



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

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Member Wynne Furth, Peter Baltay

Absent: Board Member Robert Gooyer

Chair Lew: Can we have a roll call, please?

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications for items that are not on the agenda. I don't have – see any public speakers here.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: I don't think we have any agenda changes today.

City Official Reports

- 1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Administrative Staff-Level Architectural Review Approvals, and 3) Tentative Future Agenda item**

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3045 Park Boulevard [17PLN-00073]:**
Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of an Existing Office Building and Construction of a New Two-Story 29,120 Square Foot R&D Building. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: GM (AD) (General Manufacturing with Automobile Dealership Combing District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at Graham.Owen@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Lew: We can go directly into the first item which is item number two, a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item; 3045 Park Boulevard. Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to allow demolition of an existing office building and construction of a new two-story, 29,120-square foot R&D Building. The environmental assessment is an initial study is being prepared in accordance with the CEQA and the zone district is GM with an AD overlay. Our project planner is Graham Owen, welcome.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Chair, just as a reminder it's the quasi-judicial item so if the Board Members have any disclosures, this would be the time state those.

Chair Lew: I don't see any disclosures.

Mr. Graham Owen, Project Planner: Alright, thank you, Chairmen Lew. I'm Graham Owen and I've been working with the applicant team here on the project that's here before you today, 3045 Park Boulevard. This is an application for architectural review for a new 29,120-square foot office – excuse me, RND building. This project was previously reviewed by the Board in an earlier iteration November 19th, 2015 and December 17th, 2015. At that time, it was a – the project was also tied with 2747 Park Boulevard which was split off from this application at a later date and then has been – has gone through the architectural review process and is currently under construction. This iteration of the project was previously reviewed by the Board on July 20th, 2017. At that hearing, the Board had a number of comments regarding the site plan and the elevations. The application has returned to the Board for consideration and the applicant has responded to a number of the comments that were raised. Just as a reminder, this application is subject to the Interim Annual Limit Ordinance which caps the total net new square office construction in the City – in specific areas of the City at 50-square feet. This project would be 29,000 or excuse me, 19,000-square feet because there is existing office space on the site currently and so a result it would be a large component of the total net new square footage that's allowed under the current cap for this year. This is the revised site plan and as you can see the general location of the building is more or less the same as it was with the earlier reiteration of the plans that were reviewed on July 20th. The largest change in terms of the site plan has to do with the parking structure. At the time that the application was reviewed on the 20th, the first level of the parking structure was approximately I think, 3-feet below grade. In response to the Board's comments, as well as the Staff reports that was prepared, the applicant has sunk the first level of the parking structure down approximately 5-feet below grade. The structure had also previously had a 3-foot setback off of the street and that's been pushed back considerably to allow for basically a transition in terms of the setback from the building at 195 Page Mill to the building – to the main structure of the building that's on the subject site allowing for a transition at setback. Other changes to the setback – excuse me, to the site plan involved the ramp that leads up to the second-level of the parking structure. That's been shifted forward towards the street about 7-feet and then there's been some modifications to the site surface parking. As well as the loading space and those are the major changes in terms of site design. Additionally, there's been some changes to the courtyard entrance right at the apex of Park Boulevard and Olive Avenue and some refinements to the landscaping. Previously there was a rounded seating area and that's been modified to a more kind of park-like or urban plaza sort of feel with trees, as well as park benches. I'll let the applicant describe the changes to the facades but there have been some considerable changes in terms of the materials and the colors for this structure. I think the comment that the Board had raised previously was that the building, as previously been designed had kind of a muted color scheme; tans, greys, and that the building needed a little bit more punch. So, as a response, the applicant has brightened the images using different materials, mullion patterns, etc. to give it a little bit more of a contemporary feel. These are the two facades facing Park Boulevard, as well as the façade facing 195 Page Mill; also known as the [Hobot building]. The image on the top is the façade facing the Caltrain right of way and the image to – looking at that is the façade facing the Groupon building. One of the biggest changes to the façade – the facades on the building is what has been done with the treatment of the façade frontage along Park Boulevard for the parking structure. Previously, there was a metal louver screen that was proposed on the front façade of the parking structure. This has been modified to show a different kind screen and I call it the birds nest design; kind of reminiscent of the Coliseum at the Beijing Olympics for example. Also, some new trellises have been added to the upper level of the garage structure to allow for less light to spill over, as well as to enhance the appearance of the upper deck. This is the façade on the top facing the Caltrain right of way and as you can see, this has been modified to allow for a living wall or a green screen if you will. Additionally, there's been a modification to the lower level of the deck that is more apparent in this section view on the bottom, which shows that the lower level can be accessed via a pedestrian path which leads from the lower level of the deck up to Park Boulevard. Key considerations, at this point Staff, still remains – we believe that the – there have been some modifications that the applicant has made to address residential compatibility concerns that were raised at the previous hearing; trellis structures, for example, living wall structures, etc. Also dropping the structure, a little bit below grade also helps in terms of preventing direct views from the adjacent residential units into – from vehicles that are using the structure into those residential units in terms of glare and those sorts of things. There is still the open

question of what's the best locations for this structure? We still – we believe that's either doing an underground structure or something relegated to the rear along the Caltrain right of way would be ideal, given that this is kind of a clean slate so to speak. The existing structure is coming down and we have a new acre plus to work with so we think that in terms of how the site could be developed that those would be ideal considerations from a site planning standpoint. The additional concern we have is regarding the vehicle circulation. There are a couple – this is in your plans and you can look at this if you'd like. There are a number of circulation diagrams which demonstrate how vehicles and trucks should circulate on the site or would circulate on the site. As you can see there are a number of dead-end isles both in the structure and on the surface parking lot. In terms of the circulation diagram it's – given these diagrams it's still relatively unclear to us how easily the site would be managed from a vehicle standpoint. There's not a lot of room to turn around for example so I think there is some work that can be done to make the site plan more intuitive and to eliminate some of those dead-end isles. At this point we're recommending continuation of the project so the Board can provide comments. We believe that the circulation needs further refinement but also, we're still working on the initially study for the project so there's going to be additional inputs from our environmental consultant and our traffic consultant in the coming weeks. Additionally, as we mentioned, this is subject to the annual office limit so Staff couldn't make a final decision on the project or the Director can't make a final decision on the project until March 31st of 2018. So, with that, I'll leave it at that for now and let the applicant provide the presentation. Also, wanted to introduce my colleague Jared Mullin who's our transportation planner, who has also been working on the project as well. If you have any specific concerns relating to circulation or transportation, he's here as a good resource.

Chair Lew: So, for the applicant presentation you'll have 10-minutes.

