



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: April 6, 2017  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chair Lew: April 6, 2017. Today for the first few items we have – we also have a – we’re having a joint meeting with the HRB so I think we’ll do the roll call for both Boards now and we’ll start the joint meeting actually just under Item 2.

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Chair Bernstein, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Members Peter Baltay, Wynne Furth, Robert Gooyer, Beth Bunnenberg, Rodger Kohler, Michael Makinen, Margaret Wimmer

Absent: Vice Chair Bower, Corey

**Oral Communications**

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

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Lew: We can move onto City official reports or I’m sorry agenda changes, additions or deletions. I did want to check with Staff. Are we going to – we do have a full agenda today. Are we going to shuffle anything around?

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director to the Planning Department: Yeah, we don’t have any changes.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you.

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Chair, if I may?

Chair Lew: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: We just wanted to note that in your packet that some of the tab numbers were a little bit off but if you look at the address on the first page, you should be able to align it up with the agenda and the Staff report.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Sorry about that.

## **City Official Reports**

Chair Lew: The next item is the City official reports. I think we don't – we have a Staff – we just mentioned that there's one Staff approval and that we may – I think that's all that in here.

### **JOINT SESSION WITH THE HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD**

#### **Action Items**

#### **2. REVIEW OF MINUTES OF MARCH 17, 2016 (ARB/HRB)**

Chair Lew: We can now start the joint session with the Historic Resources Board and our first item is actually to review the minutes from another – a previous joint meeting, which was on March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016. So, those minutes are in the packets on tab seven. Are there any comments from Board Members? I had one for Staff. Maybe Board Member Baltay, could you confirm this so under the motion – this is for 900 High – 901 High Street, it says that you were absent but I think in the minutes you – my recollection is that you were here and you were opposed to the project. My recollection was that it was a 5-0 vote.

Board Member Baltay: I was here, yes.

Chair Lew: Yeah. Can Staff just maybe double check that?

Ms. Gerhardt: Where are you seeing this? On what page?

Chair Lew: This is on page 6. This is the motion for 901 High Street. It says the motion passed 4-0, Board Member Baltay absent and my recollection is – but there are recollections that are was a 5-0 and all members were present as I recall.

Ms. Gerhardt: Ok, thank you.

#### **MOTION**

Chair Lew: Well, I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes as corrected.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? That passes unanimously.

#### **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 10-0**

**3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 400 Channing Avenue [16PLN-00380]:**

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Coordinated Development Permit (SOFA I) to Allow the Demolition of an Existing One-Story Medical Office Building and Construction of Two (2) Two-Story Homes, Each With a Full Basement and Secondary Dwelling Unit Above a Detached Two-Car Garage. A Preliminary Parcel Map Application (16PLN-00381) Requesting Subdivision of the Existing Parcel Into Two Parcels Will be Reviewed Through a Separate Process. Environmental Assessment: An Addendum to the Certified SOFA Phase 1 EIR has Been Prepared to Clarify Minor Site-Specific Issues That Were Addressed in the Certified EIR. Zoning District: DHS District in the SOFA CAP. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Phillip Brennan at Phillip.Brennan@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Lew: Now we can move to item number three, which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter for 400 Channing Avenue. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a coordinated development permit in SOFA I to allow the demolition of an existing one-story medical office building and construction of two (2) two-story homes, each with a full basement and secondary dwelling unit above a detached two car garage. A Preliminary Parcel Map requesting subdivision of the existing parcel into two parcels will be reviewed through a separate process. Environmental assessment is an addendum to the certified SOFA II Phase 1 EIR has been prepared to clarify minor site-specific issues that were addressed in the certified EIR and the zone district is DHS district in the SOFA I cap. We have a Phillip Brennan here.

Chair Bernstein: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yes, and we do have some recusals and maybe we could disclosures as well.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Lew. Martin Bernstein, Chair of the Historic Resources Board. I'll be recusing myself from this agenda item for 400 Channing as I have an active project just two houses away but I will return for the subsequent agenda item. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you, Martin. Are there disclosures?

Board Member Kohler: I have a – I shouldn't – hello? Hi. I should just note that Ed Woo the client or the – is a civil engineer that I used for projects of my own.

Chair Lew: Great and Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I receive communication at text mail with a neighbor, Andrew Martin, who lives in the area, who commented to me that he thought this should be a multi-family development.

Chair Lew: Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: I will also disclose that I have previously worked with Ed Woo as a civil engineer but no projects in the past year.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I was just going to say that in the course of a site visit, I – in addition to being on the subject property. I spoke with the next-door neighbors on Channing who invited me to look at the property from the very back of theirs so that was another perspective.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Oh, one more.

Chair Lew: And Beth, thank you.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I should disclose that quite unexpectedly, I ran into the architect for this and simply talked a bit with her about what the project involved.

Chair Lew: Ok and Staff?

Mr. Phillip Brennan, Associate Planner: Good morning members of the Boards. My name is Phillip Brennan. I am an associate planner with the Planning and Community Environment Department with the City. Presenting to you today is 400 Channing Avenue. As it was previously noted, the applicant is requesting approval of a coordinated development permit to demolish an existing one-story office and construct two new, two-story homes. Each with a full basement and an ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) attached to a detached two-car garage on each lot. It should be noted that the project would be replacing an approximately 3,300-square foot office building. Most recently used for a medical office use, which is not a permitted use in the DHS zoning district. The applicant would redevelop the lot as a permitted land use. The site is part of the south of Forest area -- coordinated area plan phase 1. It's subject to SOFA CAP and coordinated development permit review and entitlement process. It's detached houses on small lots zoning district, which is land designation unique to the SOFA area plan. It must comply with the DHS development standards and design guidelines. The ARB/HRB review process is required for development in the DHS zoning district to ensure new construction is consistent with the SOFA CAP plan, specifically with development standard and design guidelines prescribed by the DHS zoning district. A little bit about the subject site and surrounding context. The subject parcel is located in the western corner of a predominantly R2 zoning district block. That's primarily comprised of one-story and two-story single family residences. The development application was submitted in conjunction with a separate preliminary parcel map,

seeking to subdivide the lot into two separate and equal parcels to develop. The proposed development would reconnect the land use with the surrounding land use context. As you can see in the map here, you see 400 Channing at the corner of Waverly and Channing Avenue. If this project was recommended and ultimately approved, it would – that intersection would be comprised of --three of the four corners of that intersection would be DHS land use development. Some cursory project details, you know one is the interior lot. It's styled after an English cottage style; two-story residence. It's a little bit over 2,600-square feet in total floor area for the main residence. Nearly 450-square feet for the detached two-car garage and that has a 336-square foot cottage on top of that. In the DHS zoning district, this particular style layout of the main residence with the detached garage in the rear with a cottage allows for a maximum FAR of 65% and you'll see that the applicant has built close to that maximum at about 64.7%. Unit two is the corner lot at – budding Waverly and Channing. It's a craftsman style, two-story residence. A little bit over 2,500 total -square feet for the main residence. 450 for the detached garage with a 350-square foot cottage and that is built just under at 63.5% FAR. The homes are oriented to place the frontages along Waverly Street. This was done for a few reasons, one is to maximize development potential but another primary reason was to – it was just the most intuitive and layout in terms of reducing the impacts of the development. If the cottages or if – excuse me, if the residences were fronting Channing Avenue, it would compress the layout and the impacts to the budding properties as far as the massing of the development. It would be increased greatly and in – and the applicant did speak with the neighbor at 915 Waverly and felt that this addressed the – that concern. The proposed developments on both respective lots are in compliance with the DHS development standards and design guidelines with the following exceptions. These are discussion items we would like to receive input from the respective Boards. There are required front yard setbacks issues with these developments or consideration I should say as well as maximum lot size. Both of these items can ultimately be resolved at the discretion of the Director of Planning but the modification to the front yard setback would require a formal request for a minor exception to be granted. In the SOFA CAP, the design guidelines state that the minimum required front yard setback is to be established at 15-feet when there's no pre-existing pattern existing. If that's not the case, then you're to use the per block face average in which the property is located, which in this case would put the block face average at approximately 29 ½-feet; as you can see in the illustration there. The City's consulting architect reviewed these plans and determined that there wasn't necessarily an existing pattern lot or set back pattern along Waverly – this segment of Waverly. He did determine that the lot or excuse me, this segment of Waverly Street was split by 925 Waverly, which is an apartment building. The lots to the right have front yard setbacks ranging from 33-36-feet. The lots to the left, including 915 and the subject site, has a 21-foot setback and 428 and 426 Channing have a front yard setback just over 21-feet. In speaking with the applicant, she initially approved or initially proposed building her – designing her homes to be set back at just 18-feet but in speaking and consulting with the City's architect and myself, agreed to move that setback to be more in line with the budding properties at 915 and 428 Channing Avenue. She is proposing a front yard setback of 20-feet 6-inches and 21-feet respectively to match – better match the existing pattern of the

budding properties. The project satisfies all the required findings necessary for a minor exception. The SOFA CAP provides a provision where you can have variation from the development standards and design guidelines through this minor exception process and upon approval from the Director of Planning. Upon analysis from Staff, we believe that those finding can be feasibly made. The other talking point was the maximum lot size. In the DHS zoning district, the minimum lot size required is 2,800-feet I believe but the maximum lot size – prescribed lot size is 5,000-square feet. However, there is a specific provision in the DHS development standards that provide an allowance to – for various from the minimum and maximum lot sizes based on a judgment call from the Director of Planning. If they've determined the lot configuration is consistent with the goals of SOFA plan and necessary to promote orderly lot patterns. Upon analysis, Staff is recommending that the ARB and HRB take the following actions in recommending approval of the proposed new homes with the request for the minor exceptions to allow for front yard setbacks of 20-feet 6-inches for unit two and 21-feet for unit one. The applicant is here and is requesting to provide a presentation.

Chair Lew: Great and so that applicant can come up to the front and you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Jing Quan: Good morning everybody. My name is Jing Quan and I am the architect with WEC and Associates. WEC and Associates have been – we have been working with the City of Palo Alto for over 15-years and – thank you. Oh ok. For this project, we have been working with the City of Palo Alto since September of last – I think it was the since September of last year so at the beginning, just like Phillip had mentioned, we proposed a different type of subdivision. We have – the new property line is perpendicular to Channing Avenue and after we presented the design to the City, we had a couple meeting this the City and we decided to probably change our design and have the new property line perpendicular to the Waverly Street. That would keep the same pattern as the rest of the residence buildings along Waverly Street. We did – we spend a lot of time working together with the City. We (inaudible) have the leaders – this is our design. You can see this lot is located on the corner of Waverly and Channing and it's surrounded by – there are two and across the street, we have a lot of property that belongs to the DHS (inaudible). Most of the DHS at the corner of Waverly and Channing, their setback is even less than we proposed. We worked with the City just like Phillip mentioned, at the beginning we proposed 15-feet and then we changed it to 15 or 18. Then we looked at the pattern on the Waverly street, we changed it back to 21-feet to be consistent with 915 Waverly Street. This is the existing site plan. The brown color that is showing is the existing footprint. This is a one-story medical office and the gray tone is the parking lot. We have two curb cuts, one is on Waverly Street and another one is on Channing. This – for the existing condition being this, we don't have a lot of landscaping area. You can see this lot majority is occupied by parking and the existing building. This is a proposed site plan so we subdivided it into two lots. Each lot is 43 – 42.5-feet wide by 125-feet deep. It's very consistent with the neighbor at 915 Waverly and we have there – lot one, the driveway is on the right-hand side of the property if your facing Waverly Street and the parking – the garage is leading all the way to the back. From the street side, it's – you can hardly see the cottage. Just unit

one is the English cottage style. Lot two is a corner lot. It's located at the Channing corner of Channing and Waverly. The entrance of getting to the main house is from Waverly Street and the driveway to the garage is on Channing Avenue. It's almost the same location as the existing driveway curb cut. This is the existing condition of the property. I took the photo at the corner of Channing and Waverly. You can see, we have several trees along Channing Avenue and a couple of the trees are along Waverly Street so all the trees we are going to reserve. This is the color rendering almost at the same angle to show the proposed two properties. One – unit two is a craftsman style and unit one at the back is English cottage style. This is another existing view. I took the picture along Waverly Street so on the right-hand side, that's the existing house of 915 Waverly and you can see some of the existing one-story building of the medical office. A big palm tree located at the front and we have an oak tree at the corner of the property. This is a proposed – this is another color rendering showing the front one is unit one that is an English cottage style and the one at the back is Lot two, which is a craftsman style. Also, I prepared a material board so this is the English cottage style. We have the curved arch top entrance door with some decorative hardware and also the garage door will match the color of the entrance door. Both of them will be a stained wood door and for the window type, we're using a little bit narrower window type. For the (inaudible), it's more like a rectangular or square. The stucco would be a light color stucco with the slate type comp shingle roofing. This is the material board for lot one. For lot – unit two, this is a craftsman style so we have – we're using the – pretty typical craftsman style entrance door. That would be a wood door as well. For the garage door at the back, it will be a painted wood garage door. For the window type also, it's like a typical craftsman style window. For – also, on the left-hand side, I showed the color of the trim color and also the eave color. The wall color – is – when we printed it out, the color is a little bit different from the real color. It's a little bit gray-greenish color for the wall. Also, we are going to use some of the stone veneers at the front of the façade and also at the chimney. Also, this one would be a comp. shingle. It's showing in the right corner – upper corner. Also, I took some pictures of the existing conditions so that's the four corner houses of Channing and Waverly; that's the existing condition. You can see that this corner three – two of the existing houses, the DHS zoning –the two-story single family residences and also across the street is the R2 so all of the houses are set back; I think is less than 18-feet. These are a couple more pictures that are showing the existing condition of the lot. This is the end of my presentation. So, I think the proposed two residences (inaudible), it will be consistent with the pattern of the DHS zoning requirement and also be consistent with the neighborhoods. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you for your presentation. I do want to open up the hearing to the public and I do have a speaker card for this item which is David [phonetics] [Buamgarden] and you have 5-minutes.

Mr. David Buamgarden: Thank you. Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is David [Buamgarden] and my property is the 915 property along this development. First of all, I want to say we are very supportive of this transition to residential. In fact, it's overdue. We are also supportive of the reorientation

of the properties along Waverly Street. We want to acknowledge the architect for making those changes. We think it's a lot stronger design and more appropriate for the neighborhood. However, there continue to be concerns specific to compatibility and sensitivity of the project to the existing neighbors. These properties will transition from high density to single family. It's paramount that it's done in a seamless way. We have five specific concerns. Again, we didn't want to do a laundry list. I think the group is more capable of looking at the designs than I am but I'd like them addressed and I sent an email so that you had some runway to look at these. These challenges have been discussed with many of my neighbors and quite broadly to our friends in the community and there's been pretty universal feedback. I wanted this to be balanced when I came in front of you. They are prioritized, the first one is around the garage with the apartment along the Waverly Street line. A recommendation is not to have an apartment up above the garage because of the density. There's a reference that I'd like to point out, which is 857. The development across the street had a similar challenge and they put a single-family garage. I think it's a great way to balance existing neighborhood with the new development. The second one I think has been addressed and I think the architect – we talked yesterday and it was the balcony on the second floor and I think that's already been decided to remove that so I want to thank the architect for that. I think – again, the privacy and looking down on the property has been alleviate so I believe that's a non-issue. Second-floor window facing the property into our play room upstairs and bedrooms. If I'm pronouncing it right, clear-story windows above the eye line so that it doesn't – give them light. I'm – again, 18-inches above the sight line and I think it's doable. I think they are in agreement but again, that's technical windows that I am not sure what size but just so lighting is abundant for them but also privacy is good for us. Finally, I don't have a solution but the family room downstairs – I think they are open to on how to elevate it but making sure the two families rooms aren't looking straight at each other. We're at a 3-foot elevation, I think this is at a foot and a half. I don't want direct line into their family room and I don't think they want direct line into ours. The challenge is oak trees, which limits the ability to put screen age and a driveway with limited – there so I don't know what the solution is but I think when we talked yesterday, there has to be some viable way of elevating that. Finally, we have several protected coastal live oaks. They are pretty large trees; 3 ½-feet and 2 ½-feet in diameter along the property line. We're concerned that the proposed construction, specifically the basement and we have no issue with basements being built but I just want to make sure that it doesn't damage the trees or the root line because they certain would threaten the safety of the residences. Specifically, my kid's bedrooms so I want to make sure that there's a through arborist report. Again, I hope there is no issue. I don't think there will be an issue but I really want that to be acknowledged and ensure that we're not creating a problem for the next big storm, which we hope there will be a lot more of. Again, very supportive of the project but a couple I think I want to make sure that are highlighted and addressed. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and we have one other – one additional speaker which is [Steve Raina] and you have 10 – 5-minutes.



[Mr. Steve Raina]: Great, I was afraid I would get three. Good morning Members of the Board. My name is [Steven Raina]. I live at 840 Kipling street, to put that into context, this property in discussion is 440 Channing. Across Channing is a collection of four DHS homes. My property is on the backside of those DHS homes. At the time, I bought the property back in '98, that was – those homes were still a Staff parking lot for PAMF and now I have three DHO –DHO –DHS home properties bordering on two sides of my property. I want to address two main issues here; privacy and compatibility. As an example, one of the DHS properties has a two-story cottage garage within just a few feet of my property – of my fence line. There's also a stairway and second story landing going up the side of that cottage garage and from that landing, there's a commanding view of my entire back property and they also look into my windows – the back windows of my property. Additionally, the main house has a very large picture window and it too has or had a commanding view of my entire back yard. I have to say, on a daily basis, every time I step out, I am reminded of my lack of privacy. At the time of construction, conditions were placed on the building permit to plant a row of trees – screening trees that would eventually grow and cover the picture window and at least on the staircase landing, there was a – some attempt – we were talking about putting lattice work on that landing to get some – at least nominal sense of privacy. Although honestly, whoever stands on that landing, will still get a commanding view of my property. However, once the new owner moved in, those screening trees – those newly planted screening trees were pulled out. There is no lattice on the landing and they can do that. The new owner can do because they have their own property rights. The condition was placed on the building permit, which affects the contractor but that doesn't affect the property rights of the new owner. As a consequence, things like screening trees and special privacy windows; glazing and other additions or modifications of a basic structure. These are actually in a sense – in a very real sense – practical sense, they're a limited and fragile tool. The new owner can just change them. For the neighbors who depend on these additional mitigations for a sense of privacy, it's a very limited and fragile tool. The image I have is like a candle in the wind and you just hope the wind doesn't blow too hard. If you want a firm solution for privacy mitigation, then it seems like it has to be a fundamental part of the way the building is constructed. It has to be designed in, it can't just be added on. There are also serious compatibility issues and the transition of DHS is significant. FAR bonus and relaxed setback requirement versus the existing built neighborhood. Even for R1 zoning, there is a process of individual review, to deal with compatibility and privacy. It was a – it is a critically needed process because significant problems keep reoccurring. DHS with the same problems – the same problems with DHS will just be multiplied. Compared with single-family homes, it's already been discussed. You can go from .45 FAR up to .55, .65, depending on a cottage. Whether it's attached to the main house or attached to the garage. There are relaxed set back requirements, for instance, sit setback for R1 is 10-feet at a 45-degree angle. Side setback for DHS is 12-feet and a 60-degree angle and with this additional FAR and the relax setbacks, this just increases massing and pushes it to the edge. That is kind of the very source of the compatibility and the potential privacy issues. When DHS is going into a built neighborhood; this being the case. It's these very benefits that create – I said that sorry. With the greater benefits associated with DHS zoning, the intent – I know from having talked to many of the

original members of the SOFA working group, is to create – increase the pool of rentable units into the neighborhood. A very good purpose but those benefits are also the source of the issues we have to discuss. With greater benefits – is that 5-minutes? Can I get 30-seconds?

Chair Lew: Can you just wrap up really quickly? I think we get the gist of your argument.

[Mr. Buamgarden:] Just a summary, this is the first one since SOFA I. There's also a whole collection of DHS on Waverly between Forest and Homer. This is not a single standalone issue. This is going to be coming back over and over again and needs a coherent process in dealing with the issues.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much.

[Mr. Buamgarden:] Thank you for your time and attention.

Chair Lew: I will open up the – to the Board for questions. I think we have...

Mr. Lait: Chair Lew, if I may just – just on that last speaker, a couple of comments.

Chair Lew: Sure.

Mr. Lait: One is if the Board chooses to impose conditional of approval related to screening or landscaping or things of that nature, those allow the City to then – after the construction and changes of ownership, to go back and enforce those requirements for screening should there be a complaint filed with the City so that's something to think about. Then also, I was just talking with Staff at the table here. We understand that there are some frosted windows that are – I believe probably on the second floor of the...

Ms. Gerhardt: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lait: ...and some high (inaudible) windows that – if these are designs features that are important for privacy and things of that nature, we should impose a condition on those as well. We have a general condition that talks about compliance with plans but as you know, going through the permit process, some little detail get changed out and a planner may not know that the frosted windows are important unless we have a condition to that effect.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you.

Board Member Furth: Yeah, what's – I know there's a minimum density for this district so I think it's 8 dwelling units per unit. How – what's the minimum number of units that we can permit on this site?

Mr. Brennan: It would be four units or on the – for each lot?

Board Member Furth: No, on this site, how many units must – there's a minimum density; eight dwelling units per acre so how many units – this project has to include at least three?

Mr. Brennan: Yeah, let me get back to you and I'll give you the exact number on that.

Chair Lew: Are there any other questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, has there been any geotechnical investigation? Will dewatering be necessary to do this basement?

Mr. Brennan: I'm sorry?

Board Member Baltay: Will dewatering be necessary to construct these basements? Has a geotechnical report been submitted?

Mr. Brennan: Right, a geotechnical report has not been submitted. The applicant may be able to speak better to that with the ...

Ms. Gerhardt: There are standard conditions that address dewatering. Our Public Works engineers will be looking at that during the building stage. To ensure that all the appropriate reports are turned in.

Board Member Baltay: As of now, we do not know whether that will happen. That's correct?

Ms. Brennan: No, we don't know that right now.

Board Member Kohler: I can add a little something to that. I think we've done a home not too far, one or two blocks away that had – there were two or three of them that had basements and we didn't have to water but that of course – dewater but that was done 10 or 12-years ago so I don't know if ground water has changed in that area. I doubt it.

Chair Lew: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: Yes, I wanted to ask a couple of questions about the zoning. It looks like this project is in a DHS zoning neighborhood or area but it's directly adjacent to an R2 and I think this page in our packet really shows that boundary line. I was wondering if you could speak a little bit to why the subject property is excluded from the 'R' district – the R2 district? Then also, it – I mean in summary, it looks like this was once a commercial project, being a medical facility and now it's being transferred to a residential project. Would it make sense to include this project in the R2 zone? Could you speak a little bit about – because it's right on the boundary line so – and it – I

mean I'm hearing from the residences who are wanting it to – wanting to identify this property more as a residential zone and not a commercial zone because it's being transferred. It seems like there's a little sensitivity that in the change of the occupancy or the change of the use of the property, would that also require a change of the use of the zoning ordinance? I'm just asking that.

Mr. Lait: Thank you Board Member for the – Vice Chair for the comments. I don't believe that any of us here at the table have that institutional knowledge about the zoning boundary for why this was zoned one way instead of the R2. I know that there are some people who may be in the room who may have some deeper knowledge about that.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I was not on the Committee Working Group of course but I Staffed it so I went to all their meetings and worked on the drafting of this. Of course, all of this is about the transformation of land owned by the Palo Alto medical foundation, when they relocated to Urban Lane. Urban Lane was going to be 400 or something housing units and this area was originally designated for far fewer. When they decided to or decided they wanted to move, there was a comprehensive neighborhood driven – neighborhood and landowner driven policy. When you read the SOFA CAP, it's clear that the biggest struggle was about how much housing and how do you make it compatible with the existing eclectic, varied, very attractive existing housing stock. DHS was supposed to be modest houses on smaller lots and it could include a second unit and there was a lot of concern that – because this is such an attractive area, people with the resources to do so would want to consolidate property so that's why – and that would subvert this effort to provide more housing downtown. They have minimum densities and they have maximum lot size. DHS in this area was specifically intended to transition those commercial properties to residential uses. This is just a shoe falling very late, compared to that process but it was intended -- clearly it didn't always succeed, to give the City the tools to require development that would be a good neighbor to existing residential development.

Board Member Wimmer: I guess my question – because I've not – I don't have a lot of experience with doing any projects – I've never done any projects in the DHS district so how does that compare with the R2 district? What are the – is there a daylight plane difference? Is there a FAR difference? What are the fundamental differences? Just for my own and for the public's education of what the difference is between the two districts? Does the DHS get a higher FAR and more lenient daylight plane? Or features or -- just curious. Sorry, I didn't do my homework on that. Sorry. I should have.

Mr. Lait: Yes? I don't think we were prepared to do that analysis of the different zone between the R2 and the other. No, that's fine. We can certainly look through the code and pull together a couple of distinguishing factors about that if you want to come back to us.

Chair Lew: Any other questions at this time? No. Why don't we move onto Board Member comments and why don't we start with Beth?

Board Member Bunnenberg: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I see the lot split as a very good move because most of the properties in that area are residential have a shorter street facing and long lots back so that's to be – makes it more compatible. I think that – and facing Waverly makes very good sense. The choice of echoing neighborhood styles; I think is very interesting. Certainly, bungalows are all over that area. That one is very clear. The small English cottage, there are smaller examples of that but one really interesting one is not too far away, which is the William's house at 351 Homer. That is a modest tutor and it was built in 1906 so I'll send this down because you have the high peaked roof and the major chimney as features of the building. I think to me, there's good compatibility there. We always run into trouble when people try to do Victorian houses because, by the time you get some of the work on the front of the Victorian house, there's a question of whether it too closely mimics and one of our standards is that new work should be differentiated from the traditional work. 30-years from now, it would be very hard to tell whether that was a real Victorian or a faux Victorian. I support the choice of style. I think that that the materials look good and feel that it is quite compatible. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Beth. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Yes?

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Furth, if I may answer your earlier question. Jodi Gerhardt, Manager of current planning. Regarding the minimum density, it is eight dwelling units per acre. This site is a little over 10,000 so the minimum density would be two units.

Board Member Furth: Ok. I was thinking in terms of commercial acres and then I was rounding up and I was getting three so good things I asked. Thank you, it's nice to see this use converting back to residential after all these years and it's nice to see that strong corner in an extremely lovely neighborhood, getting a revisiting. My concerns are about usable outdoor space within the site. About not properly – not adequately handling privacy issues for the adjacent property on Waverly and not adequately, it seems to me, acknowledging and protecting the oak trees on the site. If you look at the native oak senses in the SOFA Plan on page 65. This has got practically the densest concentration of important oak trees. They are all important but these are super important, in the whole area. This dominant thing about – I really enjoyed I must say, going to look at this project. I mean the dominate thing about this area is the wealth of trees and it's not just the oak trees. It's those spectacular – are those Canary Palms? You can tell, I think, that there's been an institutional owner for years because they are in really good shape. Just as a side, it's a little unnerving to have a historic importance analysis site – Larry [Cline]. It always unnerves me when it's people I know but I'm

sure it's true. When I looked at – oh, and then the last thing is this district is different than R2 or R1. This district intends to provide modest houses on smaller lots, not big houses on small lots. When SOFA was being developed, it had already become economically advisable for property owners to install basements with light wells and what not so it wasn't that basement weren't anticipated but they were just beginning to be part of the development practice in this area. What we have is a proposal for a five-bedroom house on a 5,000-square foot lot with a very small detached assessor unit. A so-called cottage but I think the notion of a cottage over a garage is interesting but I understand the idea is that it should be charming. My first – to get to the first things first, if you look at – when I look at site plan A2 and look at the – what do you call it? The coverage of the tree – the oak tree. The canopy, thank you and the document was prepared by a canopy, how could I forget this. When you look at the canopy of the east coast live oak on the adjacent property on Waverly, it goes practically all the way over that proposed second unit if I am reading this correctly. When I went back to look at it from 426 Channing, that indeed appears to be the case. I'm concerned that by locating this second unit next to the neighbor instead of the next to the second house that's part of this project. You both are having unnecessary impacts on the neighbor on Waverly and providing insufficient protection to that tree and also, it relates to my other concern about the lack of good outdoor space that doesn't front on Waverly. Under an oak tree is a classic place to enjoy seating and being outdoors so I – as it stands, I don't think that that location of that second unit is consistent with our goals with this district. I don't understand how the parking actually works; the exiting and entering. I would like to hear more about steps being taken to address the privacy concerns on Waverly. I would certainly not support a design that includes a second story balcony looking over there and I would want to spend some time knowing that the placement of windows and the materials used were designed in a way to give lots of light and air to the occupants of the new structure but not unnecessarily deal with privacy problems on the other. I'd also like to hear about – hear comments from Staff about 420 – and my colleagues up here, about privacy in 426 Channing. 425 Channing is really interesting because it's a very – these are all very deep lots. There appears to be a second unit at the back. There's a lot of open space and how is the – how is this treated in terms of providing good privacy for them? Then my last point and I don't know if my colleagues agree with me on this but we don't have a minimum size for the second unit but we allow an addition .1 FAR so that's 500-square feet on these lots, right? I think that to meet the goals of this district, the 500-square – these units are too small. They're not going to support – they just look like instant (inaudible). They do not look like places where two or more people would live over the long term. I also am unclear as to what their outdoor space would be so I would like to hear more about those issues. In terms of the setback, I'm not very comfortable with the finding because saying that we are going to modify a setback in order to provide housing is the kind of exception that swallows the rule. Having said that, I think you've made a good case that not recognizing the bifurcation of this block by that large apartment building, give you an unreasonable result and appears to be a bit wasteful. There is a lot of freedom in the DHS and in SOFA generally to modify standards.

Chair Lew: Karen.

Council Member Holman: Yeah, just a couple things just because I was on the SOFA I and SOFA II working groups. What Board Member Furth is saying is actually one of the goals that were established by the SOFA working group. The homes were supposed to be smaller homes, larger cottages so there more – both more affordable. That was the goal that was established by the SOFA working group. Just a little bit of institutional memory and then the ones that got built as a part of the redevelopment when the clinic moved out. Those actually did have smaller units but there's no requirement of that, to my knowledge. Maybe Staff will correct me but my memory and just a review of this is that there's no requirement. The original intention was to have more reasonable sizes for both the primary home and the second unit.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah. I would just like to compliment the architect. I think you've done a nice job in terms of the style and the compatibility with the neighborhood and the finish materials are all quite nice. What I -- I think I have a -- most of a problem with is the detached secondary dwelling units. When we look at the streetscape on the Channing avenue streetscape and to reference that it's sheet A.17 in our packets. We look at the detached garage with the cottage on the top for dwelling two, which fronts on Channing avenue and then we look at the adjacent property at 426 Channing. It just doesn't -- just the height and the massing of the secondary dwelling/cottage structure doesn't really seem compatible with 426 Channing. I also looked at where it's placed on the site plan and it appears that this is 4-feet from that shared property line. In one reference, I was just looking at the site plans and on one site plan, it says it's 3-feet but maybe that's the roof line that's 3-feet from the property line but it looks like this detached structure is roughly 4-feet from the property line, which is very close. In any R1 development, we have a minimum of a 5-foot setback from the side property line. I know that this is probably really the rear -- I don't know how it's really legally classified but it seems awfully close to the property line for as tall as it is. If you just look at the existing residence and the secondary detached structure, it just seems -- that just doesn't seem compatible to me with the massing. I think that is compromising a privacy for the adjacent structures. I know that there's the same cottage detached structure in unit one -- behind the unit one but it's -- that doesn't have visibility from the street as much as this one does on Channing. I just think that -- and I looked at the sections and I was trying to see how they could possibly bring the height of that structure down. It doesn't look like -- it looks like their minimum ceiling heights so it looks like it's like 7 ½ feet in the garage with a 12-inch floor ceiling and 8-feet for the second floor so you can't really bring it down very much. I don't know what kind of solution we could come up with for that. Then also in terms of the screening, I know that on some projects the screening requirement can be part of the covenant. Maybe that's getting a little bit too deep into what the laws are but I do think that the -- I don't know. I think that's my primary problem with this project, is that incompatible secondary dwelling in the back and then I also wanted to state that I know that the requirements for the secondary dwelling units are -- the codes have changed. The ordinances have changed since January and the Cities are much more lenient now in trying to encourage these

secondary dwelling units to be built. Maybe because of that, we have to accept some of these compromised situations but I think that there's – we have to work – it would be nice to see the applicant work on the compatibility of those detached structures in the back yards.

