



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: July 13, 2017
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent: Board Member Peter Baltay

[Regular meeting started after the joint ARB/HRB meeting]

Oral Communications

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

City Official Reports

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

Action Items

3. **PUBLIC HEARING/ QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1545 Alma Street [16PLN-00283]:**
Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow an Addition to an Existing Single-Family Residence and Construction of two Additional Units on a 10,000 Square Foot lot. The Project Also Requests a Design Enhancement Exception for Driveway Width and Distance From the Adjacent Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt from CEQA per Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: RM-15 (Low Density Multiple-Family Residence District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us

Chair Lew: [Video started mid-sentence] judicial matter for 1545 Alma Street. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow an addition to an existing single-family residence and construction of two additional units on a 10,000-square foot lot. The project also requests a Design Enhancement Exception for driveway width and distance from the adjacent property. The environmental assessment is the project is exempt from CEQA per guideline section 15303 and the zone district is RM-15. We have our project planner Sheldon Ah Sing, welcome.

Ms. Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Yes, good morning. I do have a PowerPoint presentation and the applicant is also here and they have a presentation as well. So, thank you for the introduction and overview but yes, this is a renovation and addition to a single-family house and the addition of two new units on 10,000-square foot lot that's along Alma near the intersection of Churchill. This did go before the Board previously on March 2nd, 2017. I do want to bring to your attention that in front of you I did place

Attachment B-1, which are the findings for the Design Enhancement Exception. Those were apart of the March 2nd meeting. There didn't seem to be any issues with that component of the project and also, there are copies of that on the back table. At the last meeting, there were extensive comments regarding the design of the project in the amount of detail that the plans had exhibited. This slide really just shows the comments and then how the applicant responded to those and we also have some slides about that. One of the things was to select a unified style, as opposed to just maintaining the Spanish design and then going on towards the back of the property with a more contemporary design. That's what the applicant proposed is a more unified style. To consider the removal of the balcony for Unit C and that one was removed. Then there was some issue or concern about the common space that was along Alma so that space was moved to the very rear of the property. Then the colors, there was some concern about the colors being too bright and those of course have been toned down. Then there was also concern about the slope and the daylight plan for Unit A and I'll show you through the exhibits that those have now been revised. The first thing to address would be the unified architectural style and colors. As you can in the December 2016 proposal that was before you had March, you had a lot of different colors going on, it was very modern in design. Then with the recent proposal, you have much more unified elements and design for you and the applicant will go in more detail about what they were proposing there. You can see here Unit C balcony, on the left is what was proposed. There was a balcony that was overlooking an adjacent property so there were some privacy issues there that were raised. A neighbor did show up at that meeting and addressed that. Then the new proposal is that they removed that balcony. The issues was with the common space locations that was located along Alma. We did look into the noise and as mentioned in the Staff report that those noise levels are elevated along that corridor. Especially you have the train there as well so the new common space is located directly in the rear and there is access to that via a driveway area. Then here this exhibit shows the Unit A roof line and the daylight plan where there was kind of an abrupt change to the form of the house to fall within that daylight plan tent. You can see where again the – with the new design that the roof line now is more cohesive. With CEQA it is exempted on there, the California Environmental Quality Act, for new construction and conversion of small structures. Really just providing two additional units here. The recommended motion is the approval of the proposed project to the Director based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation, thank you.

Chair Lew: Now is the time for the applicant presentation and you'll have 10-minutes. Then for Staff, I think we have a speaker card for this one.

Vice Chair Kim: Could the applicant have the mouse?

Mr. Kelvin Chua: Good morning. I am Kelvin Chua from Topos Architects and obviously talking about 1545 Alma Street. I am here representing our client Manish Baldua who is present with us as well. This is – as mentioned before our second hearing. In this presentation, here we are going to talk about the design changes that we have made in response to the comments made from the first hearing. Just to reiterate on the project, as far the zoning it said that it was an RM-15, 10,000-square foot lot. Because we are not permitted, by zoning code, to do a single family or two-family unit, the three-unit condominium is the only allowed per zoning code development that we are allowed to make on this property. In our redesign, we had some parking issues before that we didn't fully flush out. In the redesign of it we have made it so that all the parking space are directly adjacent to each corresponding unit. The orange in here is representing the uncovered parking spaces and the yellow representing the covered parking spaces or the garage. In our previous design we had some parallel parking spaces in front of the middle Unit B, which is a little bit awkward. By reconfiguring it, we were able to eliminate the parallel parking space and provide for more adequate turns around or for a more functional parking lot for backing up and turning around. As mentioned before the driveway wasn't really an issue but I just wanted to reiterate the exception for the Design Enhancement Exception for the driveway. The reason for the request to have a driveway with less than the 16-foot requirement for a multi-family unit and the reason why we need the driveway to be less than 5-feet away from the adjacent property line. We have a narrow lot that is only 50-feet wide and we would like to maintain the existing driveway approach from Alma, which is the existing condition right now. We would also like to avoid the removal of a 21-inch diameter street tree, maple tree that is there and we would also like to preserve the existing Unit A

building; the footprint of the building. A 16-foot wide driveway would make us have to eliminate or demolish this corner of the building. This is an image of the original design that we had from the first hearing. Here we were trying to use mixed vocabulary, basically keeping the existing façade of the existing Unit A, which faces towards Alma. Then combining it with these larger color monolithic forms that was more of a mixed vocabulary that wasn't really unified in style. What we proposed on the new redesign is basically – the idea was to create a more unified architectural style as requested by the Board. So, we are no longer using that mixed vocabulary. We've removed the large monolithic colored forms and we have modified the existing Unit A to match the materials and the forms of Unit B and Unit C, all with the gable ended roofs and similar materials. In being a more traditional roof form, we decided – we still wanted to have some visual interest so we decided to use more contemporary materials. A standing seam metal roof, smooth off-white plaster contrasted with thermally broken dark bronze windows and doors. Another big element is the fact that we have such a large driveway and parking so instead of using concrete pavers or asphalt or so, we're proposing to use grass pavers just because we have a very limited amount of exterior space and we thought that might add a little bit more feeling of vegetation or more – a softer edge to the surfaces. This is an image from Alma, on the left is the existing property and then on the right you can see we've maintained the same type of form but applied the new materials to the existing Unit A. In keeping a kind of same consistent style, we propose to have like a three and twelve shelf roof, stainless steel, for each of the Units is consistent through all of the units on the property. While there is a different configuration for each Unit A, B and C, this roof – this entry roof is constant throughout all. You are looking at PSL posts and beams and supports over a concert slab with some more contemporary based masonry tile. This is the previous design. Like is said keeping the façade from the existing Unit. This is the proposed design with the new materials. This was the previous design with the monolithic forms and the combined mixed vocabulary of architectural styles. This is the more – well the new design with the more unified style. Privacy is obviously an issue on this project. All the windows on the second story are small and high. We've also proposed to use frosted satin etched glass for windows that directly face into the neighbor's yards and properties as well. The balcony as Sheldon has mentioned before has been removed in response to [Mr. Matloft's] from 118 Churchill. His request that there was a view from that balcony into his property, that has then been completely been removed. This is a view of the old design, on the far left you can see the balcony that was there, which is now been removed. Also, his other concern was the massing looking from his rear yard towards this building and this large red plaster form that he would be looking at. So, we worked on the articulation of that with the new proposed design. Removing the balcony on left and then also stepping back the roofs on Unit B and also stepping back the building from the setback about 1-foot 6-inches away. Then trying to break up the massing from what he is going to be looking at from his rear yard. Here's another view of the same faced from a different angle with the specific (inaudible) murals. We tried to model that in there to show how it would soften up that façade as well and showing the step back roofs as well. We worked closely with our landscape architect to provide vegetation that would also add to the privacy screening toward the other properties and also to create some outdoor spaces that we felt were usable for Units A, B and C. We know that it's a – the lot size makes it limited in terms of how much space you can really get but we worked very hard to get private spaces for each of the units and then some common spaces that can be used all together. Redesigning the front patio of existing Unit A. We know that there were some noise concerns towards Alma but we still believe that this is a patio that people are still going to use even though it is pretty loud out there. Being that we have such – a 24-foot setback, using that yard as a space is foreseeable as a common space but we also provided one in the rear corner as well just in case they wanted to use it that way. This is another image of the open space that we have for Unit B. Proposing to build a trellis with some vegetation to kind of screen it from the driveway. Once again using what we have in a limited condition but also using the trellis as shading for the living room on the inside but it's still a space that I think people will use. For Unit C, this is the rear space in the back of the unit for the private space and just another image. In closing we respectfully request that the ARB recommend this project of approval. We felt like we made, since the first hearing, a lot of design changes to address issues and concerns that the ARB Board had. As well as the neighbor's concerns that they expressed as well. We feel that this project is contextually compatible and we'll also provide three small yet efficient units and housing which is definitely needed in the City of Palo Alto. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and Staff I think we have a speaker card for this item. I don't have it. I think it's in the back there. We might have two. Then for – I think we are going to have two speaker cards (inaudible) and you – each person will have 5-minutes. The first is Ronald Baker and I don't have the second card yet. Awe, item five? We're on item three. Ok. So, then our speaker for item – for this item, which is [Jason Matloft]. Great and you have 5-minutes, welcome.

[Mr. Matloft:] Thank you. So, first of all, I thank the Board and the architects for generally have addressed most – and accommodated most of the concerns that I had from last time and it's already been addressed so I won't bring them up again. I would just request a couple things – minor things I hope to the project but will be major for us. Just to put in context, the house is literally 6-feet away from my back yard; 20-feet high and straight in my back yard because of the perpendicular context of the units. So, the glazing is great on the windows and I appreciate that that's in there. I just want to make sure that it is in there in the plans and it will be specified but also the one additional thing that I would request is a change to the vegetation. The architect was just telling – I am sorry, I have forgotten the gentleman's name. They're only 10-foot high myrtles or something like that and we have a huge house and the trees are not really screening. So, if we could get a bigger tree like an olive or something that could provide better screening, I would be very – I think it would be much more helpful and much more – much less invasive to my back yard. Again, if you can imagine my very shallow back yard and going to have a huge house 6-feet from the fence so thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for coming. Ok, I'll close the public portion and bring it back to the Board. Are there any questions?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I've got one. This is actually for the architect, the rendering that you've got here is like an applicant white. Is that what you plan on having the...

Mr. Chua: It's supposed to be a softer – the problem is in the imagines on the screen is not coming exactly how I want it to be.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I understand, I just – oh ok, so you do have that, alright. Ok, that's fine for right now. (crosstalk)

Mr. Chua: This is an actual (inaudible)...

Board Member Gooyer: Let me take a look at it. Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Other questions? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Excuse me. So, this is for Staff and then for the applicant. So, I have been trying to understand the RM-15 -- is that where we are – open space requirements. We seem to have usable open space, open space, common open space, common useable open space, private usable open space. So, I have spent hours trying to understand this with little success so forgive me. I think I understand that first of all, there is site percentage which is supposed to be an open space, which mainly means the sky – nothing between the sky and then space, is that right?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's landscaping, not driveways and things of that sort.