Mr. Tom Gilman: Good morning, Tom Gilman with DES Architects. Let's see – go here instead? So, as you may recall this is the property that's at the terminus of Olive and Park, just South of Page Mill Road. Here's a kind of blow up and some of the context images of the adjacent buildings; the Groupon and the 195 Page Mill. As Staff has said, from the comments we heard last time we went back and took another look. I'll get into the architecture a little later but in general, there were comments about well, maybe things could be a little simpler, a little clearer, maybe the overall design of the building could be a bit more bold. There were some comments that we had a number of – in fact I think we had four materials on the building, many of which were somewhat similar in coloration and so on. So, when I get into the architecture I'll show that but one of the things that we also took a look at was trying to simplify some of the front façades of the building itself to create a little stronger pedestrian plaza at the end of the – were Olive terminates at Park Boulevard. One of the things that we took a key on – a key off was the trains at the back of the property is at an angle to the Park Boulevard. So, we've kind of picked up on that and so as you get closer to the building, we've actually sliced the front of the building -- the main façade of the building has a slice that's actually parallel to the rear of the property. So, some reference to the fact that there is this other transportation element that occurs and that shows up again in some of the other more details above the garage façade and the building façade. We've actually worked with Staff, both Planning and Transportation, in looking at some of the refinements of overall of the site. So, it's a little bit of a surprise about the continued comments about the dead ends and I can show a little bit more detail but we've really worked hard to provide turnarounds at each of the locations on the property. Again, this is a site that has about 30,000-square feet. It has about 116 cars so it's not a massive amount of parking. Overall, our own experience for buildings of this size is that typically a company will have assigned parking and so the wayfinding if you in a vehicle is relatively simple because typically people know where they are going to be parking. In terms of where we have visitor parking, there's a number of places where we can provide that and could be easily seen or accessed as you come onto the site. Again, typically we handle that as a tenant desire and the tenant may have – maybe they want three parking spaces for visitors, maybe they want a half a dozen. Typically, that's something we work out with the tenants themselves. There where – let me just go – let's see, then looking at some of the circulation elements, this is a diagram that's shows in color the turnaround areas. We've broken the parking down into smaller areas and as you come onto the site you can immediately go up the ramp to the upper level of the parking deck or continue back and then go down the ramp to the lower level. As you can see, on the upper level we'd have one area where it's a little bit longer and so we have – well actually, on the site

plan itself, on the left side, we're seeing – we're showing the lower level of the deck and so you enter at the back and then you can access all the way down that parking – lower level of the parking deck and the red area is a turnaround. For instance, if someone is parked in your space or whatever but if you do go up the ramp, the drawing on the upper right then shows the upper level of the deck and the two red areas that are the turnaround at each end of that parking. Then if you go around to the back of the building at the surface parking lot, the red area at the lower portion of the drawing then is the turnaround for that portion of the parking lot. Let's see, we've got – these were some diagrams from our civil engineer showing the turning radius. On the left side showing the turning radiuses, upper left is the access for vehicles into the lower level of the parking deck and then lower left are the diagrams for the circulation and turning radiuses for vehicles into the upper level of the deck. The right-side site plan view is then the turning diagrams for both trucks that would come to the loading zone but then would continue to the rear of the site and do a 3-point turn to leave the site, as well as emergency vehicles that would come in and then leave. When we last met there were comments about boy, it would be great if the parking structure had a little bit less impact and it felt like that maybe it was crowding the street and so on. As was indicated, we had about 3-feet of landscape or setback for the building but we've now pushed the parking structure back so that we have from the rear sidewalk to the face of the parking structure 11-feet of landscape. In addition, as Staff has pointed out, we've also pushed the parking structure – submerged it so it's really half down, half up. The upper level parking deck is plus 6 ½-feet, including then the guardrail – the top of the guardrail is 10-feet. I can't dunk a basketball but I can almost jump and touch the top of that railing so we really tried to pull it down so it has a much more pedestrian kind of scale. As well as pushing it back so it's got significant more amount of landscaping along the façade as well. In this plan view, we're seeing the upper level of the structure and those five rectangular areas that we're showing landscaping are canopy elements that extend out over the parking. They extend out – they cantilever out 14-feet, they are 34-feet long in each case and so we have landscaping that – with planting boxes that occur basically at the deck level. Plantings come up that and extend out over so that the top of those are essentially at the level of the floor line of the residential adjacent. So, here we can see that and you can see the residential is the second level up on the left and directly across at that same level is the top of these landscaped trellis kinds of elements. We've alternated those and those are a five – as you look out from the residential areas, either the second floor or the third floor, there's a great deal of landscape or green space that you're seeing and not simple a parking deck itself. Those things are about 8-feet and they do have lighting under them so we tried – which will also help shade some of the lighting that would occur from the upper level of the parking deck. In addition, along the property line on the left side here, we have a 10-foot setback and we have a line both of major shrubs – evergreen shrubs. As well as a line of trees in that area to help provide additional landscaping. On the section with that cantilevered area, you can also see that there will also be a green screen kind of character so that there's additional planting as you look say down into that front either the second floor residential or from the first floor R&D looking out that way as well. Here's some views from the street and we've removed the trees in order to be able to see the building and then the view from the building – the new office or R&D building looking north. Then the views from (inaudible) from residential and from the train, up above there. This is a large plan view of that new plaza and again, you can see everything has been (inaudible) so that it's on the – on this angled – parallel to the façade itself. The eight or nine accent trees, these are the Skogi Creek Crape Myrtle. The idea of having some different kind of accent trees and we worked a little bit with the urban forester folks. We've got quite a bit of drought tolerant and native materials everywhere on the site and talking with them they felt like in this one area having a different kind of more decorative tree was probably fine overall. So, this plaza now tries to address the fact that it really becomes more of a public-private area that easily is for anyone to use. It's the accent element that is at the terminus of Olive and also by pulling out – previously we had a series of berms and built-in sequester kind of area, which helped – which kind of prevented folks coming from the parking deck over into the lobby itself. This really opens up things much more considerable and allows easy movement and access. Here's the facades of – now we've looked at – as I said, previously we had four various materials overall and we've simplified that to the entire building is now metal panel. You can see now that angled surface and sort of simplified the massing that we had previously on the building. This is the southwest face and then to the right, around the corner would be the southeast. Both of these facades have considerable sunshades preventing – sort of keeping the building cool from passive point of view. The elevation at the top then is from Park. The elevation below would be from the

parking deck looking over. This would be the elevation top – that was the elevation from the train and then from the Groupon building at the bottom. This is the façade then looking at the parking deck itself. We're using this -- what's referred to as the bird nest material, this is a boxed modern – the manufacturer of this material and used as a decorative element on the façade of the building. Then the view looking down towards the project with the building straight ahead and then to the left is the parking deck itself. I think I might have – so here's a view with the trees also and I had pulled those off on the last view so here's with those additional trees ghosted in along the façade of the garage. Again, the trees ghosted in along the façade of the building itself so I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Tom. I should open up the hearing for any members of the public. I don't have any cards so are there any Board Member questions? Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, good morning and I have two questions, one for Staff and one for the applicant. Architect Gilman, just enlighten me, if I'm coming into work and my spot is on the top of the parking garage and I go up to that spot and for some reason, it's taken. What do I do? Can you just drive my path through? How do I then take care of things? Go to your site plan may be.

Mr. Gilman: Graham, I am not sure...

Board Member Baltay: Again, I am driving in and I go to the top floor of the garage and I'm not able to park, then what do I do?

Mr. Gilman: Oh yeah, I just want to go back to the site plan. I'm going to move back to the site plan here. Oh, here we go. If you – you arrive on the site, you come up the ramp, turn left or right depending upon where your space was, you get to the end of the aisle and it turns out your space has been taken. You go to the end of the aisle, you turn in and do a 3-point turn with the turn out space, turn around, come back and either look for another space perhaps or come back down the ramp. So, it's really an issue of...

Board Member Baltay: So, the question is when I come down the ramp, then what?

Mr. Gilman: Pardon?

Board Member Baltay: When I come down the ramp am I able to make a sharp left hand turn to get back into other parking on the site? That's the question for you.

Mr. Gilman: Yeah, I think you can, yeah. That's where the road widens out to access the – what green – the green area there is actually the truck loading area.

Board Member Baltay: I see so it's big enough then that if I come down the ramp, I can make a sharp left-hand turn?

Mr. Gilman: Yes, and again, we had the idea that this size of building typically often see that this is basically handled as assigned parking. I mean those things may happen and it happens at our building occasionally as well.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you and then for Staff, if you could clarify for me that this is under the Retail Preservation Ordinance. So, what happens come April and say this building is approved for 19,000 more square feet of office space but several other projects are also approved. So, the City has to decide which projects go forward so how is that determination made?

Mr. Owen: It's – one point of clarification is that it's not the Retail Preservation but it's the Annual Office Cap.

Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry.

Mr. Owen: That's ok. So, yes, it's subject to that cap and there are about 10,000-square feet of qualifying square footage on the site currently so the cap looks at net new. If there is – just so you know, right now it doesn't appear as though we're going to be coming out excessive at 50,000-square foot cap. Should it be exceeded, then the project would need to be deemed complete and be ready for the Council's approval or denial. There is essentially a section of our code that allows for the Council, with their discretion, to determine which projects should move forward and it's a contest so to speak. So, there are specific criteria that they can use to evaluate each of the qualifying projects but that determination would need to be made between April and I believe the end of May. So, there's a two-month window during which qualify projects can be approved or denied.

Board Member Baltay: So, essentially the City Council will decide which of these projects moves forward based on these published criteria which happen to do with the quality of the design basically?

Mr. Owen: Correct, yes, sir.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Lait: When there is an excess of the 50,000 but under the 50,000 they are just approved.

Board Member Baltay: I understand, thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: If I could have the architect also explain to me then if I have some accessibility requirements like if I'm in a wheelchair or on crutches, how would I park and enter the building?

Mr. Gilman: The – maybe it's most easily shown here. On the left is the site plan itself, including showing the lower level of the parking deck. The accessible parking spaces are those shaded spaces that are kind of at mid-point so you park, you get out of your car, you go – you move north or you up the page in this drawing and...

Vice Chair Kim: I'm sorry so I have to go away from the building actually to get to the building?

Mr. Gilman: You're – the ramp itself is on the upper side of the parking deck here so then you come up the ramp and then go along the street parking lot or parking sidewalk. Then come to the entrance of the building itself so it's covered accessibility parking.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok but in order to actually then get to the building I have to go to – it will be on the top of the page, that little walking portion? Am I correct?

Mr. Gilman: Yes, so there's a ramp there that comes up the 5-feet.

Vice Chair Kim: The lower level of the parking you said was submerged about 5-feet...

Mr. Gilman: Right.

Vice Chair Kim: ...so there's then a ramp that I have to go up there. Is there then a retaining wall on the other side of the ramp or how does that ramp work in relationship with the neighboring site?

Mr. Gilman: Correct. Yeah so, the retaining wall and then there's landscaping beyond that.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Chair Lew: It's shown in a section, right? I think on sheet A-13.

Mr. Gilman: Yes, on this.

Vice Chair Kim: I see. Then one more question, the scale of the metal panels – the Bok Modern panels, is the scale that's on the materials board the same scale that would actually be used or will it be a larger scale that's shown in the drawings?

Mr. Gilman: We're thinking of a larger scale than that but that was just a model to show this is the concept of that material.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Gilman: Right, so something that's a little larger scale that makes sense in terms of the size that we're talking about.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Chair Lew: Wynne, do you have a question?

Board Member Furth: I do, thank you. I've been trying to understand the zoning in this area because it's complicated and this is the GM zone. Its lite industrial under our existing Comp. Plan and it doesn't, for example, allow a law office there. So how is this building designed differently than an office building? What makes it – I realize there's a range of uses that are permitted but what are the features of it that make it a GM district building as opposed to straight office building?

Mr. Gilman: The allowed uses in the GM zone the code is very specific in terms of allowing...

Board Member Furth: It is indeed.

Mr. Gilman: ...software type R&D use. In this case, our floor to floors is 14-feet so that we could have the possibility of 10-foot ceilings. However typically with this type of R&D use, we typically would see open – typically open structure and so; you know a more modern kind of look. Essentially the kind of use that would go inside is we would probably anticipate that it could be a variety of benching kind of layout or it could be low cubes. Typically, it seems rather open and so and we're simply providing a lot of natural daylight otherwise.

Board Member Furth: Are you saying the height of the floors are big enough so that if they did want to have labs that required ducting and whatnot that would be possible?

Mr. Gilman: Yes, absolutely.

Board Member Furth: Ok and what about in terms of loading zone? How does the truck loading work?

Mr. Gilman: We have a code compliant size truck loading zone. Typically, with these types of uses we don't see a major – particularly for the scale and size of the company that would be here, we're looking at probably a more of a startup scale company and so on. They don't typically see a lot of truck use other than say delivery, UPS, and those – you know that type of nature.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Then I had a question for Staff – oh, one more question. I can't remember, are you proposing photovoltaics and if not, is it designed so they could be added afterward?

Mr. Gilman: We are not currently. The building itself is designed so that fifteen percent of the roof area can accept photovoltaics at any point.

