



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: September 7, 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

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Just for the record, Board Member Gooyer is absent today and now is the time for oral communications. The public may speak to an item that's not on the agenda and I don't have any. I do have a speaker card for the first item.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Are there any agenda changes? No.

City Official Reports

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

Study Session

- 2. PRELIMINARY REVIEW, 375 Hamilton, Downtown Parking Garage [17PLN-00224]:** Preliminary Architectural Review of a New Five-Story Parking Garage with One Basement Parking Level with 1,709 sf of Ground Floor Retail, Bike Storage, and 331 Parking Spaces Located on a 29,164 s.f. Surface Parking Lot. Zone District: PF (Public Facilities). Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study has been Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act, for Which a Scoping Session was Held on May 31, 2017, With the Planning and Transportation Commission. For More Information Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Lew: Then let's go into the first item which is number two, which is a study session; preliminary review for 375 Hamilton downtown parking garage. Preliminary Architectural Review of a new five-story parking garage with one basement parking level with 1,709-square footage of ground floor retail, bike storage and 331 parking spaces located on a 29,164-square foot surface parking lot and the zone district in public facilities. The environmental assessment is an initial study has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA and a draft EIR will be prepared with the formal application. We have Amy French, our City Planning Official, welcome.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Good morning, thank you. Amy French. Today you are looking at three options in a study session format for a preliminary design for the downtown parking garage at 375 Hamilton. The slide on the screen has one and two options mislabeled so the one to the left is option two, the one to the right is option one and the one at the bottom is option three, as noted. Just a quick review, this is going to be going through a CEQA for environmental review. This did go to a scoping session with the Planning Commission and a meeting with the Council to confirm the direction of the project, which includes one basement level and they added a top level – an additional floor to maximize the parking on the site. The HRB reviewed this last week and now it's your turn. The Planning and Transportation Commission will be looking at a code amendment in October, October 11th, to modify the PF development standards that set forth the special setbacks and setbacks and floor area ratios and that kind of thing. So, there's going to be some amendments going forward to the Planning Commission and Council. We expect to see the application to come in, in about October and then the follow up will be the environmental review. This will all be going to the City Council, so your recommendation is to Council but not today; we're looking at direction. Just a quick recap, the HRB saw this last week, the packet page 13 does discuss what the HRB was asked to do; specifically, compatibility with nearby historic resources - there are three nearby historic resources - and to take a look at architectural review finding 2b to assist staff and the ARB. One member was concerned about the special setback encroachment and suggested that the City consider two basement levels and lopping off the top floor. Several members prefer the option one, which was the screen but with some openings in that mesh to give it more interest. They did note the benefits of the second story horizontal line on that option one with the colonnade that reflects the Post Office and they appreciated a step back at the upper floors and the desire for street trees on Hamilton was expressed. A couple folks talked about the Spanish/Mediterranean Revival style and thought that the tower might be an opportunity to express some of that Birge Clark iron work in some way. Just showing you the three nearby historic resources: we have a Victorian on the left with a turret there, we have the sport shop there which is coming forward at some point soon for rehab to more historic and potentially adding some residential on the top floor there. Then we have, of course, the Post Office across the street with its colonnade. These are the considerations at this time; we have finding 2b that looks at the compatibility and nearby historic resources. We also have the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines and there are two goals for the Hamilton Avenue District, and there are guidelines as well. I have those on the screen and they are in your staff report as well. One thing to note is that there is a look at the Hamilton frontage and we do have a bus stop there and we have the opportunity to widen the sidewalk. It's pretty narrow at this time so they are looking at putting a wider sidewalk there to match what's in front of that AT&T building next door. I am going to load the applicant's presentation and Holly Boyd with Public Works is the Project Manager.

Ms. Holly Boyd, Public Works: Hi, Holly Boyd, Public Works Engineering and I did have one correction. Originally our Council proposal was for five-stories above ground and when we went to Council in April, they actually added the below grade basement to the project so it's five above and one below, thanks.

Ms. French: Now we have Ken Hayes, who is going to give a presentation.

Mr. Ken Hayes: Good morning, Chair Lew and Members of the Board. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects and I'll be making a presentation on behalf of the team. There we go. I am joined by Watry Design this morning, Michelle Wendler and Gordon Knowles if there are questions about the specifics of the garage itself. The site, as we know, is a 29,000-square foot parcel on the corner of Waverley and Hamilton. It's an 'L' shaped parcel currently occupied by a City parking lot. In terms of the content, right across – this is Hamilton here and right across the street, we have the Palo Alto Post Office; a Category One historic structure, as well as a National Registry building located here. Then on Waverley Street, we have the Palo Alto Sports structure which is a Category Three. The Victorian house next to that is a Category Two and on the corner here at University Avenue and Waverley is the [Decoats] building and that's a Category Three historic resource. The property is currently zoned PF and surrounding properties on this side at least are primarily CDC, P, ground floor restricted uses. Across Hamilton, the ground floor restricted uses are not in (inaudible). At the rear along the property here is access from Waverley that is a one-way alley called Lane Twenty-One and it provides access to the back of CDS and the stores actually along Waverley here – the backs of those. There's also a parking space in

the back of Lot 84 I believe. These are views of the existing buildings in the neighborhood, we have the AT&T building that's about 74-75-feet tall. It has an interesting brick base to it and a big block on top. We have the All Saints Episcopal Church, which is primarily a building in the landscape. We have the Post Office which is the Category One historic building. We have 400 Hamilton, which is kind of a brick post and beam office building with some ground floor public space out front. A little bit closer in, the Post Office has the beautiful tile roofs, the arcade, it has some nice metal work that we can draw from, deep shades and recesses. Then along Waverley, we have the Palo Alto Sport Shop here, it's a little bit more modest and then the completely different Victorian building next to that. This ground floor area is all primarily retail or retail like, ending in this building here at 510 so our property is just to the left of that. The program is a four-story but five-level because we're parking on the roof, structure with the above ground with one level of basement parking; 330 stalls. The City dictated plus one stall to replace the stall that we would loosing at the back of Lot 84, which is located in here so that will have a stall in the parking structure for a total of 331. Council would like to see about 1,700-square feet of retail fronting on Waverley Street and they share a trash enclosure for the buildings kind of in this area. As well as a bike storage facility incorporated into the structure itself. The design constraints, we have setback issues here and then on this side here we've got to provide a solid wall with zero setback because opening penetrations would be an issue and so that's a solid wall. We have a 16-foot setback on the back of the building that fronts onto Bryant – Waverley Street and the reason for that is to provide some pedestrian access for utilities. We can bring our potential trash and that sort of thing out into this area but also it provides for protection of openings. So, create the open space there so the garage can be open and we're not impacting the windows that are in the backs of the existing buildings so it's kind of a dictated setback in that location. The same thing is true along this edge of the property and here's the property line but we're going to set 10-feet back so that we can have an open parking structure with unprotected openings and as you've probably noticed, the 510-existing building has windows on the property line. So, it allows for those to continue for light – daylight penetration into that existing building. Then we have a special setback along Hamilton of 7-feet located there with the AT&T building that is on that special setback. We have a requirement for 65 ¼-feet essentially to get the parking dimension to work and the dimension that we have is 66-feet so we have ¾-foot extra basically in that leg of the 'L'. In this leg of the 'L', we're required to have 87 ½-feet because of the two aisles of parking, as well as the driveway or the ramp and we have 90-feet and so we have about 2 ½-feet of extra space there that we'll be using essentially for articulating the façade. The garage is an open ventilated parking garage, other than the ground – the basement level, which will be mechanically ventilated but the floors above grade will all be designed as an open parking structure. So, we're required to have lots of openings in the walls, essentially around the perimeter and because of this wall being solid, as well as some others, being solid, that is a bit of challenge for this project. We have a 2-foot zone basically running around this edge where we can start to create some articulation and relief that's outside of the main structure of the garage so that's clear of the columns that support the garage. Auto access, this is the alley that's one-way in that direction coming off of Waverley heading over to Bryant and we're going to keep the entrances to the garage almost in the same place that it is today for the entrance for the parking so, we're eliminating all the access from Waverley Street. In terms of pedestrian access, we're trying to create an alley here and the alley will then turn and kind of create this zone in back of the Waverley buildings. The corner, sort of open court yard space is also a pedestrian focus and those both terminate on stair and elevator (inaudible) so both these locations will have stairs and elevators. Then the retail rhythm of the street will be maintained along that street edge and lacing the retail space here and that's about 1,700-square feet. So, in all the concepts before you, one through three today, the locations of vertical circulation of the entrance to the garage, those elements have stayed the same in all of the concepts. So, what we're looking at is different ways of the look and feel and expressing the form. We understand that we're going to have opportunities for pedestrian amenities and seating and that sort of thing long the ground floor. We can talk about that as we look at the alternatives. These are some, I guess local – this garage here, some presidents are over at Stanford. This is in San Jose and I think it's a (inaudible) garage and this is garage is Claremont, California. What I like about all these garages is that they are richly detailed and there's a lot of relief, a lot of shade and shadow with the deep recesses and so on and they kind of change character at night because of the use of metal screen in this particular garage here. This garage also has some metal screen here that becomes transparent at night. I like the outdoor spaces that are created here, as well as – this has a pedestrian zone retail space, basically on the