Board Member Furth: Right so driveways, parking etc. don't count as open space. This is other open space that's 35% or something?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Board Member Furth: That's not a problem on this site, right? We've got all that space alone Alma so that one is easily done.

Ms. Gerhardt: We have 36%, yes.

Board Member Furth: Ok, it took me a long time to try to understand the relationship between common space and common open space and common useable space.

Ms. Gerhardt: If you start from the bottom, they roll up.

Board Member Furth: So, take me through it.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, private and common on two separate items. They have minimum requirements, you know private being 50 and common being 100 but then those – both of those items roll up into the usable open space. The usable open space is 200, which is a larger number, therefore either common or private has to be bigger than the minimum to meet that 200-square foot minimum.

Board Member Furth: But both private useable space – both private and common usable space are supposed to be useable. They both go with – they both...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, all of this is sort of useable space; throw a ball, sit on a chair, read a book, those sorts of spaces. Whereas the site open space can be shrubs and other sorts of landscaping.

Board Member Furth: Can be juniper stuff you can't use. Ok, so I'm perplexed by where the common open space is. It's a 600-foot requirement basically, is that right?

Ms. Gerhardt: 100-square feet per unit...

Board Member Furth: Oh, 100?

Ms. Gerhardt: ...for common open space.

Board Member Furth: Right, 300, ok and then – but useable open space is 600 for this site?

Ms. Gerhardt: Including common and private, yes.

Board Member Furth: For this project, how much of it is common and how much of it is private?

Ms. Gerhardt: We have...

Board Member Furth: I will tell you where I am going. I am looking at something labeled – I'm looking on sheet A1-1 and I even have a magnifying glass and it specifies Unit A common open space 183.06-feet and it's right by the front door. Then over on Unit B, it shows common open space and again, it's right by a door. Then there is something in the back, which appears to be accessible by sidling by a car and then on sheet A04, in that areas, there's also something shown as site fencing which encroaches into that space. Perhaps that's just during constructions to protect the tree?

Male: Yes.

Board Member Furth: Ok, so I cannot – don't have to worry about that. My concern is that things which are designated on this plan is common open space are not, they are private. Nobody is going to be using the entry way in Unit A as shared open space and the same – am I misunderstanding? Is that – explain to me what my problem is?

Ms. Gerhardt: There has been a lot of discussion among Staff about this very issue and we don't have a true resolution. The plan definition of common definitely means that it's open to the public. Sort of can be seen and accessed by all so I think front yards do sort of meet a portion of that intent but another intent

could be that it's a gathering space for these different units to come together. Maybe those front yards wouldn't feel like such a nice space for that sort of thing but that's an open question for Staff.

Board Member Furth: I've been reading the definitions, I've been reading the titles and at a minimum – this is a condominium development, right? So, a common open space has a meaning in condominium law and that is that it's maintained by the condominium association, not by the individual owner and that everybody has access to it. Are these spaces that are going to be maintained by the condominium association?

Mr. Chua: They are -- so the issue with the – I'm trying to understand how we were trying to lay out the private open space and then respond also to the hearing from before. In my – the problem – the issue is that the front can't be used as a common open space because you say there is much traffic, too much noise. Really, in feasibility of the plan to make it work, there really wasn't a way to make the buildings work to reconfigure it to say and then we weren't allowed to use that front open space. I would rather have that considered -- the front as the common space. I mean that's the 300-square plus that you could use up there and I think it will be used but that's what – you're saying there is decibel levels is an issue. To me, noises (inaudible) bother me in terms of a common open space but I was trying to make the areas work and there really wasn't a definition of what the space needs to be. I think ideally, the front open space will be a space where you could develop to be some type of usable space where people could use as a common space and the rest of it should be private but because they tear up together from private becomes – can be used as common, common can be used as site usable open space. I was just trying to lay out a plan on how we could use it and meet the criteria.

Board Member Furth: I don't have any better ideas. Staff again, tell me what's the minimum common open space on this site?

Ms. Gerhardt: 100-square feet.

Board Member Furth: So, 300?

Ms. Gerhardt: Per unit, yes.

Board Member Furth: So, it's 300-square feet. So, you have more than 300 defined here, don't you?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, it's shown on packet page 90. That is our table where we lay this all out.

Board Member Furth: Ok, that's it for my questions. Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: I have a question, could Staff look up where the driveway with regulation is in the code? If you could just let me know what section that is later. Then a question for the applicant, your bicycle lockers were quite hard to find but I did see them on sheet A0.4. They look like they are in the setback and from what I could see from what you're proposing there, I think they are like actual physical lockers. So, I don't know if you've considered whether or not those allowed in the setback. Then also a setback question is, is there air conditioning in these units and there is and I see them and that's fine so ignore that second part.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, if I could jump in on the bike lockers. There is a provision in the code regarding projections into setbacks and – basically for storage and so it can't be wider than 2-feet, it can't be taller than 6-feet. So, while there are no specifics in the plans, we'll make sure they are in plan check.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok. I guess it will comply since it's 2-feet and then probably less than 6-feet high. Ok.

Ms. Gerhardt: You were asking about driveway widths?

Vice Chair Kim: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's 1854, I believe table 3.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question for the architect. You showed a rendering of Unit B from the back yard of 118 Churchill. Could you bring that up and just -- my question was mostly about the fence and the landscaping. Yeah, so what -- I mean -- I am looking just in terms of proportions. I mean it seems like you are showing a 4-foot high fence --picket fence but what is...

Mr. Chua: Right, it's 4-foot high, right.

Chair Lew: Yeah, so that's not the existing fence, right?

Mr. Chua: No.

Chair Lew: It is something -- is the proposed fence just something -- just a -- is this an actual design that you're proposing?

Mr. Chua: No, the fence hasn't been designed.

Chair Lew: That's just a...

Mr. Chua: Yeah, that's just an (inaudible) (crosstalk).

Chair Lew: Right, that's just an illustration.

Mr. Chua: There's a fence existing there now but will be rebuilt we just haven't had the design for how that fence is going to look.

Chair Lew: Ok because it makes the building look bigger than normal.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Ok, then the -- then can you talk a little bit about the wax myrtle shrubs.

Mr. Chua: Talk a little bit about them?

Chair Lew: Yeah or did -- the -- just about the mature height and the time frame.

Mr. Chua: It's 10-15-feet so I am not an expert on the plants. I would have to ask my landscape architect on that but for the -- in terms of what the neighborhood is asking in terms of -- we're willing to change the vegetation on that to make it work for something that's more appropriate in terms of the height. It's 15-20 but I think 15-feet acceptable but like I said, we're willing to work in terms of making a condition of approval to whatever plants you would recommend.

Chair Lew: Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: I did want to note that some of the trees on the landscape plan are noted at 15-gallon. Usually, we do 24-inch box and so that would give some better instant impact as well.

Chair Lew: Jodie, could you remind me about the performance standards for multi-family that backs up against adjacent houses? I think this case is R2 so -- right -- I mean, I think some of the properties on Channing are two units. I think my -- I think what I was looking at -- looking for was just the -- yeah, the

guidance on the plant sizes, right? We're supposed to provide an evergreen screen with trees and hedges at a point in – what is it, 5-years or 10-years?

Ms. Gerhardt: So, we have performance criteria on page 88 – packet page 88. It does talk about privacy of abutting residential properties. Should be protected by screening from public view – let's see. It just says – it – privacy screening. I would have to grab the rest of the language to see.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Ms. Gerhardt: We certainly have the authority to require the larger landscaping.

Chair Lew: Ok, great. Ok, I think that is all the question that I have. We will do comments, Board Member comments. Wynne?

Board Member Furth: This is very much an application that I want to support. I like the proposed use, the houses aren't overly large, I didn't mind the brightly colored plaster. I, myself, kind of enjoyed it but I think this one looks fine. I like the metal roofs but I am having trouble making the finding that this complies with the zoning because I don't see the usable common open space. I probably need to understand more about what is in the rear. I am worried about it because I don't think it's particularly accessible. If somebody is parking – that's a parking space right in front of it and if somebody is parked in the middle of that, I mean do I have to sidle to get over there or do you push the parking over to one side or do we have screening landscaping over there, I don't know. I don't see it – any evidence that it's useable open space yet. When I look at the common – the open space by Unit B, it's very attractive. It also, I think, and tell me if I am confused here. Aren't their windows opening onto it from Unit B? Isn't that their terrace basically? Their private terrace and you think of how people use spaces, not whose actually technically maintaining it. I mean I certainly wouldn't go sit there if it wasn't my house, unless I was invited and it's even more true for Unit A. Where if you look at what's designated as common open space, I don't think it is and I suppose part of the reason – I mean that's the door the living which comes off that space. I mean you can't really tell me that I am going to go over there with my gin and tonic and not feel like I am trespassing or even a cup of coffee. I suppose this on my mind because I live in a project that is small units on very small lots. The density is not a lot different than this, lay out is more convenient and when it was originally presented, it had another unit. The ARB said no and they took out a unit so that we now have side yards, which was highly functional with a minimum dimension of 9-feet and then they widen up to 12. I don't want to eliminate a unit here. I think that's a bad idea but I don't see that this meets the common open space requirement. I think a common open space basically has to be to the rear of Unit A to deal with the sheltering issue and has to be in some kind of reasonable shared space. Which essentially is going to be somewhere either between Unit A and Unit B or you pull Unit C forward and you somehow give good access to a rear yard. Not ideal because of the impacts further back. I think it tends to become private but I look forward to hearing my colleague's comments.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, actually as a kid growing up in San Francisco, our common open space was the middle of the street so that's sort of – I have a different outlook on that but I can see the concern. This project has come a long way I think since the first iteration and I guess I don't have as big of a problem with the whole concept of open space. I think people will find that in a project like this. Again, I can see it in your – the problem with this is removing the unit as you said, removes basically a third of the project. So, I mean that makes it infeasible at that point. The main problem I have is the – of all the strange things is the grass block. That's not going to work. I mean the only reason or the only time really grass block works well is let's say you've got an open field and the Fire Department says we need to have an access through there to bring our trucks through. So, you put the block in and it's never used or hopefully it's never used and then the lawn grows over it and it disappears. In a situation like that, cars are going to come in and they are going to leak oil on your "lawn" and it's just going to be a mess. I'd rather see an attractive paving stone in there rather than the grass block. In fact, to me, I think it's going

to detract from the project within a year. Other than that, I'm glad you showed me the softer color for the building. I could approve it like this based on the modification of the driveway.

Chair Lew: Ok. Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, thanks for coming back to the Board with this project. I'm not so concerned with the open space myself but I am, as Board Member Gooyer has mentioned, a little bit concerned about the grass block. I think it's just too much and too almost easy of a solution to just say that the whole driveway is going to be grass block. Maybe if portions of it were proposed with that material, I think that would be more acceptable. I think the access to Units B and C by car is still a concern to me. I think there are areas here where the clearances get very tight and you know we were just talking about the previous agenda item where people may not park in their garages. In which case with this project site, there's no street parking Alma so they are going to have to park either in front of the garage or to make space between units somehow to get in their second or perhaps even their third cars. How that leaves people driving to Unit C and in and out is quite a challenge in my opinion. I also think the access into the garage for Unit B is also tough. You're going to be hitting whatever that becomes of the entry to Unit B, whether it's a curb or whether it's flush pavers with the grass block. It's going to be a corner that's going to be consistently clipped. Otherwise, I think as far as the change in style of the architecture, I am very much in favor of it. I think the roof forms are much more cohesive, it's much more pleasing to look at. I think the materials that you are presenting here with the bronze aluminum windows and the wood doors painted to match, I think that's – those are great choices. I was looking at the elevations for the windows and doors and I was just thinking is there a way to possibly align some of those [phonetics][molians]? Especially in those areas where the doors and windows are closer together. It's just something to take another look at. Also, I – while I don't have anything against the stucco or the cement plaster siding, there probably will have to be some kind of control joints or reveal lines that are going to be put in that I think will make an impact on the elevations. So, I think those are things to perhaps also think about and perhaps present to us in the future. I like where this project is going but I think there's still a little more to be desired and I don't know that I am ready to recommend approval quite yet. I think we are getting there and we're close but I think there are just a couple more things that we need to look at and think about. I was looking at some of the sections of the taller or I am sorry, the sections of the Units B and C and I am – I would just caution you that there may be some areas that you are showing currently in the sections that may qualify as third floor equivalency on the second floor so just be cautious with that. I think I'll leave it at that but I'm excited at where it's going and I think just a little bit more clean up and then tightening up of the design would make something that I could recommend for approval, thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: Kyu, just for curiosity, what would you think on Unit B if it's flipped this way?

Vice Chair Kim: The floor plan?

Board Member Gooyer: So, the garage is in the front because I agree with you that that's going to almost be impossible to park a car in there.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I'd have to look at it and think about it. I think that could be a solution, yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: That way also it doesn't change the design really, it...

Vice Chair Kim: You know one of the other comments maybe that I have is that I think everything's in here but it was quite difficult for me to find drawings that I really wanted to look at. Maybe if you have a first-floor site plan and a second-floor site plan that shows all three units. Again, maybe you have that and I'm just having a hard time flipping through the sheets to find that.

Chair Lew: The second-floor site plan is farther back in the set.

Vice Chair Kim: I there a first-floor site plan as well? Sorry, I see the second-floor site plan here on A-3.5. Oh, I did want to compliment you on getting those imagines. I don't know if you had a drone or what but that was really nice to see. Yeah, I think I would certainly entertain that idea by Board Member Gooyer with regards to possibly flipping the floor plan so that the garages for A and B are kind of back to back, yeah.

Chair Lew: Ok, so thank you for the (inaudible). I was thinking that this project was approvable today. The – I think Wynne's – your comments about the open space I think are interesting. We've had other – in the past – I've been on the Board for a while but we've had other – I've looked at other projects like this with three units on one lot on similar size lots and the open space has always been a question in my mind. Especially when the dimensions go down less than 10-feet, as this one has on the – it has them on the side setback so they are like 6-feet to maybe 6-foot or 6 to 7-foot 9, right? So, that does concern me and it's been a challenge on the other projects as well but I think – my collections is that they had more like a 10-foot setback for the private open space. Those other projects were not on Alma so they didn't have a special setback. They had more room to move buildings up close to like 10-feet from the sidewalk so they had more space to do things in the middle of the lot. Some of the projects attached – I think one of them attached to the units, just to give more flexibility. I guess I would say maybe the open space should be possibly revisited but on the other hand -- on the other side of my brain, I am thinking that part of this is just planning calculations. I mean the reality is, when I meet my neighbors and stuff, it's on the sidewalk. Things happen and they don't happen where a planning diagram tells you it's going to happen; that's just part of the architecture. I think that a key thing is to have porch spaces – having the indoor/outdoor spaces where people just sort of happen to meet and I think that the project has that. I wish it were better but I mean it does – it seems to me that it has the – to me, in my mind, it has it. Then you were asking about the private or the common open space in the back corner behind the parking. So, I think that they are showing – it looks like there is an 11-feet between the garage and fence and cars...

Board Member Furth: You're saying that I don't have to turn sideways to get...

Chair Lew: Well, a car is 5 ½ -- a regular size car is 5 ½-feet so you don't have to turn – so, it depends on the car. So, you might have turn sideways if it's a Land Rover or something but normally you would not have to do that within that space. Is that essentially under the oak tree, is that what we are talking about?

Chair Lew: Yeah, I think that shows on the landscape plan, right? Yeah.

Board Member Furth: Under the oak tree with a rock?

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Board Member Furth: No seating?

Chair Lew: Yes, in the shade. Then on the – then for [Mr. Madloft], I think that the – if this were being built near my back yard I would not be happy. I mean I had an apartment building in my backyard – next to my back yard but it's like 10-feet away. It seems to me that the architect has done as much as they can so I was measuring the height. The height is like 17 – the plate height is about 17-feet, which they've squished the second floor down about as low as you can go. The building code doesn't let you go lower than 7-feet for a habitual room. Then the pitch is a fairly standard pitch. I would say with the metal roof; the pitches could be lower but they are trying to match the existing house in the front and that's been an issue with some of the Board Members on other projects. Then on the landscaping, I think for the shrubs, there are quite a number of – if that myrtle doesn't work for whatever reason. I haven't used that one in particular but pittosporum hedges easily go over 15-feet, I would say in the 5-10-year period. I don't – I think that you can block out almost all for the wall for that – for Unit B with hedges. Then I think my question for the Staff was because it's trees and shrubs and so the placement of that I think, could be – maybe that could be improved. I think they are just showing hedges in front of – to the 118

Churchill so maybe there's room for improvement. Then I am not sure that the private open space for Unit B is really usable just because it's so small. I mean normally a patio, I would think would be minimum 11 to 12-feet to actually put a table and chairs around it. That's where I am on this one. Let's – I was thinking this was approvable but if you guys think this should – needs to come back, I am willing to entertain that. I think we should be really clear – I mean we can't design it on the fly but I think we should just be fairly specific about what is acceptable and what is negotiable, right?

Vice Chair Kim: I think architecturally, for the most part, I think my concerns could probably come back to subcommittee but I wanted to ask you, Chair Lew, if something such as driveway access and automobile access on the site, if that's something that could come back to subcommittee or if that's substantial enough that the project should come back for another hearing?

Chair Lew: So, there are no rules about that. In the past, we thought it – I think we've generally thought that if it was a big massing issue – if we thought that the project was too massive, then it should come back to the whole Board. If it's details like a car crossing over paving – you're saying the front porch area to Unit B, yeah, I would say that could go – that would be subcommittee. If you're talking about flipping a unit -- mirroring a unit or something, then that should come back to the whole Board.

Vice Chair Kim: I agree, ok.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I appreciate what you say about sociability being enhanced by incidental places where you meet. Certainly, that's the way my neighborhood socializes is in the alley and on the sidewalk and the front porch and we do have front porches and that does help. I've been thinking about why this, to me, doesn't work and I understand Robert talking about where he actually played growing up in San Francisco. My problem is that I don't think we get to amend the code and the code says that there's supposed to be common open space and I think to come call these spaces designated as open space – common open spaces is to do just violence to those words as to be non-conforming. I am reassured to know that I could get by the car to get under the oak tree but I wouldn't consider that a common usable space unless there's somewhere for me and friend to sit and enjoy that shady place. I mean under oak trees is a good place to be but I don't know if you can do that without damaging the roots; maybe some kind of cantilever arrangement. I've been thinking – so one of the things that – when one of you talked first, second, third, even multiple cars, I was thinking well surely people who live here, that's not going to be the situation. Then you look at Unit A and Unit A had four bedrooms and four bathrooms and it's designed to accommodate a lot of adults. Not necessarily a family and I think the problem, the reason this doesn't work is because it's built around an existing building and is keeping part of it. If that building – if that two-story addition was instead parking incorporated into that original structure, you could still have a considerable size building or adequately sized dwelling unit, I think. Then you would have enough space for real common open space and you wouldn't be making all these efforts to comply with zoning, which I don't think meet the functional requirement. So, that's where I am stuck.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree with you on part of it but the reality of it is that on Unit One, the only thing that really sticks out or most of it that sticks out is the actual garage.

Board Member Furth: Right so you'd had to modify it by converting part of the existing building to parking.

Board Member Gooyer: But I meant that even if you wanted to reduce the size of the building, you couldn't do it by much because you still have that garage that needs to go there. You still need the – an actual enclosed garage for Unit A.

Board Member Furth: That couldn't be incorporated – you couldn't move that by reducing the other space? Put it in the ground floor, tucked under part of the second floor in the existing? In other words, move it rear side forward. I mean if you were designing this without the existing building, couldn't you put the unit there and have parking and have it not take up so much space? Have such a bit bigfoot print?

Board Member Gooyer: I mean you're right. You could basically gut part of the existing building and put the garage there and put it on the second floor.

Board Member Furth: That's what I think is making this not work. Is trying to keep that existing – I keep thinking of our building on El Camino adjacent to Mayfield and I feel badly about that project because it was keeping the existing underground parking that left us with that rather complex, not to say tortured, set of spaces when we could have had really nice ones.

Board Member Gooyer: No, you're right.

Male: Can the owner speak?

Chair Lew: We can – I think we usually – we'll let you guys do a rebuttal but I think we have to finish our – let's just finish our thoughts here and then we'll let you say something. But if you have a question for them about – why do you refer – Wynne? Why don't you maybe refer – you could ask...

Board Member Furth: Yes?

Chair Lew: ...the owner question about retaining the existing house.

Board Member Furth: My – I believe that this project doesn't comply with zoning because it doesn't have enough open space to the – behind Unit A – between Unit A and the rear property line. It's effective common open space and when I look at Units A and B and C and then I look at – it seems to me that Unit A is longer – much longer than the others; significantly. If you shortened it by incorporating some or all of the parking into the existing – the footprint of the existing building, you could have enough room to have good open space – compliant open space and you could still have a completely decent sized house there; residence. So, I have particularly concerned when I see a four bedroom, four bath house which seems to me within your rights if you're meeting all the other zoning requirements but seems to be pushing it for three units on this site, when as we all know it's a long way to offsite parking. My question to you is, would you consider consolidating Unit A so that it does not extend so far towards the rear of the lot and made use – made possible to have a functional code compliant, in my view, common open space?