Board Member Furth: Fifteen percent?

Mr. Gilman: Fifteen percent of the roof surface, yes.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Then for Staff, could you – one of the things that making this confusing for me is the development – recent development pattern doesn't seem to be particularly uniform in terms of density and scale. Could you explain to me how these parcels are zoned and developed along Park here or across the street if that's relevant?

Mr. Owen: The scale – for instance, the adjacent building at 195 Park Boulevard, it's sort of an anomaly. There's kind of a long history as to why that particular project moved forward in the manner that it did but in short, the project does exceed the FAR for example and the density that's typically permitted in the general manufacturing district. There's a question of – at the time that it was submitted we allowed residential uses for example in the general manufacturing district while that application was in process. The Council removed multi-family from the general manufacturing district as a permitted use but that site, in particular, is a housing inventory site so it was allowed to move forward with a residential component to it. In terms of the design of that building, in particular, there was a number of design enhancement exceptions which we granted by the City Council at the time so that speaks to that particular parcel. The Groupon building is a little bit more to scale with the general manufacturing districts. I believe it's two floors and I don't know the exact FAR for example but it's generally speaking pretty close in scale to the building.

Board Member Furth: 195 Park has a FAR of what?

Mr. Owen: I believe it's about 1.4 to 1.

Board Member Furth: So, the Council then removed the housing option?

Mr. Owen: Correct. Yeah, they removed...

Board Member Furth: But they left it on the site so that's why – on the housing inventory.

Mr. Owen: Yeah, correct. It's in the Comp. Plan that that was a site that was identified as a housing inventory site so they allowed it to move forward.

Board Member Furth: But this one is not?

Mr. Owen: No, it's not.

Board Member Furth: Ok and on the new draft Comprehensive Plan which we are not bound by and we don't even know if the Council is going to approve. It's hard for me to tell what the proposed land use is here because along the street we have a lot of yellow and this little strip of purple. Are they proposed – is the proposal that this remains GM or that it be multi-family?

Mr. Owen: I'm not sure. In terms of the Comp. Plan designation, I don't believe that there's any plan to change it from lite industrial with the current Comprehensive Plan but I can certainly look at it.

Board Member Furth: Thank you, that would be helpful. Those are all my questions.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. I have a quick question so for the landscape, what is happening with regard to fences along the Caltrain right of way and also along the Groupon property line?

Mr. Gilman: We have a green screen along the Caltrain side of the parking deck and then along the parking lot we have a variety – we have a landscaped strip that I believe is 5-feet. Yeah, 5-foot landscape stripe and then we have a series of fingers as well and they extend into the parking lot. So, we have trees both in the fingers and as well in the – as well as along the perimeter. The same thing occurs really the entire length of the Groupon site so we have trees and then shrubs along that area. As you

probably know we have to meet the shading criteria for the site overall and so we've calculated that as well.

Chair Lew: Then fencing?

Mr. Gilman: Pardon?

Chair Lew: Fencing. Is there – are you proposing a fence in those areas?

Mr. Gilman: You know I'm not sure that – probably on Caltrain we would probably want to put a fence as well.

Chair Lew: I don't know if they – I mean they've been putting in new fencing along...

Mr. Gilman: I think there's probably a recent – they have that new design of their fence with the little (crosstalk)(inaudible)...

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) they've been adding barbed wire on top of that now and so I was just curious. I guess maybe if Staff could figure out what is required...

Mr. Gilman: We'll comply with whatever the requirement is, sure.

Chair Lew: Then on the Groupon side are you think maybe no fence?

Mr. Gilman: Yeah, that hadn't been the intent. So, it would just be our 5-feet of landscaping and their 5-feet that would potentially blend.

Chair Lew: Great, good answer. Then on the garage, do you have any security concerns about having an open garage? I've been thinking also too, I mean usually tech. companies are fairly security sensitive as well. I mean if you think about A9 here in downtown...

Male: Yeah, we're not concerned about having an open garage. As you probably know, we build a lot of these kinds of buildings and our garages are generally open and our tenants don't have a problem with it so in short, that's our answer. We've never closed off our garages on other sites and we don't see a need to do so here. It would be really driven by our tenants.

Chair Lew: Thank you. It's unusual because we have so many other projects downtown where there are gates at the garages. So, I think that's the only questions I have. Board Member comments and who wants to start? Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you. This is kind of tough for me but I have a feeling that perhaps the overall site planning has been a little bit more set than maybe we would have liked to see. What I mean by that is that it just seems like there hasn't been enough done to the overall site planning and the circulation concerns that were brought up or brought up today. To me just the overall circulation of there being too many dead ends and there are only one main entrance and exit for automobiles on the site. Considering how large the site is and the fact that it's a completely empty slate so to speak, it just seems like two – at least two entries and exit points would be the most efficient and provide the best access to a site. I think it was proposed as such in a previous iteration of the project. The – other than automobile circulation, the people circulation – after having parked and walking to the building also concerns me; especially for those ADA spots. I just don't see why you wouldn't have ADA spots closer to the building or there being either an elevator or a ramp that really leads you to the building. I mean I can just imagine somebody shows up, has to park in an ADA spot and just to have to be directed by signs to get to that ramp rather than just to be able to see the building and walk towards it or roll towards it. It doesn't seem like the best solution in this case. I mention all these site planning and circulation things because it really – they bother me enough that I really can't get past those to give you more comments on the parking structure

itself and the building itself but just overall, I think the reduction and different kinds of materials certainly is a little bit of a step forward. We noticed that it's a cooler color scheme and the materials are a little bit more sleek and perhaps read to be a little bit more of a startup and more contemporary. At the same time, I'm not sure that it's something that really wows us. It's not a bad looking building by any sense but it just doesn't seem like it's special enough considering the limitless possibilities that you have here on this site. There are some other concerns that I have with the parking garage, again the metal panel, it's great. It's better than not having any kind of a panel but I just don't see how it necessarily ties into the overall design of the building and the site. The green screens and the plantings and the cantilever screens, I think those are all great but it's going to take time for those things to develop. On the renderings and on the elevations, you have them very full and we see a lot of that foliage but in reality, how many years is it going to take for that to actually build up? The – I did want to compliment you however on the relationship. I have a feeling that perhaps maybe we stressed that relationship to the [Hobot] building more than or maybe too much at the previous go around but I do think that relationship has improved quite a bit more. I'm very appreciative of the fact that you are able to sink that a little bit further down so that people on the residential floors of the [Hobot] building aren't necessarily looking directly at the screen. I think those cantilever screens actually go a long way in the future so that it goes even further to hide the parking spots. I just wouldn't – I guess I am a little bit frustrated to see that we are coming back to this above grade structure and again, it's 5-feet berried but why can't we do an underground parking garage or why can't we – it just seems like there has to be a way to get at least two entry and exit points off of this site considering the amount of parking that you have. I'll leave it at that for now.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for the presentation both Staff and applicant. On the point of the presentation, this is not the first time we've seen this but we don't have an environmental document. Why – can you explain the timing to me?

Mr. Owen: Sure, absolutely. We do an initial study that's currently under review and a traffic and circulation study that also is a component of that initial study that we're conducting. The – as far as our schedule we had anticipated that this would be returning – that we'd have an initial study around the holidays and then we look at it and comment on it. We have an environmental consultant that's doing a lot of the work right now but Staff would review it; Transportation and Planning and Public Works for example. Then we would also bring it to a hearing and have a third hearing on it so that we would be able to provide the public with the opportunity to review the document.

Board Member Furth: As somebody who's supposed to be considering the environmental factors, it makes me very uneasy to be at our -- whatever it is hearing on this project. With the applicant doing all this work to do this and I still don't have even the environmental questionnaire to look at. I don't really care if these things are ready for public circulation and of course, that would be preferable but I do not like being in a position of not having read the environmental documents. The applicant quite recently saying and our code saying, but you're here for the umpteenth time, why are you bringing up these issues now? The answer will be because I didn't have the information, let allow the public comment on the information until now. This is not a first-time concern so I would appreciate it if Staff would figure out how to at least get us more of this information sooner. I don't know, for example, is a toxic plume over here? What kind of constraints does that present? How bad is the – what's the noise contour? There's no way you can read those things off the big maps and what does the traffic and circulation study and analysis say? It's not enough to have elevations and the site plans without that information in order to do our job I think. Most specifically on the garage, I think it's much better in the relationship to 195 Park. I think both the landscaping and the depression help. I do not think that the screen itself has seemed to have been – it looks to me too much like an add-on element and not something integrated with the – either the design of the streetscape or the design of the new building. So, I am not ready to say that's a good idea or acceptable yet. I'm concerned about the comment in response to the question about secured garage parking. I say this partly as somebody for years worked in a building where I had to call the security guard, by firm policy, to go – to get my car in its open garage if I was leaving after 7, which

I usually was. Almost every building that we're looking at these days has at least some access for secure parking. I think as a woman I experience these spaces than some of you may. Silicon Valley, by all accounts, is notoriously hostile to women workers and I think this is a design that's hostile and I would like you to think about how you would make this – how this design would work so that when I leave at 11 and I'm 40-years younger than I am now or even my current age because unfortunately, those kind of violence is not limited to the young and the fit. How would I leave in a safe and comfortable passage there? It's particularly in my mind because we were just looking at another site nearby where the local merchants were very concerned about creating dark and not particularly publicly viewable spaces so I don't think it works right now. I'm also skeptical about the internal circulation as it presently stands. On the landscaping, it way very well is that the more exotic trees are completely appropriate in the context of your overall landscaping and the quality of habitat that it provides but it's too soon to tell. If we are going to use exotic trees and of course most of the trees in town are or where I'd like some information about how it at least helps with our efforts to have more bird and insect friendly settings. I'm also concerned about the very limited potential photovoltaics. One thing that tec. Companies are not is lite on electricity consumption or at least historically they aren't. It concerns me that the opportunity for this, again bare-bones site, to at least be electrically self-sufficient seems to have been missed but I don't know what the numbers look like. I don't know if fifteen percent of your roof would cover the proposed use or not but I would be interested in knowing. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Great and Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I have some of the same concerns that a couple of my fellow Board Members here, is that I like the basic design of the building. I like the use of the newer materials or the revised materials. I do have a bit of a problem with – it seems like the only part of it that really hasn't been thought out are sort of the window walls or the glass mullions. They seem a little bit random or don't really seem like they've been thought out as much as the overall concept of the building. The parking garage I think is nice looking parking garage but the interesting thing about it is it – I wouldn't have a problem with it if this was a situation where it was an existing building and you were putting in a parking garage – where it turned out you needed a more parking so you put in a parking garage. The two structures don't seem to relate to each other. There's no way of automatically saying oh, those two obviously go together and I think that's probably – you know if you're starting with a virgin site anyway, you would assume that would be the way to go. Then the big thing, which I think all of us seem to be struggling with, is just the whole fact of I don't think the parking structures works. I mean if you come up the ramp -- the first two or three parking spaces on each side when you get to the top of the ramp, you have to do all kinds of meandering around to get into those spaces. Then if you get to the end, you have to do a 'T' to try and get out of there again. It just doesn't seem to work and it seems either too small or too cramped. I agree also if you come down the ramp, that's an awfully tight turn. I mean I might be able to make that in my little two-seater but some of the other cars I see out there like some SUVs are going to have a hard time doing that. With all the dead ends, it's exactly that and I understand that putting a parking structure along the railroad tracks would leave you with a strange bowling alley effect in the front of the building. I don't think that works but something needs to be done that I think the flow would be better. I don't – I'm not married to that fact that you have to put it underground and I think you could come up with a successful parking structure that would work because going underground, it has its own set of problems to go with it and the initial cost is understandable. It's just one of these things that it's true that basically, I like the design if you just look at it but of the two units I don't think they work together and I think the flow is what everybody is having a problem with. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Robert. Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, thank you. I find myself in general agreement with my colleagues on the Board. In particular, Kyu's comments about circulation seem to be sensible. I'll start though with just talking about the design of (inaudible) two buildings, the parking structure and the main building. The main building, if I look at the two components of it there's a glazed section and a section I call a solid section with a stronger with a stronger form on it. On the glazing, I just can't seem to tell if you want it to feel vertical or feel horizontal. The mullions are sort of everywhere and back and forth and it just

needs a little more coherence. I also feel that perhaps it's a little bit too tall and when I look at your section, you have quite a bit of a parapet there and I think if you cut it down say 4-feet or so, it would just look better. I don't think it will affect the functionality inside and I'm not asking for that kind of thing but the proportions aren't quite right on that. On the solid section, again the proportions just don't feel right to me somehow. When you're doing that heavy solid wrap around a glazed panel, it's important to get the proportions of the solid piece right and it's just not quite there. Secondly, maybe the material choice on that, which is a painted metal panel, is probably – I don't think it's the right thing. In that case, typically people use a stone of some kind and it tends to look more suitable for a solid material and probably is more durable as well. Painted metal panels probably over 20-years' time is going to fade substantially and just not look as sharp as they would up front. I find the design of the parking structure to be problematic in that you're really counting on this trellis with plants growing on it as an important part of how the parking structure functions and I just can't believe that those plants can thrive in that environment without a permanent gardener every day out there maintaining, watering and pruning. Those will die and I can't imagine any landlord is going to spend what it takes to maintain them. Once they're gone it's going to look terrible because you'll have these arching 14-foot pieces of metal there and that's not an effective solution. The same things go with the view of the building from the street. It's a beautiful rendering that you have but it really is dependent on getting the perfect architectural execution and really good maintenance over time. I'm sorry but I just don't see that happening on this kind of building. Usually, it gets built, it gets rented, collects the money every month and that's the end of it. This particular design is so critically dependent on a really great loving maintenance as though somebody lives there and I just don't see that happening. Those two things said about the building – well, thirdly the parking structure and the main building, as Robert pointed out, just aren't – incompatible. They are not architecturally the same in any way and it seems to me that if they are going to be next to each other or part of the same development they should. I'd like though to come back to where Kyu started with – was the overall site planning because I also find myself very troubled by three fundamental aspects to it that I've said before in our previous meetings but the first one is maybe best seen if you look at your image P-14, which shows a view down Olive. Although I think deceptively, I think you have a tremendous opportunity to make a strong planning move by really giving us a terminus or something we see as you come down Olive Avenue. What I'd like to ask for you to do is maybe on your next presentation, give us a view down Olive which is closer to what I saw when I walked down Olive Street and you – Olive focuses the view. It's lined with trees and you come all the way from El Camino and the building really is a visual point there or the plaza or whatever you choose but I think you need to have some terminus to that view or some designed effort. What I see now is sort of the corner of a building with some sort of a plaza and maybe a door but the same problem I had back in July that you really haven't designed a terminus. I think it's got to do with your site planning because the building is not quite in the right place. I suggest that you shift it over so you can actually design something on the building to terminate Olive Avenue and then you'll get room for a second parking exit on the other side; first comment. The second one is about the traffic circulation on the site both vehicular and pedestrian and I think my colleagues and the Staff report do a fair job of explaining what the issues are. I fully agree that it's just – you have a 1-acre blank site and it's not nearly as difficult as many sites that people are struggling with in Palo Alto and there's just no excuse that a firm with the talent that DES has can't come up with a functioning parking layout. You guys have done it over and over and over again and I've seen, architect Gilman, insist on it on other projects and other review boards. You know what we're talking about and it's just embarrassing and not adequate right now. Then lastly the biggest issue I think is the parking structure and I find reviewing my notes that at the last review I suggested it should be put underground or at the back of the property. I find I have the same reaction today. I don't think you'll be able to fit the parking structure where you have it now and succeed at not having a minimizing impact on the adjacent residential building which is what the code requires. To me there are two alternative ways of locating that parking structure that do minimize the impact. Minimize means do the least amount you can so if you were to put the parking at the back along the train tracks or if you put the parking under the building I think you would take a step towards meeting that code requirement of minimizing impact on the adjacent buildings. As well as solving many other circulation issues and site development issues and creating a terminus and getting rid of the issue of the two buildings that are incompatible with each other. Then I come to the applicants just to point out to you that in the event that this does become a beauty contest, is what people have called it to City Council, the parking structure is going to sink your

project. Think really hard how strongly you want to push for this. Almost every project we see now of this type has underground parking on the building. It just seems to make sense for the applicants that the City Council is more and more expecting that so I just caution you how hard do you want to push for this particular thing. I've seen now twice it comes back to us almost the same. Putting different architectural details on it but the core issue really is the parking structures in the wrong place. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Peter. I think I'm on the same page as the rest of the Board Members. I don't feel quite as strongly that the garage has to be along the back or underground but I think that the main problem I have with the garage is the handicapped accessible route – the ramp going along the north side of the property and then down along the sidewalk. I don't think – it's not necessarily the Board's purview but I don't think you're going to get through the Building Department with that handicapped layout. You know crossing an aisle down the sidewalk and crossing a driveway to the building. I've seen it before on other projects and I just find that to be very problematic. I think there – you have made a lot of improvements and I think it shows in the drawings but the lower height of the garage and I think – and the trellises and the screens. I think that shows pretty clearly in the drawings that it's – that you've tried to minimize the impact. The concern I have would be between the handicap ramp and the property line – I guess this goes to sheet A-13, is that if you're trying to put in like the podocarps trees – like a screen tree in a little 5-foot planting zone with a basement – excavated basements on both sides. I did see you have Silva cell detail in the set but I wasn't sure where that was being used but typically I guess I would ask – I guess I would ask Staff is for the City or the Urban Forestry if they had a recommendation for the minimum soil volume. We've done that on other projects like sometimes I've seen 120-cubic feet or whatever it is for that particular species. I'd like some recommendation on that because otherwise is what happens is it will stunt the growth of the trees and then it won't really – you won't get the intended effect. Again, as I mentioned in my question before is I'm interested in what is happening along the Caltrain right of way with the fence. I would say that I think that – I use to be a long time Caltrain commuter and the experience along Caltrain in Menlo Park is really fabulous. Then you get to Palo Alto along California Avenue is – it's really pretty awful, unfortunately; where we put the (inaudible) – blank wall – you know 300-foot long blank walls facing the tracks without any windows or any relief whatsoever. It's – yeah, it's just – to me it's that – just not thinking correctly about the project and I think it's better to have a two-fronted project ideally. I don't think that doesn't show in any of our zoning or in the design guidelines but I think that's a better way to design the building. Then on the – also on landscape, I think the thing that I really dislike about the existing building is the landscape in the front because it was a car dealer and there wasn't really – they didn't really want landscaping because they wanted to show off the BMWs. To me, the Groupon building and some of the new landscaping in front of 195 Page Mill is better and I think that you're tying into that with the bulb-outs, with the London plane trees, as well as a secondary row of trees inboard of the sidewalk. I think to me, that's highly desirable in trying to connect the neighborhood back together and so I would be able to find – in favor – I could support the finding for that, for pedestrian amenities. I think the plaza also helps so I think that's all good. On the building façade, at least on the front façade, I like that you have divided the building into two. I think before when you had it into three elements it was getting a little too cluttered. I think breaking it into two keeps it pretty simple and on the streetscape elevations, it seems to work well with the Groupon building. So, that's where I am and so I'm curious to see on the Board – for the Board since this is our – is this – this is our second hearing, right?

Mr. Owen: Correct.

Chair Lew: We're not supposed to make a recommendation today but I think the Board is pretty opinionated about it so I think maybe if you have a collective about what we want to see in the final – for the final – the third submittal?

Board Member Baltay: I'd like to see us give them clear direction about the parking structure. I think two or three of us at least have – I think I've heard say clearly that it's – it really needs to be shifted to a different location but they really – they owe – we owe them a clear direction on something so critical to the project. I feel the parking structure needs to be relocated someplace else.

Chair Lew: I'm not sure that it's fixable in it's current – yeah.

Board Member Baltay: That's what I am saying.

Chair Lew: (Inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: They've had two times to come back to us and honestly, they've come back with the same thing. I mean they really didn't take our serious criticism to heart. They tried to put lipstick on it and that just leads me to think that ok, we get one – another goes at this and the answer is going to be no, at least for me if I don't see these issues solved. It's just – it's a shame, it's a beautiful parcel and there's no reason it can't be done.

Chair Lew: Jon.

Mr. Lait: Thank you, Chair. Just – as the Board continuous its deliberation, a comment has come up a couple of times about multi ingress/egress from the site and City Staff has a perspective that a single input/output driveway is a huge deal at this location due to the bicycle traffic that we see on Park. So, as you're considering your deliberations, please consider that we would be interested in a single driveway curb cut.

Chair Lew: Thank you, that makes sense.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, that's fine. It would be nice to see circulation pattern that works and it would nice to see that kind of statement in the Staff report so we understand all the parameters involved. I put back to my fellow Board Members that we owe them clear direction about big issues with the site planning and I think I made clear about how I feel about it.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree. Having been on both sides, there's nothing more frustrating than getting 15 or 20 of these comments and not really having anything that is a little bit more directed. Now having just been told that we're only allowed one access point, I think that almost indicates that you're going to have to do some changes with the building or something. Either shifting it or relocating it because that's going to be really tough to do but the -- I would even be – I understand the 'L' shape parking space, that you end up at the corner of the building with a – but if that's the case then that's something that maybe you can't with life but if that's the case, then I think the parking structure needs to work more. The parking structure also doesn't work at the moment. If the parking structure worked a lot better where you didn't have all these strange 'T' configurations you'd have to do just a – to get into a parking space I'd be more amenable to it. I'm not as adamant that it needs to be underground but – I'm not even adamant that it needs to be in a different location but it just doesn't work the way that it is now. Whether that means it needs two ramps on each floor or whatever the case, I don't know. I'm not going to design it for you but the reality of it is, it's just – it doesn't work the way it does now.

Chair Lew: Can I – the Staff had mentioned or (inaudible) – somebody had mentioned residential...

Board Member Gooyer: Can I just – one more thing...

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: ...to Staff? I mean one of the – I can understand where you want the one main access but it sure would -- seems like it would make things a whole lot easier, even if there was an exit only off the site or something to avoid some of these. Is that just not allowed at this point?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, thanks. I'm going to ask Jared Mullin to give you a more detailed response to that.

Mr. Jared Mullin, Transportation Department: In regard to the driveway or driveways potentially, the code says – doesn't say anything that thou shall not have two driveways on a property on a bicycle boulevard

but when we evaluate these sites during the discretionary review process, we look at the circulation pattern and we look at the City's bicycle and pedestrian connectivity. As well as obviously, the automobile connectivity and by – Park Boulevard is an established bicycle boulevard in the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. Generally, it's just – it's a good access management principle to limit the number of curb cuts proportionally to the size of the building. Then when you throw in the bicycle and pedestrian nature of Park Boulevard, we do try to limit the number of conflict points and every time you add a driveway you introduce new conflict points. It's not the end of the world if there are two driveways but we – if we are reevaluating the site, we'd like to start with one driveway given the size of the project. It's not the largest project in the world so that's something that we'll start with but two driveways are not the end of the world.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Mullin: You're welcome.

Chair Lew: I have another question for the Board Members. We do have – I think in one of our findings it's about compatibility with the adjacent residential uses. I think there were some comments about – I think Peter had it about maybe the vines would not be able to be maintained. Are there any – do any of the other Board Members have concerns about screening or any buffering of the – between the two uses?

Board Member Gooyer: I guess a couple – we're talking about the covered parking on the second portion. If these are – I agree that the way that those are designed, they are basically just a structural element to hold the planting up. It is true that – I don't -- I would probably suggest that if that's the case, then that becomes a little bit more integrated into the architecture. You could still put the landscaping on it but then if 2 or 3-years the landscaping dies, it doesn't become an eyesore. That it actually then blends with the architecture of the building so whether that means you use some to integrate screening or something that is on other parts of the parking structure.

Chair Lew: Then I did want to – Kyu, I think you had a question about the vines and the green screen. In my experience, typically you can actually get the vines to grow within a year or two if -- there's a big if. One is typically vines like to be in full sun and so when you put them in a shady location, I find basically you don't get any – often you don't get any growth whatsoever. Then the other thing is that you have to have the right amount of soil volume. The times when I've used it where trying to fit it in like a little 1-foot planting area, the vines start off initially and then they become stunted and they don't grow. Vines are actually very vigorous but the issue often is keeping them contained because often these species are – can grow 20 or 30-feet high. I didn't review all of the species in the landscape plan but I mean that's the typical case. Ok, is that for the Board? I think we allow usually a rebuttal period. Oh, Wynne, yes?

Board Member Furth: I would have trouble right now making the finding about circulation. It doesn't seem to me to work in too many different ways. It's an interesting point about the bicycle access and I have been looking at the landscaping again and looking at visibility because the problem always is that you're going in and out of driveways and in particular, bicycles shoot by so fast if you're gauging your – I didn't really look at it in terms of visibility triangles but it looks reasonably good. I think Kyu's point – sorry, Alex's point about – the Chair's point about integrating the landscaping with the grid landscaping that's emerging with other sites in the area is an important one. That would go a long way and the other thing is that I think that to me, the parking lot and the building don't seem – there's nothing that signals to me that this parking lot is for this building as opposed to the residential use next to it. I think that's really important for functional circulation. I spend too much time driving into the wrong driveway when I'm in strange places and there's a lot of strangers driving along Park because it leads you – because it's off a major arterial and because it leads you into a shopping district. So, it's a little different than if you were actually in the Research Park where you mostly get people who go there every day so that would matter to me along those lines. I'm concerned also that vines can be wonderful but they can also die really fast and it would be important that those structures look good with or without. I do think you might have a constituency for code enforcement if they didn't do well in the housing next door.

Chair Lew: Ok, so Tom do you have any follow-ups for us?

Mr. Gilman: Yeah, maybe just a – kind of a general question or point of clarification. I think as someone noted we did begin at one point, a couple years ago, with the building that had been more centered on the site. We had two accesses but we have been lead – pretty much as Staff has laid out just now to have one access and we can certainly modify the site in any number of ways. We've got the ability to come up with a variety of circulation on site. However, I believe that with one site access, I don't believe we're going to be able to eliminate entirely dead ends. Unless we were to rotate the building and have it run from street to the train at the back and have a broad width of the site to be about to circulate around and come out once. I think it's going to be difficult to not at least have a circulation behind the building. We're going to want them – I think that the design guidelines for this area really push for the idea of having as much integration and pedestrian activity and buildings that front the street and provide activity – visual activity and so on. So, yeah, I'm not keen on the idea of having a small amount of building but rather a broad amount of building so I'm just saying up front here that I feel like there's a little bit of conflict here. It sounded like there might be a little flexibility on a second exit, whether it's an exit only or whatever but I mean that's really truly the only way that I think we're going to avoid all dead ends. We can get close but I think we're still going to have some otherwise so that's just a comment.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean there's one item that would change this drastically is that is exactly like some of the people have said. If you drop the parking underground, then you end up with a whole lot more flexibility as far as the site. You could leave the building right where it is and come up with a fairly flea-like I said, I don't have a problem with let's say having one area where you have a dead end as long as you leave a couple area where you can actually turn around. The biggest problem I see with this one is that every one of them is a dead end so I mean you've got like five of these things out of five so that's the part that I have a problem with. If you said we made the other four works and there's one dead end just because, then I'd agree with you completely that it becomes a tossup of is it more favorable to have a single entry or exit if I have to put up with this dead end (inaudible). I'd have no problem with that but like I said, it's almost wanting it to for the parking to go underground just to give you more flexibility to do what you need to do at grade.

Chair Lew: Can I – also related to parking because I think – I mean to go underground, I think you've mentioned previously that it's very expensive and then I think the Board had not seen information about the COV plume and the TCE in the soil and if it's tier – what is it, tier one and tier two? There are different types of – two different – what do you call it? Disposal sites depending on the toxicity of the soil and the costs I think between the two are huge. I don't have personal experience on that but my understanding it's huge – there's a huge difference in that. So, we haven't seen it so we need to – we need more information on all of your thinking about that.

Mr. Gilman: Sure.

Vice Chair Kim: On the curb cuts, excuse me, I agree with Board Member Gooyer's comments that he just made. To me, in addition to that, I just see a huge point of congestion right at the entry to the site where if you have any kind of a backup, you're going to get cars waiting in the bicycle lane or cars trying to decide whether they are going to go up the ramp or to the right. So, I agree that if we can eliminate at least some of the dead ends and maybe move that point of congestion either further into the site or relieve the congestion overall, I don't think I have so much of a problem with just the one curb cut. As it is, I just see a potential for too many points of congestion.

Mr. Gilman: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Tom. I think that's – we don't have other items on this, although I do want to...

Vice Chair Kim: Minutes.

Chair Lew: I don't think we have the...

Board Member Gooyer: Do we have to move to...

Chair Lew: Oh, yeah. We need to move to continue this item. Anyone want to make a motion? Nobody wants to make...

Mr. Lait: Yeah, so I think we need a motion from the Board on that last item and I have some notes that I can offer to the record and the Board could say yes, that's headed in the right direction or strike or add some things if you wanted to articulate a motion to the applicant or do you feel like it's been done through the dialog? I mean that's the – we have a lot of ideas and to the extent that we can add a final point would be ideal.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne.

MOTION

Board Member Furth: I have two comments on that suggestion. One is that I'm missing the data to make a decision. I don't know – my perception presently is that the parking provided involves a lot of elusory spaces; that they are really quite difficult to get too and that the problem with circulation on the site is a significant one. I hadn't been thinking about the backup problem but when I look at how it all works, I think there's a good potential for tangling up that busy pedestrian/bicycle point. That's not going to help because it's also a busy car circulation place so I don't think the parking presently works. I don't know what the alternatives are that would work but I think what we have doesn't meet our standards. I'm also a bit uncomfortable about adopting a motion which says you should do x, y, z based on the partial information that we have now. I think it is very valuable for you when you get us to get on the record and line ourselves up but I don't like putting that into a motion. I would move that we continue this to a date uncertain unless the applicant wanted to ask us for further clarification on any points other than the garage and parking.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree. I mean having known the architect for 30-years, that he's more than competent to come up with a design I think and I think he understands what we're looking for. I agree, I was told from the very first day sat on one of these Boards, don't design it for the applicant. It's just not the way it should be done and I purposely don't want to do that. I don't want to say do this or do that or whatever. I think he understands that we're not happy with the circulation, we could live with say a dead-end situation based on the fact that you're limited to the one drive entry and so I don't think we need to explain that. I mean I don't want to put words into your mouth Tom but I'm guessing that you understand what we're looking for basically. I guess it took this time to make you understand that we were a lot more – it was a lot more critical to us I think than it came across probably the last time. I'll second your motion.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor? Opposed? Ok, so we will see you sometime before March 31st; that's the big deadline.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0

Approval of Minutes:

Chair Lew: I don't think we have any minutes, there's nothing on the agenda.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, Chair Lew, I know they are not on the agenda. They were sent to us for review and if I could just make a comment on them. That's, fine right?

Chair Lew: Sure, but I – you make a comment but I don't think we can vote on it.

Vice Chair Kim: Right so I just noticed that in a few of the items, I think they were items four and five I believe they were, we seemed to have gained a Board member and the votes were 6-0 but they should have been 5-0.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you.

Subcommittee Item

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Chair Lew: I did want to give the Board Members – all the Board Members an update on our schedule. It's not – I think that it's changed from what's in the – in your packets. So, the 16th, I think there's not going to be a meeting.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah, that's the latest. December 7th we are going to have a meeting and that's probably likely to be Verizon cell sites and then we may start – meet early because that's going to be Kyu's last meeting on the Board. We will have a meeting on 12/21 and we will probably have a new Board Member at that time if the Council votes on it. The Council vote is -- for Commissioners is next – is it next Monday? I think I was told it was the 13th and we do have items and there are items for that meeting.

Board Member Gooyer: Don't we also then have to elect a new Chair?

Chair Lew: Yes...

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) do that on the 7th I guess?

Chair Lew: No because the Board – the new Board Members won't begin until the 21st at the earliest.

Board Member Gooyer: 21st of December?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, I...

Chair Lew: So, we'll see what happens.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, we do it a year after and I forget – you know sometimes it floats a meeting or two but we can take a look at that and there's also sort of a Board management discussion about how you want to do your elections and when that takes place relative to new members coming in. We would plan on having it on the one-year anniversary at the last election at this point and I'll have to find out which date that is; it's coming up.

Chair Lew: Yes. Ok, we're adjourned, thank you.

Adjournment