whole ground floor here and then a stair comes down into that space that leads you up into the first level of the parking. Way-finding is pretty obvious and very important in a public parking facility from being able to find where you are, know where you've parked your car and for safety reasons. So, the idea of the stairs being very well defined in all of these garages I think makes sense and so we're trying to incorporate that also into the building. Just some close up of ways of screening, this is a metal mesh and the reason for the metal mesh is it's very open. We achieve some sense of screening to create this feeling of a block or a mask but allow that transparency to take place for ventilation purposes. This is a metal mesh at the Epiphany, this is actually a brick screen wall and that could be very interesting perhaps on the ground floor because there's a lot of – if you will go back to the pictures of the context, 400 Hamilton is a brick masonry building; it's veneer. The AT&T building, a lot of brick and – I can't believe I'm almost out of time already.

Chair Lew: Ken, it's a study session so we can – you're – we only have one item on the agenda so...

Mr. Hayes: So, I don't want to rush, normally I start to rush at this point.

Chair Lew: We'll give you two more minutes.

Mr. Hayes: So, this is some ideas for mesh, whether it's a metal or brick. Obviously, the brick would probably be lower level and then this is some kind of a louver treatment. Concept one, the idea is to create the block of the garage and get that mass on the corner to sort of hold the corner relative to the AT&T building next door but incorporate a rhythm of arcade, let's say on the ground floor that is reminiscent of the Post Office, create a vertical stair element that is easily recognizable. So, this is the Hamilton façade and then the Waverley façade, we would continue the rhythm of the store fronts and try to create some form that relates to 510 Waverley next door and then it slowly transitions into the entrance of the parking structure. So, this is a view from Waverley looking towards the Post Office on the left. Opposite the entrance of the Post Office is essentially an entrance into the garage for pedestrians; the stair defines that. The height of the first two floors is defined here and it approximately lines up with the roof of the Post Office and then we would repeat that – the rhythm as we march down Hamilton. The garage entrance is approximately in the same location as it is today. We separated the garage from the AT&T building by about a 20-foot reveal so that there's a gap in the rhythm but it's also a screened gap. This shows opportunities for pedestrian seating and landscaping on the ground floor and then on the Bryant – I'm sorry, I keep saying, Bryant. On the Hamilton Street façade, that would actually wrap and this is the entrance to the pedestrian alley that takes you down – sorry?

Mr. Hayes: Waverley, what did I say the second time, Hamilton? Waverley. We're on Waverley Street and then the garages are shielded above. This stair comes down into a small court yard opportunity for seating; obviously, this could spill out here for retail purposes. The other concept picks up on the AT&T building where we try to express the mass a little bit more formally. We still have the gap here between the AT&T building and the parking garage. We tried to express some kind of artistic treatment of the ground floor that might be reminiscent of the metal work or the brick work or something that you might find on the Post Office. So, an opportunity actually, for an artisan to perhaps get involved at that ground floor and along Hamilton. Then along Waverley Street, it would be retail space on just that first level and expressed in that way. Same views looking towards the Post Office on the left, the stairs in the same place but a little bit different expression. You start to look at this post and beam kind of idea that you see on the diagonal corner at 400 Hamilton, the brick building. So, it starts to draw from a number of the neighboring buildings. You can see where we would -- could have this ground floor artistic metal work; bars or twisted rod iron or something that then could climb up the buildings. The HRB thought that could actually be incorporated into the stair in some way. We've picked up on the openings of the AT&T building, these just big extrusions that kind of protruding from the façade and thinking that this could be some kind of a metal mesh. Then, as we come down Waverley, this is the entrance again to the pedestrian area. A little bit more generous plaza and the stair comes down as a broader stair into that space but the actual area allocated is (inaudible) all of these concepts. Then the third concept is a little bit different so instead of using a metal mesh, we could use some kind of a louver approach to define the mass of the building above. Again, to hold the corner relative to the AT&T building and the downtown

plan. We would – this is kind of a hybrid, we would still pick up on this arcade of the Post Office on the first two floors here, the elevator and stairs all in the same location, the ground floor could be some kind of the brick mesh – the brick screening rather perforated wall or more of the metal work on the ground floor. On Waverley Street, we would again go back to a two-story expression to relate to the building next door and the ground floor retail that occurs there. Same view, the stair has turned into this option but it comes down to the same plaza here. However, the ground floor retail is expressed – this is this idea that these fins pick up on the terra cotta color of the brick across the street, the tile roofs both on Waverley and the Post Office. A view from the other direction with the entrance and then as it goes down the pedestrian alley. Then this plaza is setback even more because the stair has been turned so it's more open let's say, for that retail to spill out and create some seating opportunities. We see seating opportunities in these recesses as well. It's a great place to sit and look at a Category One historic resource across the street. Of course, there will be landscaping and so on and we're not yet at that point; this is more about the massing and that concludes my presentation. I look forward to your questions.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Ken. We're going to do the speakers, we have two public speakers and then get Board Member questions and comments. I do have one little announcement, is that the Castilleja School expansion was originally scheduled to be on the agenda today and they pulled it off of the agenda because of they...

Ms. French: The applicant requested a postponement and so we sent out notices and I think we did a pretty good job advertising the cancellation.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I just want to make sure that every – if anyone was tuning in and they were looking forward to that, that's what happened today. Ok, so we have two speakers, Elizabeth Wong and Roxy [Rap] and you each have 5-minutes.

Ms. Elizabeth Wong: Buenos Dias, (followed by statements in Spanish) The reason that I am saying this is because I grew up in Buenos Aires and Spanish is my natural language. So, every time I come and make a speech, I have this language impediment but I'll try to – not to tax your ears. So, this is the third time that I bring similar issues concerning this parking garage. We own – oh, what happens? Oh, we're the owners of the Lot number 85, which is adjacent to the parking garage and there are some things that are very important and I express three times, as I said before, and I was to bring it to the public's attention. They fall into two categories, one is at it relates to our – the next – the adjacent buildings and the second category is as it relates to the garage itself. Concerning the first category, I have a problem with the access for future residences at my buildings, as well as the adjacent building but I will speak only to my building. By making a walkway between the garage and the rear of Lot 85, you pretty choke the traffic – the car movement on that – in that stripe or in that parking space. One of the – we met with Amy French and Holly Boyd and one of the suggestions that came up -- and Brad [Eggleston] – one of the suggestions that came up was the idea of tunneling a path from the underground parking to the underground of Lots 85 and 84 so that it can provide onsite parking for future residences. I believe this is a concept that has been used in the City before and it was said that it was – at the meeting that it was used at the City before and I would like to very strongly for you to consider that opportunity. Otherwise, we are landlocked and there will never be any development – any residential development at those sites. The second issue also concerns that so-called walkway and if they called it a driveway, then I would imagine that they would allow us car access to the back of the building and why do we need the access to the back of the buildings? Ok, those spaces are or has been restaurants ever since I can remember. We have owned them for 15-years or 20-years and even before we bought them, they were an Italian restaurant and with restaurants, you have constant cleaning of grease traps, which is extremely messy. You have (inaudible) that come and de-grease the hoods and the air conditioning system and all those trucks need access to the rear of the building. Right now, at that walkway, you have the dumpsters in the new design and you – the waste – (inaudible) waste will have to have access to those dumpsters. What we're requesting is that our trucks that we need for the functioning of the business, be allowed to come in and do the services that they have been providing for years. Then there is the issue of deliveries so right now you have almost no loading zone around this area and the reason is because the existing

parking lot is being used as a delivery zone. When you take that – when you build a new structure, all these delivery people – oh, how long do I have?

Chair Lew: You used up your 5-minutes but – we – I think the Board read all of your emails too but if you could just wrap up – try to wrap up quickly but we have read your emails.

Ms. Wong: So, the loading zones don't work because you have – not only do the loading zones and the garage service the Waverley buildings, they also service Apple and CVS. Well, I want to briefly tell you about my objections to the new design of the garage. I think it's super massive, I suggested that they put two levels of underground parking, and four above ground but instead they are having five levels of parking. I think that the screens are atrocious, there's no reason at all to have screens in a – for parking. You are protecting the cars where you should be protecting the stair well where people walk from the inclement weather and glass in the stair well would be a really great addition; leave it open. Make it an organic garage, alright, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Ms. Wong and Roxy Rapp

Mr. Roxy Rapp: Thank you. Roxy Rapp, 265 Lytton and I also happen to own the building on the corner of Waverley and University. I have two – well, first I want to say I support the garage one hundred percent. I think it's great the City wants to do and develop it and it's the center of town and I think it will be really used a lot. The biggest problem I have is it's not big enough and as you know, we took employee parking out of the neighborhoods and we're having a tremendous problem downtown. Especially with the restaurant workers that are not being able to find parking and it's starting to have an impact on our vacancies at restaurants and turning over now. I think this would be a great opportunity for the City to do something about employee parking. I think definitely you should go deeper, you should go two floors and there's no problem. Lot GNL has three-floors and I think you should go higher and make the top and maybe the bottom extra floor employee parking. You could do it with a gate and it would be terrific to be able to have employees to be able – close to their job and park and not have to circulate or be put way out on the – further out and have to come in. I think you should definitely try to encourage that. The second thing is I would encourage you to have Ken talk to the owners of – especially the new owner of the Toy World building and see what his plans are in the futures. I'm pretty sure he plans to go up and do something really nice there. That's the [Thorwt] family and it's run by Jon Shank and then the Brad [Hicken] family, who are another very good developers in town, I think you should try to find out what's going to go on there just to be able to have a whole picture of what's going to happen there in those two major properties that are supporting the development. I can't encourage you enough to try to get City Council and the Commission to accept higher than 50-feet and to go lower. I think it's a great opportunity for the City and I would hate to lose it, thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you, Mr. Rapp. Let's move onto Board Member questions, I'm sure we have lots of questions. Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, good morning. A question for architect Ken Hayes regarding the 10-foot setback between the garage and the Thai Pan buildings is it possible to reduce...

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Excuse me, I'm sorry one second.

Board Member Baltay: My understanding is that you need that setback to allow the wall of the garage to be open for ventilation purposes but is it possible to reduce that setback? If it weren't a pedestrian alleyway, could it be closer to 5-feet? As I read the code it seems to have some flexibility there.

Mr. Hayes: I think for the amount of openings that we need, we need 10-feet because we can't make it work with twenty-five percent, right? This is Michelle Wendler.

Ms. Michelle Wendler: Yes, Michelle Wendler from Watry Design, so when we have the 10-feet, we're allowed to have all of those be unprotected openings on that side. If we make it 5-feet, we can only have

twenty-five percent of the area and we need all of that area to make up the difference because we're so solid along the AT&T side and because of working with the openings around the rest of the façade.

Board Member Baltay: So, it's a matter of how many – what percentage of openings you can have.

Ms. Wendler: Correct.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Some question for Staff, these are – I doubt you will have the answers today but this is a very interesting corner of course and it's architecturally fascinating; context I should say. So, I'd like to know more about the history of All Saints. Do I mean All Saints or All Souls? All Souls – All Saints, whatever. The Episcopal Church across the corner and I'd like to know more about the AT&T building, particularly as it moves up towards Bryant. It has that elaborate brick façade, it's got arches, it's got the diagonal roof fading into the building's rectangular block and I'd like to know what happened there? Why is it like that? Who designed it? What's it for? Then I would like to understand more about the legal rights that the property owners facing on Waverley adjacent to this site might have. I understand that we have our own principles that say we're supposed to be – any structure going up is supposed to be respectful of what's around it but I'm curious as to what kind of actual entitlements for access anybody might have – any of those property owners might have. I am also curious about the extensive use of Lane, whatever it is, Twenty-One, for trash bins. My understanding is that that's not what those lanes are supposed to be used for. That means that the buildings have to be designed to have them somewhere else and in thinking about what I would think that this design should be accommodating or making space for, I would – it would matter to me whether those present uses are essential but probably in violation of local rule or something the City wants to continue or something we think over time might change. This is not a question but one of my concerns here is that we would be trying to accommodate buildings that aren't long for this world in their present form and so that's going to be something that I'm going to be thinking about a lot. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne, can you clarify what you're looking for on the All Saints Church?

Board Member Furth: Some discussion in the Environmental Review of what that buildings history is and what it's designed is and whether it is of (inaudible).

Chair Lew: Oh, ok, interesting. It's been – there's been a Church there as long as Palo Alto and they tore down the original church which is originally something more like St. Thomas Aquinas and that size of wood – a little wood building. Then they built the concrete building to accommodate their congregation. On the – just so you – also, on the AT&T building, that use to be a – the taller piece use to be a mid – just classic mid-century building and then in the 80's, I remember when they sort of annexed the building next door and they added all of the brick – yeah, towards Bryant. They added all of that brick work at that same time and the angle, that was all done at the same time, that's my recollection. Then also on this particular site of the garage, there was a Church, it was the first Congregational Church and it was a big shingle style Church right on the corner with a big oak tree. Yeah, the current – the existing parking lot.

Board Member Furth: Oh, and I have one other question for Staff. There's an oak tree on site, is that too small to be protected?

Ms. French: I think it is a protected tree so – but that's what the environmental review is going to cover.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, it's a protected tree.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Hayes: It's the one out...

Vice Chair Kim: Could you come and speak into the mic for the record, please.

Mr. Hayes: This is Gordon Knowles with Watry Design.

Mr. Gordon Knowles: Hi, good morning and I am Gordon Knowles with Watry Design. The Arborist report has looked through the trees in the Bay Area and I think the tree that you're talking about is a protected tree. The Arborist report is that it's been previously damaged and isn't in good condition. Though we could try and protect it and we've looked at options of possibly even moving the tree. He doesn't feel that – actually, with the damage the is to the tree, it would be viable to save as part of the process.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have some questions for Staff. I guess on the 10-foot passageway that's being proposed, has there been any thought about the passage way design? I was looking at the Cowper – the Webster and Cowper Street garage and it has about a 10-foot passage with an arbor and lighting and vines and signage. I was wondering if anything like that was considered for this site?