Chair Lew: Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for the presentation. I'm actually very much in favor of this project. I think it's been thought out a lot deeper than a lot of the projects that we see for a first hearing. It seems pretty clear to me that the DHS hold over is from when Palo Alto Medical Foundation continued to use this property as a medical office and I think the way that they are proposing the project with the two separate lots and the four units actually, does a very nice job of complimenting the surround R-2 residential zoning and also creating that transition. Overall, again, I think the project – I would be fine recommending approval for. There were a couple small nitty-bitty things but I think will pass on making any comments on that for now. Overall, again, I think it's been very well thought out. The material boards were very nice. If it were to return to the Board, however, I think it would be nice to see some more 3-D site perspectives, including some of the surrounding neighbors. Also, to see a clearer first-floor site plan. I did notice that you were showing that on creating and drainage plan but it would be a little bit clearer perhaps to see how that landscaping works and to see where those lights well exactly are. I think for the two points that Staff has asked us to comment on. As far as the variation of the setback, I think that's fine. I think it makes sense with the way that the residences are set back on Waverly and as far as the maximum lot size being slightly over 5,00-square feet, I am also fine with that. Again, I think it's that DHS carry over and it's been stated that the SOFA 1 CAP also has those specific provisions to vary from that. I am very much appreciative of the fact that it's four dwelling units so thank you for presenting the project.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you and good morning. In general, I think it's a good thing that we are going to do here but I have a number of issues and concerns. Let me start with the zoning, when the lots bigger than the minimum allowable area, we sometimes say that's ok. One of the reasons they set a maximum lot area is to get the maximum house size limit in; that's what the FAR does. We've had this come up before but it seems to me that we ought to limit the house size, the FAR ought to be calculated based on the maximum lot size, which would be 5,000 not slightly larger. That's the whole point of having this limitation. I also find myself in agreement with Board Member Furth's comments about the second dwelling unit. If you are reading the code, the intent is that extra 1.1 FAR is for the second dwelling unit and in this case, the house again has been made larger at the expense of the second dwelling unit. Those are two zoning issues and I don't know what latitude we have to enforce that but to me, it makes sense again in that the maximum development should be limited to the maximum lot size. Even if the lot is slightly large for whatever necessary reason; it's historically been that way. To address the two requirements – the two exceptions, I



guess – again, the lot size is fine to let that occur when it's slightly greater. The code allows that and I don't have an issue with it. I think the front setback as well, I find the argument that the real context of this site is from that apartment building towards the corner and so basing the front – the average front setback on that rationale makes sense. In fact, I think you could take the four house on the corner here and consider that as part of the context and let the front setback be based on that average even. It's important that this house come closer to the street to fit the obvious context. Anyone standing there would think a 30-foot setback is inappropriate for these small houses. Then I consider the historic nature of this site and I don't see anything in the building that is historic but I see six gorgeous historic palm trees and to me that's the apodeme of what a really nice lot in Palo Alto have. Think of the Squire House and I see that five of them are being saved but one is not and I find that a shame. To me, if we are trying to preserve history, that's what's historic on this property. I also see a garage being put underneath the canopy of a very nice like oak tree in the back. Again, I don't know where the development is being allowed but whenever I propose a house under a big oak tree like that, you're not allowed to do it. It's not compatible so I see that as a problem. That tree is precious and this property in particular has really, really nice trees. I certainly would appreciate feedback from my colleagues on the Historic Resources Board via the trees. If that is a fair consideration, the trees themselves are historic and what makes the property historic are these palm trees but to me, that's just such an important part of what I see when I come up to that corner. I am concerned about potential dewatering. I've also done projects in this neighborhood and we have not had to do dewatering here but if dewatering is required, it could have a significant impact on these trees and to me, the trees are really important. Especially, there are four big mature canary island palms right on the street. Right on Channing Avenue and when you're talking about dewatering 5 -7-feet away from that. That – I mean come on, I've been around. That is going to hurt the trees, we all know that and is that really what we want to do? I think that at the minimum we have to have extremely stringent requirements that go beyond the requirements even now for dewatering. If dewatering is necessary and I think that's the kind of question we should be asking. These trees are precious and if we are going to put basements that close to them. I mean even just the shore piers alone are going to be close to these trees. These are some of the nicest palm trees in town as far as I can tell. The whole question of dewatering to me is an unknown and it really needs to be known about what's going to happen there. Looking at the site planning of the properties. Project 2 I find that the garage – I'm sorry but it doesn't work. You've go 20-feet to back your car out of that garage and then turn it around. That's not going to happen. The result will be someone backing out, blindly making a 90-degree turn and backing across the sidewalk on Channing. I am fully sympathetic and aware that this is a tight lot and a tight design problem but in a residence, you have to – the same standards as everyone else, you need to be able to turn the car around and on lot two, the space between the house and the garage is just not enough. I don't know the answer but I am afraid my opinion once proposed that it doesn't function. That's one of the findings that we have to make. Then if I could, I would like to address a few more detailed design questions. I have a list of about five or six tweaks so to speak on the building but a bigger one perhaps is that I find it disappointing that the architect didn't design a separate house for each lot. One lot's an

interior lot with house on each side and one is on the corner. The floor plans to these houses are essentially the same and I've said this before on other projects but our finding is that we have to have a high esthetic quality. To me that means that each building is designed to uniquely to fit to the particular site that it is on. A corner lot is inherently different from an interior lot and in this case, you have this row of palm trees right there. It just seems to me that the house should have been designed separately and not the same floor plan with a different style, craftsman vs. English country, applied to it, which is what happened here. Again, I that – the façade of the house on Channing Avenue is fairly flat along Channing behind the palm trees and that's a result of it being an interior lot design. Where you have a tight setback and it really needs to be more modulation to soften it, to bring in some of the characteristics of a craftsman style home. That means that you need to redo the floor plan. The house will inherently be different and it just wasn't done here and that's disappointing. Then I am going to go through a couple of comments on each house. If I can start with the English country on lot number one. I find that the chimney mass is too small and really needs to be with a different material, perhaps a stone or something. If you look at other English country style houses that's typically the case. The window trim on the second-floor gable, then if I were to compare the images from the Historic Resources Board or if I compare the images you present yourself, the applicant. For an example of country style house, the trim around these windows is very simple and that to me, is part of this style. Is a simple cottage and yet the trim shown on the house here, is rather heavy and the window is not very deeply reset? Those are details but I'd like to see that thought through a bit more. I find the front door entry as well – when I look at that plan, it doesn't make sense. It really needs to be perhaps a little bit deeper and a little bit more thought out. Maybe a beveled form with the plaster. There are many houses around town where it's been done a little bit more nicely but those three things I think would improve the façade. On the craftsman style home on the corner lot, I find the front porch you're proposing at the depth of – I'm sorry, 3-feet it looks like here is ridiculous. Porches need to be deep enough to put a chair on it and this one is not. I understand that you are fighting setback and many other issues but sometimes it means that you take an extra foot or two out of the house to get a usable front porch. This is a corner lot on a pedestrian street, close to town where there will be people going by. People will want to sit out there and this is sort of an (inaudible) porch. It's not really intended to be used as a porch. I am bothered by the stone wainscot being broken by the window, which is just a little bit too large on the front. The living room steps into the stone Wainscot. If you align those, it would be nicer. When I look at your eave detail it's – clunky maybe is a nice way to put it but it's just not very well thought out. Again, you need to really look at the way this has been done in the past with the eaves. It's not the same size board that is visible on the outside as is structural on the inside and this one is just not quite there. Again, it just makes me wonder if it's been thought about. The chimney also seems a little bit too short. That's a list of small design things that could be addressed. I'm sure my colleagues will have their own opinions. Then, lastly, the issue of the garages in the back and the second story units; it's a challenge. This is a zone where we want to have dwelling units in the back then that means that those garages need to have someone living on top of them. Unless we had less parking requirements, you need the garage for parking. We want a second dwelling unit, that's

where it has to be. The new State laws coming down to us are acknowledging and pushing that. What I come down to thinking then is that we have to design these garage units really, really well. We have to do it so that they minimize their impact on the neighbors. They are going to be an impact, we all know that but in this case, one of those units could be shifted over perhaps so that it's not so close to the neighbor. I think you could have lower plate heights. Closer to 7-feet on the second floor, sloping inside where the ceiling is not consistently 8-feet but rather slopes with the ceiling. A lower plate really helps and then honestly, when I look at the design of the garages, it looks like a different person designed them. They are just a different style. They are not compatible with the houses. They are just sort of clunky. They are just not – I don't understand why they weren't – the same care wasn't give to these garages as the rest of the house. It clearly needs to be done but the eaves are different, the massing is different, they just aren't – they are not there at all. I'd like to see the garage outbuilding be really carefully designed. Very much modulated, maybe more landscaping somehow between them and the neighbors but really with an eye to minimizing the obvious impact and that just hasn't been done here. Again, the second units just need to a significant amount of work to them improved. Ok, thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Rodger.

Board Member Kohler: Thank you. I just – a few comments. I was thinking here that it's been a long time and I'm getting older but I was on the Committee that tried to decide what to do with the medical center sites and surrounding areas. I must have been part of declaring this to be an R-2 zone because I was on that Committee that worked all that out. That was a – I think that went on all summer. We met every month for a long time and worked on that and had a lot of input from the surrounding neighbors and everything. It was quite an interesting project. I'm – I have done a lot of basements in Palo Alto so I like the use of basements. They are really a huge bonus to homes of any size and the water issue is – I've done so many basements in Palo Alto that I have never had a problem with the water table. The only problem we ever had once, was when the tractor over dug and went into the neighbor's yard with his basement instead of staying on his own property. I think the basements are really good and I have to admit, the comments just recently were really quite detailed and there's not – I'm not sure I have a whole lot to add to it. I do agree that the garage designs do seem to sort of come out of a different one – the front houses are – have a lot of details and the garages look like a lot of other garages look. Unfinished and not responding to the design of the other homes so I would agree with that. The palm tree – actually, what I started to mention about the medical center's site was that there were some trees there that had to be moved and so that – the palm trees, as you know, you can buy a palm tree and have it – it can be 40-feet high and they bring it in and they plunk it down in the ground and it grows quite well. They – as long as they don't get much closer than the – what shows the line they have here, I don't think the palm trees will have a problem with the basement. I have to admit, the – it's a fairly clever kind of solution here. You have the main house and then the cottage in the back but I really agree that the cottage does seem to have been left out of the design features of the main homes.

I also have a modest issue with the coast live oak opposite the rear garage. That does seem to me that it looks like it's only – I don't know, maybe 8-feet at the most to the foundation. That's getting awfully close to an oak tree of that size. Normally, I think we have to be 10 or 12-feet away so I don't know if there was a tree report done for that – those two coast live oaks. I mean, I don't think I have much else to consider. It's kind of a – I guess the debate is whether or not -- the front house is fairly large and elaborate. The back homes are kind of this little one room cottage effect but I think that's what Palo Alto seems to be encouraging; to have these small units in the back. The State is mandating that you are allowed to do that. Now, I assume from Staff that requirement is going to be coming forward because we've to ask Staff several times on what's the new rule with these required units in the back yard and I've been told that you are working on that and you'll have a little (inaudible) – a little list of rules of what we can do there. Is that – this is kind of tricky. Similar to that idea but not exactly the same.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, we're working on a face sheet to address the new States laws and Council action when it happens on April 17<sup>th</sup> to memorialize what the second dwelling unit standards would be.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, because I've been getting a lot of requests from homeowners about what can we do. I don't think I have anything else to contribute so pass on.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, let me start with all and all I think it's a nice design and basically the overall concept of it. I agree that the orientation ought to be the way it is as compared to the way it originally was on Channing or I should say oriented that way. I agree with my fellow Board Members that some of the detailing are really what makes or breaks one of these designs. I agree with you Peter as far as some of the issues that you mentioned. As far as the palm tree, I just have an aversion to palm trees and maybe it's because of my age because I'm with you. I use to design shopping centers and stuff, way back in the stone age and we would buy these 40-foot trees down from southern California. They would ship them up in a flatbed and you want ten of them, you want twenty of them. No big deal. That's why you see so many shopping centers and areas where they have these massive palm trees that don't really fit here. I don't think they are appropriate for the area. Maybe in southern California or in Hollywood or whatever type thing but up here – so as far as – I mean, as far as I'm concerned, they can bulldoze those puppies down and it wouldn't phase me at all but that as it may, I do agree – talking about trees, is that I do have a big concern about that live oak in the back and trying to cram a two-story building underneath that. I agree with that completely. I think that needs to be either reexamined or depending on exactly how they lay this out; if an arborist says yes, you can do a certain amount of trimming. As you said, I've always had situations where going that far underneath the canopy, it's just a definite no, no. Now, let's see, as far as – a couple of the concerns that the neighbors had. I'm always amazed that the first concern that people seem to have with a two-story house is privacy and my neighbor is going to be looking down on me. The

way I see it, the way – actually, I think the architect had a lot of sensitivity. The house at 400 Channing that looks down at 915 Waverly is really the only window that has any sort of peeking tom ability is right in the middle of the stairway. I mean, I really don't think my neighbor is going to stand there on their stairway, half way up, to look down into the neighbor's house. It a – I just don't see it. They have been very sensitive in the master bedroom to put the two small little windows there on each side of which I assuming is going to be the headboard for the – so, all in all, I think a lot of sensitivity was given to that. They've also put up the wall by the balcony that's there to prevent that sort of thing. A balcony I can see more where you're sitting there having a cup of coffee and looking down at your neighbor. That's why I think they've done a good job at that. Let's see, what else? I also agree that the – I should say, the one on Channing is – I agree that the 4-feet is a little tight but the benefit is also that for the neighboring house, the driveway is there so it's not the typical 5-feet on each side where the two houses are 10-feet apart. There actually is probably the 15+foot difference between that so I think the 5-feet or the 4-feet is probably ok. I agree that those – the units in the back really – I don't know if you want to call it – where designed by a different person but they were obviously afterthoughts. I mean the reality of it is, these are spec. houses so when a customer comes in, they are interested in buying the big residence not whatever is in the back yard. The effort has been put – that being on both qualities, detailing, and everything else, the money is thrown in the front house and not the back house. I agree that they should match more; it's a single package. Those can be – again, let me back up a little bit. The sensitivity as far as view or looking into the neighbor I think was well done. Again, the smaller windows at the property line and that sort of thing but just the overall design can be toned down somewhat. You can have a lower plate height so I mean, those things are very doable. All in all, I think it's a really good start but it depends on how far we want to push this. That – I think that probably a redesign or some minor modifications, I think, are probably a reasonable request.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you and Mike.

Board Member Makinen: Thank you, sir. I think the project blends in well with the community. I would say that the main thing that people are going to see is the facades of these two houses. They are not going to be seeing the sides or the back of the houses to any real extent so the façade is probably the most prominent things of interest to these Boards and Commissions. Looking at drawing C- -- C.1, where unit number one is shown with the close proximity to the lot line, which has been previously mentioned. It just occurs to me that that really is almost an impossibility to get a car into that garage. It would seem to me from the space that's available there and it just looks to me that there could be a possibility that if the garage was moved closer to unit number two, you'd have a better shot of actually getting a car in and out. I don't think that's (inaudible) as a garage once it gets built because there's simply not enough turning radius. You could go to the exotic solution of putting in a turntable in there to get your car in and out but that's probably not in the cards right now. I think the proximity to the lot line and that I was kind of surprised that it's that close but I guess that's what the zoning allows so they built it as close as they can. I would prefer to see

a bigger setback from the property line. I think the general appearance of the façade of the house is in good harmony with the adjacent properties and I generally support the effort of the architect.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Thank you to all the Board Members for some really great comments. I don't think I have anything new to add. I think that the – Beth?

Board Member Bunnenberg: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok. Thank you, Beth. I don't think that I have anything to add that hasn't already been said. I would just say that my own – the things that popped out in my mind was – where the carriage house underneath the oak tree and the privacy too – privacy and screening to the lot on Channing. I forgot the – 426 Channing. Those really popped out in my mind and – but I do generally agree with many of the comments that have been made by other Board Members. Beth?

Board Member Bunnenberg: We did not address the historic structures report on the existing building and I completely agree with that this building could be demolished because it does not have really any integrity left of the building because it had been cobbled up from a residence to a business building, with several different additions. I don't see any problem with the demolition.

Chair Lew: Ok and I have one follow-up. Robert, you had mentioned the stair window on lot one that looks onto 915 Waverly. S, I just wanted to point out that if you look on the elevations, which is sheet A5, right? The architect has got it in the stair landing and I don't have a scale with me but I think that we're looking at something like – that the window sill height there at the landing itself is 5-feet.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: Right?

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Chair Lew: The view – I guess – and it's the opaque glass.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I understand (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Right so I think they were saying – yeah, I just want to make sure that its'...

Board Member Gooyer: The only comment was that that would be the only one you could even attempt to (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Right and I'm just saying that to get a sight line, you would be back – at the back, into the stair. That was all that I wanted to mention. Any other comments from – Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I had one comment to address the issue that Commission Baltay brought up about the canary island palms, which are not Fiji tall (inaudible), Robert. These guys like more water but section 2.10 of the DHS standards on page 100 directs us to preserve significant vegetation on the site; not just oak trees. If we think this is significant vegetation, then it's worth of our attention and it's probably eligible for some kind of covenant condition that requires its continuation and maintenance.

Chair Lew: Anybody else? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Well, one of us thinks the trees are significant and one of us clearly does not. I see nine people up here. The applicant is not getting clear direction. This is what we are supposed to be here for, is to...

Board Member Gooyer: Seeing thought that I'm the one who said you can bulldoze those down as far as I was concerned. I don't think that's an appropriate thing. Obviously, I was being somewhat (inaudible). I'm just saying that I am not a fan of palm trees. That's not to say that if they are in this condition and from what I saw there, they're in perfectly healthy condition and in good shape, then they should stay obviously.

Board Member Baltay: I would really like to hear whether they are considered historic in any sense. To me, when I walk around Palo Alto, there are many houses with Stately palm trees that help set them off from many, many places. Is that something that should be considered as part of the historic record of these properties? We have the historic Board here.

Board Member Wimmer: Yes, we have had an extensive conversation about the importance of the landscape in historic – on historic sites and on historic properties. We do consider that as one of the elements that we talk about when we are looking at the Secretary of Interior Standards when we are evaluating a project. Obviously, we look at the existing heritage trees on the site and try to protect those. In consideration that those palm trees have been on this site for a significant amount of time, would probably include those in a historic setting in terms of the landscape but when the landscape changes so quickly with drought situations and things where – it's not like a structure. The landscape is more sort of a – it's not a structure that can be maintained like a building. It's something that – it's a live thing that something survives and sometimes doesn't. The landscape is always changing but yes, I do think that considering that these palm trees have been on this site, we would probably consider them as part of the historic fabric of the site, so to speak.

Board Member Kohler: Having just talked about moving it, it sounds like that if those trees are in good shape, could probably just be picked up and moved on the site.

Chair Lew: Ok, I think – let's – we're – I think we're running a little bit behind schedule. Why don't we try to work on motions and we're going to do that separately? So, HRB will make their motion first so I'm going to turn it over to Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: Right, so because our Chair is – had a conflict and then our Vice Chair David Bower, is absent today. I’m going to the interim Chair. I wanted to see if our Board had any comments that we – any discussion quickly. If anyone has any remaining comments on this project in terms of ...

Board Member Kohler: Well, I just have to agree with the previous comments from other – well, there’s only – well, there’s four of us. I think just in the end here, if that one palm tree could be moved, I think that would be a nice jester for – that it remain on the site, that would be a good historic thing to do.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Wimmer: Maybe we can start putting together a motion and I’m sure that we can have conditions or suggestions within our motion. I guess, to craft a motion, I would move to accept the project with a couple of conditions. Maybe one of the conditions would be to protect – Rodger, are you saying to protect the palm trees or to...

Board Member Kohler: Well, that the existing palm tree that’s being removed should at least be looked into whether it could – that’s on the site and that we’re talking about removing. Maybe it can be moved on the site somewhere; relocated. Instead of just – it might be less expensive too – I don’t know but...

Mr. Lait: Vice Chair Wimmer, if I can offer a suggestion on to (inaudible) process. If you want to articulate a motion such as the one that you’ve start, which was to move to approve the project subject to conditions. You could either identify those conditions and then get a second on that or could start with the base motion of motion to approve the project, get a second on that. Then we can do some amendments to add some of the conditions based on the HRB’s interest to add conditions. I think on that first point of approving the project, there might be some -- it might be good to see if there’s a second and support for that concept as opposed to an alternative motion, which might be continued for redesign and based on the discussion that’s taken place this evening or excuse me, morning. I get confused on my meetings.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok, so...

Mr. Brennan: If could just interrupt real...

Board Member Wimmer: Sure.

Mr. Brennan: I think it’s worth noting that in the arborist report provided by the applicant, it states that the palm tree #10, which is the palm tree in question was requested to be removed at the neighbor’s request. It continues on saying that it can be relocated quite easily with an experienced mover.



Board Member Wimmer: To get back to a motion.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Kohler: Well, I'll move that we approve the project with the conditions that we've mentioned or will mention.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok so...

Board Member Kohler: We're going to make a motion to approve the project as presented and then we're going to add conditions? Is that the way you want us to do this?

Board Member Wimmer: I guess – I know we're going to put some conditions on the approval if we do find that we have approved the project. I guess first we are being asked to agree that we would approve the project and then if – we would amend that motion, I believe to add some condition. Is that the process that you...

Mr. Lait: Yeah, that's – I think – exactly right. Based on the dialog that I am hearing, a motion to approve the project, see if there is a second and then we can go through the process – without voting yet, then go through the process of adding some conditions to that.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Wimmer: I guess I'm proposing a motion that we approve the project.

Board Member Kohler: I'll second that.

Board Member Wimmer: All in favor?

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry before you conclude that section. We're actually not going to vote at this point.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok.

Mr. Lait: We're going to see if there's a moment for additional conditions related to trees or things of that – of the dialog that is taking place and then we can do a vote when we understand what all the conditions are.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok, so now we should talk about the conditions that we'd like to impose on the motion.

Mr. Lait: Yes, and these would-be amendments to the motion.

Board Member Kohler: 20-years I've been on this Board. It's the first time that we've had such a precise motion.

Mr. Lait: I accept that as a compliment. Then you, sir.

Board Member Wimmer: We're working now on the conditions of approval.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I guess I would see that the palm tree that's, at the moment, being removed be relocated on the site.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok, any other conditions?

Board Member Kohler: Is there a second to that?

Board Member Bunnenberg: Do we want to put some protection on the oak trees?

Board Member Wimmer: Well, there will be tree protection. Do you want any other further protection? They will be required to do a tree protection plan and I believe there's a program arborist, is there not on the project? The project will be monitored monthly by a project arborist who has to come by the site once a month during construction to make sure that the trees are being taken care of. I think that's already something that's in place with the building permit. I would like – I guess I would like to have a condition about the detached structure that it at least meets a 5-foot minimum setback or something because that detach structure is closer to the adjacent property at 426 Channing. Those – the detached structure is closer to that building than the main dwellings on the site. I would like to see that those buildings be moved a little bit further away from the property line. I would impose a condition that they be at least 5-feet from the property line.

Board Member Kohler: I can't quite read the dimension. It's 4-feet something already.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, it's less than 5-feet.

Board Member Kohler: It's 4-feet 6 or 8, I can't – anyone with better eyesight maybe...

Board Member Wimmer: So maybe – go ahead.

Mr. Brennan: Are you...

Board Member Kohler: On the one side – the other side is 3-feet something.

Mr. Brennan: Are you referencing the rear yard setback for the accessory or the garage structure?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes. Mostly the one that's facing Channing because I know that -- as long as – I mean, I know that they probably have to comply with the day line plane (crosstalk)

Mr. Brennan: To be clear, the garage – the ground floor garage structure is setback 3-feet, which is the minimum requirement in the DHS zoning district and its tier back at the second level 4 1/2-feet.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok.

Board Member Kohler: So, it's 6-inches. I would accept that motion. I don't see why it can't be 5-feet.

Board Member Wimmer: Ok.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I guess you have to take...

Mr. Lait: Yeah, so then is there a second to the – was there a first and second to the second story being setback 5-feet? Did – I think it was Board Member Kohler who made that motion?

Board Member Wimmer: I think he's...

Board Member Kohler: Oh, it is 3-feet. (crosstalk) Oh, I see. Oh, this is very deceptive. Ok, well, finally after seeing the drawings here. The actual house is now at 3-feet and the second floor is at 4-foot 6-inches. That's what I am finally understanding. To move the house over 5-feet would be another 2-feet – oops. Sorry. How do I turn this off?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think the difference is if you wanted...

Board Member Kohler: Put it down on the floor.

Ms. Gerhardt: Did you want the 5-foot setback for the first story, which is the garage and/or the second-story, which is the ADU?

Board Member Wimmer: I would prefer to see it for the entire structure; from the foundation, up. I know that that may be – that's not fair because if ...

Board Member Kohler: All these years, that's the first time that's happened.

Board Member Wimmer: ...project is already designed in compliance with the local zoning ordinance, I don't know if we can overstep that.

Mr. Lait: So yeah, you have authority with your findings where if you feel -- based on those findings and if you articulate that, that would be great for the record. Why the building would need to be setback beyond the minimum standard and I understand that there may be some – there's been some reference to privacy concerns and interest in better protection for the trees in the area. I think that's a sufficient cause for moving it back.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, so I would like to see it move back so that's how I would amend the motion to approve is with the foundation at a 5-foot setback from the property line because that at least allows a little bit more clearance from the adjacent Channing property that looks like it's – that's probably considered a historic building itself.

Mr. Lait: Ok, so that's a motion and then the question would be is there a second for that?

Board Member Bunnenberg: Second the motion.

Mr. Lait: Ok, so we have a condition to relocated the palm tree and a condition to set the structure back 5-feet from the (inaudible) property line. Is this from a side property line or both property line?

Board Member Wimmer: I guess it would legally be the rear property line...

Mr. Lait: Rear?

Board Member Wimmer: ...because an interior side, a street side, a front...(crosstalk)

Mr. Lait: Ok, 5-feet from the rear.

Board Member Wimmer: ...and that would be the rear.

Board Member Kohler: I have some further information delivered to me by a secret person. If we do that, then the distance between the garage and the main house goes from 21 to 19-feet in the back. I don't know if that's going to be – or the house – the main house moves up a foot towards the street.

Mr. Lait: If I can – just a procedural inquiry. If we could take a pause just a moment on the HRB motion and I'm wondering if the – just on some of the comments that I've heard from the ARB if the ARB is heading in a direction of approval with conditions or with a redesign – articulated reasons for the project coming back. If the project is going to come back at least by one of the Boards, then it would come back to both Boards. I'm wondering if we need to understand all these different conditions if the ARB is not going to be inclined to approve the project this morning. I don't know if you want to do a straw poll or some kind of...

Chair Lew: I was just thinking that why don't we do a straw poll for – with -- for the ARB with regards to the carriage houses because it seems like the ARB is much more split on the – on how the carriage houses are working. I guess I would ask the question to the Board. Is the – does the Board want to completely redesign – well, why don't we start (inaudible). Does the Board want to eliminate the carriage houses? We can take a...

Board Member Gooyer: No.

Chair Lew: ... a vote on that or should we say both – one or both?

Board Member Furth: No.

Vice Chair Kim: No.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Board Member Baltay: I don't want to eliminate the carriage houses. I do want to see a – more design work done.

Chair Lew: Ok, well that's the second – my second question would be that does the Board want to see a complete redesign of the carriage houses?

Board Member Furth: I – see if this is helpful. I think this needs redesign work. I don't – I think it may involve more than the carriage houses. It may require other...

Chair Lew: Sure.

Board Member Furth: ...changes on the site but I'm not prepared to approve it with conditions as it stands.

Chair Lew: Ok, it's a redesign and resubmittal?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I think that – I think the term complete redesign is a bit excessive. I think they need to have the same level of quality as the main residence, which they don't at this point. There may need to be some redesign on the main residence to compensate for that.

Chair Lew: That's why I said – used the word complete because if we were asking for like a larger carriage house or if we're talking about moving the carriage house 2-feet closer towards Waverly, then that's going to affect the house. So, that's... (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: ...(inaudible) minor but it is...

Board Member Gooyer: I'm not asking for a larger carriage house mainly because I understand the City's concept of what to use it for but I think, in reality, it's going to become either a place to – if they are going to rent it all, it's a student. Either one or two students, not a family that's going to live there. I think the size of the unit is ok. I just think it needs to be – the quality needs to be brought up and maybe the height reduced slightly; that sort of thing.

Chair Lew: Peter, I did want to ask you about – you had commented on the backup for lot two of – from the carriage house. Did you have an inclination about that? Would it be an attached garage or removing the redwood tree or what are your thoughts about that?

Board Member Baltay: My thoughts right now, I'd like to address my colleagues on the Historic Resources Board because I feel that putting a blanket requirement that we move that carriage house over is going to really make it even more difficult to make this site developed. What would really be helpful is if the Historic Resources Board could point to us the historic nature of what we need to be looking out for? The issue of moving the carriage house over based on privacy is not a historic issue. The issue of allowing parking is very important and when you make a motion like just move it over 5-feet, that sort of cascades through the system and it results in an impossible design and really hamstringing other Boards to do their job. At the same time, if the house next door had some historic aspect that we're not aware of, we don't see it here, that's what we need to know. If there's any way you, the Board, could somehow focus on what's the historic part of this house, this neighborhood, this property, these trees and inform us where to go with it, that would really be helpful.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) there is the driveway in between those two so it's not like they are both budded right up to each other.

Board Member Baltay: That's right. Yeah and I'm not sure I agree that the carriage house should be farther away. I think it's not a privacy issue but I'm more just looking to get some feedback and also, just to make it possible. These are really tight lots.

Board Member Kohler: I'd be willing to not require the 5-foot setback because it does – now that I am looking at it again and everything. It does – I'm not sure how the location of that house is – has to do with our historic – is there an existing building on the site that is that close or anything? I just...

Board Member Wimmer: Maybe as a Board, we just need to better define our scope and how we're looking at this project. We are looking – we've already looked at the existing site and determined that we're fine about it being demolished because we don't see it as a historic site. Beyond that, have we identified any adjacent properties that are historic? Are any of the adjacent properties – I don't believe that that was in the report so the adjacent properties are not considered needing protection from the – they are not deemed historic?

Board Member Furth: Not in the SOFA document.

Board Member Wimmer: Not in the SOFA document, right.

Mr. Brennan: Right, not in the SOFA document. It wasn't in the analysis – in the HRE report.

Board Member Wimmer: In terms of our Board and how we look at projects because the existing site is not considered historic, we're fine about the demolition of the existing structure. I guess because there are no documented historic adjacent properties that we would have to be sensitive to, I guess our – getting back to our motion. Maybe we just move to approve the project because of the – it's not affecting the historic – existing historic site or the historic – there's no historic surrounding structures that are impacted. Therefore, we would approve...

Mr. Lait: Sure.

Board Member Wimmer: ...approve the project.

Mr. Lait: Just procedurally, I might offer a suggestion, which would be to – since we know that one of the reviewing entities here is going to continue the matter. It might be – I think the record reveals that the Board – the HRB doesn't have any concern relative to the historic elements of the project but perhaps indifference to the ARB, I would recommend continuation of the project. When you reconvene, I suspect there's not going to be a whole lot of issues for the HRB to talk about. So, too – if that sounds acceptable to the HRB, perhaps withdraw your original motion to approve and make a new motion to continue for redesign and – or just continue the matter to a future hearing. You don't even have to say redesign, you can just say continue to a future hearing.

Board Member Wimmer: Since we don't – since we've already established that there's really no historic concern for this property. I think that maybe our Board can just approve it because of that. Then we allow the HRB to -- excuse me, the ARB to continue it and discuss the nuances of the project and how it can be improved because if there's no historic impact, we're done right? I mean because it seems like we tend to start talking about setbacks and heights and things but that's really the ARB's purview to discuss the zoning and if there's no historic impact then I think our Board can just improve it and we wouldn't have to review it again. Is that correct?

Mr. Lait: I think the SOFA I standards set forth the review authority and does require the ARB and the HRB to come together and be a part of this process. I would recommend – while I understand your interest in wanting to resolve the matter since it seems to address the HRB's issues. That perhaps just a continuation and we'll bring the two Boards together again when the project gets redesigned and comes forward.

## **PREVIOUS MOTION WITHDRAWN AND A NEW MOTION PROPOSED**

Board Member Wimmer: Ok, so I'll withdraw my original motion and I will move to continue this project for future review. Continue it and have the applicant make some changes to the project and review it again. Do I have a second to continue the project?

Board Member Kohler: I can second. Sure.

Board Member Wimmer: All in favor of continuing the project. That's unanimous with the HRB.

### **MOTION PASSES 4-0**

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you, Margaret. We'll bring it back to the ARB. Does anyone want to try and make a motion?

Board Member Baltay: Can I ask a question of Staff first? I'd like to somehow try to limit the FAR to being based on the 5,000-square foot maximum lot size and also to require that the guest house be .1 FAR minimum. Is there any mechanism by which we can do that?

Ms. Gerhardt: We would just need to take a looking at the findings and see how that would tie into those.

Chair Lew: I would say that we're not generally – we're not a rulemaking body. I mean that I would suggest that if you want to keep them smaller, that we just – I mean, I think the easiest thing would be to say that it's out of scale. Yeah? Anybody? Wynne, you're mic?

Board Member Furth: Oh, sorry.

Chair Lew: Yes?

Board Member Furth: We're required to find that this project is consistent with the policies, programs, and regulations of the coordinated area plan. That's why we are here. I think there are policies in the CAP that would permit us to talk about – first of all, it's pro-housing and pro-multiple units so that encourages us to find a way to accommodate four units on this site with – at least four units on this site without making things out of scale or with inappropriate impacts on the neighbors. So, I think that give us the power if the presented design presents those problems to modify it – to request that it be modified. One of the things that strike me is that – is there no landscape plan on this application?

Mr. Brennan: No comprehensive landscape plan.

Board Member Furth: I find that a bit – it's making it harder for me because one of the findings we are supposed to make is that it provides essential usable open space for each unit and I'm having trouble distinguishing places where a car is going to go over it, from places where it isn't. It would be very helpful to have a plan which identifies the proximate useable open space that we're supposed to provide by each unit under 2.10D. I also think that because this is a deep lot, this is the biggest possible lot in the DHS district. To me, that means there's more freedom if it's needed to have larger setbacks for the rear unit for example. I don't think that we need to feel that we can't accommodate housing on the site of the kind that is contemplated and encouraged by



the plan unless we push everything to maximum setbacks. I suppose my – one of my concerns is that we not be creating dead and dusty spaces with inadequate light and air to work. That's another reason why I am curious about the usable open space. I also think that the section 2.10C directs us to preserve significant vegetation and while there are a lot of trees I hate, these aren't among them so I think that that provides us with authority to ask for site modifications with respect to the protection of the trees. I will say that having watched a lot of Stanford oak die during recent construction efforts, I'm very concerned that the project that is presented needs to be modified in that regard. Maybe that's just rattling on too long but ...

Chair Lew: Can I...

Board Member Furth: ... we have authority under the plan to do anything I've heard discussed today.

Chair Lew: Can I – on your point about useable open space. I think what we have done in the past on projects – say like on Alma Village, is that we did ask the applicant to show diagrammatically how the back yard could be used but they weren't landscaping it and they weren't required to install it but they did show possible layouts. Is that what you're looking for?

Board Member Furth: Yeah. I'm not asking what plants are going to go in the pots or whatever but I'm asking what is usable open space. I also – I suppose I want to know is when they have these setbacks, are they big enough? Do they have enough light so that they could be used? For example, for screening or not or are they one of those where nothing grows but Algerian ivy.

Chair Lew: Right. Ok. We could add a condition of approval to show or we could ask if we are continuing the project, we could ask them to come back with a – what do you call in? Landscape furnishing diagrams and then if we do require – if we do want landscaping, I think we can show – we can ask for the planting plan, which actually shows the size of plants and 3-feet -- I mean, if you're just going to say 3-feet like a typical shrub-like an (inaudible) shrub. That would easily be 5-feet in diameter so it wouldn't fit without constant pruning. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to make a motion in that we continue this project to a date uncertain. Asking for a redesign from the applicant based on all the comments we've heard this morning and I'd like to give just five basic points that I think that are important that need to be focused on. One is that we would really like to see the better effort made for tree protection, especially the large coast oak in the back. Secondly, we need to be sure that the parking – the garage placement is such that you can get in and out of these garages properly. Thirdly, we would like to see a geotechnical report to understand better the issue of dewatering and whether that will be required. Fourthly, we'd like to see a landscaping plan to understand how the open spaces will be provided and then we would like to see a number of design detailing – let's rephrase that. We'd like to see the accessory structures to be redesigned to be more in keeping

with the designs of the main house. To me, those are the five major points and I think we really do the applicant a service to outline what is important.

Board Member Gooyer: I can support that.

Chair Lew: Ok, do you want to speak to the second or no?

Board Member Gooyer: I mean I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Ok. Yes, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: I just had a question to the maker and secondary whether – you all raised a number of comments about – design specific comments around the principle structures. Are those also something you'd like address or?

Board Member Baltay: Yes. My first comment was that subject to all the comments we've made this morning which would ... (crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: ...incorporate many of the design details. I think that was clear to the applicant and there was enough support but I want to be sure that they understand that tree protection is an issue and that means that you're not going to build under the oak tree. I want to be clear that they understand that. That's a big issue and it's going to affect your design. The parking has to work and that means not having a 20-foot backup space. A geotechnical report needs to find out about dewatering. You've heard how important – at least some of us feel about that. Landscaping plan means that you need to show outdoor spaces that are viable outdoor places that work. I don't need to say anything about the accessory structure redesign.

Chair Lew: We have a motion that has been seconded. Let's vote on the motion. All in favor? Opposed? None so that's 5-0.

### **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0**

Chair Lew: We normally allow a – Staff, should we allow a rebuttal period to the applicant or if it's a continuation, should we address it later?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I think – you know, I appreciate the interest in wanting to move on to get to the other items on your busy agenda. However, if the – there was a lot of dialogs and it probably is worth giving the applicant a moment or two to at least ask – responded to any questions they may have in addressing the comments they've heard.

Chair Lew: Great. Do you have any—if you have any questions or statements that you would like to make.

Ms. Quan: Thank you so much for the comments. Talking about the tree protections for lot one. The reason we are putting the garage over there is because the existing building line is in almost the same location at the proposed garage. Also, we talked to the City Arborist and the City Arborist reviewed our project (inaudible) report and the City Arborist also reviewed it. That was why we were thinking of the garage location to be under the oak tree. It should have a pretty minimal impact on the tree but we are going to take a detailed look because the garage is an (inaudible) and the existing building; I think the foundation is (inaudible) so we are not doing the basement excavation in that area so that should be fine. We are going to talk to the arborist in detail on this issue. The second thing about the dewatering. We did talk with (inaudible) we do have a preliminary (inaudible) report. Of our finding, we don't need to do dewatering in that area but we are going to provide a detailed (inaudible) report later. We are going to do the landscape plan and also, I think for the parking, Peter, I think you have a question about how the cars return and how they can get out from the garage. I did do some studies and I think (inaudible) – City of Palo Alto has a parking standard so I did study the parking standard. For the public, they don't have a detailed standard for residential, only for parking lots – standard parking law. I think they require that if it's 18-feet deep or 19-feet deep, they – I can't remember the number in detail but I think it's around 22-feet to return – the backspace but I am going to study the parking again. I think – basically, I think the five items that we are going to provide more detail design. Especially for the accessory building because of the accessory building – it's pretty close to the property lines so we have to a fire protection issue. For example, the eave, it's difficult to put the eave in the detached garage since it is very close to the property line so we have the fire protection structure for the garage. That's why the design is a little bit different from the main house but we are going to tune it up a little bit for that.

Board Member Gooyer: Can I suggest one thing? What we are saying is that you may have looked into all those things but we haven't seen those. Let me suggest, if you can get an arborist that says that you can put it right where you show it is and it won't hurt the tree at all, that would be fine as far as I'm concerned. As far as the – any of the other items, if you have a report that says that dewatering isn't necessary, either get the engineer or whatever, who created that report to write a letter that states that that's the case; I'm fine with that. As far as the packability or movability, if you can overlay the City standard on that and say look, see it works, I'd be ok with it. I mean, how do you feel – we're not saying you need to create all this extra stuff. If there's already verification that you've researched that these things work, all we need to do is see that.

Mr. Quan: Ok. I will provide some diagrams. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you very much.

Board Member Furth: Alex? It would be -- sometimes when we get plans that are redevelopments of sites, the new development overlays on the existing structures footprint and I find that helpful. (Inaudible) (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) or having an existing site plan.

Board Member Furth: In thinking about trees, I'm concerned about canopy as well as roots. Thanks.

Chair Lew: OK. That only took use 2-hour. We might be here all day you guys.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 901 High Street [15PLN-00052]:**

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Coordinated Development Permit for a 17,942 Square Foot Mixed Use Building With Retail and 25

Residential Units on a Vacant 20,288 Square Foot Parcel. Environmental Assessment:

An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated From February 26, 2016 to March 17, 2016. Zoning District: RT-35. For More Information, Contact the

Project Planner Margaret Netto at [margaret.netto@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:margaret.netto@cityofpaloalto.org)

Chair Lew: Let's move onto – well, we're going to take a quick break just to get the Chair back from the HRB. Ok, excellent. We'll take a – let's take a very short break. You have 2-minutes. I'm going to time you guys. [VIDEO STARTED MID SENTENCE] 901 High street. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a coordinated development permit for a 17,942-square foot mixed-use building with retail and 25 residential units on a vacant 20,288-square foot parcel. Environmental assessment is an initial study/mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated from February 26, 2016, to March 17, 2016, and the zone district is RT. Welcome, Margaret Netto who is our planner for the project.

Ms. Margaret Netto, Contract Planner: Thank you. Good morning Chair and Members of the Board. My name is Margaret Netto and I am one of the contract planners. As noted, the proposed project would involve demolition of the existing asphalt and construction of a new 17,000-sqaure foot, three-story mixed used building and surface parking. The project would be located on a 20,000-square foot lot. The project is located in the SOFA II area. It's been one year since the Architectural Review Board and the Historic Resources Board has seen this project. At that time, the applicant was requesting eleven residential units, 5,000-square feet of office and 1,00-sqaure feet of retail. The project was also subject at that time to the interim office growth meter ordinance. Since then, the project has been revised to include twenty-five residential units, eliminated the office component entirely and redesigned aspects of the building and parking circulation to respond to the ARB/HRB comments. This was the previous elevation that the joint Board looked at about a year ago. The members were generally supportive of the project but had some comments. The comments were related to the overall massing of the building, the fenestration, roof forms, landscaping and transition to the properties east of the property that warranted further study. The proposed surface

parking lot was another challenging of the design, which included parking lifts. The HRB commented on the proposed structure in regards to the two historic structures across the street; Watercourse Way and the Creamery Building. The HRB did request that the color accent be subtle and subordinate to the accent buildings, requested a correction in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and sought to have the transition and scale of the third-floor adjacent to High Street be improved. These items have been addressed in this submittal. This is the proposed elevation. This is looking at the corner of Channing and High Avenue. The applicant has made refinements to the colors, materials, placements of balconies, increased the building setbacks at the upper levels and articulation. Improved the fenestration and updated the landscapes plans, in an effort to respond to the Board Member's comments. This is the site plan. The applicant eliminated the office component and with that, reduced the required parking and resulted in the elimination of those parking lifts. The applicant reports that underground parking is restricted by mature trees along the premiere of the site, reducing the number of space that could be accommodated with the subterranean garage. Here are some of the elevations. That top elevation is the south elevation and that's the view from High Street. The balconies on the south have been (inaudible) back to provide modulation and if you look on your sheet A-S9, it shows that the balconies have been added on second and third level units to articulate that façade. Including using larger windows in the living room, dinner room and smaller windows in the kitchen. A revised sheet A-S9 also shows the High-Street elevation as it's been redesigned by reducing the accent color to just the retail area. More glazing has been added to the store front and the second-floor has changed from stucco to metal panel. The west elevation is a view from Channing Street and the east elevation is a view from the adjacent property and they have (inaudible). The second and third floors have been stepped back. This is the north elevation, the rear of the project. A little bit on the ARB/HRB purview, a new development in the SOFA requires a coordinated development permit as opposed to an architectural review and other entitlements. SOFA is – SOFA II established its own review process, which is subject to review by HR –ARB in a manner that is consistent to the Board's review process of any other projects. The HRB role in this project is advisory to the ARB since it does not trigger any of the historic resources. The key issues talk a little bit about – the applicant has made significant improvements reducing the height, replaced the butterfly style roof with a series of four flat rooves, added more thoughtfully designed outdoor space and created pedestrian scale entrances to the residential units adjacent to High Street. Three areas that we would like Board to comment on is Staff believes that – both of them relate to a screening of the surface parking lot. The Channing elevation near the driveway approach is the proposed location for the building transformer. More information is needed to understand how landscaping in that area will successfully screen that transformer and the surface parking spaces behind it. The Board is also asked to explore whether a substantial wall that incorporates the bench or irrigated landscaping that does not impact the oak tree as a preferred design solution. Adjacent to High Street, there's a lattice structure that appears to be intended to support climbing vines or plant material to eventually screen the views of the parking area in the back. The three key issues are screening the surface parking lot, landscaping near the oak tree, and also the lattice structures. With that, Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board take the following actions.

Recommend approval of the proposed initial study Mitigated Negative Declaration, recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of the Planning and Community Environment based on the findings and subject to the condition of approval. That concludes my Staff report and the applicant is also here to do a presentation. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Staff, did you...

Mr. Lait: Just to remind you disclosures.

Chair Lew: Oh, yes. Disclosures? Anybody? No? Martin.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Lew. I've walked past this property and I've also been a customer of 900 High Street; delicious sandwiches and I've seen the property as a – numerous times. Thank you.

Board Member Kohler: Kind of a repeat of what Martin just said. In fact, I drove by there this morning.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you. So, we can do the – Kyu, did you – no, ok. Applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

[Mr. Greg Beckencourt:] Good morning still, I think. Yeah, good morning. Greg [phonetics][Beckencourt], [Beckencourt] and Santana, 900 High Street. A little closer to the microphone, ok. Thank you. Is that better? Ok, thank you. I don't want to spend a lot of time reiterating what Margaret just said but – so, from our last engagement here, we have come back to you now with a project that we believe substantially answers a lot of your concerns and questions. Obviously, the nature here has changed a lot. We've gone basically to residential but we've kept that retail bottom level component and we think – we have also achieved a higher aesthetic, thanks to your input last time as well so we hope that you work with us on this one this time. Thank you very much, that's it. Peter, will answer your questions now.

Mr. Peter Ko: Good morning all the Members to the ARB and the HRB. My name is Peter Ko with Ko Architects. We came in front of you last year which was March 17 of 2016 so that's been more than a year. Thanks for the Planning Department, we've been working together with the – all the Planning Department in Palo Alto and have come to a – I think it's a better design for the property, which I've been – our office has been right across the street and has been there for 20-years. Just the property has been vacant and it has a picnic table there and for the last – it has been a long time. I'm looking forward to seeing if we can do something on this vacant lot. I – the first picture there, I wanted to show that that's the building we proposed last year and this is the new rendering from the corner, looking to the plaza area open space and then also, the Peninsula Creamer Deli across the street. Again, this is the zoning map of the City of Palo Alto. We are zoning on RT-35 and it's for multi-residential unit development. This is our site plan. On the ground level plan, we have parking for all the residential and retail. We meet all the parking requirements and we have located two units to the

ground level facing High Street, trying to screen the parking behind. The retail was located on Channing Street and the design of the retail – last comment was that the window moldings were too heavy and then we tried to mimic the Peninsula Creamery design across the street, which is a historical landmark in Palo Alto. We redesigned the store front and tried to reduce the size of the molding and tried to mimic the canopy across the street; also, the color. Basically, the retail design has more of the retail character and residential has its own smaller –more planters and little patio space and kind of like more residential breakdowns facing High Street. Channing Street is a one-way street and we just – that’s why we put the retail unit there. This is the elevation facing Channing – High Street on the top and then another one – the second one down is the Channing elevation. We just show some context photos and the one on the lower right is the four-story building that is residential, multi-unit condominiums across the street. This the view from looking down to where Whole Foods downtown from High Street. That’s looking down from downtown toward the residential. We tried to stepping the building down from the downtown (inaudible) to residential. This is the view on Channing Street looking toward the east or the north – north/east. This is looking toward the south from Channing Street. That blank wall is the parking garage service building next to our property and then one thing that it shows there is the tree – the live oak trees right there that we are trying to preserve. At least from our arborist report, it told us that you have to preserve that tree. The second-floor plan and on the third-floor plan you can see the large setback on the rear, close to the right. Exterior elevation we added a stone base to the ground level and then the second level will be stucco and then the third level will be metal siding. This is just – one of the comments was the night time view so we created some renderings from when you approach the building from High Street toward – walking to downtown. This is just the overall view of the project and this is a physical model. I brought two models, one is the one we did for last year’s presentation and also, we built a new model for the new project to present to the Board if you want to take a look. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. I will open this portion of the hearing up to the public but I don’t have any speaker cards. Oh – no, that’s for the next item for El Camino. We can move onto Board Member questions.

Board Member Furth: Could you show me on the tree plan where that big oak that we’re seeing in the photograph -- the one that looms over this project is? I’m having – I just want to be sure I’m looking in the right place. Right, that you – got it.

Mr. Ko: On the top left – there’s one existing oak tree on the top left there. That’s a pretty big size live oak tree.

Board Member Furth: That’s the tree that we’re seeing behind your project in that previous slide?

Mr. Ko: That’s the one sitting next to the trucks at the current situation. There are two existing live oaks, one is on the left top there and there’s another one – it’s on the second right that is aligned with that but that particular oak tree is not on our property,

it's on the other property. Most of the coverage is on our property in the parking lot. Those are the two live oak trees that our arborist recommended to preserve – those two trees.

Board Member Furth: Right. So that – in the photograph that you show on page AS4, view from Channing, that – the largest tree that I see in the background, that's the one on your neighbor's property or is that (inaudible).

Mr. Ko: It's on our property. If you look at the elevation we created...

Board Member Furth: Got it.

Mr. Ko: ... you can see that right next to the blank wall garage and our entry to the parking lot.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, for the applicant, please. I have a question about the extent of the fascia. What I am seeing is a red tapered fascia over the glazed (inaudible) coffee shop stuff and I saw in a perspective from the Staff showing that continuing all the way around to the stair over here. Then on your other view of the parking garage coming off of High Street, you seemed to show a tapered fascia there. Well, I'm confused. I'd like to know the extent of that tapered fascia compared to the flat eave and I'm not seeing that in the drawings. I'm sure I'm not reading it right so if you could help me.

Mr. Ko: I may go to the floor plan. You can see the retail units on the left, close to Channing and that's 1,000-square feet of retail space. The red canopy will cover pretty much the retail area. If you take a look at our elevation sheet AS-9, the top elevation on the left covers the retail. That's the tapered – you can see the tapered red cover and then also the lower right elevation facing Channing, you can see the red canopy. Basically, it's just on top of the retail space.

Board Member Baltay: Then the canopy over the parking entry off of High Street, that's all the way to the right-hand side of the south elevation on sheet AS-9. Is that a tapered canopy as well or...

Mr. Ko: No, it's just straight overhang.

Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry so I must have misunderstood the drawing.

Vice Chair Kim: I think the confusion was caused by the Staff presentation that had some older elevations. I actually noticed that and pointed that out to Chair Bernstein during the presentation.



Board Member Baltay: So, the intent is that the tapered red elevation is only over the retail space.

Mr. Ko: That's correct.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I think Martin has a couple questions.

Chair Bernstein: Alright, thank you, Mr. Ko. The a – one of the requirements for review from a historic point of view is that when there are historic buildings across the street or nearby, the compatibility materials – you're proposing a stone veneer on the first floor. Is there a sample that we can see? Thank you and then as that's being passed down, there's also a very visible element on your exterior elevation of the metal mesh panel. Is there a sample or I didn't see any details on the plans of what that looks like?

Mr. Ko: Yeah, the sample is on the top with the metal.

Chair Bernstein: Oh, this is the guard rail?

Mr. Ko: That's the corrugated metal on the top.

Chair Bernstein: Ok. I'm looking for the metal mesh panels for all the guards on all the balconies. That's a very visible element. I'm looking for a detail or what does that look like because that's going to be very visible?

Mr. Ko; The size – basically, perforated metal with holes – 1 ½-inch holes in it and then it would wrap around with the metal. That's -- we have – I don't know if we have any drawings in detail on that.

Chair Bernstein: I did not see a detail of that and what I am asking for is if there are any emphasis on the orientation of that or is it – are the patterns going to be horizontal, vertical, non-descript, random?

Mr. Ko: I don't think it will be horizontal or vertical. It's just going to be perforated metal. Frame it on every 4-feet of a post so every 4-feet or so, you have a post and then you have this perforated metal panels in between.

Chair Bernstein: How transparent is – are those panels? They are basically see through or are they mostly opaque, roughly?

Mr. Ko: Last year we had proposed a glass railing and it was totally transparent and I think there were some privacy concerns so that's why we proposed the perforated metal. It's about – I don't think it's even 50% transparent. (Inaudible) more in the cue of the privacy of the tenant behind because we have large windows, those are living space – living rooms and dining rooms behind it.

Chair Bernstein: What's the proposed finish from the street point of views? (Inaudible) what's the finish of that? Are those mesh panels?

Mr. Ko: The finish will be white – painted white because of it kind of matches all the aluminum finish. The window finish will be natural aluminum.

Chair Bernstein: Right. Ok, thank you. Those are my two questions for now. Thanks.

Chair Lew: Rodger.

Board Member Kohler: I just noticed – well, I just happened to look at the drawings here and I think if you look on page AS-3, the red strip of the Peninsula Creamery building, I assume that's why you picked up the red over your commercial space in the front?

Mr. Ko: Yes.

Board Member Kohler: Is that why you did that?

Mr. Ko: Yes.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, ok. Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for Staff. Margaret, in the – this is regarding common useable open space. Just a question and a comment. On page 1-10 of the packet, under common usable open space, the staff report talks about private open space. In the paragraph on the right-hand side is the private open space requirement provides 2,826-square feet. I think it's mixing up private and common. Yeah, so that's page 110, yeah.

Ms. Netto: I don't have the same packet, give me second.

Chair Lew: My understanding it in the RT zone, that there – for common open space, there isn't a square footage requirement. I was reading an old copy of the SOFA II so I don't know but you guys might have the latest – is that the – I guess as I was reading it, it was at the discretion of the Board to determine what is the – to what is appropriate but there are qualitative standards, which are mentioned in the Staff report. Like suitable for families and a variety of people and uses.

Ms. Gerhardt: In the SOFA document, it is refereeing to performance standards for private and common open space. I'd have to – we can look into it a little bit more.

Mr. Lait: You're correct. I'm reading here that is does indicated that the adequacy of the open space for the residents of the building shall be reviewed as part of the architectural review but it's not saying any specific standards.

Chair Lew: So then, I'm going to go – then in the plans, they are counting things that are like bike parking areas on the ground floor, which doesn't have very much sunlight and stuff. I was wondering how that was – how their number was calculated? Does it have to be – it's partly open to the sky but it's also being used for parking – for bike parking so should that be excluded from their counts.

Mr. Lait: So, if I am understanding the question, is there a double counting of parking and open space area? (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah, that's was my question and there is no numerical requirement but it seems like that's the ...

Mr. Lait: The qualitative consideration for that. We would not think that shared space – that a parking space or circulation space would also serve as an open space standard.

Chair Lew: Ok. Thank you. Any other questions? Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: I have a couple quick questions for the applicant. I'm sorry to make you have to go back and forth. First, just to be clear that bike storage and locker area in the center of the property, that's not a table or an umbrella. That's bike storage, is that correct?

Mr. Ko: Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Then the other question is regarding the parking entrance and exit on High Street. On both sides of that parking entrance, if I look at the elevation, it looks like there's some kind of a vertical planter. Could you clarify what the intent of the design is there?

Mr. Ko: We...

Vice Chair Kim: It would be the south elevation, I guess.

Mr. Ko: Yeah, that's the elevation on the top. Maybe I can pass along the model and you take a look. That's...

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, I'll take a look at the model. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions?

Board Member Kohler: I have a general question. These are apartment buildings, is that correct?

Mr. Ko: Yes, rental apartments.

Board Member Kohler: The rental apartment requires some much usable open space, is that correct?

Mr. Ko: Yes.

Board Member Kohler: I haven't done on in a while. So, your usable – I think it's follow-up on the question earlier. Is the one over here where is says bike storage, there's a usable area there and the area in the front, that's the corner next to the retail space? That's the other usable open area, is that correct?

Mr. Ko: Bicycle storage was in the middle of the courtyard.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, I see.

Mr. Ko: That's the circular...

Board Member Kohler: So, it's not really usable open space, it's just a parking area for bicycles.

Mr. Ko: It's a bicycle storage in the middle of the entrance space there.

Board Member Kohler: I don't know about -- the Planning Department's Staff, is this usable open space an issue or not? I'm not...

Mr. Ko: Last year when we proposed the parking storage, it was in the corner – up on the right-side corner where the landscaping is. I think what ARB's concern was that lockers are away from the tenants so that's why we relocated it closer to the circulation area but we still have a free open plaza at that corner as an open space.

Board Member Kohler: The corner up in the upper right-hand corner?

Mr. Ko: On Channing and High Street, yeah. That's (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: Then also Rodger, I think they're counting – if you look on the second-floor plan, they are counting some of the space in the outdoor hallways or corridors.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, but that's – to me, that's kind of suspect. I mean it's – you need a hallway of 3-4-feet and when you do that, you're ended up with a very small area. I'm just – at one time, I did a whole bunch of apartment buildings but Palo Alto – this Staff is saying the useable open space shown here meets all the requirements of the zoning ordinance? That's what I am trying to find out.

Ms. Netto: Yes, it does.

Board Member Kohler: Ok. Thank you.

Chair Lew: I just – I also want to comment that the private open space requirements for SOFA II are slightly different than our regular code.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, ok.

Chair Lew: It allows like 2-foot deep French balconies, which is a little different than our regular code.

Board Member Kohler: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok. Is that all for questions? Then we'll move onto Board Member comments and why don't we start in reverse this time so Mike.

Board Member Makinen: I think the plan to me, looks -- looked upon favorably. I think it replaces a pretty much-unutilized piece of property. It looks like it's vehicle storage there to something that is useful for the community too I think it's a net plus for the community. Sounds like the design has been tweaked over the past year to represent something that should be acceptable to the ARB. I don't think the HRB has any historic issues that are in our wheelhouse for this particular project. Correct me if I am wrong, my fellow HRB Board Members but I think we don't have any significant HRB issues. I think – Martin, do you want to chime in on that?

Chair Bernstein: Yeah. Thank you, Board Member Makinen. The – one of the requirements for SOFA II is that if there are any projects that are across the street or nearby a registered or listed historic structure, that the HRB does have review comments on that. It's a –

Board Member Makinen: Ok, then the contextuality issue would be something that you would be concerned with. Martin, with your comment then, I guess I see no impacts upon contextuality that this project presents so I would support the project.

Board Member Kohler: I could follow up, I just think there has been some reference – I like the red roof line extension over to the new site with the red commercial area. I think that's quite clever and does visually bring over the well-known – where everyone goes to get their ice cream and things like that; across the street. I think that's quite a nice handshake to the existing structure around the area. I'm not going to comment on the useable space because that seems to be ok but I think this is – Martin, as you said, is a very – seems to fit in quite well.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, I guess I don't see basing the design of a building on a one-story ice cream parlor across the street to be a really strong statement. I wasn't thrilled about the first design and I really don't see this one having done a whole lot better. It just blah, there's nothing there. It's got a bunch of little elements to it and it's very horizontal. To me, it's too horizontal. There's one transportation or I should say

transportation elevator or stairway that cuts that horizontality and I'm just not really that thrilled about it.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I have a bigger concern about this project which has to do with the parking lot. When I read through the SOFA guidelines transportation policy T-5 and especially T-6, I'd like to read that. It says to decrease the adverse visual impacts of surface parking and street level parking by encouraging parking lots for mixed use and multi-family to be either underground or otherwise not visible from adjacent roadways. I'm afraid that I find that this parking lot is quite visible from adjacent roadways. Visible in every rendering we've seen. Visible as I walked around the site. I think it will be visible. I think this is a point that we brought up in the previous review and to me, the parking needs to be underground. If you take that premise, it also allows you then to have real open space on this property. If you follow premise, it allows you to do landscaping. You have now, a building on top of a parking lot, which is exactly what I said about the first building and I feel that we're still here. It's a building on top of a parking lot in what is becoming a very vibrant pedestrian oriented park of our City. I think a fundamental issue here is that the parking still doesn't work. From a visually, inverse impact point of view and we have a clear direction in the SOFA guideline which many citizens in our town worked very hard to create, not to do this. The second issue that I see is that there are two residential units down on the ground floor, right next to this coffee shop and to me, that is not neighborhood service oriented things. You don't have residential units down there, especially at grade, especially with this particular configuration. It just doesn't work. In this one, there is a clear finding for us that is finding number four. It has to be a functionally appropriate use. Residential units at that point don't work. It really needs to be some sort of a retail shop of some kind. I'm going to leave my comments at that because I think those are such fundamental issues and I hope other people can support that as well. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me just interject. It's the old – we use to call the soft-story apartment building, is basically what it is, which you know...

Male: (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah.

Board Member Baltay: I plead with my colleagues. This is the SOFA District and anytime you walk around there – when was the last time you were there and not bumping into somebody you know? Somebody walking by in the street. It's vibrant, it's busy, it's the up in coming park of our downtown. Do we want it to be filled with a parking lot?

Chair Lew: We'll go down to the end. Beth?

Board Member Bunnenberg: Alright, just to clarify a little bit on the historic status of those two little buildings. The 865 High is a Category 4 on the historic inventory and it was built in 1931 by Black and [Tambert] builders. Then 800 High is the Peninsula Creamery and yes, it is a little somewhat streamline, (inaudible) structure but it is – was the corner of a huge ice cream plant at one point. So, this is like the remaining bit that says ice-cream was a big, big business in Palo Alto for quite some time. A little Water Couse Way is a very interesting little building and right now has water fountains and very, very tastefully done and is – then the buildings on that side of High are lower in structure. The building on the Alma side of High Street is that huge 800 High building that is massive block and so, it provides some transition from the great big building to some interesting smaller buildings. Then there are residences within about a block of this section so that -- this really is what we're putting in the middle to try to help to move from small residencies structures to very large buildings. So, that – I would rather like the carrying of the colors from the Peninsula Creamery to the building but I think the tones have been stepped down a bit from the first things that we saw. It is really nice to see that little open space that says yes, there's room for people to sit and to see the neighborhood. I like you – the way the tone of the cream is toned down a bit. I'm not so sure about the corrugated metal. It seems to me that it's kind of discerned at this point and I like the articulation that has happened from the first design to the second design. The stepping back helps and I think those where my major points.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Beth. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. First all, thank you for coming back to us with so many responsive changes and thank you for the model, which I find very helpful. I share the concern about whether it's possible to do this without underground parking because I think this is a pretty good approach if you are going to have surface parking but I'm not sure surface parking works. I don't think the ground floor units work as residential units. They look like they are instantly going to turn into – I suppose not software factories but software workshops. They are not going to be residential uses very long because they are not designed to be good residential uses. I'm a little concerned also about – it's interesting because this is surface parking, it's unsecured residential parking and that may be just fine in this neighborhood but I'd want to think about that a bit more. I like the redesign of the balconies very much. I appreciate no longer having floor to ceiling glass. I think those are good changes. My fence – my side yard fence blew down in January and it's not back up again and the plants are all so happy. I would like our fence to come back myself but when – if we approve a design like this, I would like to see that screen admit as much air and light and circulation as possible as is consistent with privacy. I think given the angles it would – you would be looking at this, that's quite a bit. As Beth Bunnenberg said, this is this really interesting transition block. If you look north – well, that's not north, towards San Francisco from here, the tallest structures are buildings. If you look south or towards San Jose, the tallest structures are trees and this is in between but I think that we need to make this as literally green as the site as possible as you make that transition. I mean the next block over is just about perfectly preserved small scale bungalow development. I mean

it's about intact -- I'm sure people have made lots of changes but it's -- you could put in on a register in my uninformed opinion. I don't think -- and so this is a very important pedestrian way. It takes you over to the underpass in which we spent millions, that gets you over to the Medical Foundation and Town and Country. It takes you downtown and it's good to have the corner plaza. I think that's important. I am not sure if it's big enough but it's certainly an appropriate use but when you take the half of the building that is closest to the residential in the San Jose direction. That isn't a particularly good thing to walk by. You're looking at parking and one of the things that really struck me in looking at the Landscape Plan and the landscape fixtures and there isn't space to get the kind of -- at least I don't see it being done yet but to get the kind of softening, the presence of birds and -- you know, which exist on that site right now. Birds and butterflies and whatnot, the different literal air that you get when you have significant vegetation. I live in the downtown north and I don't live very close to the creek and there's a big difference as you move from more heavily wooded and planted blocks to others. This, in my opinion, should be a block where you get that softness that comes from significant landscaping so I would be very interested to hear from my colleagues on whether the parking really does need to go underground. Also, as opposed to our previous project where the thinking is that you can go underground without damaging trees. In case, there's a comment that trees make underground parking infeasible so I would like to hear more about that.

Chair Lew: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I think this is an improvement upon the original presentation that was given to us and I was recalling some of the concerns that we had then, which were building height, the use of color and I see that a lot of those things have been addressed. I know that the maximum height for this building is 35-feet and I think that -- it looks like the elevator tower can exceed that by -- can exceed the maximum height for a certain area but I wanted to also ask, is there -- does this reflect what kind of mechanical needs the building will have because a lot of times you'll have mechanical equipment up on top of the roof, which is then on top of that 35-foot roof deck that has a shroud around it. So, it gives the appearance that the building is even higher so I was going to ask if this truly reflects all the equipment that needs -- the mechanical equipment that will be on the building? That was just a question of mine. Then, I don't really have a problem with the parking just because it looks like the building on the street sides -- on the High Street and the Channing Street side, there is some pedestrian landscaping going on and things that screen the parking, which is around the back of the building. I would encourage maybe even more -- I'm calling it pedestrian landscaping but like little planters and things at the pedestrian level to bring in natural material as you're walking by to help screen and help detract your eye I guess, from the parking entrances. I don't know if you could even pull some landscaping up on the balconies. I've seen recently -- not in Palo Alto but other Cities that have apartments and condos where there's actually landscaping on the decks that are a part of the building component so that might be something to consider. I do -- I'm glad that you minimized the red color because I think that was my comment on the original presentation. I felt like you were using too much of the creamery red and it -- I thought



it would introduce some confusion because people might think wow, is that another creamery building or something. So, I'm glad that you minimized – I like the use of it but the fact that you minimized it and made it a subordinate color; I think is a good response. Then my last comment was about the use of the corrugated metal. It looks like you're wrapping the entire third-floor with the corrugated metal exterior, which I – when I first started seeing that, I thought that was really cool because it's sort of industrial and sort of a new use of material in an urban setting. I just question how is that going to look 10-15-20-years from now? Is that going to date this building so I just wanted to bring up that corrugated – I kind of think that it's a cool look now but maybe in 5-years, we'll go oh yeah, that's when everyone was using that corrugated metal on buildings. Hopefully, be sensitive to that and this could be a timeless building because this building is going to be here probably 100-years, right? I think we have to look at – it could end up being a historic building in Palo Alto someday that is going to be protected so I think we should think forward and think about are these timeless materials. Those are my only comments.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, thank you for coming back to us with the revised project. I think the project is a huge – it's gone through a lot of changes that I feel are a huge improvement over the previous design. I'll try to be quick here. I'm appreciative with the public plaza at the corner there. I think the elevation along High Street is much better than before with more play of ins and outs at the building. I think there could be perhaps better pedestrian connections from the uncovered parking to the building itself. I also think that there are a couple of site design issues such as the bench that is located at the oak tree corner, where the transformer is. It looks like the bench is kind of a little bit of an afterthought. I'm seeing here on the model that you're proposing perhaps those vertical planters again but I think that's an area that could be a little bit thought deeper. Also, the bicycle parking is really at the opening of the building there. To me, it seems kind of like a – it's kind of weak. I think if you're living up there and you're looking down at this atrium, you want to see something a little bit nicer or have it be a feature or perhaps even a little bit of greenery and not just the top of bicycle parking. As far as the layout in the parking, I would encourage underground parking and I feel that a project of this size would certainly benefit from it. I do understand that there are some limitations there and as far as keeping it on the ground level and doing your best to screen that. I don't see how it could be done much better than what you have so I do applaud the approach there and getting rid of the lifts was certainly a big benefit as well but if this project were to come back, I would like to see a little bit more thought out landscape design and those certain little site areas that I mentioned previously. Again, I think I'd like to applaud the revision and certainly like where this building is going and I'm excited for the property as it's certainly underdeveloped currently. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Martin.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Lew. I appreciate the comments of Board Member Gooyer about what is the sense of that building? We have 500-years of architectural design from the renaissance period on and the question that I always – often ask about new proposed projects is, is this what we've evolved to in terms of architectural design? That's probably an Architectural Review Board issue and not really historic preservation issue since this project is not on – this property is not a listed historic property. Also, referring to Board Member Wimmer's comment about – whatever is designed today and certainly we can design things that look good today because of current fashion but will it look good tomorrow and I – again, because this project is not a listed historic structure, that may not be a historic preservation issues with this particular project. Through the – since the public hearing is open and through the Chair, I'd like to have some comment and then two questions for Mr. Ho, please? Mr. Ho, I've got – Mr. Ko, I've got some – two comments and then a question for you. Thank you. Also, I am familiar with your project on the 1000 block of Apgar Street in Emeryville. I saw on your website the – anyways, one of the requirements for this project in SOFA II, is that there's good articulation from the street facing façade and you're projecting on Apgar in Emeryville, I think is very successful and I've physical have seen it and I've always been impressed with it. Now, I know who the author is so (Inaudible)...

Mr. Ko: Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: ...That's Cantonese for thank you.

Mr. Ko: Just also an urban project. Just like across the street, the two units on the ground level happens also just right across the street. For the unit – actually, we have you stepping up two steps so it is higher. The two units on the ground level are 1-foot higher than the street sidewalk. I just wanted to point that out.

Chair Bernstein: Yeah, thanks. The other comment that I would like to make is that on that project in Emeryville, it's – since the Historic Resources Board is looking at compatibility with regard to local historic character. On that particular project, what you have done successfully is that you really translated some to of the East Bay – Bay Area style with those big brackets so there's the (inaudible) issue and it ties into the Burkley, Emeryville, (inaudible). Anyway, my point of bringing that up is that I see that you definitely understand compatibility and context. One of the things specifically with this project that you've done I think, also very successfully for compatibility and that I think Board Member Bunnenberg mentioned and that is the cornice detail through here on how that relates to the historic structure across the street at 900 High Street. Again, another compatibility issue there. There is one detail that I'd like to ask for you to – I'll make my suggestion and see what your response on how to fine tune this project to gain my endorsement for this project and that is, on this corner right here and maybe for the public you can put – if you have the ability for the slide, that's the corner of High and Channing; looking at this corner if that is possible there. Yes, that's it, right there. Yes, right – so you can see from this point of view, in that picture, there are two historic structures; the Watercourse Way and the Peninsula Creamery building. What would gain my endorsement on this project is if the window header just at that third-

floor, that's unit 16. If those window frames at that corner could go all the way up to the facet, that would then be consistent with what I handed out to members of the public, you and the Board Members. Showing that there's again, a good compatible detail but only at that corner because I think that corner, as you can see in the pictures, the most dominant corner in this whole project, in relationship to historic – listed historic projects there. Is that something that you would agree too?

Mr. Ko: Yes. That's pretty easy to do because in the corner right there, that's all living space...

Chair Bernstein: Yeah and it's all flushed and I can see – I looked at your detail and that could be a flush framing.

Mr. Ko: We could just mimic the design of the moldings and windows from right across. That's not a problem.

## **MOTION**

Chair Bernstein: Ok, great. That would make it consistent with what I handed out to the public with that detail exactly across the street. Good. Ok, thank you for that. Thank you. With that, I would like to make a motion, please? We've heard from – there are no members from the public, right? Ok. Alright, so I would like to move then that – with that agreement from Mr. Ko to raise the detail of the headers at the corner of unit 16 up on the third-floor. That this project is consistent with the SOFA II guidelines for compatibility requirements in relations to the adjacent and across the street historic buildings.

Vice Chair Kim: So, with all due respect to Chair Bernstein, it's my understanding that the HRB serves as an advisory role to the ARB on this project so is it appropriate for an HRB member to make the motion and will the HRB vote on the project as well?

Board Member Gooyer: I assumed that that was just for the HRB...

Vice Chair Kim: Just for the HRB

Board Member Gooyer: ... portion of it, not ours.

Vice Chair Kim: My apologies.

Board Member Wimmer: I'll second Martin's motion.

Chair Bernstein: Alright. (inaudible) that has been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion on this before we bring it to vote? Rodger?

Board Member Kohler: I'm not sure I'm going to vote for that. I have to – I – so what you're doing is your approving of two items on the building that are ok but not the whole building, is that what you're saying?

Chair Bernstein: The – one of our responsibilities on the HRB is to say how does this project – is it compatible or incompatible with the SOFA II guild lines regarding any new project that's proposed or revisited to a project that's adjacent to or across the street from a historic structure. My view would be that the design elements that Mr. Ko introduced into this revised project – the cornice on the vertical stairway there and then the other details. Then his agreement to bring that window up so that it's compatible to across the street. That there's enough compatibility with the listed historic structures. That was the reason for my motion.

Board Member Kohler: I'm not sure I – well, ok. Well, I'm just trying to think. I'm not sure how you can – a building of this scale and size is compatible with the little one-story homes – buildings around that structure. I don't quite see – technically, the corner here should be one-story and the second-floor and all those guys should be pushed way back. Then it relates – this is a big box with a feature up on top that I don't think that anyone is going to – except for the red line, which I like but to have – to say this giant relates to the other low one-story homes on the corners, I don't see how that works. I can't support that.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, any other comments before we bring it to a vote? I see none. Ok, HRB Members to vote on the motion. All those in favor by saying? Opposed? Michael? That passes on 4 yes's and 1 no vote. Thank you.

#### **MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 4-1**

Board Member Kohler: So, we can go. Maybe I can go?

Chair Lew: Ok, we'll bring it back to the ARB. I had a couple comments that I think haven't been mentioned yet.

Board Member Kohler: Is ok if I leave? If I leave now because we're not needed anymore?

Chair Bernstein: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lait: Yeah, as long as we have a quorum of the HRB then, that would be efficient. If we drop below a quorum, then we would ask that all the HRB Members. (Crosstalk).

Board Member Kohler: We have a quorum. Ok because I didn't have any idea this was going to go so long. I've got people waiting so thank you.

Chair Lew: Yeah, yeah. We're getting to the ARB motions. Ok. Let's see, we have a new finding for native plants that's – it's a new thing that started this year and I'm struggling to – with the project with regard to that. It seems to me that retaining the oak trees and proposing a new valley oak in the corner goes a long way but a lot of the other plants, it seems to me, could be substituted with native plants without a lot of

effort. The entrance – the residential entrance seems to me to be fairly weak. It's just like an out – there's no lobby, it's just – you're entering in the parking garage to get to the main elevator. That doesn't seem to be very fairly desirable at all. I'm not crazy about the transformer location mostly because I think it would require trenching in proximity to the oak tree. I was wondering if there was an alternate for the transformer? Unit five and twelve seem to be very long and potentially very dark at the ends near the corridor. Some of the other units seem – I think four of the units seem to be fairly small. I think it's the 7s, 8s, and 9s that are right in the middle. I think you're also – back to landscaping, I think you're proposing Italian cypress trees 4-feet on center, next to the private school and it seems like a fairly dense wall. I think I would be interested in seeing if those could be space farther apart. I think I would like the plans modified with regard to the common open space calculations and to not include the bike locker area or modify the bike lockers so that there's actually something more desirable down there at the entrance to the residential – to the residences. I think there have – I think there were some other comments about the corrugated metal and I think I share those concerns about it. If the Board is (inaudible) with the corrugated metal, I think I would suggest that it – you can specify like zinc coated metal so it's not quite to shining if you – it can be aluminum or steel and when it's brand new, it's fairly shiny and causes a lot of reflections. There is a way to get it pre-patinaed from the very beginning. Then I also did want to point out to the Board that the Staff has conditions. This is like – for example, landscape condition approval number 63, which is actually changing the planting plan so if you looked at the planting plan, some of the trees in there have changed or would change based on the conditions of approval by Staff. Then I think the biggest issue is Peter's question about parking and I guess this is for the applicant. My understanding is that you've done studies but I haven't seen it for the underground garage. I guess my main concern Peter, would be that if you have 125-foot wide lot and two parking isles are 120-feet, then that doesn't leave anything for landscaping, which is what we'll see on some of our other projects today. I guess, my take on it is that I would be interested in seeing those studies.

Mr. Ko: We did two option studies for underground parking and from High Street getting down to the – 13-feet below level and we can only have 23 parking spaces. Even with the tender parking, it's only 23. The total required parking was – we have 45 parking spaces. Again, I mean we have the tree preservation plan there on the back and the arborist requires a setback, from the back there, from those two large live oak trees so we can't really cut our parking garage toward the back of the property. That would really limit the size of the basement parking. That would never even meet half the requirement of the 25 units – parking requirements.

Chair Lew: Did you – so, I know we had the parking lift issue but we have had – we have approved projects for residential uses that had underground parking and lifts. So, you can get more spaces in the basement. Did you consider that?

Mr. Ko: Yep, previously we had 20 parking spaces with a possible lift, which would go underground just like the adjacent school building. You have the basement parking and then also one was above grade parking so that's like three-level parking lift. We can get

20-parkings but I don't think that was supported by the Board ARB and Planning so we eliminated that. Also, we did – like I said, we did two versions of underground parking layout for the Planning Department and studied how we can – because – first of all, you require 100-feet of ramp going down there and then the – without using the back of the property, trying to preserve those live oak trees. You only have a little part of the front, where under the building can be a parking area. That really limited our underground parking option. That's why we kept all the parking at grade at this point.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you for that. Are there any other...

Board Member Baltay: Can I chime in on the parking? If I remember right, we had an applicant just adjacent to this property that came in the other day with a full underground parking lot next to this tree. I – I've been around and I think that parking can be done. We just passed parking on a complicated commercial building on University Avenue that had significantly tighter, smaller site. They managed to fit it in. I think the parking can fit here. This is a pretty good size lot. There are many ways you could get that ramp to fit underneath there. Sure, you have to pull back from the tree and sure we want to see some landscaping on top. I feel very strongly that the parking doesn't work as it is.

Chair Lew: Ok, I guess the way that I was thinking about it, is that the surface parking isn't really that desirable but I was willing to support it because of the oak trees. I'm not opposed to seeing – for the Board to see the actual parking studies. I would be willing to – I'd be open to doing that but I think I would – if those are – if the studies are accurate, then I would support the project as proposed with some minor revisions. So, I think we have some no votes. Is there anyone who would want to try and make a motion on this? I think we've got no votes over here.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Furth: Well, I could move that we continue this item to a date uncertain and request that staff and the applicant provide us an analysis of what would be possible and feasible in terms of underground parking on this site. If – including the use of lifts or other devices. I want Staff evaluation of the applicant's information on that score. That – of course, if it's possible, then a number of our other concerns can be addressed with regard to functional useable open space. Here's my question to my colleagues, should we just do that as a comeback and let us know or do we want to try to address the issues now, that would arise if we become convinced that it can't be done? I think maybe we should just do the focus of let's see how this works with underground parking and then go from there? Does that make sense or do you want to go down both tracks?

Board Member Gooyer: The thing with – I have sort of an intermediate I guess if anything. I'm in favor of underground parking and I think it can be done. The other alternative as I said is you lose the two residential units on the ground floor. You turn that either into retail space or something where there is retail pretty much – other than

an entry on both streets and the rest of the whole façade is retail so you're not looking at a parking garage or a parking facility. That would be the only thing that I would even come close to considering. Somebody coming in and saying gosh, we can't do it underground so you're stuck with this one, isn't going to fly for me.

Board Member Furth: Well, because there are so many directions in which to go, I'm going to just make a motion that we continue this for the reasons stated. To see an underground parking alternative provided by the applicant and/or Staff and certainly analyzed by Staff and not try to go out the branching choices further but somebody else might want too.

Board Member Baltay: Can I be clear Wynne. What we are asking for is to continue it and asking them to come back to us with an option of underground parking?

Board Member Furth: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: I can support that. Second.

Mr. Lait: Ok, before you vote Chair, if I may interject? I think that the applicant may have some additional information that they would like to share with respect to the underground parking. I think it's a hinge point on this project in terms of whether it goes forward or not. I think before you continue making an action on that motion, if you are (inaudible) to at least hear from the applicant as far as their perspective on the – their studies a little bit more information.

Board Member Gooyer: The only comment I would have to that, is that I understand that he may justification for not doing it but I also don't think the way it's designed now is the best solution for on-grade parking.

Mr. Lait: That may be and I think that's a different conversation. If the direction from the Council or excuse me, the Board is to explore underground parking and the applicant's perspective is they've explored it and it's not feasible for this project, continuing the matter may not be the desirable outcome for the applicant and would perhaps be looking for direction – action from the Board.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: At this point, I'm not going to be in a good position to absorb a lot of new information without lunch and try an analysis based on that. I'm actually asking both Staff and the applicant to give us more information on this topic because if we decide that this project doesn't work with surface parking. We need to know that – we want something on the record as to it is possible – it's feasibility. We want some information on that score so that's why I am thinking of doing it this way.

Ms. Gerhardt: Just to confirm that Staff has analyzed the underground parking with the applicant. We've had the urban forester take a look at some preliminary studies and it

does seem that about 1/3 of the property couldn't be used because we would want to preserve that for the trees but further analysis could be done.

Board Member Baltay: So, I understand it right, a 1/3 of the property can't be dug out for a parking lot – for parking underground but a 1/3 of the parking lot can still be used for a parking lot proper? That doesn't seem to follow to me. The trees are so precious that we can't develop a 1/3 of the lot, then what is this in front of us?

Mr. Lait: I think the – what Jodie was referring to is the excavation of the ground for the provision of the sub terrain garage. These were some preliminary sketches that I remember us taking a look at. I don't know that we've done the type of study that I think Board Member Furth is referring to but again, I go back to my initial comment, relative to if the Board would be informed by some perspective from the applicant?

Chair Lew: Mr. Ko, do you have any – sure. [Mr. Beckincourt] if you have any other comments about the parking.

[Mr. Beckincourt:] Thank you for going through this. We looked originally at underground parking knowing that it would be the more desirable option. The – with the height limitations and the unit counts that we can get, I know where not supposed to talk about money but this project is not – I discovered yesterday, is not even feasible as it is. Now, we can push it forward. I got numbers from a general but if we have to go underground, it's dead and I'm not – that's not any way to say that – it's just a fact. It won't go underground, it won't gain enough spaces and it won't provide any return. It will be negative; no bank will look at it so it's done. The 25 housing units are gone, that's it. That's just a fact that we have to work within this environment. Housing prices – the construction costs are skyrocketing. Over \$500 a foot now, that's a fact. This doesn't work as it is. We're planning on holding this long term in the family so we can absorb that over 30-40-50-years. We can't absorb another two on top of that and I know this is taboo to talk cash but that's a fact here and so we'll look at something totally different or leave it to allow as it is and it will be a parking lot and that's not what we want to do. We'd like to create a nice project but to say that this is now hinged on underground parking, can't work. I'm sorry, it just can't and that's just a fact. Ok? Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you for that. Let's see what the other Board Members think but I think that our motion should then factor in both situations right? I think it's fine to ask for parking – the underground parking study but I think we should clear about all the other things that have mentioned before as well so that could be addressed. It's been two – I think this project has been around for 2-years already? I think we need to move this – move it along.

Board Member Furth: It seems to me that another question that was much discussed was whether the two ground floor residential units could be supported. I've heard you all speaking in both directions on that.



Chair Lew: I – it's not desirable. I would say the – I know people who've owned condos on the ground floor of 800 High and they've lived there for a while. They weren't thrilled with it and they eventually moved out but the units do have vertical separation so that's better than say 801 Alma. The affordable housing that has ground floor units without any vertical separation at all, which is to me, highly undesirable and has planters in front of it as well. If somebody were to try to convert it or illegally or whatever, you wouldn't – with having those steps, it wouldn't be assessable. So, technically you wouldn't – you wouldn't be able to do that and more parking would be required, I'm guessing.

Board Member Furth: I'm really asking – although I expressed my skepticism about it's likely to use as – since I live around a lot of apartments that are not functioning as apartments right now. My real question to you all is do the majority of us – would we approve a project which included these two ground floor units?

Board Member Baltay: No.

Chair Lew: I would.

Board Member Furth: You would?

Chair Lew: Yes, I think I would.

Vice Chair Kim: If you're taking a straw poll, I would too but could we perhaps have Board Member Gooyer present an alternative motion...

Board Member Furth: I withdraw my motion if the seconder agrees?

Vice Chair Kim: ...with the ground floor being retail or you had said something that I thought was...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Microphone, please.

Board Member Gooyer: Sorry. The design, the way that it is done right now is the on the optimum design for ground floor – at-grade parking.

Vice Chair Kim: Right but I felt that your alternative motion if you make one, would be at least some clear direction for the applicant such that we would somehow make the (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: My thought was – I agree with Peter in the sense that this is a very vibrant area. I don't want to walk down and look through a metal mesh to a bunch of parked cars or a blank wall. Their show is – what happens behind that – it could be a relatively, not very deep retail space and then have parking behind it or whatever but it

would probably mean the loss of the two units. Now if it turns out that financially they also can't absorb the loss of the two units, then it's sort of a done deal but if they can – because the thing is, you're turning that residential space into retail space. Then actually, the other thing I like about that is that actually becomes more of a mixed use. Let's face it, now it's a 1,000-square foot retail and 16,500-square foot residential. To me, that's not really mixed use. That's an oh, by the way, we've got the – a little commercial space downstairs. I mean it – that would be the only alternative but like this, I can't support it.

Vice Chair Kim: Is there a motion that you would like to propose?

Board Member Gooyer: Pardon me?

Vice Chair Kim: Could you make that into a motion perhaps?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Gooyer: Make that – ok, just whatever I said. No, no, that's fine. Alright. I move then that if underground parking is not or is out of the realm of possibility, that the first floor be redesigned in such a way that when you're walking on the sidewalk – other than possibly the mandated – I guess it's 20-foot wide opening could be viewed but there's no concept of a parking facility on the ground floor. Something like that?

Board Member Baltay: No, I won't come close to supporting that Robert. I'm sorry.

Board Member Gooyer: Pardon me?

Board Member Baltay: I will not support that motion.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, well then.

Board Member Baltay: I think you're not – I think all of us, we're – the applicant got up and stood in front of us and said the issue with the parking is not the trees, it's the budget for the project. I support that and we all want housing in town here but I'm amazed that it's swaying us this much. I mean it works or it doesn't. We have SOFA guild lines to follow and we should follow them and because he can't afford to build it with underground parking or so they say, that is not...

Board Member Gooyer: I agree, that's why I'm hesitant about the – even making the motion.

Board Member Baltay: So, to try to move that we sort of half way design it from the DHS here about where he can and can't put the building or the parking, we're just going to come back with stacked lifts then and be back right where we started a year ago. I'd like to see us try to give them clear guidance. If you guys – if we're fine with the parking on the surface, let's say so and if we're not, let's say so.

Vice Chair Kim: I'm fine with the parking on the surface so long as it's screened and since the motion has been made, I will second the motion.

Board Member Furth: What's the motion at this point?

Vice Chair Kim: That the first floor perhaps be redesigned in such a way that additional screening be provided or that the two residential units be converted into retail or something else such that additional screening can be provided. Am I on track there?

Board Member Gooyer: But see, that's the problem with this. I don't want to sit here and design it for them. It – I don't want to see parking. I mean that's about as basic as you can get it.

Vice Chair Kim: So, perhaps the motion should then be modified to say the first floor be redesigned such that the screening of the surface parking is improved or revised?

Board Member Gooyer: No, again that's not – because the screening means you put a blank wall there and put some growys in front of it and say hey, it's better than it was than looking at a parking garage and that's not acceptable to me. See that's why I don't want to be put in the situation of making a motion because I don't really agree with it. All I said was that was a possible option but to come – as I said with my fellow Board Member here, to come up and say hey, it's a money issue. I'm sorry, then maybe that area shouldn't be developed in this project. The applicant said maybe we need to come up with something else and maybe that's what it ends up being. Maybe that's going against the whole mandate of the City where we want more housing; I'm sorry. Just because we need more housing, doesn't mean I'm going to approve something in my own mind, that I don't think is up to the level that I think is, for me, a minimum for the City of Palo Alto.

Board Member Baltay: Robert, I – if you were to withdraw your motion, I have an idea to make a separate motion.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, I'll withdraw my motion.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I move that we continue the project to a date uncertain with the direction to the applicant to redesign the project with one of two options. Either provide below ground parking or provide parking that's only accessed from Channing avenue and the building has frontage on High Street on the entire length of High street.

Board Member Furth: I'd second that.

Chair Lew: Martin.

Chair Bernstein: Question for Staff, the – as the architect Mr. Ko has agreed to raise the ceiling height – the window height of that unit 16, is that incorporated into the HRB motion or should that be incorporated into the ARB motion? Just so that it doesn't get lost.

Ms. Gerhardt: It should be incorporated into the ARB motion. I think we're having some discussions with the applicant as well.

Chair Bernstein: Alright, so if – Chair, would you be able to ask if the maker and secondary would except Mr. Ko's agreement that that window head on unit 16 be raised?

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely. I think it's a wonderful idea.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Jon.

Mr. Lait: Thank you, Chair. There was a motion and a second to do one of the two options. Provide underground parking or only have parking off of – access off of Channing with the idea of extending the horizontality of the building so that you can't – this would be the addition of another couple of units, probably and also probably the – possibly the requirement for lift parking presumably. I don't know. I don't want to design it right now.

Board Member Baltay: No, you're putting words in the motion, Jonathan.

Mr. Lait: No, I'm not trying to put words into the motion, I'm trying to summarize. My understanding that the motion is going to have a – one of the comments I heard from one of the Board Members – I think it was perhaps Board Member Gooyer, I could be wrong. Was about the horizontality of the building and this would, of course, extend that some distance if we're going to fill in the ground floor area with units. That's fine, that may be fine however they approach – I'm not suggesting that's an (inaudible) issue or an issue. I only ask that the Board – because you're talking about some – we frequently give applicants a chance to respond to some motions that have been made so you may just want to extend that opportunity to the applicant in giving these two options that are being presented.

Chair Lew: You're saying before we vote? Ok, they are deliberating.

Board Member Gooyer: Can I get a clear description of exactly what we are going to be voting on because I'm confused now.

Chair Lew: Well, ok. Peter made the motion, right? Which is to provide below grade parking study...

Board Member Baltay: Well, two options. So, I'm asking – we're asking them to redesign the building to fit one of two options. One is to put the parking below grade and that's easy or to have it so the parking only comes off of Channing Avenue and you cannot see the parking. The building extends along the frontage of High Street. I guess...

Board Member Gooyer: Now, you cannot see the parking or there's actually something going on there? (Inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Board Member Baltay: There's actually something going on.

Board Member Gooyer: ... is 100-feet or 200-feet of a blank wall with a couple of growys in the front of it.

Board Member Baltay: No, no, it should -- the motion is that there's a functioning building facility of some kind be they residential or commercial along the frontage. I don't want to tie their hands too much. I'm just saying that it cannot be an access to parking or visible parking. It has to be building. I'm trying to find a compromise that meets our guild lines and by cutting back half way at least what you can see.

Chair Lew: Right and then there's an amendment to the motion which is for the flush header on the third-floor corner. [Mr. Beckincourt], do you have any other – do you have any comments on the proposed motion?

[Mr. Beckincourt:] Speaking with Mr. Ko, my concern would be what happens to the parking and the circulation and do we then have to have any different building footprint changes. I don't know if we do, to the Channing entrance on the garage – for the parking area. I guess I have some question that assuming that there's some kind of horrible gaping hole in the front on High Street and we have plants on either side of the entrance and exit, it doesn't seem that horrible if you consider across the street, you've got parking lot, parking lot, parking lots. If this could go underground as I say again, that really won't even be an issue. I just can't do that. It's not that we don't have the money, it just doesn't function. It's not – it won't pencil at all. We will be putting money into it and not getting anything out of it and that's not the idea for anyone. It would be essentially just a benefit for the City and a burden on us. I guess I'd like some clarification on what the real issue is with having the entrance also on High Street? It doesn't look that awful to me. Now, I also respect what Mrs. Furth discussed in that part of the structure has some – it's not as friendly as the other corner and I totally agree with that. I had mentioned that to Peter before and wondered if we could do some kind of bench down there. Some kind of a setback there that would allow a seating area, you know a fountain or something to liven that up a little bit. I typically have a higher aesthetic than a lot of people and I'd like this to be a beautiful building and I would like to see – guess what I would like to see why or understand why we think that that entrance is so terrible and I wondering if it actually might end up looking funny. Like it was just something that was closed off. That we put some stucco there and continued the planters and put some kind of vine – creeping vines. I don't think that actually has any benefit either. This adds a lightness to it – on the ground floor,

similar to what you have towards Channing and High Street, in my opinion. This appears to be a really large building and a really large lot but we took this way down. We gave it a giant haircut from what it was, to the actual – we actually removed one or two units through this whole process. When we worked with Jonathan through this whole thing, trying to add as much housing as we could for the City and make this thing pencil. It's tight so I just don't – I'm not sure – I'm taking up too much time here but I still wonder why that's a real problem on High Street. It seems to allow an in and out that would be helpful for life safety and things like that. Thank you.

Chair Lew: You guys, we need to wrap up but...

Board Member Wimmer: Can I just – I was just brainstorming on this new concept of the – would it – are there any benefit to making the parking direction one-way so that there are still two automobile entrances onto the property. However, they are cut in half so instead of a 25-foot opening on each side, they are 10-feet on each side. So, you can only enter the off of Channing and you can only exit off of High Street. Would that offer any benefit to minimizing these gaps and having – still offering the access – two access points but cutting the access point width in half.

Board Member Baltay: Are you proposing – yeah, I – frankly, I don't think that would work very well functionally. Is that a proposal for an amendment because otherwise, to the Chair, we've had a motion moved and seconded and I'd like us to have a vote.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I don't want to give up on this project. It's 35-units or however many it is, I forget. 25, what's a number? I think that the revised version is engaged and engaging with the neighborhood in a way that the previous one wasn't. It seems to me, when we've looked at the number of SOFA II project, we get this recurring problem. That surface parking leads you to screening parking, which leads to bigger volumes and sometimes it just doesn't work at all. Certainly, that was the case up on Forest. It just doesn't happen, it just doesn't work. I'm not convinced that this can't work. I am convinced that right now, it doesn't work along High Street. I –if it's going to work, then I think it needs to be much literally greener. It needs to be – I was interested in – if you're going to have a three-story building in this neighborhood, you need three-story landscaping, in some way. Whether it's vines or trees or hanging gardens, I have no idea but you – a building like this, in this location, isn't going to make that transition from 801 High Street block to further down without being significantly and literally green; for me. I think that the volume could work. I do not think the High Street frontage works now. I don't know what the possible solution is. I'm thinking about the project on University, where we went around and round and round. The Masonic Temple project, where we went around and round and round and we finally got to a place that worked. I would like to see one more try to address our concerns and I don't know – I'm sure that it won't adequately address everybody's concerns if we don't get underground parking but I would like to see one more try.

Chair Lew: I think we are ready to vote and I would just say – I did want to respond to your question about the Hight Street parking entrance. If you go to – if you look at mixed-use buildings like loft buildings in San Francisco. Typically, what happens is there's usually – they – there's usually some metal open gate at the sidewalk and you look in – as a pedestrian, you look and what you see is the ugliest ceiling that you can ever imagine. So, you've got a concrete floor and typically there is spray insulation that gets sprayed on there and it's – most of the time it's left exposed. A rare occasion, people will cover it with a ceiling but usually, people run out of money. You have the fire sprinklers, other utilities are dropping down and because it's a parking garage, there are often beams – sometimes there are beams and so the utilities are hanging below the beams and it's all exposed. That's the concern and you don't see it when you're looking at elevation but I think what I am hearing from the Board is that we've seen other buildings where that is a weakness. I've seen buildings that where it is addressed. Where it's exposed but there's still some screening at the garage door entrance or – and there's a door as well. That's all I have to say. Let's vote on the motion. All in favor? Opposed? None so that's 5-0 to continue the project.

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

Chair Lew: Staff, hopefully, this can be done sooner than a year. I mean, we've been taking...

Mr. Lait: Just for the record, the project will come back to the ARB alone, without the HRB.

Chair Lew: Yeah because it's a different – SOFA II is different than SOFA I.

Mr. Lait: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok. We still have more items. The HRB is excused. Thank you for baring with us. Do we want to take the lunch break now? Ok, so we're going to take a very short – about half hour or 20-minute lunch break. It is 12:30 so we'll reconvene at 1 o'clock to hear the remaining items.

### **THE HEARING WILL CONTINUE WITH JUST THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEMBERS.**

#### **5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3877 El Camino Real [14PLN-00464]:**

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of an Architectural Review for the Demolition of the Vacant 5,860 Square-Foot Commercial Building and Construction of a new Mixed-Use Project. The Project Includes a 4,027 Square Foot Commercial Building and 17 Dwelling Units (Flats and Townhouses). Parking for the

Project is Provided in a Basement. The Applicant Also Requests Approval of a Design Enhancement Exception to Allow the Basement to Encroach Into the Required Rear

Yard Setback Below Grade. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated on March 6, 2017 and the comment period will end on April 7, 2017. Zoning Districts: CS and RM-30. For more Information, Contact Project

Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at SAhsing@m-group.us

Chair Lew: Item number five which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter. 3877 El Camino Real. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of an architectural review for the demolition of the vacant 5,860 square-foot commercial building and construction of a new mixed-use project. The project includes a 4,027-square foot commercial building and 17 dwelling units, which are flats and townhouses. Parking for the project is provided in the basement. The applicant also requests approval of a design enhancement exception to allow the basement to encroach into the required rear yard setback below grade. Environmental assessment is that a mitigated negative declaration was circulated on March 6, 2017, and the comment period will end on April 7, 2017 and the zoning districts are CS and RM-30. Sheldon, welcome and he is our project planner.

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, good afternoon. Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner and I do have a PowerPoint presentation for you. The applicant is also here and they also have a PowerPoint. I'll try to get through this as expediently as possible but I do want to touch upon some important points and the introduction was really great for the project overview but this does show – the first slide does show the vicinity map and the project does have an odd shaped lot. It's kind of a boot or an 'L'. It does have frontage on both El Camino as well as on Curtner Avenue and there are two zoning districts. The CS zoning district does front El Camino Real while the multifamily district is at the back end – the heel of the boot so to speak and on Curtner. There would be a demolish of the existing vacant building and then the construction of a new mixed-use project. Within the CS district, there would be a new 4,000-square foot vertical mix use building that would include retail on the first two floors and then you would have six residential flat units on the upper floors as well. Then in the back of the property, in the multifamily district area, you would have eleven townhouses and all the parking, as mentioned in the summary is below in a basement. There is a design enhancement exception with a rear setback to encroach in the – below grade by 4-feet and that would allow for all the parking again, to be on the – within the ground floor – within the basement. The (inaudible) of the project does have site and design review and it also has the environmental document. This was previously reviewed by the Planning Commission on March 8<sup>th</sup> so there were some public comments regarding the historic aspect of the existing building, as well as some of the traffic on the site or coming off the site or within the vicinity of the area. Since the project does have an environmental document, the circulation period does end, I believe tomorrow so we are still receiving comments on the environmental document and a lot of these comments regard the



historic aspect and the traffic would be addressed in our response to those comments. The Commission did recommend approval of the site and design. Also, to make sure that they – that they take a close look at the historic aspect. There is an appendix in the environmental document that does include the historic resource evaluation for the project but that recommendation when onto the Council. The site does have a flat photography. It is surrounded by both commercial and multipin-family and the commercial is mainly along El Camino. Multi-family is towards the rear of the property. Also, mainly low intensity development along El Camino. This area hasn't been built to its full potential necessarily just yet. As mentioned, the request does include the site and design and there are certain findings for those. Part of the process is to go through this Board. It was reviewed by the Planning Commission and the City Council. There's a density bonus concession because the project does include affordable housing units so that is allowed by law and what they've asked for are additional square footage. So, because of the level of affordability and the number of units, then they would get a certain amount of additional square footage. The architecture review is – the site design by this Board and also, a recommendation would be to the Council. As I mentioned, the design enhancement exception are findings for that deviation of the 10-foot setback. This is taken from the plans but it does show you the context of the areas mentioned. It's kind of a low intensity area, both along El Camino and Curtner and the project is designed to meet the context findings and be within the context of the surrounding area. The project does meet the development standards with exception of the setback for the below grade parking. What that does do, by allowing all the parking to be below ground, it does allow for a lot of flexibility on the top and I think that was kind of presented a little bit in the previous items. They have all their open space or common and private open space areas. There are pedestrian and bicycle circulation is made on the top there. Then your entrance to the garage is both from El Camino and Curtner but the exit is only off of Curtner so if you're wanting to go back the other direction on El Camino, you would have to go through the signalized intersection there at Curtner and El Camino. This site plan does demonstrate that there is a separation there. Kind of a buffer between the larger mix used building and the townhouses but it does all cohesively work together. Then of course, here's the below grade parking. They are utilizing the entire footprint. (Inaudible) ramps going down. Your garbage would be collected in bins on that level and then they would be brought to the upper level long Curtner. There is a stage on site and then when the garbage vehicles arrive and they would service those bins, put them back into the stage area next to the ramp and then they would be placed back down below so there wouldn't be any space taken up along the curbside. Just some project perspectives showing you how the project fits in. The applicant will describe a little bit more about their architectural details but as we mentioned in our findings, that we do believe that the project does meet those context findings. Here's a perspective of the mix use building itself showing a lot of horizontal types of orientation. You would have the retail area on the first level. You have some outdoor space. There wouldn't be any restaurants per say at this place. There's no grease interceptor or other types of facilities that would accommodate that but you may have a deli or something like that there and other retail uses on the second floors as well. Then the townhouse is very similarly designed. Maybe a little more vertical with the wood paneling but these are all consistent with the neighboring development – the

new development next door that's multi-family so this is consistent in massing with that. The affordable housing component of it; the code does require 15% of the total units. When you do the math, it comes out to 2.7 units so they will be providing two units on site. The .7 amount is going to be (inaudible) and the concession as I mentioned, is for the additional square footage at 2,600-square feet for the project. The project does not seek any parking relief. Again, all the parking is provided on site below ground. They actually have an excess of several spaces. As I mentioned previously, by having the parking below the ground, you do allow for some flexibility on the surface and this diagram demonstrates the connective of open space and some of the amenities that would be provided again, with the mix use component of it. That's a good gathering area and then that transitions to some of other more private areas within the townhouse are. There's also some common space area and open space there too. As part of the project, there was a completed Mitigated Negative Declaration that is being circulated currently. That our potential significant impact to the biological resources and that's actually due with nesting – potential nesting birds and roosting bats. That's pretty common type of impact that occurs and there is a mitigation measures for those. After the review of the project and this initial study, Mitigation Negative Declaration, the Board shall recommend adoptions or provide comments or recommend changes as they may deem necessary. We are looking for that type of comments and direction as well. The next steps for the project is to complete the environmental document period – circulation period. Respond to any of those comments. We have already received some and then we would schedule a Council meeting after the Board makes its recommendation. Then a decision would be on the site and design and the design enhance exception. The Council would also adopt the negative declaration. The motion from Staff is to recommend that the City Council adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration of approval of the review and design enhancement exception application to allow construction of the mix use project based upon the findings and conditional – the conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Again, the applicant is also here with a presentation. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok. Thank you, Sheldon. We normally do the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes. I do know that we have one speaker from the public who has scheduling issues and I wonder – we normally do the speakers after the presentation but if somebody – if you need to leave, we could do it before. We'll get there. I'm sorry? Yeah, it is Julian who needed to leave early? Ok, so, I think that may have taken care of itself.

Board Member Furth: Excuse me, Chair Lew. Before – could I disclose a communication before...

Chair Lew: Sure.

Board Member Furth: ... the public hearing part starts. I was at the site. I met with Dorthy Bender and we looked at the building from the landscaping down the Starbucks drive-thru driveway and also from the neighboring property. The property adjacent to this projects frontage on Curtner and she provided me with her copies of documents

from the first review of this project, all of which are part of the public record. Provided me with information about her conversations with the [Silvestria] family, which I believe are repeated in other communications to us. We discussed, in general terms, the security of the parking arrangements and the existences of rolled curbs and also concerns of the neighbor on Curtner about construction impacts. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other disclosures? No. Ok, we'll do the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

[Mr. Mark Walmack:] Good afternoon. My name is [Mark Walmack], I'm an architect with EID Architects. We've been working together with the City on this project for a number of years. You – many of you no doubt recall seeing this project in its prior incarnation. I thought I'd start by just quickly listing what primarily we were responding to during the period that has passed in between the last time that you saw it and now. The first two are the more important changes and they were – one was to move the parking podium level down so that it was flush with the grade to reduce the massing of the buildings and help with the transition to the multi-family neighborhood that's next to our – adjacent to our project. The second one was to add driveway access from El Camino Real so that shoppers who want to come to the property have direct access to the parking garage. There was concern that driving all the way around to Curtner to find the driveway entrance was more than just a stretch so we reconfigured the site plan to accommodate those two items. There was also a desire to redesign the commercial façade to be more consistent with the (inaudible) and other requirements for the El Camino Real district. To improve our open space and enhance its continuity. To create a path that allowed pedestrians a clear and open access from one side of the property to the other. Those were the issues that we were attempting largely to address and I'll describe how we went about doing that. The project, as you not doubt have all seen, is an area of El Camion Real that hasn't seen a lot of development yet. We're sandwiched in between the Starbucks restaurant and an older oil lube building. The project building itself – the existing building is really quite small and doesn't have much of a presence on the street, other than the very street frontage there. It's important I think, to take a look at the overall neighborhood. This community was built up in the 1960's, before that it was largely orchards and a few single-family homes. Excuse me. During the 1960's, what you see here is that there was a very intense development of apartment building and this is kind of unusual neighborhood for Palo Alto. There aren't many neighborhoods like this and this is why we've come to you with a fairly dense multi-family solution for this project. At the same time, wanting to respect the existing neighbors, particularly the one directly to the left of us. We broke the scale and massing of the duplexes on the RM-30 zone, down to be more respectful of that type of scale and massing. The site itself is really very challenging. The leg that comes in from Curtner is only 55-feet wide. You can imagine the challenges that would be associated with any sort of on-site or surface parking solution for this property. Contextual, the parcel directly adjacent to use is currently under construction with a six-unit multifamily building that pushes all the zoning criteria, floor area ratios, setback, lot coverage. It's perhaps consistent with the kind of residential development that you're probably going to see more and more of as the demand for housing continues to apply

pressure on the city. Directly across the street is another small project that was recently completed, which contains six units in two buildings. The scale of this is more in keeping with the overall nature of the – of Curtner and beyond. That brings us to the – our sitting here and you can see that we've got the mix used building up in the CS zone. Satisfying the criteria for that zoning district by itself and then it transitions down into a more residential scale, which – you can see based on this slide is really much more pedestrian and human in scale than most of the other existing construction in the neighborhood. The site – we started by increasing our setback off of Curtner. We have a 65-foot front yard setback to the first building – first duplex here and this is in spite of the fact that the existing condition all the way down Curtner is essentially built to the front yard setback line. You see the eleven townhomes clustered in a duplex in a triplex on the narrow portion of the lot and three duplex buildings on the leg that extends back to El Camino Real. Speaking to the point that Sheldon made about the amount of open space that you see here. One of the advantages of putting the parking underground is that we do have an excessive amount of open space on this project. In the RN-30 zone, we have ten times the required private open space than is required by the code. These open spaces range from just under 200-square feet for the two smaller yards on the narrow section of Curtner to over 600-square feet for some of the larger yards. That's also true of the residential buildings in the mix use portion of the lot. We redesigned the El Camino Real front to bring the plaza area from the north side of the property down to the south side of the property. This was done to address some of your comments but also address some of the concerns that were expressed to us by the owners of the Starbuck property. Who wanted to make sure that we were respectful of the view corridor so that customers that are driving south on El Camino Real would still be able to see and identify their property. They felt that was important for his business and his retail space. The commercial building shifted to the north side and we shifted the plaza area to the south. This also allowed us to really enhance the pedestrian linkage between the commercial portions of the project and the residential RN zone to the rear. The retail space is on the first floor primarily with the second floor, which could be a mezzanine or could be a standalone retail space. The residential units behind it and above it is designed to fill out that building. Meeting all the criteria for FAR and setbacks and so forth for the CS zone. Those six flats balance out the remainder of the residential area. Moving down the garage, you can see that we've got a one-way access point in off of El Camino Real. This provides that direct connection that you wanted to see so that customers could have easy access to parking and get into the stores. It was believed by many of the stakeholders in the City that having a driveway exit on El Camino Real would have created confusion in a rather hazardous location so we hit upon a solution where all the traffic leaving the parking garage would leave on Curtner. The added advantage to that is being that they would be able to reenter El Camino Real at a signalized intersection. The parking garage, as was pointed out, has a lot of extra parking. The peak demand for this parking shifts from more commercial during the day to residential more during the evening so we believe that given the fact that we are over parked and given the nature of our being able to cluster guest parking and commercial parking reasonably close to each other, we think that this project can be built without creating any real impact on the existing community in terms of their parking needs. The – Sheldon described to you the character of the commercial building here. You can see

as you move into here, that you do have this open corridor along the south side of the property that does connect you with the common open spaces in the rear. The driveway ramp is designed such that we're going to have landscaping planters ring it with cascading vines to soften and lessen the impact of that entry. We're repeating that on the Curtner side of the property. Here you can see very clearly the stark contrast between our front yard setback and the setback of the neighbors. The transition from the common or the public space to the common space of the residential area helps create an attractive entrance into the project. Here you see the relative massing of our duplexes transposed against the two-story apartment building directly to the east. This shows you the position of the podium on the grade and how that really did drop the building down and allow us to maximize to full effect the amount of open space; both private and public open. Then finally, I'd like to point out that we have incorporated into the townhomes bike lockers essentially, that are bike garages. They are designed to be as effectively used by the owners as possible. You know how people spend a lot of money on their bikes when they are into community on their bike and rather than have these remotely places around the site and inconvenient to the individual units. These are designed to really encourage the use and the function ability of residences to use their bike. I've run out of time. I'll stop and take questions.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you very much. Ok, we have four speakers. I will allow 5-minutes for each so we have Judy [phonetics][Gittelsohn], [Simon Cintz], Dorothy Bender and Jeff [phonetics][Levinsky].

[Ms. Judy Gittelsohn:] Hi, I'm Judy [Gittelsohn] and I'm a resident at – like the second slide, third slide, where you show the overview. I'll just give you an orientation to where I am. Keep going back. That one. One forward. Yeah, in the other direction. Ok, so there's the neighborhood. I am the – right between the – Hi. I'm Judy [Gittelsohn] and I reside at 399 Curtner and I'm the unhighlighted area. The – one of a few single-family homes in the neighborhood. The darker yellow is 405 Curtner and I want to speak to that but I first want to say that I felt that the notification of the City was really weak. I've been paying attention to 405 Curtner because it impacts me and I felt like the only – we walked by the 387 – 3877 El Camino regularly so we saw the pictures in the window but I felt like the first notification I got on issues was March 8<sup>th</sup>. I just wanted to make a note and I've been paying very strict attention to 405 Curtner, which has been being built since November of 2015 and it's six units and that – my big point is traffic. That has completely impacted negatively Curtner Avenue and they have trucks and they don't have underground parking. It's a project the third of the size of this one in terms of construction and it doesn't have the underground parking. My big wish and I'll highlight the response I did to the Mitigated Negative Declaration, is that you redo a traffic study in 2017 because I've been living at this address since 2010 and over the past few years, the population has swelled. People in Palo Alto cannot afford to use their garages for garages. They are storage and living and 405 Curter has glass on both sides and those two-car garages, in my best view, are not going to be used for storage of cars. Those cars are going to be on Curtner. The Gabrielle Court across the street has added another dozen new residence and it just feels like Curtner is constantly backed up. I just think that 2014 traffic study that you did is applicable to what – the

conditions that exist with this building. That's my big request. My letter – my response to Sheldon was or the four things were traffic exiting from the project onto Curtner, the underground parking, the studies of the historically significant and the entrance to the property on El Camino; the 3877. I feel that that driveway is too sharp of a turn in, right after the exit from the Starbucks. If you're a pedestrian and I state this in the letter that I wrote. You are constantly or not constantly but whenever I walk by, people are leaving Starbucks with their coffee in a hurry and they don't look that direction and I – from antidotally, have had near misses – near accidents there on a monthly basis and I'm pretty cautious. I think that their proposed driveway going in at that point is an accident waiting to happen from someone leaving Starbuck. I just want to say that. Exiting onto Curtner is a big problem, which I stated in here. I just feel that the increasing amount of these 62-cars only leaving on Curtner is really putting a strain on a street that is – do I get 5-minutes?

Chair Lew: I think you have about a minute left. We started a little late because of the presentation or the slide.

[Ms. Gittelsohn:] Ok, cool. That Curtner is a two-way street but because so many people are using the street for their parking, it really – to drive up and down, you really have to wait for the car to come by. You cannot drive two cars against one another unless they are smaller cars. Then the trucks for construction that have been on the street from 405 Curtner, which are a fraction of what's going to happen with digging an underground parking, are making it so that not only can one not go by, it's a real slow transportation corridor. I don't think Curtner is sufficiently designed to support the parking and the exit onto Curtner and I think new traffic studies need to be done to consider the exit that way. I would prefer to have the exit be on El Camino. Also, I think that just in a – doing the underground parking is really pushing up against the environmental aspects of it. I think that's it. I'd be happy to answers any questions. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Ok, next speaker is Simon Sims. I don't see him. Oh, there...

[Mr. Simon Cintz:] Hello, my name is – I was going to say good morning but now it's afternoon. My name is Simon Sins. Our family has owned the property that Starbuck currently occupies. We've owned it since the early 1960's and I'm here to speak in support of getting this project done. I really don't know much about the architecture. To me personally, the project visually looks very pleasing. What I am concerned about is that right now, right next to us is the old Compadres Restaurant. We really have a bad situation. The building is – looks terrible; the existing building I am referring too of the old Compadres restaurant because there's nobody there. It's been vacant now for 8 or 9-years. That's a long time for a property, especially a large property be vacant and garbage and trash and old newspapers collect on the sidewalk in the front. There's nobody there to clean it up. When you go to the edge of our property, I think Ms. Furth I guess was looking over from the wall down there. What you'll see are discarded blankets and sleeping bags and trash. This has been an area where transient people often stay there. There's – the property – the subject property here is on grade maybe

a foot or two lower than our property so we have like a 4-foot wall and on the other side, people have put chairs and other things to make it easier to get over from their side to our side. This is a problem for people that are drinking, using drugs, potential fire. This is not a good thing to have in a neighborhood and it's not a good thing to have for a long period of time as we've had here. I'm really encouraging the ARB here to move this project forward quickly because I think that what you have in front of you is an overall good project. Again, I am not an architect but I would very much like to see the area improved and the hazards that come with an unoccupied building that has been vacant for many, many years, be removed and the neighborhood improved. In terms of just driveways and things like that. If you're going to have a driveway on El Camino, the current placement of the driveway, which is next to our Starbucks drive-thru, in my mind, is a good location simply because it creates more space between my drive-thru and the buildings that are going to be occupied. In my mind, it's a – the proposed location for the driveway for the subject property is in a good location to separate us from – commercial use from residential use. Again, I hope this project moves along quickly. I would like to see something happen with that property. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you and Dorothy Bender.

Ms. Dorothy Bender: Hello, my name is Dorothy Bender and I've been watching this project for – well, 45-years. I mean, as long as I've lived in the area and when I first moved into Barron Park, this was my neighborhood restaurant. Then Iron Works and then it became Compadres and in 2008, I had my retirement party there so I've been watching it and live nearby. This is a photo of El Camino taken yesterday and it's just a feeling that I have that we have 9-minute oil, Compadres, we have Starbucks and a gas station. Wouldn't it be nice if we had some kind of overall design for El Camino? This is the Starbucks where a car – you can see a car exiting and a car driving. I'm across the street in front of the liquor store. This is again, a car exiting Starbucks and see the fire hydrant there and along – just a long side of that door there, will be – which is now the – was the entrance to Compadres. Will be the driveway down into the underground garage. Yesterday, we noticed the Iron Works sign that's still posted on the side looking from Starbucks. So, it's still there and one of our speakers -- we have talked about the historic relevance of that building, which we would like to preserve and the Planning Commission did recommend, in addition to three people approving the project, that it do a full historic – that it continue with historic analysis before approving. This is also a photo of the Compadres building and I know that the homeless people if they don't go there, they'll go across the street to the alley on Military Way or sleep in the underground Garage. Last Friday, March 31<sup>st</sup>, this is Julian [phonetics][Silvestie], he's the grandson of the original owner of Compadres and of Iron Works. [Gonzalos Silvestie] who was born in Mexico in 19 –1898 and he came here to build and run the store. This is in the architect's office and we were shown some 28 or so objects that were saved from the historic building. Here was a diagram that we show off the objects that, I believe are the Iron Works objects that came from the original shop. This is a photo of the parking lot that use to be the Compadres parking lot. I'm looking at it from Curtner. This is what it looks like and there are trees on both sides. I think all those

trees will be removed by the current plans. This is my – I found this picture. This is what I assume the parking lot will look like underground and here is the diagram, which you've seen before of the 62-parking spaces. That which is highlighted in blue on the bottom is the 4-foot density enhancement exception, which they are asking for. I have a great deal of concern about this underground parking lot. Notice that if I live there and I come home with my baby and my groceries, I'm going to have to look for a parking space. I've just paid \$2.5 million for a townhouse that's above me and how do I get to my townhouse? I have no easy way. I've highlighted in blue some of the ways in which you can get upstairs and then there are two elevators but we have packages and there's a great deal of issues surrounding this underground parking garage. I have a statement here from – I checked – is that the 5-minutes?

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Ms. Bender: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you for to speaking and then Jeff [Levinsky].

[Mr. Jeff Levinsky:] I have a hand out for the Board Members. I'll be referring to that later. Good afternoon, Board – I'm not used to saying that. Good afternoon Board Members and Staff. Firstly, a very quick thing. Sheldon mentioned that the ground floor would be retail but I think the plans say it could be an office so it would be good to get that clarified if it's really being designed for retail or office. I have some concerns about the historic review. The (inaudible) historic review for the building mentions that there were – are original frescos that have been painted over on interior walls but say the date and artist – but it doesn't mention the artist at all and says the date is unknown. However, the [Silvestie] family has identified the artist as [Renaldo Be Rubio], who worked for the federal art project in 1930's. His commissions include the Los Angeles City Hall and the San Bernardino post office. I think that information should get into the historic review and there should be an evaluation of the artist significances. The review should also then evaluate whether the murals are restorable. It says that they have been painted over but that doesn't mean that they can't be restored because that would lead to some opportunities for historic preservation of at least the murals. Then there are criteria in three of the historic review. It asked whether the existing building is an example of a type a building that was once common. Then the review says well, there weren't many (inaudible) buildings constructed in Palo Alto in the 20<sup>th</sup> century so it's not common. However, there's no reason why the review chose that particular period of time to look at and the Adobe buildings were of course quite common in this area in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and not the 20<sup>th</sup>. It's – so, if you go back and look at the criteria, the plain facts are that the building being Adobe, is of a type that was once common in this area and is now indeed very rare. The review doesn't get into it but apparently, it may be the last such Adobe building left in Pal Alto altogether. When said that way, the building does then appear to meet criteria for #3. Then I have some questions about the concession for extra FAR and I've given you each a copy of some of our laws. The minuscule code at 1815080A says that any request for concession and I've to highlight this, shall be submitted with the first application for a discretionary



permit for a development. Becky Sanders of the neighbor association asked the City for copies of all the materials related to this and the documents she got back were all dated in 2016, whereas the application went in in 2014. So, there's a question, how – was there information about the concession submitted with the first application as the law requires? It goes on to say that the applications shall be on a form prescribed by the City. The materials were given to Becky were not on a form prescribed by the City. Then, down below on item four, there is says that if a concession is requested, there should be included a brief explanation (inaudible) actual cost reduction achieved through the concession or incentive and how the cost reduction allows the applicant to provide the restricted affordable units. Well, there was not such explanation of any cost reduction associated with the materials that Becky received. In fact, it's a little curious and you as Architectural Board Members might want to comment, how does extra FAR reduce costs? Normally – well, we heard before that it was \$500 a square foot to build FAR so how does extra FAR, in this case, 2,600-square feet, lower the actual cost? I've included for you the State law and the State law says that the – a concession means something that reduces the actual cost of the project. So, it's not clear to me what the City is offering to provide, is actually a legal concession under the State law. There are some problems there and I'm hoping that you'll have a chance to address all that. Thank you very much and I have to go.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you, [Mr. Levinsky] and I just wanted to say – just give one more chance to [Julian Selvestry] if he's back. Excellent and you have 5-minutes.

[Mr. Julian Selvestry:] Good afternoon. Thank you for letting me talk. I just have a short statement to read. My name is [Julian Gonzalos Silvestie]. I'm the grandson of [Gonzalos Silvestie], the man that built the building at – on El Camino I would like to request that you revisit the historical aspect of 3877 El Camino Real. The Adobe building built by my grandfather [Gonzalos Silvestie] in the 30's as a representation of Mexican-American culture in California and my heritage. Many homes and businesses in Palo Alto like Menlo Park and Atherton, still have the artist iron made from [Silvestie] (inaudible). Allied Arts in Menlo Park is a treasure of Menlo Park in this great example. Some of the other clients include Shirley Temple Black, the Dupont family, Sunset magazine, James Gardner, (inaudible), way before Joe Montana. John Broady, Ricky's (inaudible) House, Alta Mesa Cemetery, Town and Country Village and the Romano Street Historic District and many other businesses and homes in the area. Besides being one of the last Adobe buildings in Palo Alto, there was also Fresco on one of the inside walls done by a Mexican artist [Renaldo Bah Rubio]. Not only was the building an Iron Works, it also served as a gathering spot for other artists and craftsperson in the area and of the time. It would be a shame to destroy one of the last links between Mexican-Americans and present Hispanic culture. On March 31<sup>st</sup>, last week, the architect had shown us a few iron works saved in his back room, including labeled diagrams of all the [Silvestie] items preserved. The [Silvestie] family hopes that Palo Alto will do a complete analysis of this historic culture of the significance of the Iron Works Compadres building as was recommended by the Planning and Transportation Commission at its March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017 meeting. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Ok, we'll close the public comment period and bring it back to the Board. Questions?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. We saw this project last – when did we last see this project at the Board?

Mr. Ah Sing: It was in December of 2013 for the preliminary.

Board Member Furth: I don't believe that's correct. No.

Chair Lew: We had two – I'm not sure. I've seen it twice (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Board Member Furth: I've seen it before and I wasn't here in 2013. So, we've got another set of plans. I just can't find any reference in the Staff report.

Board Member Gooyer: Looks like...

Board Member Furth: Yeah, November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2016? I think one of the steps of review fell out of the Staff report so I found it. It was a preliminary review, was it? I'm not trying to ask trick questions, I just got quite confused.

Ms. Gerhardt: The preliminary view was in 2013. I had been – you had asked a question earlier. I was looking for that but I could not find the previous review so I will keep looking.

Board Member Furth: Well, we have a set of plans dated November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2015, which are not the current version and we reviewed these because I found myself wondering how many strangely constraint 'L' shaped projects next to a drive thru – fast food and good coffee establishment do we have and I don't see any reference to our previous discussion or recommendations except in the applicant's presentation. Dropping out that piece of the experience, I think is both confusing to us and the public.

Board Member Baltay: Alex, if I – if she is finished?

Chair Lew: Wynne is you...

Board Member Furth: I'm finished.

Chair Lew: Ok. Mic? Wynne, you need to turn the mic off. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Do we have any material samples for this project that we could see?

Mr. Ah Sing: The applicant does have some.

Board Member Baltay: Could you bring them up, please. If you've submitted a material board, is that available? That would be – this is difficult.

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry, we can't hear the conversation taking place. We need you to step to a microphone if you don't mind and Sheldon, can you respond to the material board issue.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes, we do have one. I can bring it down from upstairs.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I would like to see that, please.

**Male:** I think you have the answer that you were looking for at this point but if you another question, I'm more than happy to answer and we have lots of information about the process that we have gone – come through as well and the chronology if you like to have further info about that.

Chair Lew: Kyu, did you have any questions? Why don't we wait – if it's Sheldon, why wait till he comes back.

Vice Chair Kim: I have maybe just a quick clarification question for the applicant. There was some mention in the Staff report about garbage and how it's going to be taken out. Could you explain – could you repeat that information and explain to me whether these are plastic rolling carts or larger metal carts?

[Mr. Walmack:] They are the smaller carts and the procedure will be that property management will be responsible for bringing those carts from the two areas within the basement that are designated for collection, up to a staging area on the property adjacent to the curb by Curtner.

Vice Chair Kim: So, both of the garage garbage areas will be taken out to Curtner Street?

[Mr. Walmack:] By property management, yes.

Vice Chair Kim: These bins are going up through the elevator or by ramp?

[Mr. Walmack:] No, no, up the ramp.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

[Mr. Walmack:] It seems like a lot of work to me but evidently, project management – property management companies are used to doing this.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok. Then on the second floor of the mix use building on El Camino where you have that second-floor retail/office space. Is there a restroom that those office occupants...

[Mr. Walmack:] The restrooms for the retail space has not been identified yet. The assumption is that (inaudible) improvement plan will be submitted by whomever it is that rents those areas, depending on how it is leased. The design solution for a single occupant would be different than it would be if there are two.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

[Mr. Walmack:] Rather than try and anticipate how that might be used, we elected to remain vague about that area.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Peter?

Board Member Baltay: I guess I'll wait for the material board to get here but I really want to understand what these materials are on the façade here.

Chair Lew: We can get back – we can return back to that. I have some questions for you. Where is the electric transformer?

[Mr. Walmack:] The electric transformer that was identified for use on this project recently is by the Chevron property. Quite a bit of work was put into to working with the City to determine which of the transformers that are around the property could be used and there are -- the Chevron transformer evidently wasn't available when we made our original application. That has been very well scrutinized by the City, Public Works, and utilities so that there's a high degree of confidence that that transformer is appropriate for supplying this property.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. Then the garage – the underground garage is showing pedestrian – well, wait. Let me go back for a second. For the townhouses, right? I think you're showing gates at the pedestrian entrances...

[Mr. Walmack:] Right.

Chair Lew: ...but it's not clear what is happening at the automobile entrances. So, at the moment it looks like it – the automobile entrance is open but you could go up the middle staircase to the units.

[Mr. Walmack:] The idea that we're working on with the gating of the garage. It's an interesting challenge because, on the one hand, you want to make sure that customers have access to the garage during business hours unimpeded. At the same point in time, you'd like to have some degree of security after hours. So, the solution that we would implode would be to have gates to the bottom of the ramps that would be deployed only after hours. Those hours specifically are to be determined. I think probably somewhere in the 8-9 o'clock PM, they would start to be – they would be closed. Then

they would be opened again at 6 in the morning but yes, then once you're in the garage, our plan is to have one assigned parking spot per unit. Then the remaining guest and commercial space would be available in a first come first serve basis. Once you've entered the garage and found your parking spot. There are three points where you can get out of the garage. Since all of the townhome parking is cluster essentially on the Curtner side of the project and around that first corner. We have two stairways that give you more direct access from the garage to those two points, plus an elevator for people when they are carrying more than they want to or can carry upstairs or if they aren't able to climb the stairs, we have that elevator. In the mix use building has its own elevator too, which serves not only to provide access to the flats but also provide access to retail.

Chair Lew: You're going to need – then there would be a gate at the – probably at the middle staircase.

[Mr. Walmack:] Yeah, except that – in the case of where these staircases are, they are behind the primary gates for the residential area. So, the gates would not necessarily – like the gates into the garage. After hours, when the garage is closed and the primary gates into the residential portion of the site are closed, the stairwells aren't really an area of concern.

Chair Lew: Ok. I think there were more questions from Peter and Kyu for Staff. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I'm looking at your material board and I see Epay wood siding for horizontal siding and you just presented us with a box of Trespa laminate. Would you mind walking through the street elevation on El Camino and pointing out the 4 or 5 dominate materials and showing which ones they are, please?

[Mr. Walmack:] The material board which you are lookingg at probably predates the most current submittal. As you are aware, the project has been before you for a long time and the majority of the work that's been done in the past – a couple of years has been focused on addressing density and building placement and so forth. The one point that was made very clearly by the Board on the last visit, was that natural wood sidings really are just not appropriate for use on buildings of this type. What we are proposing now to do is to use manufactured materials like the Trespa, which are sustainable and very durable and they don't fade. The areas on the El Camino Real elevation that you're looking at that have the appearance of being a wood like product are not wood. They area Trespa product.

Board Member Baltay: Could I interrupt you? Please pull up an elevation from El Camino and just point to the various elements and tell us what they are, please.

[Mr. Walmack:] Whoops, this is not my presentation. Thank you. That's it. Like this one? No, I don't think so. There we go. Ok. Also, on sheet A-2.5, you'll see the areas of materials labeled. On the front elevation, you're not really going to be seeing any stucco at all. There's not a lot of material here because there's a lot of glazing but what

you do see here that is a solid color or the wood like product. That's all going to be Trespa or Trespa like building system with a hidden fastener detail. It will produce a clean and very durable and very presentable elevation. It will not be subject to the deterioration that you raised as a concern with a wood product. The window frames and all the metal components of the building will be a match aluminum finish. Then we're employing a sun shade system to help break down the massing of the building. Maintaining visual continuity between the street and the retail area...

Board Member Baltay: Excuse me, please? I just asked for you to identify the materials. Which Trespa panel...

[Mr. Walmack:] Oh.

Board Member Baltay: Which piece – I just want to know what is being proposed?

Stuart Welte: If I may assist? The brown color -- on this elevation, the brownish color is the Trespa products. The horizontal lines are the rain screen products.

Board Member Baltay: Which Trespa product? There is a box of them over there.

Stuart Welte: These are – there are many, many options.

Board Member Baltay: Which one is proposed, please?

Stuart Welte: This one here is proposed. It's all the same material. They have different colors and textures and this one is to simulate a wood grain but it is a composite material with – very durable as Mark was mentioning. That is the "wood" material. The rain screen product is in the other box. The Tera 5 box, which is a terracotta product and it – are the horizontal lines that run up along the building. Now, this product line here, they make all these colors that are on the color chart but when they provide you the samples, they can't provide you a sample of that actual color – of your actual profile in that color until you make an order. We are proposing this profile, which is the -- all these are also called out by the way, in the set – the current set on the elevation sheets as note tags but then – so it would be that product in a color to match the window and door frame curtain walls. That's an extruded terracotta product that is long so it's the long lines on the image that you're looking at in the elevation. (Inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: That's what goes in front...

Stuart Welte: It basically looks like a Venetian blind.

Board Member Baltay: On the exterior of the glazing?

Stuart Welte: That's correct.

Board Member Baltay: Would it be the terracotta color or the silver color shown in the elevation?

Stuart Welte: The elevation color and the color chart here – in – on the cover of the box, they have their color chart.

Board Member Baltay: Ok and then the material for the columns, there's these white post...

Stuart Welte: The material for the columns is either going to be concrete or it's going to be clad in stucco.

Board Member Baltay: Beautiful. That's a nice product. So, the columns are either going to be clad stucco or they will be concrete but most likely, the structural engineer is going to recommend that we clad them with stucco.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I think that's the end of my question. Thank you.

Stuart Welte: Sure.

Chair Lew: Kyu, did you have another – any other questions? Ok. I have some – I have a question regarding the landscape. You have some storm water retention areas and I was wondering if you could explain that and how those are placed in coordination with the trees that are proposed on the property line? This is the property line or there's a property to the north on Curtner. I don't have the address.

[Mr. Walmack:] The civil engineer on the project and the landscape architect on the project coordinated and they worked together to concentrate the C3 retention in the property within the 6-foot setbacks that occur all along either side of the parking garage area. They recognized the challenges that they would face with making sure they could plant trees in that space without interrupting the function and flow of the storm water system. That is something they looked at very carefully and worked together to resolve.

Chair Lew: So, are the trees – proposed trees in the retention area or are they in between them? Are they in between the retention areas?

[Mr. Walmack:] They idea as it was presented to me was that the bio-retention area would start and stop to allow placement for trees.

Chair Lew: Between them, great.

[Mr. Walmack:] Because the trees – they are not – they are incompatible.

Chair Lew: Got it. Ok, thank you. Ok, why don't we move on to Board Member comments?

Mr. Lait: Chair, you're getting – I'm sorry...

Chair Lew: Yes.

Mr. Lait: ... over at that table. As you're getting ready for your deliberation, we did find that other study. Jodie, can or that other discussion regarding the project, Jodie can speak to it.

Chair Lew: Sure.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so there was a study session on December 3<sup>rd</sup> of 2015. So, it was a study session, there wasn't a vote at that time but there was some discussion about the width of the courtyard off of El Camino, the depth of the below grade parking, entrances – entrance routes to the residential units, automobile access to retail spaces on El Camion Real, the calculation of lot coverage and ensure that that was done correctly. Location of mechanical equipment and wood siding on the units. The Board Members commented regarding the permitted office uses, the lack of parking space for retail uses, lack of open space, height of housing at the rear of the property, the use of the Epay wood siding, the west face glazing, locations of bike lockers, placement of BMR units, quality and usefulness of the drawings and linking the building design to surround businesses. There were questions about an alternate design for egress and ingress automobiles.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Ok, are we ready for Board Member comments. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Actually, I've relatively happy with this design. I like it much better than the previous one that we saw. I think the units work more. The – I remember the – if I remember right, the last one, the parking garage was sort of 3 or 4-feet out of the ground and so now, it's been pushed all the way down, which I think is a big help. It just – the flow along the site is much better. I guess the main concern I have is now seeing some of the – the colors are a little strange to me as far as some of the mixtures. I think I have a little bit of a problem with that but other than that, I could probably approve the project the way it is now.

Chair Lew: Ok. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Yes, I share Roberts sentiments that changing the way the parking is done is dramatically improved a lot of other things about the project. I also find coming in off of El Camino as a one-way entrance in is a very good solution. It makes sense to drive in there. I heard and understand the neighbors' concerns about Starbucks being right there and it will be more difficult; you are correct. I still think it's much better than having people going all the way around to Curtner and come back in. That would result in no parking. People stopping and looking for a spot and causing even more trouble. We are compromising. I think this is one of those compromises that works very well. The same things go to the comments addressed about traffic exiting



on Curtner. Well, there's no question that there will be more traffic driving on Curtner because of this new building. At least it's kept close to El Camino and there's enough space on Curtner now for it to be done safely and properly. The real issue is whether or not you have this many new housing units coming into the neighborhood and this is not a Board where we take that kind of issue up. That goes to the City Council. I find the pedestrian circulation on the project really nice. The way you come in through these, what I find fairly attractively designed gates. Especially the one on Curtner. I find the massing on El Camino is improved. It fits, to my mind, more the desirability to the street line. I find it intriguing that the historical aspect of the site and the older building but again, I just don't see what we can do about that. It's important to save those old parts of the old Iron Works but the new owner of the building has a right to build this project and I can't see what we can do about that. Again, maybe the City Council will see otherwise. My concern and it's not mollified by the presentation is that I just really don't understand what the materials are and the finished and how this rain screen works. I'd like to suggest to my colleagues that we might be able to see this as a consent item coming back to us, just to really understand because everything else seems ok to me and I could recommend approval. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, thank you for your presentation. I also find that this plan is much improved. Lowering the parking podium so that it's completely underground is huge to this project and I feel that the added ingress to the garage parking from El Camino is also a nice way to figure out the auto traffic underneath. I was taking a peek at the older drawings and it – I think overall, it's just a huge improvement as far as the circulation throughout the site but I do still have a little bit of concern with vertical circulation, especially for the residences. If you are living there, you really have no choice but to park in the underground garage and I can just imagine if somebody's left and you forgot your bag or something. To have to come back onto the site and to park underground and then go back up. It – I could see it just being a real hassle. It's – I don't see what else could be done really but maybe perhaps another elevator or just some other vertical circulation options that would maybe ease that a little bit. I like the bicycle storage that you have in the townhouse units. I notice that on the elevations, there seems to be a pony wall of some sort towards the front of that bicycle storage. I just hope that there's enough clearance to be able to maneuver your bicycle in and out of that bicycle storage without that pony wall having been kind of an afterthought. My questions about trash have been answered. I would be ok recommending approval of the DEE. I think it makes sense with the underground garage and overall, I think it's a great improvement. I think we do still need to see how these materials really mesh and come together. The Trespa panels, are they going to be divided? It won't be one continuous shot of Trespa as shown in the rendering so it would be nice to see some additional construction details about how those come together and where those lines meet. Overall, I'm pleased with the site planning and I think we've got something now that really works and I'd be excited to see some of those things come back but overall, I'm very pleased. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. First of all, I want to apologize to Sheldon for not trying to figure out what the date was and then asking you if I was right but I was quite confused about whether if my own memory was correct. I agree that this is a much more successful approach. I appreciate the responsiveness. I appreciate the more useful outdoor spaces. I appreciate the attractive common open space that is set back far enough from El Camino Real so that the noise level should be appropriate. I have two concerns. One of the – I'm wondering if one of them is gendered, which is, this looks like it's designed by men for men. This is not an ok garage parking and access arrangement. I am not coming comfortably into this building at 9 o'clock at night or 6:30 in the morning or 8:30 or 7 o'clock in the winter and entering a garage where I can't see whether there's anybody else in it. Where I don't have secure access so I need to see a security plan for this garage. I don't know what it involves. Ideally, of course, it involves gates – roll up gates but this is not – I couldn't make finding number four. That this is ok for use by users. Maybe I don't understand the terrific lighting and the fact that you're always in view of somebody else but this just reads as unsafe to me. I wouldn't be able to make that finding. With respect to the historic nature of the site and the [Silvestie] family presence and the Iron Works presence. It was quite startling to see the side wall and see the Iron Works sign and to see the tile. I suspect that the lamps that are on El Camino are not [Silvestie] work at all. The remnants that are shown in the [DUDEC] report is really gorgeous. We don't have a program of putting blue ceramic tiles on buildings to identify historic sites but you have some choices that you can make about how you do things on this site and I would be very supportive of the commemoration of the importance of this site. This is an important family and an important person, an important link to the design of this City and you're designers and this is a predecessor of yours. One of the things that has been bothering me a lot as I look at projects that come through is that they seem oblivious both to the setting here in terms of our light air vistas and our history. We do have a history. We didn't just appear last year so I would be most interested in what you could do to acknowledge and honor that which happened earlier on this site. As I say, my – the thing that would keep me from recommending approval is that I don't understand access for residences to be safe or as safe as I think it should be in perception as well as reality. I know we have relatively few assaults in this City but relatively few is not very cheerful when you're coming home with the groceries.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you. I guess I have some questions for Staff. I just wanted to try to respond to some of the public comments. Ok, so, I think Judy [Gittelsohn] has asked to redo the traffic and transportation study and I wonder if Staff had a comment about updating the traffic counts.

Mr. Ah Sing: So, the – I mean – the traffic study was conducted inconsistently with the City standards so there's not really a precedence to redo that unless there are other types of substantial evidence that would contradict the information that we have.

Ms. Gerhardt: That study has been reviewed by our transportation division. With this comment, we will take that back and we can have our transportation team give a more complete answer to that as well.

Chair Lew: Right so comment period is still open...

Ms. Gerhardt: We are (inaudible)

Chair Lew: ...so they – we do have to – they do have to respond, right? We do have to respond.

Ms. Gerhardt: We respond directly to the commenter, yes.

Chair Lew: Then I think also Ms. – (inaudible) we had the email – it may have been from Dorothy Bender but I think there were comments about – by email about parking on sidewalks and I think that's outside of the Board – purview of the Board but does the Staff have any idea about trying to address that?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so our understanding is that there are rolled curbs along this street and so some people are sort of pulling up onto the sidewalk and that's blocking the sidewalk. We would need to further check with Public Works Department, to see what enforcement action could be done for that type of issue.

Chair Lew: Then Mr. Levinsky had a comment about the concessions and we have our - - Palo Alto's ordinance and there's also the States directive to – for Cities to have their own ordinance for BMR units. Could you explain how that happens? I mean, I've seen that happen – we've seen that happen on other projects. It seems to me that's held – that kind of discussion is held at the Council level with regard to concessions. I'm thinking of the project on Page Mill Road.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, well, on this particular case, I read that was – I'm having a little bit of a problem now with my computer accessing this but I was glancing through the code provision and I – the code does – the reference here is – does speak to application requirements. It's probably a little more detailed than we might stipulate for other types of applications but if we don't have in the record some of this information that's being requested and I don't know if we've got the administration file here right now. We should make sure that we have that as far as a record. As far as the concession goes, the City does have a list of, what we call, on menu concessions and these are -- by right a developer could ask for these – for this so there's not a whole lot of discretion involved in that aspect of the – of this part of the request. It's just one of the ones that are given.

Chair Lew: It doesn't matter if it's happening today versus hopping at say like a preliminary from a year or two ago?

Mr. Lait: Right.

Chair Lew: Because they didn't – at the time, they didn't ask but it wasn't an official – it wasn't a...

Mr. Lait: This is the first formal...

Chair Lew: ...first hearing.

Mr. Lait: Application.

Chair Lew: Today is the actual...

Mr. Lait: Well, the...

Chair Lew: I think this is the trigger that he sent. I mean, he's saying that there's...

Mr. Lait: What it says is that – shall be submitted with the first application for discretionary review. This AR – I don't know what are planning number is for this thing but this is the first formal application and you know, the project also adjust and modify in response to Board comments. I'm not particularly concerned about the timing of this issue as it relates to our code.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you. Ok, and I have a comment for Staff. If you go to – it's my packet, page 192. I think it's condition of approval number 78 and 79. This is landscape and trees. So, we actually – there are two 78's and there are two 79's and they are different with regard to trees details and what not. This is just a – the conditions of approval are a draft so I sort of understand that but I was wondering if there – do you have a sense for which ones are the correct one or should we just follow that up in a feature...

Mr. Ah Sing: I think they're just formatting. Just a continuation of a number list.

Chair Lew: But they are actually different. I was reading them last night.

Mr. Ah Sing: I'm just saying that it goes 77, 78, 79 and then the second 78 should be 80 and then so forth.

Chair Lew: They are sort of different topics but they're overlap – they are kind of overlapping. Some of them are about landscape and some of them are about trees. Anyway, I – let's – I just wanted to point it out that there's some inconsistency there. In general, I'm also supportive of the project. I have a couple of concerns as well. The one I mentioned before, which is the security. I think to Wynne's point, I know female friends who will not even go into the Whole Foods parking lot in Los Altos. It has the underground garage. They won't even shop there. They will only park on the surface lot and if that's full, they'll go to another grocery store, which is crazy to me but that's how they feel. I have some concerns about that and also because it's long and dark and there are corners. So, it's something unusual but it is a very difficult site I'll grant you.

Townhouses number one through five have second-floor balconies that look down into 397 and 399 Curtner. There may be 397 and 399 Curtner – it seems like it's two units and it seems like there are trees in there. They are not shown on the drawings that we have but I did look at aerial photos and I have been to the site previously. I mean normally the Board is concerned about second-floor balconies impacting privacy on houses and it seems like this has five units looking down into a house. I'm concerned about that. There are also townhouses – 8-11 also have balconies but there are trees proposed on the project that would mitigate it but I don't see any trees – new trees on that shared property line. I think I also had a concern about the land – the quality of the landscape drawings. I think that – I think some of the ideas that they see in the landscape drawings look great but the conceptual planting plan isn't showing any of the location of the shrubs. I think we just have locations of some of the trees. You're showing a lot of the podium above the garage as green but I'm presuming that's paved or maybe there's a raised planting area on top of the podium but there isn't really any information on that. Then we also have a native plant finding and I think a large – I would say on the landscape, there are some really interesting California plants that we don't see on other projects so we do want to acknowledge that there's something interesting going in there. That there are a whole bunch of Australian and I think maybe South American or south African plants there in the shrub list that --conceivably to me, those could be – some of them could be native. Maybe a 1/3 or 1/2 of them could be native plants without too much of a challenge but I don't know where any of those plants are going so it's hard for me to make a judgment on that. It seems to me that that needs more development before I could make the finding for landscape. I guess my comment for the applicant is how are you thinking about the balconies up on the second floor? How did those come about and are there mitigations for that to protect the privacy to the neighbors?

[Mr. Walmack:] Those balconies were intended to just allow more light and air into the bedrooms. They are very small balconies. In most cases only about 50-square feet so they don't function very well for a gathering spot for more than one person. I do understand your concerns about privacy. We do not need these balconies to satisfy the (inaudible) or open space requirements or any of the criteria of the zoning analysis so if you would like to direct us to remove those, we can do that.

Chair Lew: Then could you comment on the existing property line plants or trees. Are they all being removed?

[Mr. Walmack:] Most of those trees is invasive trees that were planted by birds and squirrels. The trees that are on our property were identified as not working well without landscaping plan with our C3 drainage so to the extent that we have to accommodate so much infrastructure into the property. Yes, the trees on our side do need to go. The two most important trees on this project are the oak tree behind the lube oil and then the large Eucalyptus tree that is behind Starbucks. Our site plan was developed so that we would make sure that we did not adversely impact either of those trees. The arborist has looked at the plan and has (inaudible) a solution in terms of protecting those trees. The City arborist was involved in that analysis.

Chair Lew: Ok. When we have a – when we put in a multifamily project next to a single-family house – actually can I ask is the Curtner (inaudible) is that zoned multi-family as well? I guess my question is the performance standards. Do we have to – the performance standards require screening of 10 – isn't it 10-feet to single-family houses and maybe duplexes. I think I need to see the exact language of the code, which would include trees and shrubs that would provide screening within 5-years but let me confirm with Staff. If this is all multi-familied, then does that – does the perimeter screening requirement kick in? It's under the performance standards. Yeah but this is in the performance standards. I think in the RM-30, that's where the link is. If it's next to low density, then you have to do the performance standards.

Ms. Gerhardt: The contact space design criteria applies. Performance standards are not in the RM section.

Chair Lew: Rm-30.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Lew: Ok, those are – they're in the commercial –it's like when you have a commercial project or a mixed use project next to a –but is this – would – since part of this project is commercial, CS zoning. Would part of it be required to have the...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so we look at whatever portion of the site is zoned commercial. Then yes, you would be using those standards but for the rear portion of the sight that is zoned RM-30, then you would be using the RM standards.

Chair Lew: Got it. Ok, thank you. Then my last comment is on building height. I don't know. The rest of the Board seems to be ok. When I was looking at the drawings, I mean my first thought was that they are a little too high. Your 10-foot ceilings, I was thinking could be 9-feet without affecting much. It might affect the retail space because retail typically has higher ceilings but my thought was the 10-foot ceiling could come down but I am the only one. I don't see anybody – I didn't see any other support or comment about that from the other Board members. Ok, yes?

Board Member Furth: I'm sorry to be so iterative in my thinking. When I was looking at the traffic study, I was looking at the discussion of pedestrian circulation and I didn't see much or maybe even any. I'm concerned – I think we need to have some information about whether the time for rolled curbs on Curtner is over because it's not that a few cars are parked on the sidewalk. The entire sidewalk is blocked and infringed upon and it's not – I think we can also assume that enforcement will not solve that problem. It's going to require reconstruction of the sidewalk. I realize that this – that it will be interesting to hear what experts have to say. I realize that this project has a very small frontage on Curtner but this is a site and design review because this is a complex project and a complex lot. It would not be unreasonable in my view if the traffic engineers think that it would be a significant improvement to pedestrian safety

and good access to reconfigure the sidewalk down to their – from El Camino down to their frontage to do so. You do not ordinarily generate this number of trips out of that kind of frontage. I don't know what experts will say but I think it's a problem as it exists. Also, this is a small matter but this is going to be the most attractive section of this block of El Camino Real for a pedestrian and I think it would enhance people's lives and wouldn't diminish your project if, to the right of your entry and the left of your driveway, that planter is an actual bench with a back facing the sidewalk.

Chair Lew: Ok. I did get a correction from Staff is that the performance standards are required in the multifamily zone. I don't think that I've seen – I think that has to come back because we – I don't think there's enough information in the packet today for that to make – for me to see that this is conforming. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Let me bring Robert and my discussion here to the public I guess. I am looking at the elevations of your buildings. Showing the second-floor balcony as a large – A-3.9. It's a large stucco projection with a metal railing on top and by the elevation shadows alone, it seems to be projecting out at least a foot and I just don't see that on the floor plan anywhere.

[Mr. Walmack:] You're right. That's an architectural project, it's not a balcony that projects around the corner of the building. The shadow lines are somewhat deserving because of a sharp sun angle but no, the balconies do not extend that far around.

Board Member Gooyer: So, the left elevation is basically the reality of what it actually is?

[Mr. Walmack:] West elevation...

Board Member Gooyer: No, the one right next to that. That same sheet, it looks like it bumps out...

Chair Lew: Like 6-inches or something.

[Mr. Walmack:] Yes, Yes. (Crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) balcony, you can't stand there or do anything there?

[Mr. Walmack:] No, n. You can't even sneak out there.

Board Member Gooyer: If even that. Yeah.

[Mr. Walmack:] Yeah.

Board Member Baltay: I guess I'm maybe coming to listen more carefully to what my colleague Lew is saying about the height of the buildings because frankly, these drawings are a bit deceptive. Then having a projecting balcony like that in the middle

does help to mitigate the height and yet, in reality, that's just a decorative horizontal piece that...

[Mr. Walmack:] It is.

Board Member Baltay: ...is not projective.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: A couple times in this presentation frankly, I'm finding things that just aren't constant or fully thought through. The materials, the balconies now, the trees and I'm wondering if this is intended to be a formal application for approval or is this still at a schematic stage because these things count and we're trying hard to find a way to get this through. I don't know if I am the only one feeling that but I think the privacy issues (crosstalk)(inaudible).

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: Robert is pointing out that there are very tall plate heights relatively.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm just going by – if you look at 3.10, the section across the top shows basically a clear space, it looks like, of 10-feet for the lower level. Floor to ceiling and the top floor on -- the lowest point on a sloping ceiling is 9-feet. We could easily – to lower the whole thing down, lose a foot or a foot in a half on the ground floor and a foot on the upper floor or something like that.

[Mr. Walmack:] Well, you could but I would make the case that given the nature of the existing neighborhood, which includes – well first of all, this example of the height of our building visa via the flat roof 8-foot plate of the apartment building next to it and then in relation to the massing of – come on – that building, which is pushing the 30-foot height limit to the extreme. I think that – the applicant has done an excellent...

Board Member Gooyer: Wait a minute, you said that building is pushing the 30-foot height limit?

[Mr. Walmack:] This building here is pushing the 35-foot height limit to the extreme. I have a copy of the CDs and the average height of the highest roof on that...

Board Member Gooyer: You're pushing 30-feet for two-stories; that's three stories.

[Mr. Walmack:] No, I agree. I agree that we have volume in the middle of our building to try and make the hallways more dramatic. I would feel more comfortable with looking at lowering that massing of the building than I would in taking height out of the living areas.



Board Member Gooyer: Yeah but I have a feeling that if you do that, it's going to make it less – I like the proportion of the central part versus the other one...

[Mr. Walmack:] Right.

Board Member Gooyer: ... so I think it makes more sense graphically if you want to call it, to lower the whole thing, let's say a foot and a half, than it would to lower just the central part a foot and a half. I don't think the result is going to be as good as if you just – because the average person is never going to notice that.

[Mr. Walmack:] The people living inside will though.

Board Member Gooyer: You really think somebody is going to notice whether they have 12-feet or 13-feet?

**Male:** Yes. Absolutely.

Board Member Gooyer: I disagree with that.

**Male:** We question – we when are proposing the design that we feel has more interest (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: I tell you what, look, we've already been here for god knows, what? 7-hours or something so I really don't want to argue a foot, ok?

**Male:** We are happy to change it.

Board Member Gooyer: What we are doing is we are discussing – trying to get this project through...

**Male:** Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: ... and there have been some people that have a problem with the height so I'm trying to come up with something – then maybe on your behalf (crosstalk) (inaudible)...

**Male:** (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: ...let me finish. On my or on our side it's, what can we do to get this passed. So, if there is some concern here about a height issue, we're now talking about the possibility of doing that. It's not where – you're at 8-feet and if we cut a foot out of it, people are going to be walking around with a 7-foot ceiling.

[Mr. Walmack:] I have a recommendation.

**Male:** We do appreciate your creative thoughts. We do. We just sometimes feel like we want to remind you of why we did what we did. We didn't just do it haphazardly and some of the elements that we have on the elevations that are bands, that are drawn in a program called [Revit], which you fudge. So, the band (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: I'm not worried about how it's drawn. I'm just going by what the dimensions are.

**Male:** So, the – I just want to remind everyone that the elements that we have on the building as they are designed as thought out and they do have a meaning and a reason to be there.

Board Member Gooyer: I understand.

**Male:** But thank you very much.

[Mr. Walmack:] I would recommend that we drop the upper story plate to 8-foot 6-inches and that the clear story areas that define the center of the building be dropped additionally. Not so much as to force the architecture and imbalance the design but enough to bring some of the architectural elements down. There's also the possibility of the – that the – second – lower of the Chevrons, we might be able to look at eliminating or altering that architectural element so that the overall perceived massing of the building – because if you think of this building with just a standard gable roof on it...

Board Member Gooyer: Ok. Well, I'm not the one that had the issue about the height so what are we talking about? Are we talking about lowering the whole building a foot or a foot in a half or what?

Chair Lew: What I –well, now I want to say two things. One is that I find this project is much more desirable than the project – the recent project on Curtner because I voted – and I voted against that one. The – because it is the three stories and we argued about the roof for 4 or 5 hearings or whatnots. So, I think this project is way ahead of that other project by far because you put the parking underground so I'm willing to – my height thing is just something that -- I looked at the drawings – when I was just looking at the drawings, it seems like they were high. I'm not necessarily – I won't necessarily require that the building is lower.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: How's that?

Board Member Baltay: My comment about the height Alex, has to do with the fact that without these projecting balconies...

Chair Lew: Yeah, the balconies...

Board Member Baltay: ... it changes things...

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: ... and I'm just not sure we're really understanding or seeing what's really being proposed.

Chair Lew: Yeah, the balcony thing seems odd. Ok.

Board Member Gooyer: The balconies you can't even walk (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Do we...

Mr. Ah Sing: Sorry, (inaudible) Chair...

Chair Lew: Yes?

Mr. Ah Sing: ...(inaudible) packet does include the performance criteria for the project.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Mr. Ah Sing: I know you mentioned previously about that. (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. So, why don't we get an (inaudible) with the Board? It seems that there is support – generally, support of the project. If there are the thing that can come, they could come back to subcommittee. Peter, you mentioned consent. I think Staff is saying that we don't really have a consent (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: I meant subcommittee. I misspoke.

Chair Lew: Is there – so for all the items that have been mentioned, do we want – do we think that subcommittee is appropriate?

Board Member Gooyer: What's that?

Chair Lew: Like the landscaping (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I think those – the same thing with the whole relationship of the exact colors and all that sort of thing.

Chair Lew: The colors and materials.

Board Member Gooyer: I think – to me, it seems like... (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: If it comes back to subcommittee, we don't all see it.

Board Member Gooyer: ... it seems like the longer I sit on things like this or whatever. Everybody is always worried about privacy. I swear it seems like everybody assumes their neighbors a – trying to peek into their – I mean, I'm not that concerned about the balconies. I really don't think – it's not a huge balcony. Basically, 99% of it is tucked inside the building envelop almost so you're – and if you sit back there, with a 3-foot rail, you're not going to really see anything anyway. Not down to the neighbor next to you. So, I don't have that much of a concern about it.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Board Member Gooyer: I think if we leave the design with the balcony, then the proportion for the height is ok.

Chair Lew: Got it.

Board Member Baltay: Can we get the privacy issues mitigated with landscaping at the boundary? I mean that would make more sense I think, in this case, to get a landscaping plan (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Right, so I think we don't have the landscaping plan, which is – right?

Board Member Gooyer: We were talking about maybe (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: This is not that...

Board Member Gooyer: ... have better-refined landscaping plan for a subcommittee.

Board Member Baltay: If I could ask Staff, does this – goes before the City Council as well for approval?

Chair Lew: Yes, (inaudible)

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: So then, I think it's incumbent on us to make sure that this is well presented to City Council with – a lot of these question that we are asking for (inaudible). The thought of City Council looking at this and saying we approve it and then these questions coming up is not good. Maybe it is better if this comes back to us directly and not on subcommittee but rather we can really see that these things have been resolved and get this presentation also so that it's clear. Honestly, gentlemen, there have been a lot of questions that should have been already presented.

Chair Lew: Any other thoughts? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Yeah, the – I would like to see the parking lot security issue addressed. I want to know how that's solvable. I do not have a parking lot phobia.

Board Member Gooyer: I think with a gate – I don't think – I mean I think that's easily enough solved. This isn't the first...

Board Member Furth: In my experience as a human being wondering around the peninsula, it frequently isn't. If this was going to be gated – my sister lives in a Seattle apartment building with roll up a gate but it's in a mixed used building but there's a separation between residential parking and non-residential parking.

Board Member Gooyer: Right, there usually is. There's an intermediate rolling gate.

Board Member Furth: So, that doesn't appear to be possible here. It maybe that lighting and cameras and where you locate – which kinds of spaces can make this reasonable but I do not think it's a trivial issue and I don't think it arises out of unreasonable perceptions. It may very well arise out of different perceptions.

Chair Lew: Ok, so I'm hearing – here's my list. So, parking and security, landscape screening that complies with the performance standards, all the materials, colors labeled on the drawings and then Wynne, I think you had a suggested some sort of commemorative something. I don't – whatever that could be.

Board Member Furth: And a bench.

Chair Lew: A bench.

Board Member Gooyer: And a bench.

Chair Lew: Did you not see the seat mounds?

Board Member Furth: It doesn't have a back (inaudible). (Crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Ok, have I missed...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Sure. Another – that's not a motion. I shouldn't make the motion. Somebody else should make the motion but I did want to highlight those five items.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Gooyer: Well, why don't we just say that if you have all those items, I'll make a motion that uses those items.

Chair Lew: And we're – you're saying it's a motion to continue the project...

Board Member Gooyer: Sure.

Chair Lew: ... and are we picking a date?

Board Member Gooyer: Do you want to do a date or I guess a lot of that depends on how quickly you can get back or do you just want to leave at a date uncertain?

Chair Lew: It's better to pick a date because then we don't have to notice, right? We don't have the same notification and then if you have to – if something comes up and you have to bump it, I think that the Staff can work with that.

[Mr. Walmack:] The sooner the better.

Chair Lew: Then...

Board Member Gooyer: So, what's the next available...

Chair Lew: Well, the next – well, I'll let Staff do this.

Ms. Gerhardt: I mean, I'm assuming you're wanting at least a short Staff report that summarizes these things and so 5/4 – actually, we're already late for that Staff report so really 5/18 would be – that only give us maybe a week or two to fix up the plans.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, let's go – I guess go with that then.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, May 18<sup>th</sup>.

Board Member Gooyer: So, we'll do it a date certain of 5/18.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that motion.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None. That's 5-0 so we will see you in May. Thank you.

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0**

Mr. Lait: Chair, if we can have just a couple minutes to set up for the next item?

Chair Lew: We will take a 5-minute break.

- 6. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 744-748 San Antonio Avenue [15PLN-00314]:** Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Two Existing Commercial/Office Buildings at 744 and 748 San Antonio Avenue and Construction of Two, Five-Story Hotels (Courtyard by Marriott with 151 rooms and AC by Marriott with 143 rooms). The Site Will

Include Surface and Two Levels of Basement Parking. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Public Comment Period for the DEIR is from March 27, 2017 to May 10, 2017. Zoning District: CS. For More Information, Contact Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us

Mr. Lait: Is he back here?

Chair Lew: Kyu?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, did he leave?

Chair Lew: Kyu left so I need to his recusal for him.

Mr. Lait: Are you going to explain why's he's recusing?

Chair Lew: Yeah, and then we have disclosures as well. I should make an announcement. We have item number six. Is a public hearing on a quasi-judicial matter for 744 and 748 San Antonio Avenue. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of two existing commercial office buildings at 744 and 748 San Antonio Avenue and construction of two, five-story hotels which are the Courtyard by Marriott with 151 rooms and AC by Marriott with 143 rooms. The site will include surface and two levels of basement parking. Environmental Assessment is a Draft EIR has been prepared pursuant to the CEQA and the public comment period for the DEIR is from March 27, 2017, to May 10, 2017, and the zone district is CS. We have the Staff report but I think that I should announce that Vice Chair Kim is recused on this item because he has a working relationship on another project, not related to this one, with Randy Pop, the project architect for this item. I think we also have disclosures from other Board Members.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I did meet with architect Pop in my office last week where we discussed the project and he outlined what he was where the various merits of it. Of interest was that he felt that he and the City Council were in agreement with what the contextual nature of this site was and then that this was very much in context, in his opinion. That's – thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne?

Board Member Furth: I met with architect Randy Pop in his office. I – we went over the images that are part of the official packet but more slowly and larger setting. We discussed my previously raised concern about how to minimize the risk of up back-ups from the hotel driveway into San Antonio travel lanes. He mentioned that there would be 24/7 valet parking to address that. The shuttle would be unloaded to the rear of the

properties and there was no event space in the hotels. I'll just mention that in looking at the TDM, I don't think I saw references to all those and I don't believe that there's anything else that is not in the public record that we discussed. (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Robert? No. I will disclose that I talked to Randy Pop on the phone on March 14<sup>th</sup> about some other items as well as this particular project and there's nothing that we discussed that isn't in the Staff report or the drawings. Sheldon?

Mr. Ah Sing: Ok, thank you again. I do have a PowerPoint presentation and the applicant is here with their PowerPoint as well. You got a good introductory there. The location it's along San Antonio between Leghorn and Middlefield and it's right on the boundary of the City of Mountain View, as well behind. We are here this afternoon, Staff – while we did provide findings, they're just the base findings. There's no recommendation of approval for instance so just reconsideration to conduct a hearing. Seek input on the EIR, which is now in circulation. As well as input on the architectural review itself. I do want to mention that the Draft of the Environmental Impact Report, there is one unavoidable significant impact to the historic resources on site. There's no mitigation to demolish a potential eligible historic structure so just to highlight that. The project requests for architectural review. There's also a parking adjustment up to 20%, that is for the valet parking or parking spaces that are within the drive aisle so they are not standard parking spaces per code. There were previous meetings for this project. The preliminary Board meeting in June of 2015. There were concerns at that time regarding massing compared to the surrounding. Some of the relationship of the building to the driveway and entries. There was one formal ARB meeting in December 2015. At that time, the applicant did revise the plans to step back the front façade. They did push the mechanical equipment to the center of the buildings. Generally, though, the buildings are separated. The brands, the two brandings are separated. There is also an additional meeting that was specifically for the Environmental Impact Report. It was a required scoping meeting that was conducted in March of last year and we hear from the public concerns about traffic, water, esthetics for instance. The site plan for the project, there's a 24-foot special set back along San Antonio. The street trees would remain there but the balance of the site would be raised and that includes the two different buildings – the two different properties and also the eligible historic building. The projects include two different branded hotels by Marriott; just different brands. They are five-stories at about 50-feet. That includes a driveway down the center. There's a circular round-a-bout there that would service the lobbies and the applicant can describe a little bit more about the operations there in regarding the valet parking. There is some surface parking towards the rear and there's a ramp that leads down to a full basement and there's like a smaller second level for basement parking. Not a full site level but just a smaller segment. This drawing here demonstrates the front elevations. They have some perspectives there but it's a little difficult to tell from the front of what's going on but you can see where the applicant has proposed some erosion of the building to step back from San Antonio. That's their response to some of the massing along that street and there's some articulation along the sides, although that is still roughly about 10-foot setback but there's some articulation there. This does show a little bit more about what's going on in the cross section of that and especially



in relation to the residence across the street. You can see that line demonstrates the height of the greenhouse residences and how that relates to the new buildings where they do step back from the street from the third-level. There's approximately about 200—feet difference between the buildings there along San Antonio. I thought this was maybe one of the other better drawings to show the stepping back. The roof plan, you can see again, from the different levels of how that occurs at the front. That doesn't necessarily occur on the other sides or the rear particularly. Again, I wanted to stress the side. There is – you are going up five-stories and it kind of just drops down. In adjacent to the site, you're going to have existing buildings that are relatively low intensity at this time. It could go to .4 FAR but they probably wouldn't be as passive as this project is because it does allow up to 2.0 FAR. Some of the keys issues there that we want to highlight and we do in the Staff report, is the architecture, the context compatibility, the site plan and some of the environmental issues. As I mentioned, that the surroundings include low-scale commercial residential institutional buildings. These are all FAR around 0.4 or less, along that stretch. The project again, would include two, five-story hotels and that's – on this block, is – would be the tallest structure. San Antonio road is a wide infrastructure. It's four lanes and it's a divide street. This exhibit does – diagram shows the present FAR along San Antonio. You can see, again it's roughly .4 or so. You have some really low ones there because they are gas stations. There's not really much – but definitely at 2.0, this would be one of the larger buildings in the area. I wanted to mention a little bit about the parking. This project provides 294 spaces, 278 of those are in the two-level basement. There are 236 self-park and 58 valet spaces and valet spaces are located in the drive aisles as I mentioned as they are not standard parking space so therefore they have to apply for the parking adjustment and the 20% equates to 58 spaces. A transportation monument program has been proposed for the project. That reduction was not calculated into the traffic study so the traffic study just shows what the net trips would be on the traffic and it didn't not count for the transportation demand management so they wanted to be on the conservative side there. Moving on to the CEQA. The Environmental Impact Report was required because of – mainly the cultural resources unavoidable impact. The scoping meeting was conducted on March 3<sup>rd</sup> to get comments on what should be studied for the impact report and that draft impact report was circulated on March 27<sup>th</sup> and that will be – we'll be getting comments on it through May 10<sup>th</sup>. Again, the potential impacts would be on air quality, that's with construction. You have biological resources, again, some of the same things we had mentioned in the past project. The cultural resources, there's an existing building on site that I'll mention in just a little bit that's eligible for historic listing. Then you hazardous and hazardous materials on the ground that there's mitigation for so all those can be mitigated except for the cultural resource. Just speaking to that, the structure was erected in 1961. It was used as a mortuary -- a funeral home and there was a significant rear addition in 1983 but end despite that, based on the evaluation, it's eligible for listing on the California Register due to its age and also the characteristics of its mid-century modern architecture. Just the timeline on the EIR and what's coming up next. Responding to public comments that do come in, to complete the mitigation monitoring program. We'll have to come up with statement of overriding considerations for the unavoidable impact and the then the certification of the final EIR by the City Council. In conclusion, the project complies with the objective

developments with the exception of parking. They are asking for that adjustment. The ARB has identified some issues in the past regarding compatibility and overall massing in previous meetings and we do believe that many of those concerns have not been adequately addressed so we are – in the next steps, seeking some direction from the ARB on this. We want to conclude the circulation period, respond to those comments, received recommendation from the ARB and then that would be forwarded on to City Council to decide on the architectural review with the parking adjustment as well as certification final EIR. Today what we are asking is to review and comment on the draft EIR and continue the project to a date uncertain for redesign. That concludes my presentation and I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

Chair Lew: Why don't we – are there any questions or we can do the applicant presentation now? Why don't we do the applicant presentation and you'll have 10-minutes and then we'll do the public comment period and I do have four speakers for that. Sure, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: So, I just wanted to ask Staff to explain the CEQA process on this project a little bit. We've been looking at this, at least on an informal basis, for some time and the scoping session was held March 3<sup>rd</sup> on the environmental review?

Mr. Ah Sing: Of 2016.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I was thinking that you were running on a very compact schedule.

Chair Lew: Ok, so you have 10-minutes.

Mr. [Mont] Williamson: Good afternoon Board, it's nice to be here. My name is [Mont] Williamson representing the owner of this development. I just have a couple thoughts before our team does their presentation. We were here in front of you 16-months ago and we were in front of the community in a session about 18-months ago so it's been that long since we were in front of you all. We've been busy this last 16 and 18-months. I want you guys to know that we listened to what he heard from the community and we listened to what we heard from you. The two issues we heard where from you folks, mostly massing. The idea of taking this project that was designed around the perimeter of the land and putting it more in the center is what we feel we heard. I want to know that we studied those options and we have some slides to show you the effort we put into it. More mentally, the slides are simple but we did really work hard to come up with a successful hotel using just the very center of this land mass. We didn't think it was super successful so we went back to our original idea and have a presentation for you to show what we've done to improve. On the community side, traffic is what we heard the most. We've spent the last 16-months with the City on an environmental impact report that we feel shows the facts on the impact of traffic and we worked hard at that. We also care about that issue so we're hoping the whole group can look at those facts and understand the true impact of traffic. So, we are here hoping to get approval. I do want you to know that we're – we want you to understand the efforts we've put forth

and we're here to listen. If there are some tweaks that we can do to gain that approval but what we have in front of you is roughly what we think works and we are on a timeline with Marriott. We have convinced Marriott to stay with us for the last year and a half, largely because Council went on record about 16-months ago saying they like the project and they'd like us to push forward. That helps us convince Marriott to stay with us. We are still on a tight timeline so here's our team presentation.

Mr. Randy Pop: Alright thank you. Randy Pop, architect. We all know each other so thank you for sticking around so late today to go through this with us and I'll try and move through this very quickly. As everyone says, we're trying to move forward and we know what the issues are and we feel we've responded to those in a thoughtful way and I'll take you through that quickly. In regard to the EIR process, Sheldon did a great job summarizing that for us but I wanted to just point out that everything other than the historic aspect of this site, which we hear Council is going to resolve through a statement of overriding concern, produces a less than significant impact. Traffic, acoustics and even aesthetics that wherein the EIR were resolved. Just very briefly, right? Here's our context. This hotel – this site as many of you have said is in the right place and we're near demand. We're going to reduce (inaudible). It's on Palo Alto land. Many of you have heard, this generates \$3.5 million dollars of (inaudible) a year so a very valuable project for the City. This is our context – there is a loss. Not what today's zoning encourages. Over time this area is changing. The JCC, Hausner, it's near Linkin, it's near Google. I would be challenged to bring something like this to the Board today and so we heard you and we tried to really study what we heard from you. These three diagrams are really simple little diagrams but there was a lot of work and a bunch of days spent the sort of studying these things and I'm just trying to bring you along with us in the process. I apologize because over the course of the time that we were working on them, we were sort of rotating the diagram and so San Antonio is on the left and then at the bottom and then on the right so I'm sorry about that. What we are looking at here is how to shift the mass of the building to the center and if we do that, we need a fire lane that goes around the outside, there is parking that goes around the outside. We lose the brand identity because we don't have the dual brand buildings anymore; pretty difficult. Even farther from that, there's just no way to keep the room count. We're dropping from 294 down to 220 to 210. I didn't even show you the option. It's just a single bar building in the middle that was down at like 140 and so they are just no longer economical. It just loses its ability to really be a financially viable project at that point and beyond that, we really felt that surrounding a building in a sea of asphalt is not really an appropriate tactic. Based on all of that, we went back to our earlier concept and thought about how can we really start to adjust and respond within the framework of what we had and so doing that, looking south, we really wanted to show you what it looks like. I went out in the street. I took pictures. We had a renderer insert these pictures into – insert the model into the pictures for us and want you to really see how things will change and what it will look like. We've – as Sheldon has mentioned, made some changes to this building where the last version you saw kind of had some eroded corners but still had a five-story mass on El Camino. We've pushed all that back to the middle of the site now and the three-story element that's on San Antonio really a response to the pedestrian experience and to the contextual

compatibility guidelines to the scale of the buildings that are in the vicinity of that and what is coming in that area. Just moving on, still looking south but this I the pedestrian perspective and I want to – oh I lost my clock. I don't know how far I have gone here in terms of time. My clock turned off.

Chair Lew: 4- minutes.

Mr. Pop: 4-minutes, alright thank you. I'm going quickly so we get through this. In the for the ground you see (inaudible) and the trucks and the chain link fence and it's too close to the street. Then beyond that at 760, you see the concrete box and beyond that, in the current photo, you see this corrugated metal building and that is something that we are planning to replace. Frankly, what we are proposing improves on all of this. It really is just so much better to resolve this 24-foot setback and terrace the building back and maintain that kind of height that is so consistent with what is across the street from it. Then looking north, again you can see, I think how successful the terracing is. Really pulling the mass of the building back and away from the street in a way that we heard everyone wanted and what we've attempt to really resolve. Taking a look at that in this other direction, Sheldon already took you through this section so I won't belabor that but what we did is in order to achieve this changes the types of rooms that are in the AC. We had some rooms that were two keys and modified that so it's just one key so we're taking mass out there and we're shifting the mass around to the back and into the inside to where that green area is. It's really much easier to see on this upper level. Sheldon showed you kind of a roof plan of this but just diagrammatically at the top floor, you can what we are doing is removing the double loaded corridor at the front. We're creating some really deep terrace and pulling the building back and all of that mass is either being removed or shifted around in other ways but we're staying at that 2.4 or 2.0 FAR. I wanted to just touch on that FAR for a minute. What we heard from Council recently in their discussion of the Comp. The plan is that they are moving the FAR. They are moving the FAR to 2.5. They want bigger hotels, they want more of this and you zone for what you want. Hoping that your incenting people to create it. Then it's up to use as architects to craft that on the site in a way that works. Hopefully, I'm bringing you along in a way that shows you that we've gone back, we've tried to study how to compress this more to the middle. I resisted putting a picture of the Luxor Hotel in the presentation but I think that what we are trying to do here is pretty reasonable with buildings that have a base, a middle, a top. They've got character. The corners are different from the middles. There's a lot of articulation here and responding particularly to Board Member Baltay's comments. This three-story glass element that opens the building up and is very inviting. The same thing is happening at the Courtyard. We've got very similar tactics that we're taking. You can see how just the eroded corner from the 12/15 hearing has changed now to a much broader building and just – I want to just touch on materials before my times up. These are some examples of what Courtyards and ACs look like in other areas. For Silicon Valley and for Palo Alto in particularly, we know that those need to be elevated. We bring you A+ materials here. They are beautiful, they are durable, they are crisp. You've got the sample board and we brought some additional material to show you what the metal panel – the thickness of it. What the character of that Venetian plaster. It's very smooth and hand applied.

These are beautiful, durable, crisp material. Really consistent with the brand standards are but at the same time, elevated in quality. I dropped in really quickly this image of the shading to show you that there really is very little to no effect, that the building height is creating around it. The only place that we're really impacting is a wall that has no windows. Just in summary here, we've spent quite a bit of time studying the site. We've got other information here that I can take you through if you like but I want to leave it – ah, perfect. I want to leave it with this image and let use have some discussion about where we are and hopefully come to some resolution. We're open to any ideas. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Randy. I'm sure we will get back to you with a lot of questions. Let's do the public comment period now and so we have Pat [phonetics][Starett] and then followed by Joan [phonetics][Betzurey], then Joan [Lariby] and Nancy Martin.

Ms. Nancy Martin: First of all, I'm not Pat. I'm Nancy Martin but Pat had to leave and she gave me her objections to read. They are hand written to bear with me. I'll have trouble with her handwriting. Her main concern is traffic and where is the emergency vehicle problem addressed in the EIR? We know under CEQA, I guess emergency vehicles are exempted but are they exempted under all codes? Where is this addressed? Which code exempts this problem? I mean constantly you're hearing emergency vehicles going to accidents and problems down on 101 and they use San Antonio and they use Rengstoff and this is going to cause huge problems – traffic problems. The left on Leghorn is the – is inadequately addressed. It is a tragedy waiting to happen. How do the emergency vehicles get around to attend a fire or a medical issue? Nowhere did I see in the EIR where this problem was addressed. What about emergency vehicles going to 101 to help with an accident? Please tell me why these issues have not been researched? How many people are going to use the shuttles? Not discussed. Numbers from the studies do not override the human element – do not consider the human element in the area. They count. They are real and are already there. The tables used in the report are just numbers. It looks like they share this information and then wave the magic wand and they see how the problem disappears. A good fairy is a children's fairy tale and how modern problems disappear. This is Pat. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Joan [Betzurey].

[Ms. Joan Betzurey:] This have been a marathon. I'm here as a concerned homeowner and I'm at Greenhouse one and I would like to strongly request that the ARB will not and I repeat will not approve demolishing of the two existing buildings at 744 and 748 San Antonio Road. My reasons for that are as follows. 744 has been designated as a historic resource per EIR point 3.4.3 and I quote, "744 San Antonio Road demolition would result in the loss of a California Register eligible structure and mitigation measures would not reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The project, therefore, would result in a significant unavoidable impact to historic resources." Also, we find that there are realistically major problems and issues that continue to be associated with this project with Marriott and as a result, approval could be

questionable so why demolish two perfectly viable buildings? Some of the major on-going problems and issues are being addressed at today's meeting. We are submitting comments to the EIR and as a majority of its conclusions of less than significant impact is not based on complete or current data or information, which therefore makes those conclusions questionable. As an example, I would like to refer to the Comprehensive Plan policies, especially to the aesthetics and visual resources that apply to this project. That would be L-5 and L-5 states, maintain the scale and character of the City. Avoid land uses that are overwhelming and unacceptable due to their size and scale. With L-5 in mind, I refer Board Members to EIR 3.1.2.2, which has a questionable conclusion, which is impacts to existing visual character. Comparison pictures are included showing the existing site compared with the proposed site. I've brought here a high tech. copy of that picture of the comparison. When you look at this, you can't help but question how the existing site comprised of single-story commercial buildings with trees, with open space, is not visually degraded – thank you. Is not visually degraded by the proposed massive, high-density, unattractive, five-story hotel structures, which are not compatible with the neighborhood. I again ask the Board to deny permission of the demolishing of the two buildings. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you and Joan [Lariby].

[Ms. Joan Lariby:] Good afternoon Board Members. It's nice to see you all again. I'm Joan [Lariby]. I'm a longtime resident and property owner here in Palo Alto; at 777 San Antonio Road which is Greenhouse One. I'm opposing the construction of two hotels at 744, 748 and 750 San Antonio Road. This two-acre site should be reserved for housing. The Comprehensive Plan is stating that in the next several years, we can expect 3,400 more employees – people working here in Palo Alto. These 3,400-people come but not by themselves. They bring a spouse, they bring a baby and increasingly they are bringing the grandparents so these families are going to need a place to live and we all know that Palo Alto has quite a shortfall in available housing. This is a good area for families where I have lived for the last 34-years and where my daughter graduated from Gun High School. We have the Mitchell Park library, we have the Mitchell Park Community Center, we have the YMCA that's open to everybody, the Jewish Community Center is open to everybody. We have the San Antonio station for Caltrain just down the block. The primary land use along San Antonio Road from 101 to Alma Street is housing. We don't see it when we drive by because everything is very nicely landscaped with nice pretty walls. One whole – about three blocks of it is single-family housing. There are two schools as we know. There's a daycare center so this is a good place to live and I would suggest that the 2-acre site could have maybe what, 30-35 townhouses or condos. That's my primary reason for opposing it. The next reason is because of reading the EIR. The Environmental Impact Report is incomplete for two hotels. The soils and water studies were done at least two years ago and they only studied in one of the parcels, 744. I couldn't find any data for the 748 and 750 acres; it's almost an acre. That's the site where the Courtyard by Marriot is being planned. They were done when the planning was only for one underground level of parking. Now, we have two underground levels of parking but the studies were only done down for one level of parking so you've got to go down another 10 or 12-feet; certainly, more

than that. The water underneath this site is a major aquifer for Santa Clara County and in 2015, the engineers in the EIR said that it would take 10-months to dewater this site. This is under appendix H section 3.3. At that time, the water table was at 7 ½-feet below grade but they pointed out that during wet years, the water table rises to only 4-feet below grade and friends, we know we have had a very, very wet winter. Palo Alto goes 28 ½ inches in the last – since last July 1<sup>st</sup>. We are expecting a category storm two to come in and so we know Ben Lomond got 99-inches of rain. That water is coming down both underground and through the creeks. In conclusion, I would like to see townhouses there to at least help with some of the housing needs that we have for new families coming in to work here. It's zoned for housing and housing would not need to go down below grade, except for putting in the utilities. It would not need to go down 20-feet for the excavation, which is going to cause some pretty hardship lateral taking away – I think the lateral support of the adjoining buildings and for all of our utilities, which are under San Antonio Road. Again, thank you for your attention and I would like to again, recommend housing. Yeah! Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank You and Nancy Martin.

Ms. Nancy Martin: This time it really is me, Nancy Martin. I've been a resident at Greenhouse One since 1976. My comments are going to be a bit scattered as I read through the EIR. First, one that jumped out at me was cancer exposure for children, less than significant. Excuse me? If it's even a little bit significant, it is significant and there are many schools in the area. There are schools on Middlefield, schools on San Antonio, schools over off Charleston so to me, that is significant. Hazardous material contamination. In reading through, it didn't sound like tests had been thoroughly done on hazardous material contamination. Why was this not done prior to issuing the EIR? Many of the issues brought up are cumulatively less than significant – well, not cumulative. I'm cumulative. Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated but if you take all those issues and I went through and tagged off six or seven. Those added up cumulatively to significant impact. Noise impact, how long? I don't think the noise impact studies counted for all the trucks that are going to be coming and going in San Antonio. I jumped to the section in the EIR of a summary of alternatives; needed hotel. Excuse me? We have so many new hotels on El Camino, we do not need hotels in San Antonio. Loss of Hyatt Rickets. Excuse me, two new hotels went up within yards of Hyatt Rickets. This area is designated that it could handle 38-57 housing units. Seems to me that that should be more of the focus of what Palo Alto is looking at. Taking care of our own residents, not those that are coming into town. One of the things that I'd read is that the City Council was saying housing should be built closer to transit. Excuse me? If the hotels are going to use transit and its close enough for them to be putting it in their report, it's close enough for residents to use the transit. Project objectives, I'm sorry, I only see the project objectives as money, money, money. Money for both the developers and money for Palo Alto through the hotel tax. They refer to this area as an under-utilized area. I'm sorry, it's not underutilized as far as the businesses are concerned or as far as the residences are concerned. Traffic, you can access the hotel if you are coming from 101 by going up – coming up San Antonio, making a U-turn and turning right. Everybody that's going to be staying in that hotel is not going to be

working at Google. They go to work in the morning, they are going to drive down San Antonio, make a U-turn at Leghorn and go to HP or Google up the street or all these other companies. The traffic impact is going to be horrendous. Sometimes it already takes me 3-minutes to get out of the driveway at Greenhouse One onto San Antonio if I am going straight onto Leghorn or turning left. Nowhere do I see anything addressing as far as the number of employees? Where are the employees going to drive from? We know they aren't going to live in Palo Alto. They're going to be driving in. Where are they going to be parking? We are very concerned about parking on the street, which is already a huge problem and the fact that people will sneak into our property to park. That is a real concern. Where will the valet parking be? I know they've said around the circle but you can't tell me that those valets aren't going to sneak out when things are crowded in there and park on our streets. The number of cars, the traffic is going to greatly increase the ozone and pollution levels and the trucks are going to just be horrendous and we've only recently redid San Antonio. Trucks are going to make a mess out of that again. Five-story hotels are incompatible with the one and two-story buildings in the area. One last point? I think of the Greenhouses as being two-stories. You cannot see our garage from the street and what are we going to go about dewatering? Where is that water going to go? Thank you very much. I see nothing positive and I'm for the 38-57 housing units that could be built there. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you. Thank you for speaking and thank you for being patient with us for the previous items and the EIR comment period is open and so the Staff will respond to the EIR comments. Yeah, Jon.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, that's correct. We're taking notes and we'll include those remarked into the final EIR, draft EIR that comes out and then also, we have an opportunity for the applicant to have a rebuttal if we're done with the public testimony.

Chair Lew: Did you want to rebut – you can also – I think we can – you can reserve time and (inaudible) later too as well. Ok, are there any questions? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: How many feet above sea level is this site?

Female: (Inaudible)

Mr. Pop: I'm not sure exactly what the height level is but -- oh, I'm sorry.

Female: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry, Chair. Thank you.

Chair Lew: I'm going to...

Mr. Pop: I was going to – so, I was going to say my recollection and you know, I'd hate to be held to this but it's...



Board Member Furth: Right. That's alright.

Mr. Pop: ...for sure (inaudible) but my recollection is that we're around 15 or 18-feet, something like that.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Pop: I think that Nancy...

Female: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Excuse me, I – hold on.

Mr. Pop: My recollection is that we're about somewhere around 15-feet. Something like that.

Chair Lew: For the members of the public, I think – I'm going to close the public hearing portion of the – if you have an additional comment, you can send them by email but also, when you speak out in the – from the audience, it's not on the microphone so it's not getting recorded and it's not getting put into the transcript. Ok, Wynne, did you have a follow-up to that?

Board Member Furth: No, thank you. I appreciate being referred to the appropriate section of the EIR, which I clearly didn't read as fairly as some people.

Chair Lew: Peter? Robert? Anybody? Questions – this is just questions. I have a question for Staff. One of the members of the public mentioned about the hotel's room count and do we have a—has anybody been keeping a tally of the loss and net increases of hotel rooms across town? Is that maybe PTC? Anyway, I don't need to know but I do think that maybe a feature report – I think the Council would be interested in knowing where we are with hotels rooms because we do have 3 – oh, Randy. We have three new hotels, right? We have Clement...

Mr. Pop: Again, I'm just...

Chair Lew: ...Hilton Gardens Inn...

Mr. Pop: ...(inaudible) I'm sorry, I'm sorry to just be doing this from memory but my recollection that since Hyatt Rickey's closed. With the constructions of all of the hotels that have been built since then, we're still about 30 rooms shy of where we were when Rickey's closed and so this project would then tip us up above that level. I'll just share briefly that the studies that we've done show that the hotel occupancy rate in Palo Alto is beyond 98%, which is unusual and challenging.

Chair Lew: Thank you for that. I have another question for Staff. Please correct me if I am wrong, I think that maybe in previous hearings, we were talking about increasing

the turning lane – the left turn lanes on San Antonio or am I just – is that just – is that incorrect or am I mixing up projects? No. Ok, that's fine. It's not – I don't think it's critical at the moment.

Mr. Lait: It doesn't look like we have any recollection...

Chair Lew: I may be mixing it up from -- we have projects on Page Mill Road that – Ok, thank you for that. Let's move onto Board Member comments then. Who wants to go first? Wynne, do you want – thank you.

Board Member Furth: I'll be the right wing. First of all, thank you to the applicant for the new presentation and particularly for the visuals. Those are very helpful to me. Thank you to David Powers and Associates for the really informative cultural resources information and thank you Sheldon for putting the period drawing of what the – how the semi-sacred space of the funeral home viewed itself in this context and thank you of course to the public for your careful study of the project and continued discussion with us. Most – as I listen to the public discussion, I keep being struck by the fact that in most cases in regard to most of the issue that is raised, as my great grandmother would say, I'm not on that Committee. I'm not making the zoning decision. I'm not making the discussion about whether or not a hotel should go here or housing should go here. The only thing I get to comment on is given this proposal, does it comply with the City standards for this place and this use. With respect to CEQA, we could, of course, comment on the adequacy or inadequacy of its analysis just as any member of the public can. I keep being struck by the fact that saying that something is not a significant impact on the environment, does not mean that it won't be both perceptible and adverse – have both a perceptible and adverse effect on people living there. An impact on the environment is different than an impact on us. A significant health impact surely should be addressed but on our – in some of the other ways, I can see things that I believe would be adversely affected as well as things that would be positively effected about this project but I am not convinced they rise to the level of environmental – adverse environmental impact except the removal of the interesting mid-century building. I don't find anything – any fatal flaws in the CEQA document based on what I know so far. I'd be interested to see what later drafts look like. For me, there are two areas that I think we can and should address. One of them is high local traffic flow and traffic flow on the site. The other is what this thing looks like and on the first, I think it could work with really aggressive management on site, that pulls vehicles and people and shuttles off the street fast and pulls them deep into the site. I think that could work almost all the time and that's probably about as much as we can require. With respect to aesthetics, one of the things that I didn't discuss about my previous time with Mr. Pop was that I did rant at him about – in general, I am distressed by buildings that come to this town, which does have a specific geography and light and setting and aesthetic and climate and tradition and give no difference to any of those things. Now, that's – I've overstating that a bit. We have a wonderful temperate climate and I think this hotel does provide more access to the outside than some of its other designs and I also believe and I'll be interested in hearing from my colleagues on this, that it's accurate that when they say that the building materials

being used at better than those that we frequently see when we drive by similarly badge or flagged hotels. However, I don't particularly see things about the design that say to me, we looked at the tradition. This is south Palo Alto, it had this – it was a post war – post-World War II phenomenon. It – a lot of plain trees. It backs up to these gorgeous hills and there where particular kinds of indigenous design and materials that flourished here. By indigenous, I'm really thinking about post-World War II Blue Skies architecture and not earlier settings. Instead, it has a great deal to do with the need and desire of an international corporation to have its product easily identified by those who it wishes to attract as customers and so that they will both be attracted here and feel comfortable when they are there. Having said that, subject to hearing from the rest of you on this topic, I think the site-specific traffic problems that most worry me, which is that this project blocking the difficult flow of traffic on San Antonio could be addressed with City required and enforced on-site mitigation. With the 24/7, hot and cold valet service and the unloading of whatever to the back. I so appreciate that we're seeing the TDM proposals now rather than later because, at this point, they are so integrated into our evaluation of the project, that we need to see that and I think it needs more work. Not to say onto flippin but with respect to the building itself, I think it has lots of virtues and I don't think that – I like the Greenhouse Project. I'm not – I'm very fond of the JCC as a person who uses it and I like some of its frontages. Some of them I think is quick beautiful. Some of them are less successful but my – this is Palo Alto. We are a City masquerading as a suburb. That means that we have lots of significant vegetation. If we're going to build five-story buildings, we need 4 ½-story landscaping. My basic feeling on this, once you do what is possible with respect to stepping things back, opening them up, using materials that we like, is to plan it out where that makes sense. I am interested in hearing what my colleagues have to say about what's possible with landscaping as oppose to what's been achieved so far and I couldn't figure out where the – couldn't figure out where the artificial turf goes. It's one of the listed materials but I forgot to ask that question. So, those are my comments at this point.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. So, you know one of my friends from New York City come and visit. They always tell me that Palo Alto is a City masquerading as a soap opera.

Board Member Furth: Well, that too but that's the people they talk too.

Chair Lew: Ok. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I'm going to focus my comments on two areas of concern that I've struggled quite a bit with and given it an awful lot of thought too. They have to do with the overall building massing and whether it's compatible with the context of the building. Then the question of the parking in the local sense the way Wynne was discussing it. I distinctly made some strong comments at the last hearing about this needing to be one building in the middle of the site and I greatly appreciate the applicant studying that option. It seems coming to the conclusion that it's just not viable for this site. I also appreciate them stepping back the front of the building. I find

that the massing of the building as it's seen from San Antonio is much improved and I think acceptable. I spent quite a bit of time last Sunday, really trying to drive up and down San Antonio and get a sense for what is the context because I -- this is something that is going to come up quite a bit as the City grows. Especially as we allow larger hotels into areas zoned otherwise for small buildings. I find myself further up San Antonio, close to the shopping center up near El Camino and there are some very large buildings there. I didn't realize I had gone that far up and it's been a few months since I was there. They are quite large...

Chair Lew: They are 84-feet high.

Board Member Baltay: Then I found myself turning at the JCC and that's also quite a tall building. Then I was driving up El Camino and there are quite a few large buildings like this as well and I guess I've come to the conclusion that this is contextually compatible. In a broad sense, what's on El Camino -- on San Antonio is compatible with the way this is going to look. It's been a tough, head scratching, really thinking hard about it because it's not an easy call to me but in the end, I feel the building is compatible. I feel that they've done quite a bit with the massing to make it step back and fit into the area and then I can support it. That leaves with the question of the traffic and rather than going on and on, I support what Wynne said. I think with aggressive management; the design can work. I'll leave my comments at that. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I had the same thing. I mean obviously, the biggest problem with this is just the sheer size of the building and then I -- we have the same thing. Out of the blue, my -- couple of weeks ago, my wife decided that she wanted to have dinner at Chief Chu's, which we hadn't been to in quite a while. Driving up San Antonio, all of sudden what use to be the Sears building is now a -- I don't know, six-story, seven-story straight vertical walls up and it's like my goodness, this area really is changing. As you said, it -- if you look and see the larger pictures rather than just the one or two-story buildings immediately adjacent to this building. A lot of the buildings there are getting to be four or five-story buildings. I mean it's the same on the peninsula itself. I mean for years, people who moved into the peninsula in the 60's and 70's -- let's face it, the various Cities, no matter what they are, are no longer bedroom communities. I mean they are -- they're Cities unto themselves and no longer an adjunct to either San Jose or San Francisco. Having said that, I was actually very pleased -- having kept the older presentation that you had. When you put the two next to each other as to the amount of effort you really did do to relate or I should say to tone it down for the residences across the street. I have to give you credit for that. There are a couple of minor things that -- I think you made the comment that -- I guess Peter made the suggestion about the three-story -- sort of the larger entry on the building. I like the way it works for the AC. For the courtyard, I think it's just too big. I'd rather see -- if you're going to do something like that and you want to keep it open, I'd rather see it go up two stories and then angle back as a glass roof like an atrium type entry if you want

to do that. Where you still bring the light in but yet again, tone it down as much as you can do. This is a good example, the one we're looking at here, that you really have done a good job at stepping it back and I really do appreciate that. Now it's a matter of – I agree with a lot of those areas. You can work with some landscaping up there so you get the landscaping up higher and it begins to tone the sort of severness of it down. I think it's come a long way. The issues as you said, is traffic and the problem is we don't really regulate traffic here but the – I agree with my Board Members that a lot of that is going to depend on the management of the hotels. One advantage is if this was an enormous group of or if it was a large condominium process, where there are all kinds of individual owners, then you wouldn't really worry about who was in charge of making sure that the parking got taken care of. With a hotel like that, it – there's sort of a boss that can regulate these things and actually get it done. For that reason, I agree that if it's done properly, there are a lot of hotels that I've stayed at in very large urban environments that do it beautifully. I mean, my god, before you turn around, your car is gone. I don't know where it goes but it's gone. That sort of thing and that could be done here also. You know, it's that sort of thing. Other than that, I mean we're not making any final decision here but I think it's a definite improvement and I haven't gone into the nits and bolts of exactly – I think maybe this ought to be trimmed up a little bit or that sort of thing. I think that's very doable. Other than -- like I said the lobby, I think needs to be – there are two – the whole idea of being totally separate, these two almost look like their sort of a kid brother of the other. The only thing is the one at the Courtyard seems to be bigger and more dominate, which I don't think it what you really want over the AC. I think I'll leave it at that also at this point.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you for the revisions. I think the stepped massing on San Antonio is a significant improvement. I think I had a different reaction than the rest of the Board, maybe. I – how do I want to say this? I don't think your site is (inaudible) – I want to say that your building, I think looks larger in the drawings than it actually is. Like when I look at the frontage, 280-feet, that's similar to the Hilton Garden Inn on El Camino, which is maybe 300-feet. 280-feet is about the same size as the Mayfield housing on El Camino, which is 50-feet high. When I look on your elevations, the building looks – for whatever reason, however you've designed it, to me, it looks huge. It looks like the projects on San Antonio Road in Mountain View, which are way taller; 84-feet high. Your project is nowhere near that big but when I look at the drawings, it looks that way and I so think that there's something is amiss and I don't know – I can't put my finger on it exactly. I have – I save all the drawing for all the hotels that come by and I'm going to hold you to the same standard and I think you're close but there's – I think that there are little things that are missing. I would say for example, on the Homewood Suite, the cornice is like 4-feet deep, the windows are recessed. Not all of them but are recessed 12-inches. Sunshades are probably like 3-feet deep. There's a lot of quality materials like there's brick, there's a lot of variation in the color and I think that on these four or five-story buildings, you actually do need to use all of those tricks that architects do to make it work. Actually, I should back up for a second. Also on the Hilton – on the Homewood Suite, there are balconies, there are deep recesses in the modulation and in the massing and I think some of those are missing. I think you've got – I mean you started it. Some of it's there but I'm finding it a little bit chaotic and my

take on it was that you need one more revision to sort of tie it all together. If I can give you an example, if looking on some of your elevations, you'll have one thing in the first, something different on the second floor, something different on the third floor. I think it's making it kind of chaotic.

Mr. Pop: I'm going to just bring it up so you can be specific for us.

Chair Lew: Yeah, so let's say for example...

Mr. Pop: Do you want the front elevation? Is that what you're looking for?

Chair Lew: Try – actually, you can do it on this or what about the (inaudible). I think you have some 3-D and I'll get...

Mr. Pop: Start with the Courtyard?

Chair Lew: Yeah, so why don't we do – yeah, the Marriot (inaudible). I would say for example – well, just – let me – in general, the Marriot Court Yard Hotel, I think the beige color scheme with the wood. I think that you've made design linkages to the (inaudible) company next door. It's the same pallet. It has a wood-textured concrete thing so I think you're making design linkages there. I would say also with regard to landscaping, you've made designs linkages. Say the olive trees, the New Zealand Flax, some of the [Raphael Lepus], you've taken some of the plant pallets from the Greenhouse and brought it over to this site so there are linkages. Here on the Court Yard, like if I just look on the [Axon] here, the – right at the corner. You have one thing on the first floor, you have something different on the second, something different on the third floor, stepping on the fourth and yet more stepping on the fifth floor. Does it really need to be chaotic? Can it be simplified? That's just one example, I think there are others if you go in – on the interior Courtyard side. On landscaping, I'm a little troubled that the basement garage extends beyond the footprint of the building. Particularly on the sides – side property lines. It seems to me like your only – you're proposing shrubs or maybe Italian Cypress there because you only have 5 or 6-feet to plant.

Mr. Pop: You mind if we (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Sure, and why don't we – we have Gary Layman the Landscape Architect here. I think – Gary, thank you. I don't think we have the exact plant proposed for the – no, you do. Excellent.

Mr. Gary Layman: We do. Along the side elevations, we wanted to get something that was very fast growing; evergreens. So maybe give us some good scale there. Create some layering. We have a sort of semi-transparent wood fence right on the property line and the step back behind that we have the Italian buckthorn shrubs, which are coming up vertically against the building edges there. We've chosen that because that's one of the fastest growing, drought tolerant, you know really resilient plant materials

who can really thrive in that kind of environment. So, we're expecting that hedge -- it's unbelievably fast growing, to be in the realm of 20-feet after about 5-years. So, it's a very impactful shrub planting there and it would work well within that 5-foot zone. We are taking advantage of those areas where we have the garage slab (inaudible) of the building wall and on many of those areas, we have out stormwater treatments. So, we have flow through planters that occur there so we have shrub planting in those zone in addition to the hedge planting along the property line.

Chair Lew: Then for the -- is it you're saying it's Indian Buck Thorn and then have you factored in that there's basement waterproofing -- Italian buck -- Italian? The basement waterproofing. I mean that would typically take a foot out of the soil areas so I think -- where you have -- what is it? We have 5-feet now or 6-feet?

Mr. Layman: Yeah, we tried to illustrate that there in the sections and the waterproofing and the dewatering and such would be right up against the building wall. It actually would be a fairly narrow profile so we have a generous amount of soil to be able to sustain the planting in those areas.

Chair Lew: Then how do you get access for maintenance there? I mean you've got a raised planter and the Italian Buckthorn and you're planting. I mean it seems like a challenge -- I mean, it seems challenging to me to maintain that in the narrowest locations.

Mr. Layman: It is a narrow location but there is enough room to be able to access those areas. It's a -- part of what we were trying to do as well was not to make those areas inviting for those -- other than for those people who are going to be doing maintenance but there's enough room there to be able to survive those areas.

Chair Lew: Then are you aware that we have the new finding for native plants and providing -- or plants -- or non-native plants that provide beneficial habitat in...

Mr. Layman: That's right and we've included a lot of native plants, as well as Mediterranean, adapted plants as a part of the plant palette. As you said, these are -- we tried to borrow from the adjacent sights to help continue that context.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Gary.

Mr. Layman: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Alex or my colleagues, I would be interested in -- what Alex's had to say about the Court Yard has -- if this project resonates for me, that is somehow sits in the site better and ties in better than the AC portion and maybe it's that cold gray white and when I particularly look at the corner -- looking at 3.0, if you look at the right

most corner on the second row, that all – that whole frontage – it's hard for me to read an elevation but it doesn't...

Board Member Gooyer: I think part of it...

Board Member Furth: ...work.

Board Member Gooyer: ... is that I think the AC is more formal – I think they want to press a higher end.

Board Member Furth: I'm fine with formality. Apparently in Europe – another piece of information I picked up that I forgot to disclose. They use more white. I wouldn't mind more white but this cold gray black...

Chair Lew: And there's green too.

Board Member Furth: It doesn't – for me, when I look at this, it seems harder to assimilate into the setting and when I'm thinking about how – I must say, we should remember that sun microsystems use to be down the road. I mean we use to have significant height but people were use to low-rise residential vibe. Sorry, atmosphere, there and I think when we evoked San Antonio at El Camino, we probably terrified people. That as much – as nice as it might be to go to a three-story Safeway, this is not what they want to live in or near so I'm still trying to figure out – I don't think this is the destruction of a great view. I think it could be a creation of an attractive view. There's nothing inherently awful about a nicely scaled, welcoming hotel where I can walk in and get a drink but I don't – I would like your thoughts on could – is there a manageable way to make the AC section work better from the street?

Chair Lew: I have a question? Yeah?

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question and I'm – it was just brought to my attention and we just talked about this. We were talking about the – and I made the totally incorrect statement about a three-story entry space that I said about sloping it. When in reality, if you look at that and it's real deceiving. They are just rooms above those two and the reality of it, that means there's just going to be curtains that are drawn in front of that and that's going to destroy the whole look of the, I think entry.

Mr. Pop: May I respond?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure.

Mr. Pop: Yeah, thank you. So, you're correcting correcting. Those are – at the lower level its lobby space and common space that's downstairs. At the upper level, it translates to rooms – to guest rooms.



Board Member Gooyer: I mean it's a three-story space basically but the top two stories are rooms.

Mr. Pop: Three stories of glass but the top two stories are rooms, that's correct. You know, I would draw your attention to the Hilton Garden Inn that was just built on El Camino Real. I live near that and I drive by it all the time. That's got some tall glass – you know, Alex mentioned a couple other hotels and the Homewood Suites is one that I'm intimately familiar with because I designed that one but the Garden Inn has this similar type of glass, where it's multi-stories. At night, you notice that the shades are pulled because you can see into the building but during the day, you really don't. It just looks...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Mr. Pop: ...you're moving past it. The glass is pretty successful but you know, this is what's interesting about architecture.

Board Member Gooyer: The classical example is the Four Season (East Palo Alto). At night when you drive by, you're looking basically in the hallway. The first time that happened it's like what the heck is that and it turns out it's the hallway and it destroys the whole look of it, to me. Here, it's got this perceived grand entry and to me, the thing that kills it and I've seen it done in other or I've seen it happen in other hotels. It's main not so much even the designer, who maybe had a vision of some sort but the reality sets in and like you said, in the day time the curtains are all closed or open or all this and it just destroys the whole concept of entry.

Mr. Pop: I understand.

Board Member Gooyer: If that's the case, for the Court Yard, maybe just treat it as part of the hotel and then do something of an (inaudible) or whatever. Something that just says this is the entry and you showed the other various Courtyards that you have. Almost all of them have a Porticulshare and it's that sort of thing or something at least just to say that -- well, that isn't actually the main entry but still, it's perceived to be or then just change that so that it doesn't look like an entry.

Mr. Pop: I'd just take your comments in concert with the comments that Chair Lew described in terms of variety and the differentiation that's happening in the building. To tell you clearly, what we were trying to do is break down the massing.

Board Member Gooyer: (Crosstalk)(inaudible)

Mr. Pop: (Crosstalk)(inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: ... what's next to it and extend it over. I wasn't thinking that.

Mr. Pop: I'm comfortable doing something like that. These other hotels – particularly, the Court Yards that you're seeing.

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Mr. Pop: Unfortunately, we have a 24-foot setback, that's a special (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)(crosstalk) Like I said, I'm not even worried so much about the...

Mr. Pop: We can't put a cornice, (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)(Crosstalk)

Mr. Pop: Nothing can extend into that and so that's the struggle with – 24-foot setback is...

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, I understand.

Mr. Pop: ...really difficult zoning issue.

Board Member Gooyer: Anyway, I just thought I'd – (inaudible) and I realized (inaudible). Oh well, ok.

Mr. Pop: I appreciate that though, thank you.

Chair Lew: Can we go back to Wynne's comment about the pallet the AC hotels. You're proposing (inaudible) colored stucco, not painted.

Mr. Pop: Yeah, I wanted to make sure that you had (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) we haven't reviewed – I saw the sample board but I just wanted to mention to you – so, I haven't seen it. I'd like to see it. The buildings that I've worked on at Stanford and Stanford generally uses (inaudible)colors stucco. It's much richer and has suddenly far more than a painted stucco or...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: ... I know – well, it cracks.

Board Member Gooyer: No, not even that but when it rains (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: The color looks darker. Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: The only way to do stucco is integral ocolor and then paint it.

Board Member Baltay: No.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm serious. I've done that for years. That way it (inaudible).

Mr. Pop: So, Mont has just a comment for you about this but I just want to make sure that you understand what you are seeing in there because there's a bunch of different materials. We have a sample board that reflective of most of the materials and the colors that we're doing. Then we brought some individual pieces that are floating along with that, which are indicative of the character and the quality of the materials. We have a physical sample of the plaster that we're talking about. This hand troweled venetian finish that's an integral color finish. That's it and then we also have a piece of the metal that would be painted in the colors that you see on the board that Wynne has now. The reason why we brought that metal along is to show you sort of the...

Chair Lew: This is not the color. This is (inaudible)

Mr. Pop: That's not the color, that's the thickness and the weight and the durability of that material. We wanted to bring the actual physical samples of what we're using so that you could really see that because they really are A+ materials. I think Mont has something he wants to share.

Mr. Williamson: Just a comment on plaster. So, this is near and dear to our heart. We're a hotel here that's across the country and in general, we don't like plaster. We don't do – I wouldn't consider this plaster. This concept of a Venetian plaster, it is – there are a lot of labor in the steel troweling and it closes all the little capillary breaks in the concrete. It doesn't look like a typical plaster that soaks the water in. It is a different effect so it's almost like stone. I want to make sure we're communicating. It's applied like plaster and then there's a ton of labor, like they do in Europe, to close all those pores and make it very high polished.

Board Member Furth: What's the material that the (inaudible) go is stuck on?

Board Member Gooyer: Stuck on?

Board Member Furth: It says AC hotels...

Board Member Gooyer: That could be the metal.

Board Member Furth: ... what's the material (inaudible)(crosstalk) What's that?

Chair Lew: It's P8.

Mr. Pop: That's the Venetian plaster.

Chair Lew: P8.

Board Member Furth: It's the lighter color?

Mr. Pop: When you think of that – you know what I'd like for you to be able to visualize when you look at that is it's essentially like having stone panels on the building. That's almost how it's going to appear when you see it.

Board Member Furth: There are two different colors of that?

Chair Lew: P8 is the darker color.

Mr. Pop: There are two different colors of the plaster finish.

Board Member Furth: In the drawing it looks like the lighter color, right?

Chair Lew: Yeah but it's labeled P8.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so I'm having trouble...

Chair Lew: If you go to sheet A4.0, P8 is the darker color and P7 is the lighter color.

Board Member Furth: Does that match what we're seeing?

Mr. Pop: I just want to make perfectly clear to all four of you. This is the kind of stuff that we are happy to adjust and temper and come to some terms with whether it's in this process or if you wanted it to come back to the subcommittee and just deal with tweaks to the color. We would be – we're very flexible about that. There's a certain brand recognition that I have spoken about in the past but Mont has told me that there's a lot of flexibility about this. We can adjust here if we need to but Board Member Lew's comments --Chair Lew comments about the Courtyard being on the side that's on – to respond to 760 and the character of that. I'll say this and maybe it gets me in trouble but my expectation is that the Cross Roads World Market that's on the other side is a very underutilized parcel. I'm expecting that that's something we'll in a few years or maybe a little bit longer than that, be a parcel that is renewed and that we would see something a little more contemporary over there. The idea is about indigenous architectural and this was something that we talked alto about when we were building the JCC. Should we build what's old? Should we try and reflect that? You know, that becomes a little Disney Land. It's not really architecture in the same way. What we want to do is we want to build for 2017 and something that's appropriate for now and his reflective of the history maybe in some way but really looks forward. That's how I tend to approach that and so, you know everyone has their opinions about architecture and that's what's fun about it but that's where we are.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) To defend my own honor esthetically, I would never be asking you to build Soto whatever. I ask you to acknowledge where you're building.

Mr. Lait: So, Chair...

Mr. Pop: Understood.

Chair Lew: Yes, Staff?

Mr. Lait...just in the effort of...

Chair Lew: Yes, it's 3:15.

Mr. Lait: ... moving us along. We have one more item after this in our record breaking ARB meeting. We do have to come back with some findings. It did sound like – I don't want to speak for the Board but it did sound like this was moving toward yes and if – we do need to come back with some findings, we can do that. It sounds like there are some very specific things that maybe need to be fine-tuned when we come back and if we can articulate those, we can get this scheduled back for the Board within probably the month or so.

Chair Lew: You would like comments on the draft findings?

Board Member Furth: Can I request one more thing and then I'll shut up?

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) It would be very helpful for me to see the drawings we sometimes get, which show – for example, sheet A -3.0 with the plants. I know you gave it to use with no landscaping so we can see the building. It's very helpful for me and I think also for the City Council to see those elevations with 5 or 10 or 20-year landscaping in front of it.

Mr. Lait: That's the kind of thing I think we should get in a motion as far as what you want to see coming back.

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to throw one more thing out there I guess. Randy, I'm looking at this and I'm really bothered by this three-story glass element on the front. As I really studied these plans, it's really wrong that you would put that out there and say that's a three-story space. That's what I asked for and it's not. It's a bunch of rooms above it. There's no change in the building itself that justifies that. Looking now at the facade for the AC building, I think it – you need one more pass at the just organization of the massing. You've done a fine job getting it back in a big sense to me, our concerns about contextuality but you just can't have a three-story wall of glass and it is two hotel rooms above it. I mean the people in there aren't going to be happy. The people outside aren't going to be happy. It's going to look different all the time. There's no door underneath it. You're just trying to sort of appease one comment without really taking it to heart as a designer and designing it differently, which is what I asked. I'd rather – I think you need to go back around once more and maybe get rid of it if it's not working. You don't want to put the door there. You can't afford the three-story space. Well, don't try to trick me and show me something at first (inaudible) looks like that. That said, I think Wynne's comments about the pallet of materials also on the AC

building. I think you could make it a warmer, softer gray. Try to get the grays to be more compatible with the warmer (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: ...after so I can move that – if – are we ready – are we looking for a motion Alex or do you want to do that?

Board Member Gooyer: If that's the case, I'd like to see the same thing occur on the three-story space at the....

Board Member Baltay: Oh, absolutely. Yeah, on both of them. Yeah, I mean as much as I'd love to see a three-story glass lobby. If that's not going to happen, don't just put the glass there without everything else. That's just not going to work and because you've done that, now I'm afraid you're back to the drawing board to figure it out so it really does work. I don't support approving it now. I think you are in for another round but the basic idea works. I'm ok continuing this – shall I make that motion Alex?

Chair Lew: Right, I think the Staff recommendation is to continue it to a date uncertain.

Board Member Gooyer: Uncertain or certain?

Chair Lew: Well, the Staff recommendation that – the thing that I have says uncertain.

Mr. Lait: Right so that's the Staff recommendation. Based on the Board's dialog it does seem like there's some discreet – I'm hearing it's not there yet but there are some discreet things that need to be addressed that, I think the applicant could probably do within the next couple of weeks and we can schedule this to a date certain, to come back in a month's time.

Board Member Gooyer: Would you be happier with a date certain?

Mr. Pop: Yeah, I was just going to say that I really appreciate how specific everyone has been today. It's very helpful to hear the precise comments the way you have delivered them. 5/18 would be an easy option for us.

Board Member Gooyer: I don't know. We did the last one at 5/18, can they...

Mr. Lait: Yeah, we're looking at the schedule now to see what's on there but...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) use to long days.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, let's not make a habit of this

Mr. Pop: Don't want to beat you up but we're anxious to come back to you and we can certainly turn this around thoughtfully but quickly.

Board Member Baltay: I will not be present at the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup>. If that's combined with Kyu being recused, then that's not a good idea.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok. That's true. That's right because you're stuck with four people rather than...

Chair Lew: Peter, you had sent out an email on the dates that you are going to be absent and then I think Robert, you had mentioned that you're going to be absent?

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, so you're not...

Mr. Pop: 6/1?

Chair Lew: Is it 6/2? I'm just looking at the schedule.

Mr. Pop: Oh, do I have the date wrong? 6/1 I think.

Chair Lew: OK, I think our schedule is off.

**Female:** (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: No, I think we've closed the public hearing but you can – please do continue to send – you can send emails to Sheldon and we can keep the communication open.

**Female:** (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: I have to say the – we can't – everything that you say now is not being recorded as part of the hearing.

**Female:** (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Actually, it does need to be recorded.

Mr. Lait: We just need a motion from the Board as to whether you want to continue it to – what is it June?

Ms. Gerhardt: 6/1.

Mr. Lait: June 1<sup>st</sup> and then with a discreet list of things that need to be addressed upon its return. Alternatively, you could push it to the 18<sup>th</sup> but you're going to have three members.

Board Member Gooyer: To a date certain.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I'll move that we continue this project to a date certain of June 1<sup>st</sup> with a request that they revise the design. The massing of the three-story façade of both buildings to not have a three-story wall of glass and perhaps slight better articulate the overall integration of the forms.

Board Member Gooyer: Different – a warmer...

Board Member Baltay: Then secondly, to go for a warmer pallet on the AC building. The grays are fine but a warmer tone instead of grays.

Board Member Gooyer: And a better landscaping to show what it would look like with mature...

Board Member Baltay: The third one is about the landscaping. Is it the landscaping itself or the presentation of the landscaping?

Board Member Furth: What I would like to be able to do is see it but my goal is to have landscaping that is significant with regard to this building. We pushed up the landscaping...

Board Member Gooyer: As Gary was saying, what is it going to look like in 5-years?

Board Member Furth: And what I am saying is that I want it to be up there. We had Mercedes get taller trees...

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Board Member Furth: .... because it's a taller building. I want tall trees.

Board Member Baltay: So, the third condition is then to get a more detailed landscaping plan with larger, taller trees per Board Member Furth's comment and then present it on the plan's set...

Board Member Gooyer: Nice to show what it would look like.

Board Member Baltay: ...to really show what it would look like. Did I cover it? That's the motion then.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.



Mr. Lait: I don't know if – Chair, you had your comments about the recesses and the canopies and so forth. The depth – adding some depth to the façade wall.

Board Member Furth: They eyelashes on the upper stories.

Board Member Baltay: That's what I meant by that first comment about...

Chair Lew: I think that's...

Board Member Baltay: ... improving the articulation of massing.

Chair Lew: ...in the articulation of forms and there are built to requirements and building code requirements for cornices and projections with regard to the property line. I mean – I think that's stuff that Randy has to work out so I think we'll just leave it at articulating forms. Ok, so we have a motion by Board Member Baltay and seconded by Board Member Gooyer. All in favor? Opposed? None and we have Vice Chair Kim abstained.

**MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH VICE CHAIR KIM ABSTAINED.**

Chair Lew: Ok. It's 4 – it's almost 4:30 and this is a record.

**7. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2555 Park Boulevard [17PLN-00064]:**

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of an Architectural Review of a

Minor Project to Allow Design Changes to Exterior Materials and Architectural Features of a Previously Approved Project to Construct a 23,269 sf Three-story Office Building with One Level of Below-grade Parking. Environmental Assessment: Environmental Impact Report was Certified and Statement of Overriding Considerations was Adopted on June 1, 2015. Zoning District: CC(2) District. For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Phillip Brennan at [phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org)

Chair Lew: Item number 7. Public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter at 2555 Park Boulevard. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of an architectural review of a minor project to allow design changes to exterior materials and architectural features of a previously approved project to construct a 23,269-square feet three-story office building with one level of below-grade parking. The environmental assessment is that the EIR was certified and statement of overriding considerations was adopted on June 1, 2015, and the zone district is CC2. Phillip?

Mr. Brennan: Thank you again Members of the Board. I have a very brief presentation and the applicant also has a presentation that they would like to provide to you. This is

a previously approved here-story office building with one level of below grade parking in the CC2 zoning district. The project essentially consists of exterior materials substitutions and finishes and minor architectural changes. The building footprint has not been changed nor has any square footage been added. The proposed rooftop tinsel structure and stair towers were removed from the design. That's not part of the project proposal currently but it's just a note that was a change to the design. The project – just a really brief background. The project was originally reviewed at a preliminary ARB meeting in June 2014. October 2014, the ARB recommended approval for the AR – architectural review and design enhancement exception. The project was approved and a final EIR certified by City Council in June 2015. The DEE, however, was denied. The applicant – this is a current rendering. The applicant is providing the Board with a more – excuse me, the Board will or excuse me, the applicant is going to provide a more thorough walk through of the proposed changes but some of the primary modifications consist of steel and wood trestle replacing the concrete slab roof deck at the third-floor. Glass barrier replacing out the steel cable barrier. Providing a more transparent perspective. The green vine wall is being wrapped around Grant Avenue for – to enhance the pedestrian experience and environment. Porcelain and tile siding is replacing the cement plaster and finish of the wall curtain surrounding the vertical (inaudible) system. Staff is recommending the ARB to take the following action and recommend approval of the proposed exterior revisions and based on findings and subject to the conditions of approval.

Chair Lew: and...

Mr. Brennan: I'm sorry, the applicant is – would like to present – make their presentation.

Chair Lew: Then for Staff, do we – sometimes we allow 5-mins for minor projects or 10-mintues for major projects. Is – what are your thoughts about that?

Mr. Lait: I think that this is a regular application so it's 10-mintues. I don't know if the applicant needs that much time but of course, they've been waiting around all day.

[Mr. Rob Zirkle:] Do you guys want to open it for public comment first?

Chair Lew: No, we're going to put you up first.

[Mr. Zirkle:] Hey everybody. Rob [Zirkle] from Brick. Very pleased to a part of this historic day. You can imagine with the last name [Zirkle], I've been at the end of the line may times throughout my 46-years so this is regular business for me. Thank you for your service. This is a long day doing what you do and I appreciate it. If no one else says it, I know that other people do to. I have been asked by new ownership that have purchased this asset that was previously entitled and designed by a very capable architect. To come in and move the project forward, which is now under construction. There are a lot of moving parts and pieces, some of which involve making some minor changes, which we think and hope you agree, enhance the aesthetic proposition of the

project. We're here before you today to just sort of go over what those are so you understand and we keep the process moving forward. I'm going to quickly walk you through those. We tried to give you in the packet the side by side of the affected sheets so you could do sort of a before and after comparison but I just wanted to summarize things for you quickly. Just in the three main areas that we are focusing on. As Phillip said, the project footprint stays the same. The area of the building stays the same. Ingress points, egress points, vertical circulation, all this stuff stays the same. Landscaping stays the same. Previous proposal is up on the screen so there are three things that we were trying to consider when asked what we could do to help kind of raise the bar on the materials and aesthetics a little bit. Do so within a restrained way because we know that this is already entitled so we really focused on the element at the corner with the cement plaster and the curtain wall. We focused some energy around the axes points, both the pedestrian access points but also the vehicular access point off Grant. We started to think a little bit about the stair towers which have a presence on both streets and wanted to try and create a strategy that threw those three areas in investigation and we could knit these three areas together a little more. Quickly, the building corner. This is the 3-dimensional view showing yellow cement plaster with a curtain wall with vertical aluminum fins that sit proud of the plaster. What we're proposing is exposing the slab edge of the concrete frame to basically frame the curtain wall as opposed to having the curtain wall feel like it's applied to the building. To try to unify that move across the corner. Substituting glass – frost glass fins into the curtain wall system in place of the aluminum vertical extrusions as well. We are recommending that we change the yellow colored cement plaster to a porcelain tile. The dimensions of these tiles are quite variable in size as you know but we are operating within a jointing pattern of 1-foot by 4-foot panel to try to bring a little more richness to that corner element than cement plaster. The entry points; on the screen now are images from the previous proposal. Some of the things that we thought were actually nice about this was the wood picketed guard rail at that second-floor lobby and wanted to think about the warmth that that presented and how we might use that as a device in other areas of the building. Also, started thinking about the view of the underside of the concrete decks from the sidewalk and wondered if there was maybe a different viewpoint that you can see as a pedestrian as the underside of those concrete decks and maybe think about a different material proposition there. What we're proposing is to keep the nice wood picket in place as an identifier to the front of the building but we are introducing a metal panel on the underside of the first-floor facet and then utilizing Resysta wood siding. Well, it's a wood composite. It's made from rice husks and bound by resin but it looks like wood and its stains like wood. Operationally, it's more durable and last longer and looks very similar. What we are doing is wrapping that up the sides of the first two stories and underneath the facet of the third-floor deck so that when you are standing on the sidewalk looking up, instead of only raw concrete, you're seeing metal panel and Resysta to help increase the quality that you see. Thirdly, you start to also see the comparison of the – in both of these images of the attitude about the third – about the roof. The roof in the previous design as you can see here on the left and this is thru both the pedestrian entry that you can see here trellis on the third-floor and a trellis that you can see here. Instead of having that roof come all the way over and fully cover that upper area. We wanted to propose using a steel and

wood trellis to help give a little lighter appearance again, from the ground but also filter the natural light up onto that deck as opposed to the heavy concrete roof that came over the top of both those. You can kind of begin to see that there's a little bit more access to the sky through the laciness of that trellis as opposed to the concrete roof. Lastly, it's the stair towers. These are images of what the previous stair towers look like. The one on the left is on Park and the one on the right is on Grant. There was an idea about using glass in the stair in a way to create a marker and we quite like it in these small buildings. Especially that the stairs feel nice so people take the stairs as opposed to relying on an elevator. We wanted to try to unify the aesthetic of those a little bit and leverage the board from concrete that are proposed for the project. You'll see that on Park, we've created a corner element here with (inaudible) glass at the corner, that returns on the interior property line. Only a short distance because the building code limits how much glazing can face that interior property line but use that as element that provides a better experience in the stair and is also a little more visible on the street to use as a little bit of a marker. You can imagine especially, at dusk or even in the evening that that presents its nice little warmer beacon effect there. Similarly, on the Grant Street tower. Well, going back to this one real fast. You'll see in plan in the upper left that we've actually battered the wall in a little bit to kind of create a little shape there at the window. On Grant, it's a little bit different. The engineer needs a little bit more mass there for sheer purposes so we're using the same attitude about expanding the width of that window, just to give it a little more prominence. Visually connect the two together on the various street but no batter on that side just because we need a little bit more girth in the concrete to perform the structural job. Materials as I had said before are really very similar and we've levered in some of the porcelain tile. Continued with the board from concrete aesthetic on the stair towers. Introducing the Resysta siding for the facing of the first floor/second floor underside of canopy. A little bit of metal panel accent on the underside of that first level overhang. Again, still keeping the same idea about landscaping and the green wall that screens the parking structure from view. Again, a nice curtain wall with frosted glass fins and that's what I've got for you. 5-minutes.

Chair Lew: That took 7 ½-minutes. Thank you, Rob. Ok, we'll open this up to the public – this item for the public comment but I don't have any speaker cards. So, we'll move to – I'll close the public part of the hearing and move to Board Member questions.

Mr. Lait: Any disclosures if we have any.

Chair Lew: Yes, any disclosures? No.

Board Member Furth: I have a question?

Chair Lew: Question, yes Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Why did the removal of elements not constitute a project to the needed reviewing? I understand – you're saying that addition of elements does but

removals don't? I thought you began your report by saying that various elements were removed?

Chair Lew: The Council removed the roof deck.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, Council did not approve the DEE.

Board Member Furth: I see, sorry. So that was part of that stage of the review process then. Got it. This was all before my time.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? No. I have some questions for you. Are there any – my recollection is that on the glass curtain wall that was on the previous project. My recollection is that that architect was proposing a film – like an obscure film to hide anything below desk height and I was wondering what you're thinking of with regard to that?

[Mr. Zirkle:] Yeah, we have no plans for film. We have mullion at desk height. So, in case the final tentative improvement plan that there is desk that sort of move there, there's logical (inaudible) that's there but we don't have any plan to film it. We quite like the idea of there being floor to ceiling glass.

Chair Lew: Great. At least mullion gives us an option for requiring...

[Mr. Zirkle:] Yes.

Chair Lew: ...blinds below that or something. It gives us some flexibility. Do you have – are you far enough along to know what the glass is going to be? Is it tinted or reflective or clear?

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

[Mr. Zirkle:] I think we've run the energy model.

Chair Lew: I – sorry, I haven't seen the spec. of it. I don't even know – what did...

[Mr. Zirkle:] Yeah so...

Chair Lew: Do we know what this is?

[Mr. Zirkle:] ... well, the energy model is still underway so exactly what the spec. is. If it's going to end up being solar band because we have – you know, we have an exposure there where we're going to be concerned about southwest facing sun. We – that gets to be determined but the idea would be that this is transparent and non-tinted as we can possibly have it.

Chair Lew: I think the project description was mentioning a coding on the concrete instead of painting. I was wondering...(crosstalk)(inaudible)

[Mr. Zirkle:] Yeah, so the...

Chair Lew: ... graffiti coding?

[Mr. Zirkle:] Yeah, clear. The coding that is mentioned on the concrete is specifically related to the interior property line elevation so those aren't public accessible. Previously proposed, they were supposed to be painted and we would prefer a clear sealer over the concrete just to help kind the unify the idea that the board form concrete elements in the previous proposal. What we would like to continue forward just unifies that idea of concrete all the way around the buildings so we proposed a sealer as opposed to paint.

Chair Lew: Ok. Then is it – I see. The back – the interior portions aren't board formed?

[Mr. Zirkle:] No (inaudible)

Chair Lew: Those are just panel formed?

[Mr. Zirkle:] Yeah, paneled formed.

Chair Lew: Right and you're changing the board formed orientation.

[Mr. Zirkle:] Well, what's interesting is that it was horizontal in the ARB package but what was drawn at permit, it was vertical so we're continuing forward with vertical board form, which we feel like is actually a good move on the part of the previous architect to help accentuate the verticality of those towers.

Chair Lew: Ok. Thank you. Comments? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: I don't have any comments. I can recommend approval at, is it?

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Thank you for bringing up the issue of film because I don't like floor to ceiling glass unless the building is being used in a way where that makes sense and our usual experience is that it doesn't because there are offices or people wearing skirts or something that makes this not a good approach. I would ask my colleagues or the applicant that there is a condition that would enable the City to require some kind of – category two storm? – film or treatment once the design is determined if that's appropriate? There may be a better way of saying that but to avoid the problem we have for example, on Litton. With the floor to ceiling windows and the close-up view of waste baskets and the back to desks.

Chair Lew: Do – yeah. Can we do that? It sorts of interior furnishings of the building but...

Board Member Furth: They're just asking not to do it now but (inaudible).

Chair Lew: Ok. Do we have...

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I mean I think you can impose a condition that requires the film unless the interior is not going to have...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah, it's tricky because you realize that over a long period of time, the tenants are going to change and so it's going to be hard to – yeah, it's a tricky one to enforce.

Board Member Furth: I want to give them maximum freedom but I want to avoid that unfortunate condition that (inaudible).

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair, if there's – because we haven't figured out the actual glass material at this point, is there a possibility that would be dark enough where it wouldn't need the extra film on the bottom? You could somehow say that.

Chair Lew: Possible. It's hard because we can say – say the building looks one way and say in the evening when the lights are one, then it looks completely – it totally reverses so it's tricky. I would say that the film is being used on 278 University Avenue. That's one of Ken Hayes's buildings, below deck height and the previous architect noticed that and wanted to – and proposed using it, I think on this – on the earlier version of this scheme.

Board Member Furth: Maybe we should – does it make sense to just require it because, in real life, we are going to have these problems? Other than (inaudible), where are you going to put it (inaudible), which they are not going to do. What are you going to put up there that doesn't create this problem?

Chair Lew: I don't know but the – open – once upon a time, offices were all cubical but that's completely changed. If you look at what offices look like now, they're – yeah. They're doing things way out of the box. I don't know. My take on it is to require it and then see – and then we will see what happens.

Board Member Baltay: I say looking at this design, they're doing a lot to minimize the floor plate in the middle of the glazing and I think the film is going to actually have a detrimental effect. I'd rather see a few wastebaskets than a consistent film line when otherwise twelve pieces of glass here.

Board Member Gooyer: Then you're going to have the big band in the middle.

Board Member Baltay: When I'm looking at the previous design with the band, I don't find it that desirable but it does help that you have another band with the middle floor. I was looking at this drawing. There's a white band there.

Board Member Gooyer: That's why the gray band above it is not as noticeable.

Board Member Baltay: This design also somehow –I can't put my finger on why but it – maybe it's not as much as a frame with a piece of glass in the middle. Whereas the new proposed design really is a heavy frame around this glass and I guess I think we're just making it less good architecture by benign worried about garbage cans. That's my opinion.

Chair Lew: Now, I was going to say that I do like your Visa project around the corner and you have a very good eye for proportions and details. I wish more architects had your talent but they don't.

[Mr. Zirkle:] Thank you.

Chair Lew: I will – ok, so – why don't you propose a motion?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I move that we approve this – we recommend approval of this project based on the findings in the packet.

Chair Lew: Any seconds?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Lew: OK, all in favor? Opposed? So, that passes 4-0 with Board Member Kyu absent. Thank you.

## **MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH VICE CHAIR KIM ABSENT**

[Mr. Zirkle:] Thank you, thank you. Thank you for surviving attrition. This was a marathon. I am amazed and impressed.

Chair Lew: We're not completely done.

## **Approval of Minutes:**

### **8. March 16, 2017, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes**

Chair Lew: We have the minutes. Going to – we did the minutes for the first portion under tab seven in the packet but we do need to approve the minutes for March 16<sup>th</sup>,



2017. I don't think I have any comments on them. Does anybody else – I didn't see anything.

Board Member Furth: Staff asked that we give them our transcription corrections offline so I will do that. my favorite one was when one of you said misled, you know something misled somebody and it said m-i-s-s-l-e-a-d. Followed by all the young men.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Board Member Furth: Seconded.

Chair Lew: All in favor? That's 4-0 with Board Member Kim absent.

## **MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH VICE CHAIR KIM ABSENT**

Chair Lew: OK, it's 4:45, you are now excused.

Ms. Gerhardt: I just wanted to let everyone know that as a tiny reward, there will not be an April 20<sup>th</sup> hearing so we do get a reprieve there. I know, tiny reward.

Board Member Furth: We have no meeting on the 20<sup>th</sup>? Yea, if I was flying down here for every meeting.

## **Subcommittee Item**

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

## **Adjournment**