Ms. Manish Baldua: Hi, thanks for the question Wynne. My name is Manish, we would be very open to considering it and work without architects to make sure that we address these concerns. I – there was one other thing that I wanted to state about hearing the discussion around the open spaces. I am by no means an expert on this, I'm probably more confused than anyone here present but what I took from you Jodie and you Sheldon was that you need a total of 300-square feet of common open space. Would you consider the lawn in the front to be that 300-square foot of common open space because the rest of the requirement is around private open spaces and then there's the overall requirement to have 600-square feet of open space? We went – in my mind, I think we went by that definition so maybe we misinterpreted some of that and if so, we would love to find out exactly what that needs to be and then make sure that we adhere by it and are in compliance. Thanks.

Chair Lew: Wynne, do you have any other...

Board Member Furth: Well, I am very appreciative of the applicant's statement. I don't think that the 300-square feet gets to go right along Alma because I think it doesn't meet the code either. More to the point, I appreciate that some of you have much better ears than I do but it's to noise and to impacted by the traffic to meet the zoning.

Board Member Gooyer: I think part of it is also the whole idea that it's called open space for Unit A, open space for Unit B rather than just open space. If something says open space for Unit B, you pretty much

figure somebody from Unit A isn't going to sit in that location and that sort of thing. I think that's part of it. It's semantics, I think part of it.

Board Member Furth: I think there's room to do it if you compress Unit A.

Chair Lew: I am not sure where the Board is so why don't we try a motion because I – yeah. This is a tough one. I am going to leave it to you two.

Mr. Chua: Excuse me, can I say something? So, in the idea of using this – the technicalities that we need to fit for this common useable space. Is there provisions that say that you're not allowed to have a common open space because you feel that it's too loud on the street? Is that...

Board Member Furth: Staff can – I've got my notes but I'm sure Staff has theirs but basically it says that common open space is subject to the standards of 15 – I am sorry, usable open space is subject to the standards of 1813040E, shall be protected from activities of commercial areas and adjacent public streets and to provide noise buffering from surrounding areas when feasible. The problem that our noise studies on Alma show 70 decibels ambient, which is too loud.

Vice Chair Kim: It also does say when feasible and I guess in this case it's just not feasible.

Board Member Furth: I am saying it would be feasible on the site.

Ms. Chua: Well, it's feasible if that Unit A your saying becomes demoed but if he's trying to maintain the existing unit –we're trying to work with in parameters here. So, that's a complete rebuild of an entire house so that's economics, that's everything to it as well. So, I am just trying to find something – some direction where we are heading with it and we would like to get some clear direction on where that goes with that.

Vice Chair Kim: Let me say that while given my initial comments, I was hesitant to recommend approval. I think I am leaning more and more towards thinking that my concerns can be addressed at the subcommittee level. Then perhaps somebody can propose an actual motion.

Chair Lew: I am going to leave it to you, Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, so let me understand that the – this—what part do you want to get done at the subcommittee?

Vice Chair Kim: Making sure that the – well, the material of the driveway and the paving.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah that's a – I was going to make that comment now, that it was an absolute part of it.

Vice Chair Kim: Right and then in addition to that. Some of the auto maneuvering and circulation of the driveway itself in relationship to the garage.

Board Member Gooyer: The only reason I am mentioning it is that – I mean I see on here for instance on Unit B and that's what made me think about flipping it. You have – you've got the diagrams of how a car could go but the thing cuts through about a quarter of the decorative paving for your pedestrian area, if you want to call it that, for Unit B.

Vice Chair Kim: It also cuts...

Board Member Gooyer: You already know you're not going to make that turn the way you've got it designed. Where you have to go over the decorative paving and one of the concerns, I understand that.

Vice Chair Kim: That was part of the concern and also my concern is that in that diagram, they are all just showing cars going over the trees on that side yard.

Board Member Gooyer: Right. I mean you assisted us by showing us how the route goes but also, you're sort of showing where the problems are. I don't think – the only reason I say this, I don't think that could be addressed at the subcommittee because they may have to make such major changes that I don't know if that's a subcommittee item.

Ms. Gerhardt: Can I just clarify that the – you're correct that the circulation does show a car going over the kind of paving for the front door on Unit B but there's not required size for that decorative paving.

Board Member Gooyer: I am not arguing that. I am not arguing that but then invariably it's one of these things that if that's an area like that, you may end up having some future on there because that's a seating area. All of sudden the car has to do all kinds of (inaudible) or you have to move the chair if you want to get into your driveway or into your garage. That's the thing that – that's why I said an easy solution would be to just flipping it, which seems to eliminate all those issues and just puts the two garages next to each other towards the front of the building. Something – if it's that simple, it could be done at a Staff level mainly because it's – the design doesn't change at all but if they come up with another solution, then I think it gets into the whole concept of the design and I don't think we can do or I mean I don't think its recommended we do that at a Staff level or not at Staff level but subcommittee level. See the other problem is with four people here and the way it's already starting to – I'd hate to push this issue and then have it end of up being two to two because that means basically a no vote, doesn't it? So, I mean it – there's enough concerns here that it could easily get that. You could easily end up with a two to two vote so I am wondering if it wouldn't make more sense just to bring it back?

Chair Lew: Ok, I have a couple questions – ok, let's get – I think we should answer that question in a moment and I just want to a – two questions for Staff. So, one is that Kyu had mentioned third-floor equivalence floor area and that's for houses. Does that apply for multi-family?

Ms. Gerhardt: For – that would be under the single-family regulations, not under the multi-family, correct.

Chair Lew: Great and then on the open space, if they were to build a solid fence in the front yard. Are they allowed to do that in a special setback area because that's -- a solid wall does reduce the noise as my understanding.

Ms. Gerhardt: Wooden solid walls don't have the...

Chair Lew: Like stucco.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, a stucco wall would certainly reduce more than – but you can have solid wood fencing as well that reduces the noise.

Chair Lew: But is it allowed in a special – we have – Alma has a special setback.

Ms. Gerhardt: Not in a special setback and then in the front setbacks, I'd have to check. I mean it's usually the lower height that is the...

Chair Lew: The 4-foot.

Ms. Gerhardt: ...front setback.

Chair Lew: Yeah, yeah, ok. I think my take on it is the projects – I think it's very close to being approvable and I think my main concern, based on the things that we've been talking about is actually more adjusting Unit B. I think I am not supportive of changing Unit A, so putting a garage in an existing house doesn't work. I mean it's basically you're sitting – the back house – the garage is built completely differently than the house; just based on the floor levels. So basically, you are saying they would have to tear down the back half of the house and so that's like \$500,000 to a million dollars. You are destroying something that is already there so that's not great for sustainable design. So, in my mind, it's just tweaking and not a redesign of Unit B so I would be ok with that going to subcommittee.

Board Member Gooyer: Do you mean flipping it or...

Chair Lew: Tweak – flipping or just shifting a foot or two or something but if it was a redesign then I think it has to come back to the Board.

Board Member Gooyer: Well are you comfortable enough to have that at the Staff or at the subcommittee level?

Chair Lew: Yeah, as long as everybody is ok with the general – right, everybody seems to be ok with the architecture, then I would – yeah, I think it's ok.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: Just in the effort of trying to moving this forward.

MOTION

Board Member Gooyer: You want me to try again, then. Ok, I propose we accept the project as presented with the –

Chair Lew: Recommended.

Board Member Gooyer: Recommend approval, ok. With the exception of a change in the design of the driveway. Preferable with a paver of some sort but an actual paver rather than the grass and a tweaking, if you want to call it, of Unit B to allow a simpler or an easier ability to use the garage. Like I said, the easiest solution that I can come up with is literally flipping the unit, like that, which would then put the garage for Unit B towards the front of the property. Anything else? Oh, and to have that obviously – those two items brought back to the subcommittee. Sorry, I forgot that portion of it. Yeah?

Chair Lew: Well, before we talk about it, we need a second.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, alright.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, now go ahead.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Board Member Furth: Would you consider adding a condition that the area designated Unit C common open space be revised to include seating if feasible?

Board Member Gooyer: To include what?

Board Member Furth: Seating if feasible.

Board Member Gooyer: I am assuming that is probably doable, sure. Like I said, I have a real problem with calling it Unit A and Unit B and Unit C open space.

Board Member Furth: I am just using that...

Board Member Gooyer: I just think that you ought to just eliminate that designation...

Board Member Furth: I agree (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)(crosstalk) I've got enough for the total of all three.

Board Member Furth: It's designated that way on sheet A-1.1.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, can – I think you have to – that little amendment, is that acceptable with the – with you, Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Sure.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok. Alright, it's up to you.

Chair Lew: Were there any comments on the DEE for the driveway?

Board Member Furth: I think it's fine.

Chair Lew: I think it was fine too.

Board Member Furth: I think the findings are easily made. (crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Are there any comments on the regular findings or conditions of approval? I didn't see anything. I didn't notice anything. Ok, so I think we are ready to vote. All in favor? Opposed?

Board Member Furth: No and I'd like a brief comment.

MOTION PASSED 3-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSENT

Chair Lew: Yes?

Board Member Furth: I decent, I think this is an admirable use of the property. I think that the design is excellent but I think that by retaining Unit A and adding a garage and second story addition to it, the result has been a design which is not compliant with code because it does not, in fact, have common open space as required by the code.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you. Do you have any – if you have any closing comments. Ok, then we will see you in subcommittee sometime. Great, thank you. Ok, so we are going to take a 15-minute break. Sorry about that Ken and then we'll get...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: ...then we'll hear the next item. Sorry about that.

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 480 Lytton Avenue [17PLN-00052]:**
Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for Interior and Exterior Modifications to an Existing 6,222 Square Foot Commercial Building, Including a new Façade, Roof, Replacement of all Windows, Landscaping, new Trash Enclosure, and Improvements to the Existing Parking Lot. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline

Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CD-C(P). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Adam Petersen at APetersen@m-group.us

Chair Lew: Ok, everybody I think we're ready to hear the next item. If you could quiet down, please. Item number four which is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter on 480 Lytton Avenue. Recommendation on applicant's request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow for interior and exterior modifications to an existing 6,222-square foot commercial building. Including a new façade, roof, replacement of all windows, landscaping, new trash enclosure, and improvements to the existing parking lot. The environmental assessment is that it's exempt from the provisions of the CEQA in accordance With guideline section 15301 for existing facilities. The zone district is CD-C(P) and we have Adam Petersen, our project planner, welcome.

Mr. Adam Petersen, Project Planner: Good afternoon Chair Lew, Members of the Architectural Review Board. I am Adam Petersen from the Planning and Community Environment Department. I am here today to present the project at 480 Lytton Avenue. The project before you this afternoon consists of a reskin of the building in order to create a new identity and to modernize the structure located at 480 Lytton. This project was before you on November 17th of 2016 as a prelim application. The project before you today is the first formal hearing for the application. Staff is recommending that the ARB recommend approval of the project to the Planning and Community Environment Director. The project is located at the south corner of Lytton and Cowper Avenue. It's surrounded or (inaudible) surrounded by other commercial and office uses. There is a five-story building located a little more to the northeast of the site and some other taller structures around the building as well. At the November 17th ARB meeting, there was some – the ARB had questions and concerns related to the landscaping, some of the built-in planters, reducing the height of the clear story window and then also just on the solid wall on the west side of the building. The applicant responded to this by removing the planters along Cowper and Lytton Avenue. There are planters that frame the entrance to the building on Lytton Avenue and then there are relocatable potted plants in front of glass windows along Cowper and Lytton as well. The applicant has reduced the height of the clear story window and they have also incorporated a – sorry – a large scale translucent glass windows along the facades. This slide shows the site plan. The site utilizes the existing entrance from Lytton, it comes around back behind the building and the project improves the parking conditions on the site. Again, the project is going to retain the same building footprint so there's no new square footage that's being added to the building. In fact, this reskin would actually reduce the square footage internally in the building. Then, as a result, the parking is staying the same and it's actually improving the parking conditions on site by giving seven conforming stalls adjacent to the building. Then retaining the nine stalls that are on the – sort of on the other side that are opposite those stalls. The parking is screened by landscaping and that landscaping forms a bit of a buffer between the parking, the building and then also the parking in the street edge. This – these – excuse me – this slide shows the building elevations and renderings. The building, again, it's comprised of porcelain tile along the first floor along the parking lot side. There is a wall screen or a vegetated sort of a wall screen that sort of provides a little bit of a buffer between the building and the other structures to the west. There is translucent glass along the second floor that frames the second floor of the building. In terms of the analysis of the project, the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, it meets the development standards for the zoning code as it relates to set backs and building height and it's consistent with architectural review findings in context based criteria. Based on this information, Staff recommends that the Board recommend approval to the Planning and Community Environment Director. Thank you and I am available for any questions that the Board may have.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Adam. Let's move on to the applicant presentation and you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Ken Hayes: Thank you, Planner Petersen for your presentation. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects and I will be presenting the project on behalf of my client Hillary Stain with Wing VC. Hillary is here in the audience if you have questions for the owner or the tenant. I am also joined today by Marco Lei from Guzzardo Partnership if you have questions on landscape. As Staff pointed out it's a corner – about a quarter acre corner parcel at Cowper and Lytton. There's an existing 6, 200-square foot

building on the property. The property shown here is completely surrounded by CDCP, pedestrian overlay zone. The existing building is a mid-century building that has a limited window line, very limited ceiling heights inside, minimal landscaping, essentially no connection from a circulation stand point with the side walk on Cowper or on Lytton. The entry is off of the parking lot currently. The project statement is to renovate the existing mid-century building for a modern office tenant with needs for flexibility, energy efficiency, daylighting and iconic identity that embraces sustainable design practices and enhances the working and pedestrian environment in downtown Palo Alto. When we were here in November, you were generally supportive of the concept. I think we had a lot of positive comments, however there were some things that Staff has pointed out this morning that I would like to address and show you how we responded. One, there was some concern about the existing solid wall at the west side of the building; it's a poured in place concert wall. Two, consider the future entrances and flexibility of uses over time, which contributes I think to some of the sustainability of a project and also reinforces the pedestrian overlay zone. Three, consider more landscaping and pedestrian friendly. At the time, we had a raised planter around both frontages and someone made the comment that it seemed like a mote of landscaping so it prevented someone from being able to walk up to the building. Considered reducing the height of the clear story windows. So, if we go to the site plan on where we are today, the planters on the Lytton side of the building, here, have been significantly reduced by a third. It starts to frame where the entrance will be off of Lytton. As we wrap the corner, we are eliminating the raised planter that wraps the corner as an 'L' shape and essentially cut it back to frame the entrance on Lytton and to frame the entrance as you come in from Cowper. The area in between will be open landscaping at grade with large potted plants that could be removed at will should someone in the future decide to put an entrance at the corner. We felt like that was a great solution. I am really having a hard time reading the screen, there we go. At the west side of the building this is the area that we are talking about, that there's a solid wall there and is there some way to mitigate the impact of that because it is visible and will still be visible above the new landscape fence that we're going to put up at the property line. Then in the parking lot we tried to enhance the existing condition. The asphalt will be removed by and large and replaced with permeable pavers that will occupy this area of the site. It helps us from a storm water management C3 perspective. Plus, it's just going to add much more texture to the parking field as opposed to what's there today. Then lastly, when we came here last time we said we were really pushing for a single exit story but we were not able to get there so we – this is the biggest change, I said to the architectural probably. We had to add an exit stair on this back side and so that comes off the outside of the building. It's an exterior stair, not unlike what's there today except it goes the opposite direction. So, as you come down this stair, it will – you're deposited in front of the exit below. That was it there and then I think this is showing a solar diagram. We know which way is south here in the downtown, basically 45 degrees down off to the left side. So, although the solid wall is not an issue from a solar standpoint, the other sides of the building really are and the Lytton side in particular because of the western exposure there, so the solution that we have addresses that. We are creating a new entrance on Lytton to enliven that, as well as address the parking lot. So, it's real important to have this entrance that sort of response to both frontages and it makes for an interesting space inside. This is some of the imagery we were working with that we showed you before. We like the very simple, modern sculptural form, deep floating overhangs, lots of deep recesses for solar, trying to differentiate the building base. Although the large mote planter as a (inaudible) has been removed, we still have some planters there and the potted plants I think also help act as a base to the building. This is the streetscape previously. Not a whole lot of change but if you look at the center of the drawing you can see the new. So, there is still the transition from the two-story house here to the V of A building there. We think the building has much more presence now. One could say also that the sloped roof form starts to create some transition from these residential scale buildings and roof forms to the commercial building itself. Larger scale – this is before and so where we are today. We've lowered – you can see we've lowered the clear story windows, we removed the planter at the bottom in most cases and create the colorful pots rather on the corner as that wraps. This is the Lytton – I am sorry, the Cowper side facing the V of A building before and where we are now. Similar handling of the planter, this defines the walkway from Cowper down to the parking lot and then the potted plants at the corner. Then the parking lot side, really just shows the reduction in the height of the building and then this is the new stair. So, the stair – we're trying to get the stair to look like this eyebrow came down and peeled off and sort of just descended down to the platform in front of the door. It will have a glass railing on it and so it will still be very, very minimal. Then the façade that faces southwest or maybe

southeast but we were thinking that what we would have on there would be a stainless-steel standoffs and wire and Guzzardo is proposing a trumpet vine – a red trumpet vine so it starts to pick up the color of the red pots along the corner of the building. So, that will be covered with trumpet vines and the pattern eventually will go away but in the beginning, it mimics the eyebrow pattern – excuse me – so that's why you see the – you may not see it. I can't see it up there right now but hopefully on your drawing you can. There's a double line at the bottom, a double line at the top and that's supposed to mimic the eyebrow on the other sides of the building as it wraps around. This section of the building shows how daylighting plays a key element in the design. With the clear story spilling into the two-story space, which is the entry and also a break area for the tenants. Then we have the pattern of translucent fins that wrap the three sides of the building that will give solar coverage or protection rather from the western sun. We kept that same vocabulary on three sides of the building. Just the plan of the building. This area is two-stories so that's the area that we're craving out so we're losing that floor area, kind of. Then this is the big daylight clear story volume above on the second floor and that's intended to be an open office area. Then we have little detail of the fins and how they are randomly spaced. We do really want them randomly spaced and off of the glass wall just to be a little more organic because we are envisioning it sort of in the canopy of the trees. So, a 3-D view of the drawing of the building there. We have the porcelain tile, I gave you the finish board. We have the dark porcelain tile base; the body is kind of a leathery color porcelain tile and the metal clad paneling on the eyebrow and then the window frames. Just walking around the building, Board Member Baltay asked all of all these views. It's too bad he is not here. This shows you how the planting will be on that corner and I think that's pretty much it. So, I am happy to answer any questions that you have, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Ken. I don't have any speakers – public speakers for this item. Are there any questions from the Board?

Board Member Furth: Yes.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you, that was nice to hear and see. In the landscaping plans you talk about four Vera benches with resistor back and seat top, can you tell me where they go?

Mr. Marco Lei: Yeah, previous – I am Mark O'Leary with Guzzardo Partnership and landscape architect for this project. We previously showed the landscape benches out in the public right of way but as the result, the plans got to City Public Works and they actually did not allow us to put any type of sit furniture – site furnishings out in the public right of way and that's why we had to remove that from our plan.

Board Member Furth: So, you have no seating?

Mr. Lei: Actually, we do provide seating at the planter – the raised planter walls along the building entrances on the north side, as well as one on the east side. The planter walls are at 26-inches high and we can – we proposed to put in a wider seat cap so people when they walk by if they need to have a place of rest they can utilize those areas for seating.

Board Member Furth: Could you show me where those are on the plans?

Mr. Lei: Yes. Where's the mouse? Oops, ok.

Board Member Furth: I am looking at sheet L1.

Mr. Lei: Yeah, L1 is going to be – I can't even see my cursor. Ok, right here. There is going to be raised planter walls right here, to the left of the entrance and also to the right of the entrance and also right down here from the east entrance. Those will be raised planter walls with an extra wide seat caps.

Board Member Furth: So, there will be seating?

Mr. Lei: Within the public right of way.

Board Member Furth: On both Cowper...

Mr. Lei: On Cowper...

Board Member Furth: ... and Lytton...

Mr. Lei: ... and Lytton.

Board Member Furth: ... on your property, not in the public right of way. Maybe the feet are in the public right of way.

Mr. Lei: Correct, our property, sorry.

Board Member Furth: Thank you that's helpful. I kept looking and looking and could not find...

Mr. Hayes: Just like us (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: Well, I've discussed this whole issue with the City on another property and I was thinking, gee they got permission to do that.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you, Mark.

Chair Lew: Any other questions?

Vice Chair Kim: I have a question, you have a ramp on the first-floor kind of at the middle of the building. Is that a ramp down or up or...

Mr. Hayes: So, Board Member Kim, if you're walking from the entry gallery, let's say south, it's a ramp up and that's – the existing slab steps in the building...

Vice Chair Kim: I see.

Mr. Hayes: ...so that's responding to a condition that's there.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert, will you start us off on comments.

Board Member Baltay: Actually, I like this building. I like it the first time and I think you've improved it so there really isn't much I can say at this point. I am happy with it.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I can approve it.

Chair Lew: Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I am also very much in favor of this building. I appreciate you lowering the clear story. I just have a few minor comments, the new egress stair that you have on the exterior of the building. I don't know if it's an occupancy number thing but I was just curious if the door can actually swing into the building as shown or if it will have to actually have to swing out.

Mr. Hayes: The door will be able to swing into the building. (Inaudible) (crosstalk)

Vice Chair Kim: Great, I think that's favorable so that we don't have to widen those (inaudible). Then also looking at the clear story, the overhang of the clear story window. I think that clear story faces north, maybe slightly northwest and I am just wondering if that overhang has to be as deep as it is but it's a very minor comment. Otherwise, I liked the building the first time around as well. I think the improvements that you've made are great. You've addressed our comments and I think for the second story where you have the full height glass, I think in the past we have asked for like a lower portion of that glass perhaps to be frosted or opaque just so that if there are desks pushed up against the wall, that any kind of mess or privacy issue can be somewhat covered. I realize that you have the overhang of the lower eyebrow so I don't know if that's quite as necessary but perhaps for any buildings across the street – I don't know if that's something that you have thought about but I know that's something that you've done in your previous projects.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, I didn't think that I wouldn't hear that comment today so I think that given the 3 ½-foot or 3-foot 8 eyebrow at the bottom, obviously is not going to be an issue when you're on the sidewalk on this side of the street. I also think that the translucent glass fin – you know as you are walking (inaudible)(crosstalk) really not going to see it. I'd like not to do that but if...

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I think you're taking another measure that I think perhaps, in this case, could be fine without that so thank you for explaining that. Then otherwise I have no problem recommending approval of the project today. Thank you.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you for those comments.

Chair Lew: Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I look forward to seeing this built. I am glad you are putting in seating. There is no seating anywhere on the – I walked it this morning again on the 400 block of Lytton and there is nowhere else to put it. There's no public parking lot so I think it's pretty essential. If this were a new project instead of either minor essential alterations or whatever of a nonconforming facility, we'd be wanting more. We'd be wanting something backing more into your property to give it a more welcoming arrangement but I think for this kind of project, this is fine. Are those vines growing up or down, the trumpet vines?

Mr. Hayes: Up.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Then I will be watching with interest to see if I agree with you on the adequacy of the lighting – sorry, the clear glass. There are a lot of buildings on Lytton that have a problem with that.

Mr. Hayes: We'll be doing the interior too (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: I will let you know.

Vice Chair Kim: Just one other minor comment, I saw on your presentation and then also on some of the 3-D views you mentioned Kipling. It's just Cowper and Lytton so...

Mr. Hayes: Oh, I say Kipling?

Vice Chair Kim: No, on one of your slides – on one of your floor plans slides you had Kipling instead of Lytton. Then on the 3-D views of where the views are taken from, some of them say from Kipling when it's probably from Cowper.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, you're right.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Ken. I can – I'm in support of the project. I have just a couple of questions on landscape. So, I think the landscape you are showing a fence along the driveway edge and there's nothing there now.

Mr. Lei: There's nothing there now.

Chair Lew: Yeah, so I was wondering if there's a proposed design for that? Is it in here, I didn't see it.

Mr. Lei: There's a picture (inaudible) page.

Chair Lew: Oh, I see. Like a green screen? Ok.

Mr. Lei: It's basically a 4-foot tall green screen with growing vines on it.

Chair Lew: Ok, that's fine and then I was wondering if you could explain the tree selection for the parking lot street tree? (Inaudible) valley oaks...

Mr. Lei: Yes, those are valley oaks.

Chair Lew: ...which is unusual. Most of the times we...

Mr. Lei: We talked to Dave Doctor the City's arborist and that is basically his recommendation. He thinks that would be the most appropriate for this sight in terms of creating a large – fast growing large shape atmosphere for the parking lot. That was his recommendation and we followed his recommendation.

Chair Lew: Ok, interesting choice there. Ok, so I am in support of the project as is. Does anybody want to make a motion?

MOTION

Vice Chair Kim: I'll move that we approve the project as is.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None so that's 4-0.

MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSENT

Mr. Hayes: Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Ken.

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. Charleston-Arastradero Corridor Complete Streets and Green Infrastructure Project (17PLN-00128):** Recommendation on Staff's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review of a Planting Plan in Conjunction With the Charleston-Arastradero Corridor Complete Streets and Green Infrastructure Project. The proposal spans 2.3 miles from Miranda Avenue to Fabian Way on Charleston Road and Arastradero Road. The Concept Plan for the Project Was Previously Approved by City Council on September 28, 2015. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) Was Prepared for the Project in 2004. An Addendum to the IS/MND Was Prepared in Conjunction With the Concept Plan Approval in 2015. For More Information Contact the Project Engineer Valerie Tam at valerie.tam@cityofpaloalto.org or the Project Planner Graham Owen at graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: Ok, we're ready for the last item and thank you for everybody in the audience who have been patient on this one. It is item number five is a public hearing for a quasi-judicial matter on Charleston-Arastradero Corridor, Complete Streets and Green Infrastructure Project. Recommendation on Staff's request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review of a planting plan in conjunction with the Charleston-Arastradero Corridor Complete Streets and Green Infrastructure Project. The project spans 2.3 miles from Miranda Avenue to Fabian Way on Charleston Road and Arastradero Road. The concept plan for the project on -- was previously approved by City Council on September 28, 2015. The environmental assessment is an initial study/mitigated negative declaration was prepared for the project in 2004. An addendum – yes?

Board Member Gooyer: No, never mind.

Chair Lew: It's alright. To the IS/MND was prepared in conjunction with the project or with the concept plan approval in 2015. We have Valerie Tam and we also – we have Graham.

Mr. Graham Owen: Thank you, Mr. Lew. We are just going to be setting up the presentation but I am Graham. I was working my colleague in Public Works, Valerie Tam, as well as Holly Void on this project which has been in the works for many years at this point. So, it looks as though Valerie's PowerPoint is ready to go so I'll let her take it away when she is ready.

Chair Lew: Ok and just – since we have a little break. Just for the public speaker, I have four speaker cards and you'll each have 5-minutes. I think we have maybe a fifth one and we'll get that. So, we'll do that after we give the applicant – the City has a 10-minute presentation and then we'll do public speakers and you'll each have 5-minutes.

Mr. Owen: Also, I have one thing to disrupt which is a slightly updated utility plan.

Chair Lew: Ok., welcome.

Ms. Valerie Tam: Good afternoon, my name is Valerie Tam and I am with the Public Works Engineering Division. I have Linda Gates here from Gates and Associates who is out landscape architect consultant and she'll start off the presentation.

Ms. Linda Gates: Hi, I am glad to finally see you here. So, let me advance to the next slide. We're going to review the planting concept. Oh here –Ok, it was the middle one? Ok. Alright so this is kind of a great project because we're impacting over 2-miles of corridor of a pretty major corridor and as we talked about before, a lot of work has gone into figuring out where improvement could be made in the sight line. I am here to talk to you a little bit about the planting concept that we're using and some of the big ideas. When we were looking at the planting concept, was that we wanted to do something distinctive. You know it's a corridor and kind of stood out and Palo Alto is willing to have sort of, I think distinctive looked so we wanted to do that. Obviously, water use and maintenance were a big concern and we worked pretty actively with the Maintenance Department and Peter Jensen, your landscape architect about what's working really well and not. We wanted something that is absolutely successful in an urban situation. This is many miles of street so you want to make sure that it works. We wanted to provide a shade canopy along the pedestrian edges because part of the project is to get people to sort of get out of their cars and move so those are some of our criteria. To accomplish that, we looked a lot – our plant (inaudible) is a lot about color and contrast and color in texture of the plant materials themselves and leaves and such like that. Rather than relying on a lot of things that are blooming that have requiring dead head and such like that. We also looked at a lot of things like sight lines and visibility and where we could have certain heights so those are kind of central corridor concepts. Alright because this is a 2-miles streetscape, I am not going to walk you down two miles so basically, I am going to break it down in conditions that we have. We have typically a median and in looking at the medians – did I skip forward to far and have to go back? Sorry. Yeah, ok, I got to the medians, so in looking at the medians, we wanted to have both evergreen and deciduous trees large and small. You can see we introduce some of the more distinctive kind of plantings. Looking at some of the [gobbies] and aloes and sort of false yucca, that is

pretty striking, very low maintenance, very visually distinctive plant palette. We didn't want to plant those on the side of the street because they are not necessary pedestrian friendly but they are really great at sort of a car scale and as I said so we have smaller (inaudible). That's just to create – that runs along the whole corridor. I am going quickly because I know we need – sorry, I'll get these going in the right direction. So, the other side really is the street edges and the street edges are a combination of the existing Parkway. Where there is existing trees and we basically left those there and areas where we are making improvements and we modified the parkway and we added storm water treatment areas in any place where we thought we could fit it in. We retrofitted that in so out pallet along the street edge is sort of a canopy tree and then we looked at sort of grasses because we're looking in – a lot of it is storm water retention areas and where that may be (inaudible) things; things that are soft. There are a lot of school kids walking along here and things that can take that kind of movement pattern. As we gotten an interface with either a school or a park or something like that, we tried to adapt the planting both in the parkway strip and the median to kind of celebrate that event along the street. One, two, three – there so that's – as you can see as you look at the sections sort of in some areas, in particular at the park, sometimes we had a very narrow parkway strip so we would be planting a taller grass or where we had a wider parkway strip we'd plant more. If you want to (inaudible).

Ms. Tam: Charleston and Arastradero is one of the few residential arterial roads in Palo Alto and that attributes it to a distinctiveness that we want to showcase. Young Palo Alto residents attend the eleven schools found on the corridor, as well as frequent the parks and community centers along the area. Cyclists and daily commuters travel up and down this 2.3 mile stretch on a regular basis, while residents interact with the corridor and get to experience all the amenities that it has to offer. So, creating a beautiful landscape can provide a curious environment for these young residents and safe travels for cyclists, as well as enhance the experience of daily communities and residents. So, from the time of submittal back in April to the Board and we had submitted our 65% plan. Up to today's date to the meeting, there has been further development towards our 100% set and we've come to see a lot of conflicts between proposed tree plantings and the existing underground utilities. We have come to – in an effort to protect our goal which is too beautiful the corridor and the streets in this residential dense area, we have come to a compromise by revising the plant pallet, as well as a planting plan. We'll go over the revised planting pallet and it does include more smaller canopy trees, as well as trees with shallower root depths. Our City Urban Forestry section, as well as our City landscape architect, will be reviewing these trees and the pallet themselves in the final planting plan. As well as this revised plant pallet is just for the conflict areas alone so they should be seen as supplemental to the originally submitted plant pallet. We have the eastern redbud, Carolina cherry laurel, water gum, dogwood, Princeton Sentry, and Marina Madrone. We've also selected some shrubs that can be trained into being a smaller tree, that includes the European smoke tree, western redbud, hogweed bush, tobira, and Indian Hawthorne. The tree planting plan that was revised and is in front of you --another hard copy in front you take into account the trees that we selected to keep within the – for the proposed trees. In the exhibit, we show pipelines that are within 5-feet of a proposed tree location with a red circle and those outside with a green circle. With this, we were reduced – we reduced our tree count to 50 trees and so trying to keep with our goal with beautifying our streets and including trees in this project, we have look too – for further break down the trees circled in red into different ranges within 1-foot -- within 1-2-feet, 2-3-feet and 3-5-feet of a pipeline. In the criteria for selecting which trees we would keep -- we looked at trees that were within 2-5 feet of an underground utility. Also, trees that we felt enhanced the beautification of the street and also kept the existing landscaping in the area balanced. With the – with this process, we raised our tree count to 80 trees. So, you can see that some of the trees that we removed here on the – (inaudible), they are single trees that we decided to take out just because it's just one tree in a small median. Just moving along the corridor, you can see which trees we decided to ultimately keep or remove in the proposed plan. When we also hit around Carlson Court, it's the start of the dual sewer sanitary sewer line, which is where we ran into a lot of trees conflicts in this area and it affected a lot of proposed trees from Nelson to Fabian. In conclusion, we do want to try to keep as many trees in this project as can. This is a design on paper and so during construction, we will go out and field verify the actual clearances for these trees so these numbers can possibly change. We are asking the Board for comment and feedback regarding out plant pallets for this project. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Valerie and so let's go through – for the public you'll each have 5-minutes and here's the order that we're going to do it. I've got – up first is Ronald Baker, then Linda [Kursh] I believe, Warren [Kursh], Jim Folton, [Neena] Bell and Penny Elson. If you could come up to the microphone, please.

Mr. Owen: I believe Mr. Baker has left.

Chair Lew: Yeah, ok, sorry about that. I would say the – I know it's kind of late in the afternoon but for the members of the public, you can still submit emails and that will go into the Board – into the public record for the project. Ok, welcome.

Ms. Linda [Kursh]: Linda [Kursh], I've been working at Gun High School for probably 20-years and I just wanted to give you some feedback today on what it is to deal with the traffic going in. I seem to have a lot less difficulty, I come in off of Arastradero often by way of Donald Drive to Arastradero and in. Coming out in the past year it's been very noticeable to me how difficult it has been. I have set at that traffic – just trying to exit from the school in order to try to get out between say 3:30 to 4 and there are times when appointments are you must be at my place in downtown Palo Alto by 4 PM. I have found myself sitting at the traffic light goes one, two, three cycles because we literally are not getting out of Gun High School to be able to go left or right to be able to do that. That's been far more noticeable and it will get even worse on rainy days for sure. Then my other problem has been coming off of Foothill Expressway when that merging area comes together, the people are all bundled together when if we had a little more space, some people would diverge and go off on Georgia or one of the other –then allow for a lot less mess. That's been my perception and it's been quite dynamic I would say in this past year. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and so Warren [Kursh] and then Jim Folton.

Mr. Warren [Kursh]: Hi, thank you for letting me talk today. My name is Warren [Kursh], I live on Donald Drive and this project has been going on for a better part of 18 – by the time it's finished it will be 20-years in the making.; there are no really good solutions. Between San Antonio Road on the south and Paige Mill Road on the north, there are only two east/west streets that allow you to from 101 or even El Camino to Foothill Expressway; they're Arastradero/Charleston and Los Altos Avenue in Los Altos. The amount of traffic – the perception of the community -- the neighborhood is that the amount of traffic has increased and increased dramatically both on Arastradero/Charleston and in the neighborhood. The traffic engineers when they look at the data say it hasn't increased significantly but when we look at what's happened at the VA Hospital expansion, at Gun High School's expansion, at the Industrial Park's expansion, we don't feel like that's right. We can't argue the data because the data is what they measure but during the peak times, we know that you can sit at a traffic light and watch cars just blocking the intersection and the traffic doesn't move. We know the problem is very complicated, we know it's complicated by the fact that El Camino Real is governed by the State of California Caltrans and they make the rules. They don't always cooperate with the City of Palo Alto and we also know that Foothill Express Way is also governed by County organizations and they don't often cooperate and they will sometimes do things independently. They just put in a new turn lane going from Arastradero Road onto Miranda and Foothill Express Way. They made a single turn lane, that blocks traffic and it was done by Caltrans. Not by Caltrans, by the County, not by the City but it has caused additional congestion to back up onto Arastradero Road. When somebody wants to turn onto Foothill and they stop at the corner of Miranda and back traffic up. They wait for an entire light in order to go 50-yards to make a turn. I don't know what the solution is but I – my guts telling me that doing a hardscape and trees is not going to improve the circulation. I can visualize things like in the fall when it's raining and the leaves are falling off the trees and cars skid on the leaves that are still in the street. That there might be situations where things will not improve by doing a hardscape. Those are my observations and my comments. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for speaking. Jim Folton has left and I'll make a note of that. Then the next one is [Neena] Bell.

Vice Chair Kim: I think we might have additional speaker cards.

[Ms. Neena Bell:] Greetings and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is [Neena] Bell, I live in the Green Acres One neighborhood which abuts Arastradero, it's a landlocked neighborhood. For 14-years I have been on the Stakeholder's Committee for the Arastradero/Charleston Corridor project and I have attended almost every – not quite all City meetings and what have you; community meetings. So, you're deciding today the landscape design for the Charleston Corridor project and I am here to speak in favor of that plan and to ask for your unanimous support to go forward with it. The corridor project has received unanimous support over 14-years from every City Council and what has enabled that support has been the care and attention to detail all along the way. I think as you heard the landscape presentation, it also fits into care – the detail. In addition, the landscape factors into the safety aspect of the corridor. It's imperative to finish this project in its entirety so as to fulfill the projects main goal which is safe for all users of the corridor. I thank you for your consideration and do hope that you will support this landscape design. So, thank you for your time.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you and Penny Elson.

Ms. Penny Elson: Good morning or afternoon. I am Penny Elson, I was the 2016-17 Palo Alto Council of PTA's Traffic Safety Committee Co-Chair. First, I want to say thank to Staff for a very robust community outreach process. They listened carefully and responded thoughtfully to a lot of community questions and comments in their process. It's exciting to see this important project, a central piece of the south Palo Alto bicycle pedestrian network moving towards construction. In 2015 City Council received letters from all six corridor PAUSD school site PTAs and the PTA Council asking them to approve the concept plan lines. The concept plan lines were unanimously approved at that meeting. Charleston/Arastradero presents a complex set of multi-motor safety challenges for people who bike, walk, ride transit and drive on the corridor every day. After 14-years of study, a moratorium, a Nexus study, countless community meetings, two striping trials, 15 study sessions and public hearings, we have a project that works in the important ways we need. Offering functionality and improved safety for all road users, including the many students who use this road each school day. Landscape median islands will beautify the street but more importantly, they will provide significant additional safety. For people who drive and bike, built medians will control turning movements, making merges and lane changes calmer and more predictable. Medians will protect left turning cars and bikes from the rear end and roadside collisions. Existing paint striping provides no pedestrian refuge, not traffic smoothing or calming effect. No bulb out benefits no physical barrier between vehicles and people who are walking or biking or driving at potential conflict points. The planned hardscape will provide these important safety benefits and more. I'd like to see as many trees as possible. Median trees affect how people drive. Sorry, didn't realize that came off. Median trees affect how people drive. When drivers perceive an object like a tree in their peripheral vision, they respond more as those they would to a residential street environment. Automatically easing up on the accelerator and scanning for cross traffic as opposed to how they respond to a wide asphalt express way like a road. One that invites drivers to accelerate and focus on the horizon, like the road we have today. This is something that you probably have noticed as the driver, you find yourself sometimes accidentally speeding on streets like Middlefield and Charleston/ Arastradero. You might end up – look at your – you might look at your speed and say oh my gosh, I am going 38 and I didn't realize. That's because these streets are wide and they really invite you to behave that way. I'm glad to see a pleasing, low water plant pallet and bio-retention facilities integrated into these plans. Please approve the proposed project and enable Staff to move it expeditiously toward implementation. This plan is the best solution to accommodate increasing auto traffic volumes while creating safer conditions for the diverse needs of the people who drive, walk and bike on this street. Especially large numbers of school bound children. Please recommend approval of the proposed project. Move it toward construction after more than a decade of study. Finally, I wanted to address a couple comments I heard earlier. I have observe that there has been an increase in congestion at the Gun entrance and I think that's part of what you heard about earlier. Largely because of a separate project, it's not related to the Charleston/Arastradero project but there was a project that the County did with the City, where they allowed people to get in right turn lane to turn right on Foothill Express Way and that has created backups that go as far as Gun High School. Transit has created some congestion at that intersection but that is unrelated to this project. It's a

separate project entirely so aside from that, I have not noticed additional congestion through that intersection, in my experience. I have a kid at Gun this year so my experience as a bicyclist and a driver, my point to point travel times are essentially the same from 2003 I've been timing it. I time it almost every time I drive it. It takes me 17-19 minutes to get from Middlefield to Gun High School. It was that way before the trial and it's that way now. Thanks.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Penny, and our last speaker is Diane Chambers.

Ms. Diane Chambers: Thank you so much. I am Diane Chambers the Director of Young Life Christian Preschool at Palo Alto Christian Reformed Church on Arastradero Road between Termen School and Gun High School; one of the more congested areas of the road. We've been a vocal and constant supporter of the traffic calming. We always saw it as a way to increase the safety of Arastradero Road for our students who bike and walk to school with their parents. I've been coming since the beginning of this whole project and say yes, please do this and I just – if you could help me with a little clarity. At one point – well, for all this time, every meeting that I've been too they assured me that our exit from the preschool across from Georgia Avenue, naturally a right exit. The assured us that the left exit would be preserved and then at a meeting at the Elk's Club, it was taken away and so we were very concerned that our parents – the three churches that use the property plus Common Ground Garden would have to turn left and then find a way to weave and hopefully – it would impact the neighborhood across the street in making it a U-turn to get back up to the park. If I am reading this correctly, does it – it looks like we still have a left turn that comes out of our driveway across from Georgia Avenue. It does...

Chair Lew: We can have the – we'll have the – when you've finished speaking, we'll get back to that (crosstalk). We'll ask the...

Ms. Chambers: Thank you.

Chair Lew: ...landscape architect to...

Ms. Chambers: Ok, in regards to the trees and the different things that you are planning. With our students learning about trees and deciduous and evergreen, the bushes, the humming birds, everything that we teach the preschool. The more trees, the bushes and everything, we appreciate everything that will go in. Thank you.

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

Board Member Furth: I wonder if we could hear from the architect – the landscape architect about – I must say that this is one of the most constrained landscaping projects I've ever seen. I remember this from – let the City 11-years ago and I remember many, many public hearings before I left. One of the findings that we have to make is that to the extent if possible, we're using regional and indigenous drought resistant plant material capable of providing a desirable habitat. Does this have any habitat value of what you are doing? Can you talk about that?

Ms. Gates: Sure, I can talk about your habitat and probably you can talk about the habitat value too. So, the circus trees, they are good bee habitat. Your oak trees, we have both the labata and cork oak. You have acorns and also butterfly larva like it, that kind of thing; small mammals. So, you have habitat, plus you have nesting sites and perching and such like that. A lot of the grasses like the [carics], the (inaudible) grass and such like that generate a seed that birds and such like. In addition, we have the California fascia and the salvia which are good for humming birds and butterflies and such. I think – what nice about trying to use these kind of more contemporary pallets is actually (inaudible)they provide better habitat values than some of the far more traditional habitats. I've been looking a little bit at some of the smaller trees that we may need to – as we proceed with our negotiation about planting within the setbacks and of course, circus is one they are looking at. If we do a California – Carolina cherry, there is habitat there. We have to be careful because we don't want droppings of where that goes and brutus obviously provides habitat value. If we end up with any of the more traditional like the [raf] or the

pittosporum trees, those obviously are bee habitat. So, I think in general, just when you add more landscaping in, you change the environment and it makes a better habitat.

Chair Lew: Ok, then I have a question which is to address Diane Chamber's question. The – from...

Ms. Gates: (Inaudible) Oh, I'm sorry. I have to look at the plans and (inaudible).

Chair Lew: So, I think it – on our page, it's on – oh, we have different drawings but it's...

Ms. Gates: L-4.

Chair Lew: ... yeah.

Ms. Gates: So, we believe we have the right driveway and you should be able to take a left there. Oh, you guys have it on – (inaudible) landscape plan – on LS-7. So, it's kind of down there where the AB and the DY are on the right-hand side of the page if you look at LS-7.

Chair Lew: But the – so my – we discussed this recently because of the school next door to this particular church but there's a median right at the end of Georgia Avenue that I think restricts the turns.

Ms. Gates: Well, it sort of protects that left-hand turn going up, yes.

Chair Lew: Right but I think the church is...

Ms. Gates: They are further down. They would be like – we think the driveway is where it says AB...

Chair Lew: Oh, I see, further down.

Ms. Gates: So, they can come out there. See where the arrow is?

Chair Lew: Yeah, ok. So, they can actually – they can get out. If you get an open window in traffic, (crosstalk), which is another issue.

Ms. Gates: Physically it's possible.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you for that. Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Could you identify the place where the little pedestrian access between the vicinity of – it's just up from Middlefield. There is a pedestrian access between the Unitarian Church and the school that goes back into the City park. Could you identify that for me? It's sort of an under signified entrance, meaning it's hard to find.

Ms. Gates: Sorry, we just always have too – with 2-miles, we always have to search on the drawings where...

Board Member Furth: I've been searching too and I couldn't find it. Yeah, it's just west of Middlefield. On the corner you have a school, then you have this pathway, then you have the Unitarian Church, then you have the storm channel, then you have Stevenson House.

Chair Lew: I think it's on sheet LS-14.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Chair Lew: This is opposite Nelson Drive?

Board Member Furth: Exactly.

Chair Lew: Then if you look there you will see a little cycle...

Ms. Tam: There is a bike path, as well as a concrete median that is going to be constructed in that area to divide the two-way traffic along that bike path. This section is also going to be signalized to allow for drivers in the driveway next to that bike path to come out and exit onto Charleston.

Board Member Furth: So, there is a signal right now.

Ms. Tam: We are adding a bike phased – bike phase to that signal so we are modifying it so that we can accommodate that.

Board Member Furth: What do the gray marks along the side of the road signify?

Ms. Tam: All the...

Board Member Furth: There's this sort of series of (inaudible)...

Ms. Tam: For the land – so the bike lane is – for the areas that are in front of driveways, the bike lane is going to have conflict zone markings so it's just a...

Board Member Furth: So, that's what that is.

Ms. Tam: Yeah, the green thermoplastic.

Board Member Furth: So, in that area, all the changes are – all the landscaping changes are either in the median or across the street, is that right?

Ms. Tam: Yes.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I am glad you are going to be making that bike path more visible.

Chair Lew: Ok, if that's the end of the questions, we can move onto the Board Member comments and try to make a motion. Does anyone...

Board Member Furth: Did we just finding...

Chair Lew: Yeah, I haven't read the findings yet. Wynne, will you start us off?

Board Member Furth: Based on what we heard today and the plans submitted, I support the project as presented.

Chair Lew: Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I don't have very much to add. As I understand, we're very far along in this process now and the Council has seen this. My – if I were to have any comments it was that I think this could be a very nice corridor and I was excited with the original tree proposal. It's too bad that we have to scale that back. It's good that we were able to bring some of those back but I think I would be fine recommending approval. Maybe if we could have had some kind of a symbol key for the red and the green and the slash throughs but otherwise I think this could be a nice project. I hope to drive down and bike down myself.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree, from everything that I've seen, this is – looks like it's going to be a very nice project. I am sure everybody who's been involved in it is just dying to get it going so it – we probably shouldn't hold it up any further.

Chair Lew: Ok and so my take on it is I'm actually – well, I just want to acknowledge that this project has been going on for a long time and I can see all of the hard work that's been put into it. When I – my next comment is that I am a little disappointed in the number of trees in the median. When the project first started, I had a very idealistic idea of what – notion of what it could be or should have been and this is not it. There are definitely – I did bike the whole thing the other day and I did go through the plans very carefully and there are some – several critical places that – they're huge improvements. We haven't really talked about it today because we've been talking mostly about the landscape and so I definitely wanted to acknowledge that. With regards to the landscape and the tree sizes where they conflict with utilities, my take on it was I think what – which was being proposed today, which is to remove the trees in the smallest islands where you just have one. I've seen other – I've seen islands where they just use the flax and agave and just do very striking plantings and that's actually better. I think that's better than trying to force one tree in this isolated pocket so I think that's the right direction. The – I am not crazy about your small tree selection, like all of them. I am not crazy about the pittosporum tobira and the Indian hawthorn. I think of those as screening shrubs. The catinus, I see that a lot in garden conservatory tours and stuff. It's a pretty trendy plant but I've never seen it in a median but it has beautiful foliage. Also, the same thing of the [sursees] and so I think you're on the right track. It's just sort of disappointing but I do understand the City's concern about tree roots and sewer systems. I mean that is a problem so we do have to address that. I was wondering – I have a couple questions for Staff yesterday and I was wondering if you had any thoughts about the existing bike paths at Terman and also at Hoover? I think you had mentioned them to me yesterday, that there's a – about some of the changes. I just wanted to make sure that the people of the public know that there are some changes being proposed there and also the one at the Los Altos/Palo Alto bike path.

Ms. Tam: For the bike path on L-3, that's the one to Alta Mesa or right next to Alta Mesa. That is a bike path that we're proposing to get widened for – from the existing 8-feet to 10-feet paved. That will be standard to (inaudible) guidelines for two-way bike traffic. There is going – the pathway is going to be extending onto that sidewalk so they won't be able to shoot out from the bike path onto Arastradero, which has been a problem that's been seen from folks at Alta Mesa. So, they won't be able to cross Arastradero because of the median. They will have a safer pathway on the sidewalk that we've also widened on that side of the road. They will be crossing at that Gun intersection in order to continue onto Foothill.

Chair Lew: Then the one at Terman or yeah, there is one at Terman that just goes to the bike enclosure.

Ms. Tam: I confirmed that there isn't a cut out there and I do believe it is just because -- for the same reasons at Gun or near – at Alta Mesa. Just so that bikers don't go out frantically or very sudden for drivers. Also, there is no crosswalk at that section as well and that's – we didn't put in a ramp there for bicyclists.

Chair Lew: Then the one at Hoover you have a transition zone, also on the sidewalk; you have the wider sidewalk.

Ms. Tam: Yeah so that area is going to be all paved for students that are biking from Carlson – the Carlson Court side so they can have access to the Hoover School site.

Chair Lew: Great, so I'm in support of the project. I think that you guys – with regard to the landscape when I was doing the site walk through, there were places where I saw that there were really minimal plantings along the edges. It seems like every -- in all of those places, I looked on your drawings and I saw that you were filling them all in with street trees wherever feasible. I think that you have a sort of taken a hard look at this project and so I am willing to support it. Then I think we just want to acknowledge that we have emails from the public. That people are still frustrated being – getting out of

their cul-de-sac onto Arastradero and there are long ques. That is – I just want to say that is my experience as well and that's just an ongoing problem. I think we've discussed it before on other projects, is that the average – when we measure the traffic, it's the average delay at an intersection. So, during commute traffic, it could be bad (inaudible) peak hours going one-way and there might not be traffic going the other way so when you average it all out, it doesn't look horrible. Our experience of everyone here in Palo Alto is that it takes 20-minutes to travel the length – to travel 2-miles. That's just the way the City measures traffic. That's the City standard. Ok, so we have motion, anybody?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: I move we approve the project as submitted pursuant to the findings and I believe there are no conditions. Are there conditions? No conditions. What are we approving?

Chair Lew: I haven't read the – what came At Place, the findings, Attachment D (crosstalk) or are those different?

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) take some time for that? They just weren't in the...

Chair Lew: They weren't in the packet which is why I didn't read them.

Board Member Furth: I think we're familiar with the findings themselves. The question is facts that support those findings and I have one suggestion. There are no – are there any conditions? I didn't see any.

Mr. Owen: We didn't develop any, no.

Board Member Furth: Ok, finding number one about consistency of the Comprehensive Plan seems to me to be uncontroversial. Second with unified and coherent design and high aesthetic quality and it's all about bicycle and traffic circulation. On finding number five, the reason I ask the landscape architect to comment on desirable habitat was not that I was worried that it wasn't but I wanted evidence that it was. I suggest that after the second sentence in the first paragraph of – well, I guess the only paragraph of finding number five, we add at the end of that sentence shrubs and perennials suitable to the site that provide desirable habitat. Then I think six is fine so even though I think Indian hawthorn is a boring plant and over used and I would say the same about pittosporum tabira, I believe that many people have given a lot of thought to this and you are doing as well as you can. I love the aloes and agaves along 19th Avenue which I usually see at three miles an hour, so moved.

Chair Lew: Ok, do I have a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second it.

Chair Lew: All in favor? Opposed? None, so that passes 4-0. Great, can't wait to see this one goes forward after all these years. Thank you.

MOTION PASSES 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSENT

Approval of Minutes:

6. June 1, 2017, and June 15, 2017, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes.

Chair Lew: For the Board, I think we have minutes. We have the minutes for June 1st and June 15th. We will do the ones for June 1st first. Wynne, did you have any...

Board Member Furth: Oh, I have some transcription errors but I'll just give the notes to Staff.

Chair Lew: Ok.

Board Member Furth: They can verify it on the tape.

Chair Lew: Great. Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: I was not present at the June 1st meeting so I'll skip voting on those.

Chair Lew: I had just the names of the public speakers for the minutes so I'll give that to Staff. All in favor? Opposed? None and Board Member Kyu is recused. So, that passes 3-0-1-1.

MINUTES PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0-1-1 WITH VICE CHAIR KIM RECUSED AND BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSENT.

Chair Lew: Then for June 15th. I do not think I have any comments on that one. Anybody else? Ok. All in favor? Opposed? None so that 4-0-1.

MINUTES PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY ABSENT

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you, everybody. I think we are adjourned if there is nothing else.

Subcommittee Item

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment