Lew: Please use the microphone.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you.

Mr. O'Hanlon: Since there's a variation in driveways between some of the lots. Some of the afford one covered, one uncovered certainly. Then some of the driveways could actually accommodate two cars in addition to that. Another point I think I'd like to make on the parking is the private street – the (inaudible) has designed that with a rolled curb and of course, the fire marshal will paint certain portions of that red which would not permit any parking what so ever. Then there would be a certain about of distance that would not be painted. As we see in a lot of neighborhoods those rolled curbs can accommodate deliveries and family and other cars on the street quite well. I think what the question that will help you guys understand that better might be in the next rendering to identify what the fire marshal – how much of that he's going to need to stripe red and how much of that might be more available on a day to day basis for the people who live in there. I'd just like to circle back to another point on driveways on Maybell. There are four existing homes on Maybell. One of them has a three-car garage, the other three have two car garages and the curb cuts are 20-feet wide. This is an existing condition. We're trying

to actually improve it with these lesser curb cuts. It does make things a little bit more difficult for the ultimate homeowners on the lots 2, 3, and 4, 5 but we think and we think the neighborhood agreed with us while we collaborated on that idea that it will be a safer environment. It already is harder to back out onto Maybell at certain times of the day and those renters actually deal with that. We're not trying to exacerbate a problem, we're trying to minimize it going forward but...

Chair Lew: Can we just hold that off on that. We'll get to the Maybell driveways in a moment.

Board Member Baltay: Can I address...(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: (Inaudible)(crosstalk) deliberation is – I do want to ask that if it's not acceptable to have visitor spots in the driveway and if it really needs to be somewhere else in the street or something?

Board Member Baltay: Yeah. What is was going to say is that to me the visitor spot or the extra spot – it's important that it not seem like it's in somebody's driveway. That somebody – anybody coming up that street feels comfortable – say one of these houses is going through an architectural review a few years from now and I want to drive into the street and park and do my thing. I'm not going to park in somebody's driveway but I want a spot on the street some place where I can park. Our parking regulations do ask for two parking places. That's based on the assumption that every house is on a street with curb parking and what I'd like to see us do is ask for – I think 4 is a good number – parking spaces that are not distinctly – that are public. That are not visually somehow connected to the houses and I think it could be accomplished by reducing perhaps some of the pavement in front of the houses. Right now, each house has probably space for two cars plus the two on-site spots. That's more my issues are that they really feel public and there are to be more than just one.

Chair Lew: Other Board Members?

Board Member Furth: I think that – I don't know what the number is but I think parking that looks – that is usable by somebody that doesn't live there is important. I do think that this is a typical problem when we use private streets. I live on one of those. Very little frontage projects and – but we do have public streets and if you don't, you really undermine the functioning of the day – day to day functioning of living here and that's really what's driving me.

Chair Lew: Any other comments on that? I would just say for Staff that we do have some other private streets. I know one in particular because my parents live on it. There's Ponce Drive off of San Antonio Road and it's a very narrow, private street and it does – like Peter's comment, it does have – I don't know maybe 4 or 6 visitor spaces that are separate from the narrow private road and it seems to work. It seems to me to work fairly well. I would be agreeable to that. Should we move on to the detach garages? I think we had some – Robert, I think you very in favor of them and then...

Board Member Furth: Can you explain what the issue is?

Chair Lew: It's in the Staff report, right?

Board Member Furth: Lot #14?

Chair Lew: It's the two -- 9 and 14 have the detached garages. Lot #14 you have a garage in somebody's front – facing somebodies front yard. If everybody could weigh in on that.

Vice Chair Kim: I think lot #14 situation could just be improved by flip-flopping the uncovered spot and the detach garage so that the adjacent lot – the unit type 3 has a little bit more front before hitting a building. Does that make sense?

Chair Lew: You're saying just shift it towards the house.

Vice Chair Kim: Right so flip flop it with that uncovered spot that's between the house and the detach garage right now.

Board Member Furth: They will have a car parked there instead of a garage?

Vice Chair Kim: Sure.

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) I think Robert's concern was pushing it in the backyard so that would preserve the back yard.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I didn't mention that at all.

Chair Lew: I thought you did...

Board Member Furth: That was Peter.

Chair Lew: ... that was my understanding.

Board Member Baltay: (Crosstalk) I said I think it's important to allow them to create backyards on projects. I think it's important but it's up to them. Shifting it over does accomplish that. I put it to you all if you look at the other one, the detach garage with the 90 degrees turn into it. It's a tough garage to get into. It's even tougher to get out of. I think we're creating these situations that sort of meet the zoning code but don't meet any practical guidelines to working.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: Yes, Robert just suggested flipping of lot #9 so that garage is...

Board Member Gooyer: Sort of mimic what's going on at 14 and then you can take a big chunk of that parking and make it part of the backyard.

Board Member Baltay: Maybe our comment to the applicant is two-fold. One that the Staff comment about the garage being right next to the neighbor's front yard line is correct is should – on lot #14 but you should shift it over and then on Lot #9, the 90 degrees turn in doesn't really work again on the parking there but why not let the applicant figure out.

Chair Lew: I think the Boards in agreement that that is an issue.

Board Member Furth: It all comes down to trying to imagine people living here and not getting in fights every morning.

Board Member Baltay: You will find that if you take Kyu's advice and show the vehicles on the site plans – I have little cut outs in paper and I have a radius and I drive them because my clients get very upset they scratch their car on the garage door as you know.

Board Member Gooyer: That's a tight corner there.

Chair Lew: I would just mention one other option that I've seen in Palo Alto is where – and in other Cities, is that the end of the hammerheads, right? Where you have the private garage and driveway. I've seen that's where they put the guest parking. I'm not telling you to do it that way but I've seen it – I have seen it that way so it is an option. Item number 3 is the unit mix. I think some of you have weighed in. Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I don't have to may further comment.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree with Peter in the sense that it's tough – I mean if you design a modern house that doesn't mean that the floor plan is going to be exactly the same as you would design it for a Spanish or whatever so I think it's tough to have – like I said, I'd rather see – I don't think we need to go individually on all 16 but my thought was that they've already got 8 units anyway. I'd rather see two of each and then you can even have two – I don't care – you could have two craftsman for instances and that sort of thing. They can be a little bit similar but the thing is, if the floor plans are totally different, nobody is going to equate the two (inaudible) being identical. They just happen to be two craftsman. I'd have – I'd be much better with that then – like on this thing, looking at some of these cases like on Clemo, the two bookended ones. Even though the design is different, you can tell the floor plan is the same. I mean I know my wife keeps saying, only guys like you that are architect's spots stuff like that but I don't think that that's the case.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I'm not entirely sure what – I mean, unit mix in the case is both this variety of floor plans and that the varieties of stuff stuck on the floor plans on the exterior. That's a little harsh I'm sure. What I'm looking for is an internal sense of order and some coherence and a harmonious – we don't say harmony anymore but I want – I don't care whether those are the same or different but I want those four houses to look good next to each other and if they are different, I'm – this is a subdivision. These are not custom built houses. These are spec. houses and they...

Board Member Gooyer: Just because they are spec. houses do they need to look like spec. houses or does...

Board Member Furth: They need to look like well-designed houses and I would say, built in 2017 and built as a group so if there are ways to make things to work well together because you have repeated paving materials or fencing materials or whatever (crosstalk) (inaudible)...

Board Member Gooyer: That's the difference that I have because I wanted to in 10-years, people to assume that it wasn't a track house and that's the difference. We both want well built, quality homes. We just have a different approach as to a – I guess how to get there and what it should look like.

Board Member Furth: Yeah, I use to live in a custom built 1950s gorgeous modern and now I live in a planned unit development and they both have their artistic – architectural satisfaction. They can go with whatever approach they want but if they are all – I don't want this visual disharmony that I see presently. I think that about as much as I...

Board Member Baltay: What I think we're trying to do is give them feedback that it's ok to have an eclectic mix of styles and I think all of the use are ok with that basic idea; they should all be the same. We've given you a lot of different opinions as to how to accomplish that. You're not quite there but I'm certainly ok with the overall mix of styles.

Chair Lew: I'm fine with the overall mix of styles... (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, me too.

Chair Lew: ... and I generally like the floor plans. I don't really have issues with the floor plans in general as individual units. I think I agree with Wynne's comment about the solar orientation. I think somebody else mentioned it to. That you've got the large patios facing north which isn't so desirable in my mind. I think we'll leave it to you guys. I think you guys are skilled enough to understand our comments and come up with something. Why don't we move on then to four which is the shared driveways on Maybell? I don't really have a – I'll let everybody else weigh in. I don't have an issue with...

Board Member Baltay: I thought I spelled out a number reasons why I thought individual driveways where better. I do find myself bothered that they clearly have worked hard with a bunch of stakeholders

and if they've come to something that they all like. I think it's – I feel I'm comfortable pushing our way into that. I'd like to think you could consider what I said based on the merits. I think of a minimum, though, you do have to make them work. The garages have to be functional when you have a solid wall 20-feet back from the edge of a garage door. I don't think that's functional. It required a skilled driver to get in and out.

Chair Lew: For Staff, where the driveways reviewed by transportation? It's come up before on other projects. You know how they do the back out and a 3-point turn.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes, it was reviewed and so there weren't an issue with them. However, when I do mention about the excessive pavement, there's not a requirement for how to back out of a garage. If you can get out and get in, then that's sufficient per the guidelines.

Ms. Gerhardt: I do just want to clarify and give you some background. When the subdivision was going through the process, there was a lot of conversation about how many driveways should take access from Maybell. There's currently four houses, four driveways. The neighborhood really wanted to see that number reduced and so that's how this idea came to be of these shared driveways so that there are only three curb cuts. I think that the three-curb cut idea is something that a lot of people have worked hard on.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I tend to agree that if this is what people who live in the vicinity think would work best. They're probably right and that it's an enormous contribution to the – an improvement to that City to have the dedicated sidewalk and landscaping area. That's a tremendous asset. What bothers me and I guess we'll see this when we put Kyu's toy cars on this, is that I don't understand how you back out of some of these. I understand you're not going to want to back into Maybell. I don't particularly want you backing into people riding their bikes or walking and I can't understand how I back out of – for example, lot #2, without going over to lot #3, where I presumably have an easement but what if they've got a car parked there? I mean these spaces describe both (inaudible) places to park cars and places to back into. It can be one or the other unless you've got a really good working understanding with your neighbor that that will always – anyways. I'm concerned. I need to be shown that they work. I can't draw that conclusion yet.

Board Member Gooyer: I was just playing with this a little bit and based on where the driveway is – what looks to be between 4 and 5. Trying to get from that driveway into the unit at 5 is going to be one real tricky – I mean that's the driveway and you have to get to there. That's one real tricky maneuver to get into that garage.

Chair Lew: What I'm going to say is the – just for a second – we need transportation to explain how this is going to work in a diagram. Is that...

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we'd also ask the applicant to provide the plan set that shows those maneuvers as well.

Board Member Baltay: I think Alex –I've generally not had positive experiences with transportation division helping us with layouts and I think we really need to use the common sense and experience that we have as a Board to sort of insist that this work in a practical sense. No disrespect to the Transportation Department. They are great when it comes to the streets and parking garages but these are nuanced details that we have the experience about. Generally, when you have a shared driveway, the houses also have a plan that puts two garages facing the street next to each other so you benefit from it. These don't really have that. I think the applicant probably we – it's fair enough to say to them that we are not going to insist on individual driveways which are what some of us might like but rather that they need to work better.

Chair Lew: I think that's fine and it doesn't look like they work at the moment to me, to my eyes. Let's keep on going. Item five was – I think Wynne, you were looking for sustainable design.

Board Member Furth: I haven't seen any evidence that these buildings are designed with orientations that take advantage – that acknowledge where the sun comes and goes. Either in terms of light within the house or orienting these back porches and I have no idea, with respect to everything else, whether it works or doesn't but I'd like to know and because these are units being flipped from lot to lot, that makes me skeptical.

Chair Lew: Anybody else?

Vice Chair Kim: I think if we see each lot with each unit with Cardinal North on each of those plans, that's going to explain a lot of that.

Chair Lew: Especially on both floors too. I think that would help with privacy. Number six was the private outdoor space and privacy.

Board Member Baltay: Well...

Chair Lew: I think those were the back porches really...

Board Member Furth: and the yards.

Chair Lew: ...and the yards. I think we should clarify on private houses and subdivisions the land – the back landscaping isn't included typically.

Board Member Furth: I understand – sorry (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: ... but I just wanted to comment that we do have projects like Edgewood Plaza with the houses where they – the developer did include the landscaped screen between units because they were really tight. There was no – I think that the back yards were tiny on that particular project. There may be ways of addressing that in the landscape. Then, if we have the second-floor plan we can look at the window privacy but I think the main comment was on the porches, right? The large back porches.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, to me the – a lot of the privacy issues will be addressed as we enforce this – as we review it bases on the IR guidelines and I'm not sure if the applicant is quite – took that into account but I'm just concerned with the large number of very large covered outdoor porches that don't any functional logic to it. I just don't think that they should be there.

Chair Lew: Then I would add to – just to that that we have another project – we had another subdivision that had second-floor balconies or decks and it made all the downspouts really difficult. At the end of the day – they didn't show it in any of their drawings but then when it was actually built, it looked terrible because of they – it adds up. All that other clutter adds up so I do think we need to see – I think I share the concern about the balconies. The extent of them, that there are large numbers of them.

Board Member Furth: In my neighborhood, these second story balconies are all being replaced because they've all rotted after 20-years.

Chair Lew: Then the last item or let's see. I'm sorry, I mixed them up.

Board Member Baltay: Alex...

Chair Lew: We did – let me just finish one thought. That was the porches which I had said before was number seven but that was – we just discussed that. I think Wynne had a comment about private outdoor space, right? That's a slightly different comment.

Board Member Furth: I was really bringing that up in part because I think that for any of these single-family dwellings to meet the minimum standard for what a single-family dwelling should be. It needs to have some reasonably private, reasonably large outdoor backyard space.

Chair Lew: We don't have a standard. Is that correct, from Staff? We have a 20-foot setback but they don't have to do – we don't have any – correct me if I'm wrong but we don't have any particular requirements for what goes in there. Yeah.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. There's the 20-foot setback. There isn't a private open space requirement.

Board Member Furth: My standards are going to be functional. Can I eat out there? Can I sit out there? Can I plant out there? I mean, these are supposed to be single family detached houses and that's an essential element. If there is no space to garden. I'm mostly concerned about – it really came up because this question about the orientation or location of the driveway on lot #14 and I want to know that we have spaces that will let people garden if they want to. Throw a nerf ball, whatever. It's up to them what they do with it but they shouldn't be shaded out by their neighbors and they shouldn't be overlooked excessively by their neighbors.

Chair Lew: That's all I have. If there are any follow-up comments and then I think we've used your rebuttal time before but I mean if you do have any – one last thought.

Board Member Baltay: I wanted to see if perhaps we could bring the architect up and just see – I'm curious if you're really familiar with the individual review guidelines from Palo Alto Design Standard? It seems to me like you perhaps didn't quite have those in the front of your mind when you were designing the houses.

Mr. Sakai: Am I familiar with them? Pretty familiar. We've done maybe 30 houses in Palo Alto over the last three years.

Board Member Baltay: You know what we are talking about regarding second-floor balconies? I see you have a couple of these 5-foot high walls on the sides of them but if you've been through the process 30 times. Then you're very familiar with much of the issues we've been a discussion, right? Are you comfortable taking these comments and applying those guidelines a little more?

Mr. Sakai: Sure.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I think the Staff recommendation is to continue this item.

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry, can I say one more thing so I just don't bring it up for the first time later. I know that you're mostly reserving your comments on an individual or maybe I don't need to. If we're going to reserve our comments on the designs of particular structures and whether we think they work (inaudible) to later, I don't need to say a thing.

Chair Lew: I would say, I think other Board Members have sort of picked out a typical example so if there is something that – prime example, I think it would be... (crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: Helpful...

Chair Lew: ...(inaudible) would be helpful to say it now.

Board Member Furth: I'm bothered by lot #5 which is a corner lot. It has two frontages and I know that looking at an elevation may not give me an accurate experience of the building and partly, I feel – I look

at that two-story, two window elements and I think, that's no craftsman design. Those proportions are wrong. This is not a craftsman house. You're putting in little panes in the fenestration does not make this craftsman. For me, the roofs don't work. The whole house doesn't work though I think it could be fine. Probably if you cover this whole thing in brown shingles and grow ivy over it, I'll be good but it's too busy. It's badly proportioned for a craftsman building. I don't get it. That's not exactly putting it in technical terms.

Chair Lew: I'd like to entertain motions.

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: I move that we continue this to a date uncertain.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: That passes 5-0 to continue to a date uncertain.

MOTION PASSES 5-0

Chair Lew: Thank you, guys. You have a very interesting project.

Approval of Minutes for January 19, 2017.

Chair Lew: We have one last item which is the approval of the minutes. Are there any comments? I have one comment. For Staff, I think on item #5, the minutes are – how do I say this – where mentioning comments by Matt Raschke in Public Works but I think it was actually Jonathan Lait's comments on that particular project. It was the Research Park and Matt was here but that was for the fire station project so I think there's some mix-up in there. I didn't – once I realized that, I didn't go back and check to see if all of the other speakers were properly attributed to so maybe if you guys could do that too; just double check.

Ms. Gerhardt: We'll certainly go back and check the names. I think we also found that aerial was – aerial maps was spelled in the wrong way.

Chair Lew: There was a lot of miss spellings and especially, landscape species and stuff like that but I think that's fine on my end. Motion?

MOTION

Vice Chair Kim: I move that we approve those minutes with those changes that have been mentioned.

Chair Lew: A second? Somebody needs to second and I don't think it's me.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second it.

Chair Lew: Thank you. All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: That passes 5-0.

MOTION PASSES 5-0

Chair Lew: That's it. We're adjourned. Thank you, guys.

Subcommittee Item

None.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

None.

Adjournment