Ms. French: The last sheet of the set would be the sheet to refer to as to the thinking thus far and perhaps Mr. Hayes would have any...

Mr. Hayes: I really don't think we've given it a whole lot of thought yet. They should a paving pattern right now or I'm sorry, we show a paving pattern right now but that whole space needs to be studied on how it relates to the garage, how it pulls people down to the elevator and the stair and that sort of thing. There will be eyes on that space and I mean there are windows into the adjacent building and then the parking garage would be primarily open at that level.

Chair Lew: I would say the living wall is a really interesting idea. I've looked at some of the ones in San Francisco and they are really beautiful; like the one at [SF Moma] is really gorgeous and there's also the one at the private school near California. I would just be – I guess my concern on that is just the scale of having a very tall wall of the garage and I mean that's – I would be interested in seeing something that breaks down the scale. So, if you're thinking of a living wall, is it only two-stories or would you think it would be even taller? That would be my question, is real – you know you've got something – basically, you've got something 10-feet wide and 50-feet high and that's like a mid-evil street so I would be curious to see how you mitigate the scale on that. I have some questions on the – I was wondering if Staff could maybe talk a little bit about how the City is going to manage the parking because I attended the Council hearings and I do understand that there's some discussion about changing how garages are used. Is there any thought and it's not necessarily the Board's purview but I just want to say that there have been larger discussions out there about permits or attendance or what not and – or active monitoring systems.

Ms. Boyd: Yeah, so we are – this garage is going to have a parking way finding to help guide people to open spaces to they will be able to tell on each floor which spaces are available. I – at this point, we don't – I don't know what the Transportation Division and Planning is going to decide regarding how many permit spaces various public spaces; that hasn't been discussed. I know for transportation they have been discussing for future garages – we show in the plan that there are provisional gates at the entrances that may be added later for future pay for parking but again, that hasn't been decided on.

Chair Lew: Then I have a question on the – the plans are showing a bike station and is that intended to be similar to the outdoor bike racks or is this something else like a supplement to the existing – to the bike share system?

Ms. Boyd: This – the desire for the bike station was requested by the Transportation Division and they want it to be similar to what’s at the University Caltrain Station lot, where it’s a key access and a secure station but no attendant though.

Chair Lew: Also, a question for Staff, on Lane – what is it? Lane Twenty-One, so the alley there, does – has Staff received any complaints on how that functions from the various businesses in its current configuration? Do we know anything about how it works? I mean there’s a lot of dumpsters and I walked through yesterday and there are lots of dumpsters which is pretty normal for our alleys downtown but it’s only 15-feet wide. So, it’s narrower than some of our other ones so what do we know about that?

Ms. French: Well, we’ve – over the years there have been code enforcement cases like people putting pallets out and this kind of thing. This is true of many of the alleys downtown, we – people – there are dumpsters and as buildings re-develop, we ask that people provide trash enclosure rooms and then it becomes please use those for the trash instead of for something else. In this project, they are proposing the trash enclosure to handle the trash from those three – two or three businesses there on Waverley...

Ms. Boyd: As well as the trash from the retail on our parking garage site.

Ms. French: Then we still have the CVS pharmacy and the other uses there and Starbucks etc. on University that has a need for placing detritus in the alley.

Chair Lew: Then my last question is regarding the special – the 7-foot special setback on Hamilton and I know we have that on many of the streets downtown and it was originally used to widen the streets. It’s come up before on other projects on Hamilton – on several projects on Hamilton and I was wondering what – you’re proposing to change the zoning for this zone or were you thinking that it would be a variance and there would be findings for a variance for this?

Ms. French: This is part of a larger discussion that will be with the Planning and Transportation Commission and Council, and that is for City public or for City parking garages that go below grade in a setback and above grade in a setback. This would be a change to the Public Facilities Zone Development Standards for this particular use. In this case, the Public Facility Zone Standards require a 20-foot setback on any street, which is actually wider than the 7-foot special setback. Yes, the original intent of the special setbacks was to widen the streets and that plan has not, since the 1950’s, come forward to widen Hamilton, but in this case with the geometries of the lot, it’s really tough to meet that 7-foot setback and so they are requesting the 5-foot encroachment and we’ll do that through a zoning, legislative decision by Council.

Chair Lew: Yes, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: What would the setback be if this was a commercial development on this site?

Ms. French: If it was a commercial zone? Oh, 7-feet.

Board Member Furth: If we (inaudible) looking at the adjacent uses that we have there. The retail and whatever...

Ms. French: Yeah, it would be a 7-foot special setback on Hamilton.

Board Member Furth: From the property line?

Ms. French: Right, not a 20-foot.

Board Member Furth: But absent that special setback, if we already had as wide as the street (inaudible) because (inaudible) it’s zero setbacks?

Ms. French: Correct.

Board Member Furth: Thanks.

Board Member Baltay: In the same...

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: ...(inaudible), what would the setbacks be regarding the 16 and 10-foot walkways to the adjacent commercial buildings if this were a standard commercial development in a CDC zone, would those setbacks be required?

Ms. French: There would be no setbacks required in the CDC zone, which this is not going to be changed to a CDC zone but yeah, to compare. We can have – if you'd like for formal review so you can understand - a comparison between the CDC – if it were a commercial building in the CDC, if you'd like that.

Board Member Baltay: It's ok, I'm just trying to understand what – where these parameters have come from because they are restrictive on the design.

Chair Lew: Ok, Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Could you explain how the trash will be picked up from the trash enclosure?

Ms. Boyd: So, I've been in talks with our refuge group and the trash collector will come down Lane Twenty-One...

Vice Chair Kim: So, a truck can navigate down Lane Twenty-One?

Ms. Boyd: Yeah, they do because they have to pick up all the trash from Starbucks and everything.

Vice Chair Kim: I didn't know if they came down Lane Twenty-One or if they actually access the parking lot.

Ms. Boyd: I think they probably do both to come down the parking lot for the three buildings here for frontage but there's quite a lot of trash bins along the University front – businesses as well.

Vice Chair Kim: To me, it seems like perhaps the enclosure doors should then be facing Lane Twenty-One and not the pedestrian access but perhaps – I don't know. Was there a reason the doors are facing the pedestrian alley as opposed to the Lane?

Ms. Wendler: (Inaudible), we have a couple different things happening on the frontage to Lane Twenty-One. One is we have a mechanical exhaust duct coming up from the basement that needs to discharge out that direction, that's what's on the left corner. Then we have the access – the vehicular access – right next to that is a sheer wall and we have very limited places to put our seismic shear wall elements in this building. We've squeezed that into that particular location and so we imagine that the dumpsters would be pulled out and around that sheer wall.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: No other questions? We're going to go to Board Member comments. Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I have three general rounds of ideas/directions/ thoughts for this. The first one has to do with the overall site planning and so overall, I agree that it makes sense what you have here. I'm wondering if it wouldn't – I'm questioning the 10-foot pedestrian alley between Waverley Street and (inaudible). I think it's going to feel very tight and I think that if you were to reduce that to

more like 5-feet, you could actually get a greater setback along Hamilton, which I think would be really a good thing. I think that the – when I look at the guidelines for the Hamilton Avenue again, it's asking for a pedestrian connection from Hamilton through to University somehow. My office is very close to this site and I walk past it several times a day and the pedestrian traffic cutting from the corner of the AT&T building through – behind Prolific Oven and out to University is pretty intense. I mean I would say every 30-seconds somebody is walking through there and I don't think that's going to change. What you're going to have – the way this is designed is people walking through the parking lanes to make that same connection. Secondly, I'm very empathetic to the businesses in like the Thai Pan, Prolific Oven, whatever happens to the Toy Sport building and that they just need some means to service their business functions. It's true that they are perhaps not legally entitled to that use of that land but if we take that away, they are just going to be trying to access things off of the diagonal parking on Waverley Street; which is really a hit to the community and that's just not an attractive thing. So, I think we have to (inaudible) somehow, which means that pedestrian access has to be somehow functional.

Mr. Hayes: At the back of those buildings?

Board Member Baltay: At the back of those buildings and I think that we just – unfortunately, we just have to accomplish that and I don't know if it's 16-feet or 20-feet. You're very sympathetic again, to the – you got to make the parking spaces work and that's not – there's no squeezing on that and it has to work. The thought process is that could that pedestrian access goes clear out to Hamilton and then remove the pedestrian connection – 10-foot connection over to Waverley Street. That's a – not one of your options here but looking at that, I think that that's the pedestrian connection you need and...

Mr. Hayes: To force people through the garage you're saying?

Board Member Baltay: Essentially come up with a very creative garage design where you also have a pedestrian connection through. I say that because I think that's what's going to happen. If you go through a number of garages downtown today like the one over on the corner of Lytton and I think it's Waverley again. There's a lot of pedestrian traffic just cutting these corners, working their way through; it's a tight urban area. I think it's going to happen regardless and maybe there's a creative way to get that connection and keep your parking functionality and better serve these businesses that are going to be impacted. It also better meets the guidelines of pedestrian connection from Hamilton and I think the 10-foot alleyway out to Waverley is really just going to be a dark, almost dangerous tight alley. That's also duplicated by Lane Twenty-One cutting through adjacent to it. In that same vein, I'm really struck that there's the little corner back there where the alley jogs and there are two other buildings that are very likely or three to be redeveloped...

Mr. Hayes: Right here?

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, and it feels to me that on one hand, we're dealing with an incomplete set of information here because the City really could look into more of what is going to happen with the buildings in that area? Then is there an opportunity to create some sort of a micro plaza back there, some sort of -- what you would find in a European City. A little pedestrian area way or something where again, you mix the pedestrian with the functional needs but right now it's not being thought about and we're developing it in reaction to what local businesses do. When we're developing a garage like this, it's the opportunity for the City to try to take that into control. You do have one little green space indicated back there but if you go back on these alleys during the day and the evening, it's remarkable how many people – a guy taking a cigarette break, a couple having an argument, a person who is pulling off the sidewalk to do something. These alleys are used but they are not designed and it's incumbent upon us as architects, as City planners to take that into account and maybe we can do something more back there. Again, my thoughts about the planning of this are that the 10-foot alley at Waverley, I don't think works and I think you're missing an opportunity to make an important connection to Hamilton. My second set of thoughts really had to do with – I guess I confessed to my fellow Board Members that I've just been struggling on trying to understand the importance of the historic aspect of all the buildings around this. Clearly, the Post Office is an important building and the Historic Resources Board seems to – when I

listened through to their discussion, they seem to say that they like the idea of some sort of element on the garage that mimics the height of the eave; that second story line. I think Wynne pointed out very (inaudible) that the Church across the street is a very interesting and striking building that doesn't seem to have been considered. I guess I'm just really feeling like the ARB is in a bit of a vacuum here on understanding how much should we be considering? Should we be treating this Birge Clark building across the street as some sacrosanct thing that we have to respond to or can we ignore it? What I am sort of hearing everybody eludes to is we need to pick up some of the details; maybe some metal detail or maybe an eave line. The best idea I heard was what architect Hayes mentioned in the past meeting that by having a bit more of a setback from the parking garage, you have a place where you can see and look at this wonderful building. I have to say that I walk by that Post Office several times a day and I always look at it and it always brings a smile to my face. Maybe that's the best way to respect this because I'm not sure by putting some clever iron detailing that's of our time, modern, but still eluding back to that and that it's going to work or that it's really a historically appropriate. I don't think we want to put a bunch of masonry arches or a tile roof on this building. What I am finding though is that there doesn't seem to be quite enough discussion about how we're fitting into the history or what we want it to be doing. I really wish on the historic resources level that somebody really understood the history of this was coming forward saying this how we ought to be approaching it because I think again, we're reacting in small levels to it. With that said I did, in walking around, come to one idea that I think the Post Office and the Wells Fargo building and the Church have in common a sense of an enclosed outdoor spaces; the arcade along the Post Office, the covered two-story portico on the Wells Fargo building. The Church has wonderful outdoor spaces around it and it leads me to think that the stair tower on the corner is an opportunity for what I would call an enclosed vertical space and I understand that there's some concern about wanting it to be safe by being visible. At the same time, I think that that's the one place Ken, where I think you're failing on the design; it just looks industrial and scary to me. If I were coming down with my kids, I'd really hold their hands tight.

Mr. Lait: Excuse me, Board Member Baltay. Chair, if you don't mind, I'd like to take a break and just discuss a procedural matter with the Chair. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok, so we're going to take a 5-minutes break and sorry about that.

Board Member Baltay: No, problem.

Board Member Baltay: So, I apologize to everybody but it appears that I might have a conflict of interest in this project so I'd like to recuse myself from any further participation at the moment while I check with the City Attorney. So, at this point, take what I said with a grain of salt and I might be back later but at the moment I am going to recuse myself from participating, thank you.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Lew: We do have to wait till he actually leaves the room and then I think we'll go to Board Member Kim.

Vice Chair Kim: Alright, so this is a study session so I'll just kind of go out of order. I also agree that – I feel strongly that the City should look at two underground levels and really try to max out the parking lot as much as possible with a certain sense of responsibility to the mass and scale with the neighbors. When I look at some of these elevations, especially the Waverley elevations and seeing those building outlined in the background, I don't see why adding another story to the top and also the underground levels would be that detrimental. I was also thinking if – and looking at seeing if there are ways to maybe reverse the ramp such that perhaps the portion – perhaps there's on a half sixth level that is up against the AT&T building. That way it would still remain five levels at the Waverley Street elevation and I realize there are complications with possibly reversing the ramp and so on and so forth but just kind of ideas that I was thinking through. Another thing that I think is missing currently that will – that could eventually play into the design of this is the solar canopy. I know it's been mentioned in some of the

sections and I'm just wondering isn't there a possibility for that solar canopy to kind of tie itself into the design of the elevation of this garage as well, rather than it being kind of an afterthought and stuck on.

Mr. Hayes: Actually, can I have Michelle just address that real quick (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, it's a study session so I think that's fine.

Mr. Hayes: I know this is comments but...

Ms. Wendler: Just currently in our program and in the budget, solar panels are not in the project. Although we are designing it for the future possibility to add the solar panels into the project. So, looking at the architectural (inaudible), that's possible but it's currently not in the project that was given by Council.

Vice Chair Kim: Well, I'll just say for the record that I feel that that's a huge shame...

Ms. Wendler: (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: ...and that's a disservice to the public and to this building project actually. Moving on, some other comments that I have with regards to the circulation of the garage. I think there are some things that bother me enough, such as these dead-end aisles on every floor. If I am coming up the ramp and I need to – there are basically these dead ends that die into the Lane Twenty-One area of each floor of the ramp except for the first floor. I was also thinking that perhaps the entry and exit from Lane Twenty-One maybe that can only be an exit only. I don't know if we want to encourage the public to access Lane Twenty-one from Waverly just to enter the garage. That would also free up those extra two stalls that could be deleted or may have to be deleted if that – the (inaudible) for entry from Lane Twenty-One as well. I was also – you know looking over the different options, at first, I really appreciated the options one and three where you have this taller arcade element that kind of relates to the Thai Pan building but listening to the discussion and reading emails of possibilities of redevelopment along that Waverley set of buildings there. I'm wondering if that's a strong enough element that the parking garage should try to tie itself into, especially if that building is going to get redeveloped or changed. For now, I mean I guess if we're assuming that building is going to be staying the way it is, I do like the way that it ties into that. So, the element that ties into that is the retail and I'm a little bit concerned about the proportions of the retail space as far as the depth and the height. It doesn't appear that the first floor of the parking garage is any taller and I know that retail has preferred heights. I did read in the Staff report that perhaps it's a florist or some other kind of specific retail that may not require the height but I just want to put it out there as a comment. Also, looking at the bike station, I notice that there's an intake right in front of the bike station entry. In my opinion, I don't know what the intake is going to look like but sometimes it can make for a situation where it really turns people off from wanting to enter and exit that bike station. I think the City's desire to have a bike station there is great and wonderful but we should try to make that entry and exit experience a little bit more favorable to the people that are using it. I also wanted to make a note on the different stairs that you are showing at the corner of Waverley and Hamilton. While I've personally preferred the overall design scheme of option three, I felt that the stair kind of dying into the wall as you come down on the street level probably wasn't favorable. I do prefer something like option one or two where they kind of exit out onto either street as opposed to the wall of the parking garage/retail area. Then in the future, as this comes back as a preliminary review or a formal application, I'd liked to see some 3-D views of the alley ways and I realize that they are still under developed but I think those are important for us to see. I think those are – that's it as far as my initial comments.

Mr. Hayes: Great, thanks, Vice Chair Kim.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for the presentation. I did watch the Council's deliberations on this and so it did seem much of the Staff report in the study presented to them and it was a very impressive amount of thinking and research that has gone into this. I know this area very well because I've lived near it but not within 500-feet of it, for 18-years. I patronized the Post Office and CVS and Prolific Oven and all those areas; the farmers market so that's of great interest to me. First, I started thinking about the context and you know that one of my concerns is that we don't seem to be thinking about the church across the street; heavily used outdoor space. Those – that's not just a – a kind of not to well-kept front lawn, that's an assembly space and their court yard goes in and out, it's going to be sort of across the street from this and that should continue to be something desirable. Another thing that I wanted to say about context is what I think of as the Wells Fargo building. It is kind of classic Wells Fargo in the sense that it's red brick but the building is fascinating because it is set way back with those big elaborate porches, terraces, galleries, and large elements that come over planters. It's also really impressive if you ever use the ATM there because the flowers are at shoulder height so instead of having flowers at knee level with cigarette butts in them, you have really impressive landscaping that is a pleasure to be around. With respect to the Birge Clark Post Office which I understand we owe to Lou Henry Hoover, just like the Girl Scout House, because she had her husband call the then President of the United States and say no, we're not having federalist here. We have a very good local architect and so we got this building. However, if you look at the entry, it's true that it's shades of, I guess stucco. It's very square and it has what looks like a national recovery act eagle on it. I think that's the most – so it's very a steer and rectangular. I realize that it's round but it looks very squared off and formal. We seem to have a lot of volunteer trees in front of the Post Office and it's all great to look at. I think Council Member Filseth pointed out that one of the pleasures of walking down Waverley and along this parking lot and generally, it's a hot, glary, unpleasant corner with a restroom, is that you get to see that entry. So, I think preserving to the extent possible the ability to see that portion of the building would be valuable. Not that the rest of the building isn't lovely but it's lovelier as experienced. I'm also concerned that when we spend these many, many millions of dollars, we don't spend too much time and money and design compromising important project goals for buildings that may not stay long or that logically under our existing zoning will change. Then I thought a lot about the current functions of this surface parking lot and one of the things that I think I see is that this is a place that I can always find a parking place. It would be nice to pretend I never drive over there but I do; often on my way home from somewhere else and I can always find a parking place. There's always one or two spaces available and if there aren't, there will be within 90-seconds. So, an important part of this in supporting retail, is quick in and out parking, which is not served by having a whole bunch of electric charging stations on the ground floor, in my view. I won't say anything about the urge to key Tesla's while trying to find a parking place but I don't – I think we should think about what – by definition, you don't use charging stations for a 5 to 15-minute stop. They should be somewhere else, put them in the basement, (inaudible). The other things that I've been thinking a lot about – I mean actually complaining to Staff a lot about for years is there is no bicycle parking. You guys want to me to ride my bike but I end up climbing through the Algerian Ivy or lifting my bike up onto the bumpers – the curb next to the cyclone fence next to the AT&T building because there is nowhere to put a bike unless you want to trip people on their way into CVS. So, I think quick in and out (inaudible) parking is also important. I don't need a bike station for running into CVS for 15-minutes so I think bike stations – more secure parking might be important but I also think that accessible, in fact, I'm sure it is for some people, places to park are an important part of this. You know you're just across the street from the farmers market and that's the other big function that happens around here. The front of the AT&T building is a major place for workers to take breaks because there are benches – seating areas integrated into it and as members of the public pointed out, you can look – it's got a good view, you look across at an attractive place. There's great landscaping on the parking lot across – what is the name...

Mr. Hayes: (Inaudible)(crosstalk).

Board Member Furth: Hamilton, that's more fabulous landscaping so it really makes it an inviting place. So, I'm expecting to see great landscaping with flowers, which brings out the point that if you're going to have a living wall, I want to see the endowment that goes with it. I love the [SF Moma] living wall, which among other things features Agapanthus growing out horizontally but that must cost a great deal of time

and energy and expertise to maintain. The last thing that I guess I want to say about context is all those corners go in and out – let your eye go into the building, let's you walk along and still see the street but be in a protected way. I'm sure that All Saints doesn't have the kind of maintenance budget it would like and that's not a great wild life habitat on the corner yet and I know it's heavily used for their purposes but these are inviting spaces for the eye. They let you go in and out and I think that would be important to have here. I also want you to show me designs that are going to let me see the corner towards the bay of the Post Office as soon as possible as I walk up Waverley. I think if you are going to have 50-story buildings, you need at least some 40-story – 40, sorry, 40-foot architect – landscape elements. Whether they grow up from the bottom or not and I am not in favor of maintaining trees that we think are not going to make it in the longer run. Pedestrian access is interesting, it is a heavily used area, however, I don't think the alley from Waverley may be heavily used by people who work there, by people who are making deliveries, by people who are doing service work or servicing these buildings. As far as I can tell, pedestrian walk through CVS, you know you just walk – you come straight out of the sidewalk on University, you walk through CVS, you walk through the parking lot and you're over here. I am not in favor of a walkway from Waverley that's shared with motor vehicles, I don't think that's a walkway. I'm also not really in favor of a 10-foot wide walkway with 50-foot walls next to it. So, I tend to think that it – that space would be much better used on the Hamilton front of the building. I'm perplexed by the staircase and generally, I like the idea of visible staircases but I may be having trouble understanding how these staircases work and look but I think we have some less than successful parking lot stair cases in town. I'm not particularly fond of the one across the street from – gosh, which park?

Mr. Hayes: The one on Bryant?

Board Member Furth: Yes, there's seems to be consensus on this point. It doesn't work, I mean it seems askew, I don't see people using it, it's hot when it's sunny, it's wet when it rains. I'm very familiar with the Claremont parking garage.

Mr. Hayes: So am I.

Board Member Furth: I spent more time, Ken. You were just visiting your daughter but I was one of the people who put together the redevelopment agency. What works is the broader shallow steps of the lower level and they are kind of gracious, they invite you in but it's because they are wide and relatively shallow and they only go part way and then it gets a little more whatever. That is an incredibly busy parking lot and you are never up there by yourself. It is always occupied because that's a retail zone with a hotel across the street and a train track on the back. I don't particularly like the stair cases – the look of the stair case coming out towards the street but I don't know what should be done but I don't like the way these things appear to the point of where I wondered if they should be tucked up against the AT&T building instead. So that you could have more setback for greenery and view, I don't know but I do think if you can move the building back another 5-feet that will help. Retail, I didn't read the City Council to say that they wanted 1,700-square feet of retail. I heard them say they wanted retail that was functional, that was going to be highly (inaudible) and desirable for some kind of use and I do understand the paradox that as you make it bigger, it generates some parking demands. I think we have seen sort of token commercial when we have districts that require commercial. That's not really what's driving the redevelopment and then we get commercial that we're quite skeptical about so it would be important to know that this is designed for real world, successful retail or whatever other permitted use we have in that area. I'm also concerned about the lack of public restrooms facilities there. I think they are hard to design into parking garages but it's a long way to the nearest restroom. The (inaudible) I mean there is actually one somewhere if you finding it in the Wells Fargo building but it's a long way so I would be interested in that. I don't know if it's possible to essentially say we think the pedestrians can't be bothered to walk around the corner which is now going to be lovely and attractive with benches and plantings. That that's -- that the cut through basically should be satisfied by cut (inaudible) – I mean from the policy that encourages inter-block pedestrian connection. If we just need to be sure that that's designed so that when in fact people cut through that, which they are going to do all the time, it's reasonably safe for them to do so. I don't know how you do that but it's important. Let's see, I have a whole bunch of notes. The other thing is that this is a really interesting project because the City is

struggling to maximize and budget desirability. Desirable things including the number of parking spaces and we've had to make serious compromises and have – the Council has in the past. If you look at Heritage Park, Staff didn't recommend Heritage Park. Staff said Heritage Park is too expensive, the neighborhood went bezerk and we have Heritage Park and I don't think anybody regrets it and we were able to attract private funding to develop it. More on point, the Opportunity Center was a site both graced and constrained by great big trees and we were looking at building not only low-income housing but no income housing on that site. Every unit is precious and I think we sacrificed two to three to preserve the trees and I think it's been totally worth it. So, I would bear that in mind when thinking about how this works. I do hope that this redevelopment lets us make the existing alley work better for whatever it needs to work for. I'm not sure that casual pedestrian cut through is going to be much of it but I don't know. In terms of the designs, I found the rectangular window attachments unconvincing. The AT&T building is very formal, everything is balanced, symmetric and I don't know if they used the golden mean but it's very formal and I don't know think quoting it works at all. I also don't think quoting other elements necessarily works but I do notice the great – the preponderance of creamy stucco and brick and tile and those might be things to learn from. I went to Stanford in the 60's and we had the original Richardson Romanesque and then we had to use the technical term really stupid buildings that had a lot of yellowish stucco with little tile veneer roofs on top. Most of which have now been torn down because they started to just build well design buildings that because of their setbacks, their landscaping, their parapet heights, and their materials complimented those existing buildings and respected them; that's more of what I am looking for. I do sort of like the idea of a different element – a different thing going on lower down. This is a very tall structure new to a very tall structure and I kind of have liked, at least in the drawings that we've seen, the idea of something lighter at the top. I mean I'm certainly not looking for five-stories of stucco.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Furth: On the 50-foot height limit, that's a Council directive, that's a voter directive, right? That's a ballot measure.

Ms. French: The 50-foot height limit in the City is Comprehensive Plan, as well as...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) the Comprehensive Plan right, it's a voter enacted initiative?

Ms. French: It came out of that era.

Board Member Furth: It's a – we've never repealed it, right? It's a voter directive and we don't get to change it. Am I confused, has it changed? That's why we had to have an override vote to do the new Stanford Medical Center buildings.

Ms. French: Well, it became – had a rezoning to a different zone but its...

Board Member Furth: Well, you had to have voter approval to go over 50-feet. Could we...

Ms. French: I know it's a Comp. Plan policy.

Board Member Furth: I believe it's a voter initiative so it was not a Council idea so we need to check and see. I don't know if they stuck it in the Charter or just did it as a – they could have done it as an intuitive ordinance rather than a Charter amendment but double check because PAMF was built and in many ways, it made sense for that building to be taller. Almost any health care facility it's easier to move by elevator than long corridors but I think we are constrained by that so if you could check. Maybe we repealed it but that's not what I understood.

Mr. Hayes: So, I'm sorry, are you in favor of – if it's not, are you in favor of a taller structure?

Board Member Furth: I have no idea. I think the damage is done by the time you get up that high so I don't know that I could tell the difference between 60 or 50-feet but I think we've been (inaudible) structures above the 50-feet if it is a voter mandate. On the – I hope that it's – I realize that there are lots of problems but I share the view that's been expressed by others that it's a pity not to go down two floors. We've been looking at a lot of projects and we keep struggling to approve them, particularly downtown or in the areas around downtown if they don't have two below parking because you can't get what you want above ground if you don't have two floors below ground. More recently we've been looking at a hotel that's proposed at Su Hong on El Camino and it's next to a Palo Alto Redwoods and Palo Alto Redwoods is – what's the density? It's high like 50 or somebody look that up for me; 50 or 60 dwelling units per acres. It's fully parked, it's got great loading zones, it's massively landscaped and it works because they have two floors of underground parking and a big deep site but I'm concerned that this doesn't – we're going to really regret it if we don't go under. We also have parking lots that encroach into the street underground; it's our street. I don't know what kind of utilities, it's mostly our utilities so have we seriously studied encroaching into the street and what we could get there? I would think we would want to do that because I think if you are going to build a garage, boy do you want it to (inaudible). I also and I'm sure other people think about this too but if you are going to spend these many millions of dollars for cars, I hope – I would like us to think about its next use; whether it's housing or whatever. I understand the load factor for parking garages is so huge that actually the load factor is not a problem for convertible uses but it's about are the plates flat and a few other things. So, I would like to know how we've considered that. There's seems to be an exhaust vent over by the, at this point, 10-foot pedestrian alley from Waverley kind of near its entry. It shows on sheet PK-2.1 and I don't know what's that about but that tends to be uninviting to go into – well, I don't think that's an inviting space anyway but if you were going to keep that as a 10-foot alley, that tends to discourage people from walking in. I don't – sorry.

Mr. Hayes: It would be up high. It discharges (inaudible) (crosstalk).

Board Member Furth: Ok, that's what I wondered so it's up high, it wouldn't be bothering us. It's just something going by but I do think that – this does not strike me as an alley that I would like to go down. I think of our funny little alley adjacent to the historic building, is it on Florence too – no, no, that one works, it's short, it's straight, it's well lite, it's wide enough and the buildings are short. No, this is next to...

Mr. Hayes: 420 Florence?

Board Member Furth: The – yes, I think it's the one – it's the garage that fronts on Bryant and then I guess backs up on Florence and there's this funny little zigzaggy thing and it's not a pedestrian access way. It's a...

Chair Lew: You're saying from Lytton?

Board Member Furth: Yeah, from Lytton, the one that wonders by the historic buildings. It's because it needed to be done to accommodate a complex setting but this -- I don't think this is going to be where people walk. So, I don't think we should dedicate a lot of space to it if we can pull the building back and do better on Hamilton; that's my thought at the moment.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Wynne. Great, thank you to the Staff and also to Ken, I think the packet and how you presented the project were perfect for preliminary. I guess the first thing that I want to say is that I have not read the HRB minutes yet because we just got them today but I have been talking to other Board Members on – about other historic projects and I've been – I think there's some unhappiness about the way we've been reviewing new buildings when they are adjacent to historic buildings. So, I've been doing some research on my own about this and in Philadelphia, there's an organization and they try to sort of frame the discussion about the design of new buildings. So, you could have literal replication of the historic building on the new site or you use that style but come up with a new – something new within that style or you could just make an abstract reference, which would be Ken Hayes preferred way

or you could just do a completely different strategy where you do something completely different and you just respect the old as old. Maybe you can't replicate an old colonial building but you just make it completely different and there – so there are these four strategies and we don't really talk about them. We sort of talk about the projects on the – you know like cornices and metal work respecting – similar to the Post Office but we don't really actually talk about the four strategies and which strategy would be the best for a particular site. I think that probably should have happened on some of our other recent projects like Avenidas and what not and also, we have the Junior Museum project. I think that there's some sentiment on the Board to try to elevate the level of discussion about that and debate about these different strategies so there's that. On the site plan, I have several concerns that have been mentioned before which one is the 10-foot passage way. It just seems like it could be a very dark, undesirable place if it's not designed correctly. I have also been concerned about as exiting this garage onto Land Twenty-One, which is only 15-feet wide and it's one-way. I'm also concerned about the – as cars enter the garage from Hamilton. I'm concerned about queuing and stacking because once you – the car enters the garage, they have to decide are they going straight, are they going right or are they going up the ramp and so that seems to me to be a tricky point where you – we could actually end up with a lot of delays there with people not trying to figure out where they are going. On the retail depth, I think it's been mentioned before that there are concerns about the dimensions of it and so if you have a 25-foot deep retail space, my unscientific survey of downtown is that's going to be one of the small – shallowest spaces downtown. We have some barbers in the President and also the Cardinal Hotel and they are around 28-feet. There's some – I think there's a little ice cream place on University that may be around 28 or 30-feet but I mean most of the time they are like 40 or 50 or more in depth. So, you're just going to limit the types of tenants that are going to be able to go into it. Then you – (inaudible) – also, within that 25-foot depth, you're going to have to take out like handicap accessible bathrooms so you're taking out 7 or 8-feet from that depth. So, I just have to give caution to Staff that there is a – that it's very desirable to put the retail space in there but we may be limited in the number of tenants – types of tenants that could utilize that space. On the options, I think I would – I think I'm in agreement with – I guess it was the HRB's sentiment which was something in between options one and two and I think I'm sort of there.

Mr. Hayes: I thought it was one and...

Chair Lew: Oh, one and three. Yeah, one and three with some sort of – some openings on the upper levels; I think that sounds fine. Two seems top heavy to me, having four floors of the garage over a low base and then I think the other concern that I would have on option two is that the – it really requires a hand of a very skilled designer, as yourself, but it's really tricky. If you look at the federal building in San Francisco, the architects maybe a lot of mistakes with perforated metal. It's very hard to get the right proportions of openings on the perforated metal and the public just doesn't like them at all. Then with the – all the different meshes, sometimes they look good like there is a mesh on one of the UC Mission Bay buildings, it looks great from one direction and then you look at it from the other direction and it doesn't look so great. It's a trick material to use and it has its place, for sure. Anyway, it seems to me that something in between one and three is safer.

Mr. Hayes: I mean one also has a mesh or metal of some kind but there are ways to mitigate that kind of impact. I mean it could be a bronze kind of color so it's a real earthy – it's not a shiny metallic metal (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Chair Lew: Yeah, no, there's definitely a place for mesh in the right – there are beautiful meshes out there but some of them are very expensive. So, there's definitely room in there to work with. I do want the – your Hamilton Avenue façade, I think you're showing some – you're trying to make some recess in there and I do want to see how that works with the arcade of the Post Office and how they look together in perspective. I'm curious to see if the Board wants to see a sun study on this and how it would impact the Waverley Street properties, especially if they are proposing residential uses there. It seems to me having a very tall garage on the southern side of those properties is going to impact the sun light on those; although we don't really have any requirements. I don't think we have and requirements on the – in the downtown zone for that. One just nitpicky item that I've seen on other garages that have had to

have fire sprinklers so if you have to have fire sprinklers – you’re not normally required to have them but you might have to if you have a retail use.

Mr. Hayes: Retail, yeah, we’ll have fire sprinklers.

Chair Lew: So, I’ve seen – there’s one near my house where they just didn’t figure out where to put all the stand pipes. They do this zig zag thing in the (inaudible) stair case on the corner and it looks terrible so I trust you to figure out where that goes.

Mr. Hayes: Can you comment a little bit, Chair Lew, about the corner entrance and stair.

Chair Lew: Yeah, you know I hadn’t – I am undecided on the staircases. When I use the stair cases in San Francisco, I prefer the stair cases to be completely open for – the feel safer, even if they are exposed. It just seems to me to be a nicer experience but then when I look at it and I think about all of the Birge Clark buildings and what not, I’m not sure I want to see this big open stair case with the big wing wall that goes all the way up. Then the other thing that I think about too is that on the outdoor stair cases are usually, like in a hand of unskilled lighting designer, they’ll just put these really ugly wall pack lighting and exposed conduit on there so it doesn’t look that great at night. I do trust that you sort of design the lighting to be attractive there. My take is a little modern and I could go – I’m open. My take on it was something more enclosed but I’m flexible on that.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Lew: So, I think that’s all that I have. Any other closing comments? Yes, Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Elizabeth Wong mentioned underground connectivity to the adjacent parcels, which we did in the 800 block of the City and the 800 block of High Street to accommodate affordable housing on an adjacent site. So, I think under the right circumstances, that can work and that did involve funding from both parcels. On the stair case, I was suddenly thinking of the ornamental staircases with tile risers around – across the street on Ramona which is probably not appropriate here but I think there’s enormous variation in the attractiveness of stair cases. I think lighting makes a huge difference and I look forward to seeing that. Then I just wanted to tell Staff that on the 50-foot ceiling limit, I’m perfectly willing to believe that I’m dead wrong. I was just terrorized by the City Attorney who hired me in believing that it was sacred but I would like to know the history of that because I thought that we had to do a ballot measure for the more recent Stanford health project because it was going to exceed 50-feet. So, I look forward to understanding where I came across the misapprehension if it is one.

Chair Lew: Great, any closing comments Ken?

Mr. Hayes: No (inaudible). Thank you very much for your comments and we look forward to coming back.

Chair Lew: Thank you.

3. **PRELIMINARY REVIEW, 1310 Bryant Street, 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street [16PLN-00238]:** Preliminary Architectural Review of a Concept Plan for Phased Redevelopment of the Castilleja School Campus for a Proposed Expansion. The Project Anticipates a Lot Merger, Demolition of Two Existing Single-Family Residential Structures, Construction of a Below Grade Parking Garage, Replacement of Several Structures and Other Site Improvements. Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A Draft Environmental Impact Report is Being Prepared, for Which a Scoping Session was Held March 8, 2017 With the Planning and Transportation Commission. For More Information Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org. **At the applicant’s request, this item will not be heard.**

Approval of Minutes:

4. Draft Architectural Review Minutes of August 3, 2017, and August 17, 2017.

Chair Lew: So, we have the approval of minutes and we have two sets. We have two – well, they – you mean the minutes were sent by email.

Board Member Furth: I'm thinking I missed one of those meetings.

Chair Lew: Yes. So, should we do – do you want to do the August 17th?

MOTION

Board Member Furth: So, moved.

Chair Lew: I don't have any comments on them.

Board Member Furth: Move approval.

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor? Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSES 3-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER BALTAY RECUSED AND BOARD MEMBER GOOYER ABSENT

Chair Lew: Then for the minutes for August 3rd, we will push those back to a future agenda.

Subcommittee Item

Avenidas Expansion Project

On September 21, 2017 the ARB subcommittee reviewed project details per approval condition 2c from the ARB approval of the project in October 2016, and verified consistency of same with AR approval findings. Project details included were light fixtures including courtyard trellis light fixtures, photometric plan, trash enclosure roof/trellis detail, and final palette showing the paint color for the exterior of the existing Category 2 building.

Chair Lew: We have one last item which is subcommittee.

Ms. French: So, before adjournment of a full Board, I would like to note on Jodie's behalf that packet page six there are some corrections needed. Let's see, today – sorry, on the 21st, which it says the 22nd but that's the 21st, Board Member Furth will not be attending. Then the dates there after are a day off so we'll fix that on the next packet, thanks.

Board Member Furth: I have a conflict of interest with respect to Avenidas because I live within 500-feet of the corner of the park so I will not be participating in the subcommittee.

Ms. French: Thank you, Alex, for agreeing to step in for that.

Chair Lew: So, we're adjourned.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment