



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: May 3, 2018  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Member Alexander Lew, Robert Gooyer, Osma Thompson.

Absent:

Chair Furth: Good morning. I call to order the meeting of the Architectural Review Board for May 3, 2018.

**Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: The first time on our agenda is oral communications. This is a time for any member of the public to speak on a matter on the agenda, but within the subject matter jurisdiction of our board. Is there anybody who would wish to speak? Seeing no one, we'll go to item 1.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions *[Not addressed]***

**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 items.**

Chair Furth: Staff?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Yes. Just wanted to make a few changes to the tentative agenda. May 17th, it looks like we're going to be hearing 356 Hawthorne. It's a three-unit project. The 4115 El Camino is going to be moved off to June 7th. That's it for now.

Chair Furth: Before our meeting ends today, perhaps on our last agenda item, let's talk a bit further about our study session, which is going to be about architectural standards and their impact on development proposals, particularly in this new PF zone, or housing--Well, we'll talk about that. Height limits, etc. Thank you. Any questions from anybody? All right.

**Action Items**

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3406 Hillview Avenue [17PLN-00438]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Site and Design Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing 62,500 Square Foot R&D Building and Construction of a new two-Story Approximately 82,030 Square Foot Office/R&D Building. This is a Designated Project Under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. Environmental Assessment: A Review of the Mayfield Development**

**Agreement Environmental Impact Report has Been Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: Research Park (RP-5(D)). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at [graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org)**

Chair Furth: Our first public hearing item is a quasi-judicial public hearing on 3406 Hillview Avenue, located in the Stanford Research Park. We are being asked for a recommendation on the applicant's request for site and design review to allow demolition of the existing 62,500 square foot research and development building and construction of a new two-story, approximately 82,000 square foot office/research and development building. This is a project that makes use of the additional floor area that can be built under the Mayfield Development Agreement on certain sites. There has been -- this is interestingly phrased -- a review of the Mayfield Development Agreement Environmental Impact Report has been prepared in accordance with CEQA. The zoning district is Research Park 5(D), which is why it is a site and design. The project planner is Graham Owen. Has everybody visited the site?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Chair Furth: Everybody has visited the site? Does anybody have any conversations to disclose?

Board Member Lew: No.

Chair Furth: Okay. Staff?

Graham Owen, Project Planner: Thank you, Chair Furth. I've been working with the applicant on 346 Hillview Avenue, which is a site and design review application that's before you today. This is an application, as you mentioned, to demolish the existing 62,000 square foot office/R&D building and construct a new 82,030 square foot office/R&D building, with additional 1,000 square feet of FAR-exempt amenity space. This is a designated project under the Mayfield Development Agreement, and as such, it follows the Mayfield Development Agreement provisions, as well as the Environmental Impact Report, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan that was prepared with that program. Typically the ARB does not see site and design review applications solely. They typically see them in conjunction with a PTC hearing, as well. Per the Mayfield Development Agreement, all designated projects are subject to review only by the ARB, with a decision to be made by the planning and community environment director, with the ability to appeal to the City Council. In this case, unless it's appealed, this would be the only body that would see this application. Just as a brief history of the Mayfield Development Agreement and its provisions, Stanford University, back in 2004-2005, and the City came to an agreement about a couple different things. Stanford University was to construct the soccer fields that are located on the Mayfield site, which is at the southwest corner of El Camino Real and Page Mill Road. In return, they were also going to construct 250 housing units at two different sites, one on El Camino Real and one on California Avenue. In return, they were able to take the associated square footage that was on those two housing sites and transfer them to other places in the research park. The total amount of replacement square footage is 300,000 square feet. This is a designated project that utilizes the provisions of the Mayfield Development Agreement. This is the site. This is located at the southwest corner of Hillview and Coyote Hill. The actual Coyote Hill is immediately adjacent to the site in that open space area. To give you surrounding context, you have SAP campus that's directly to the south; the VMware campus directly across the street on Hillview; and Xerox or PARC, which is directly to the north. The subject site was used by PARC Xerox for many years, but they've since vacated the site, which is a one-story R&D building. I believe most of their facilities are moving across the street. This is the proposed site plan. It's going from one story to a two-story office/R&D building with an open floor plan. The project involves one level of subterranean parking underneath the building, as well as two modules, essentially, of surface parking. The site's topography, it slopes up to the west, so Hillview is down and the western property line is up.

There are two grades to the site. I'll go into a little bit further detail about the actual elevation and how it changes on the site. Essentially, you have compliant parking both in the subterranean garage, as well as in these two areas, one in the upper area, and one in the lower. This is the grading plan. I'll come back to this in a second, actually. These are the street-facing elevations. These got kind of clipped, but this is the east-facing elevation on the top, and the north-facing elevation on the bottom. On the top, the elevation is facing Hillview, and on the bottom, the elevation is facing Coyote Hill Road. These are the two elevations that face away from the street. This the west-facing elevation, which is facing towards Coyote Hill property. The one on the bottom is the façade that's facing SAP to the south. Coming back to the grading. There is a substantial amount of grading that would be involved in the project, one, to dig out the subterranean garage, but also owing to the site's topography, which is sloping. Additionally, the site does have, kind of a legacy of hazardous materials that have both been stored and, unfortunately, released on the site, so as a part of the project, there would be a clean-up effort, as well as engineering fill that would need to be incorporated into the project to bring the site into conformance with the environmental screening levels for commercial development. As you can see here, the proposed grade is shown in the dashed line and existing grade to remain as shown with the solid. You can see that there would be a significant amount of grading if it's associated with the project. This shows the change in elevation, kind of gives you an idea how the site changes over time compared with the existing condition. On the top, you're looking at the elevation change, if you were looking at it head on from Hillview. And then, on the bottom, this is the site section if you're looking at it from the SAP, directly to the south. The existing condition is shown with the dashed red line. Key issues. Creating landscaping in the Hillside context, kind of all going in tandem with each other. This is a Hillside site. The zoning on the site is RP-5(D), which is the zoning that we have for the hilly sections of the Research Park. The (D) combining district is the site and design review combining district, which requires that projects be in conformance with the site and design review objections. In addition, this is a site and design review application, but it also requires that the Architectural Review Board meet the ARB findings, which are your standard findings. These four objectives that are shown here, these are the site and design review objectives that need to be made in addition to the ARB findings. In a lot of ways, they are similar to the ARB findings, Comprehensive Plan consistency, ensuring the desirability of investment, and enhances business as well as enhancing the general area and the neighborhood. Ensuring that it's operated in a conformant manner with the zoning code. It also, most importantly, adheres to principles of environmental design and ecological balance, ensuring that those are observed on the site. With that, staff recommends approval of the project based on the findings, as well as the site and design review objectives, which are contained in your staff report, subject to the conditions that are in that staff report, as well. I believe the applicant has a presentation, if you'd like to hear from them. But, if you have any questions...

Chair Furth: Are there any questions from the Board of staff before we open the hearing?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Chair Furth: Board Member Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. Thank you for the presentation. Is there any limitation on the parking on the site, regarding either the zoning or any other agreements?

Mr. Owen: They do have compliant parking in the sense that it meets our design criteria for parking standards. They have the numerical count. In terms of the review for the Architectural Review Board's consideration, the Mayfield Development Agreement does limit the City's purview with regard to subterranean parking, so they are proposing one level of subterranean parking. We can't require per that agreement any additional, like an additional layer of subterranean parking, but they have proposed one. Beyond that, we can't require anything additionally in terms of an additional layer.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm not sure I understand that. To be clear, we could not ask them to put more parking underground? Two levels?

Mr. Owen: I can read the language of the agreement to you if you'd like.

Chair Furth: That would be good.

Mr. Owen: [Pause.] Okay. Sorry about that. This is page 19 of the Mayfield Development Agreement. I'll just quote it verbatim where it picks up. This is talking about the limitations on design review, so the ARBs purview. To quote, pick up mid paragraph where the question comes up: "*The City may require that all or some of the parking on a site be placed underground in order to accommodate the permitted FAR, including the 25% bonus, but only to implement the creek protection policies and programs described in...*" a section above, "*...provided City may not require more than one level of underground parking or underground parking outside of footprint of the proposed building.*"

Chair Furth: Would you also read the section about materials?

Mr. Owen: Sure, just one second. "*The City shall not require landscaping, design, materials, finishes, or building methods which are substantially more expensive (after adjusting for inflation) than those generally used in the Research Park in the ten year period prior to the determination. Stanford shall have the burden of establishing the greater expense.*"

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions before we hear from the applicant? Okay. Applicant, please. And if you would spell your names for the record because our transcriber often doesn't know. And just as a note to all of us, in looking over our minutes, it frequently says "crosstalk," so I will try to be alert so that you can ask to be recognized to speak. Please go ahead.

Tiffany Griego: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Tiffany Griego [spells name], like San Diego. Thank you, Graham, for that excellent presentation. I'm wowed by your deep knowledge of the Mayfield Development Agreement, so, thank you. Good morning. I am the managing director of Stanford Research Park and our team is excited to present to you this project today, at 3406 Hillview Avenue. This obsolete building has reached the end of the useful life. Thank you for all visiting it. I am very proud of this project. I think it's stunning, and we are seeking your approval today to replace it with a modern, sustainable facility to accommodate next generation R&D. This will be the sixth Mayfield Development Agreement project that we've brought to you, and I just wanted to highlight that when we do develop our R&D buildings pursuant to the Mayfield Development Agreement, we are making a deliberate decision each time to locate the replacement square footage along corridors that are well served by transit. And 3406 Hillview is really a perfect example. You may not be aware of some of the TDM statistics for this area of the Research Park that we're now kind of calling the foothills gateway of the Research Park. Seven long-distance shuttles that Stanford is providing privately in partnership with Tesla, VMWare and SAP, serve San Jose, San Francisco and the East Bay, and they all drop off at the bus stop right in front of there, plus they serve other areas of the foothills gateway. We run last-mile shuttles to and from both Caltrain stations in Palo Alto, which also drop off right there. This site is surrounded by tenants that are already making full use of our van pool programs and our carpool programs, so the SOV rate by this robust community of sharing rides back there is lower than the parkwide average. We're really excited to bring this facility into that context. I just wanted to highlight that for you. We also have really paid a lot of attention to the pedestrian experience and to the beautiful habitat and adjacency to Coyote Hills. Thank you for the opportunity, again. I just want to make sure you're aware, I'm able to answer any questions about our TM programs, or the Research Park in general, or the Mayfield Development Agreement. Next, I'd like to ask our architect, Jason McCarthy from Studios Architecture, to talk about the project.

Jason McCarthy, Studios Architecture: Thank you, Tiffany. [spells name] Tiffany did well to introduce the project. This is really envisioned as a new center of collaboration and innovation in the Research Park, and what we propose here today is a very forward-looking, very modern facility, very high-performance, sustainable design, but also very warm and inviting and open, and we think appropriate to its context within the Research Park, and within Palo Alto. A bit about the site context. I think Graham described it very well. We're set amongst some of the most innovative companies in the Research Park. It's a wonderful site, and it's exposure to Coyote Hill and the open space district adjacent to us. [Short pause due to technical difficulties.] The presence of Coyote Hill on the site really is phenomenal. It's just the

picture of what you imagine, all the Palo Alto rolling hillside with golden grasses and studded with beautiful oaks. We really wanted this project to be inspired by that. The project as proposed is an 83,000 square foot two-store R&D office building over a one-story parking garage, as Graham mentioned. The decision to house a substantial amount of the parking below grade, together with the decision to locate the building, generally speaking, over the existing footprint of the property to be demolished, those two moves together really allowed us to develop the architecture and the landscape design that's proposed. One, where we're able to have stepping in the architecture, substantial landscaped berms and setbacks, significant outdoor amenities spaces, as well as enhanced wayfinding, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, and substantial open space area of natural habitat, if you will. A bit more about the site and its approach. We positioned the building closer to the corner of Coyote Hill and Hillview Avenue to engage with the road, but also to orient the building toward the north, to really capitalize on the sustainable benefits of that, environmental benefits. And, significantly, to really have the front door and celebrate its relationship to Coyote Hill. Ultimately, Stanford does plan to readdress the project to the Coyote Hill address. We saw that as a far more substantial identity for the project and really wanted this building to celebrate its relationship to the hillside, and have the hillside really become part of the project's identity and the day-to-day experience of the building. On the site circulation diagram, you can see in the blue lines here the substantial amount of pedestrian walks that we've added. We've improved and added walks along the site's perimeter, as well as a network of internal walks connecting from the building to parking areas, as well as connecting out to open space amenities and the bus stop along Hillview Avenue. A bit about the building's internal organization. We've conceived the building as two wings, a north and south wing, organized around a central double-height connecting space, a collaborative hub of activity, we think. It's generally a very open and flexible floor plan to support a variety of uses. As you look at the image of the building, this is conceived as a composition of volumes, a dynamic composition of these two bars framing that central glassy spine that's the connecting length between them. And then, the volumes are further articulated with wood panel clad elements that are adding scale and, in a sense, framing some of those outdoor amenity spaces. This is really proposed to be a very warm palate, again, very much inspired by the site and the natural materials of the site. We have a warm gray terra cotta cladding. We have some samples here if you'd like to take a look at those in a moment. And again, this wood panel is a Prodemra rain screen cladding. All very high-performance systems, thermally broken systems, and a very high visual light transmittance in the glass. It's not a high reflective glass. Here, a view of the north façade. You can see through our design that each orientation is highly tailored to its solar exposure, so on the north we've got a lot of glass, really trying to draw light in and celebrate wonderful views out towards Palo Alto to the north. And then, if you look at the ends of the building, you'll see the openings are heavily protected with deep roof overhangs, horizontal sun shades at the windows, and trellis elements at the exterior decks. For the south elevation much smaller openings, obviously protected with horizontal sun shades. Again, just to reiterate on the performance of this project, we're very proud of energy modeling we've achieved. Right now, we're at about 18 percent better than Title 24. We're doing everything above minimum as we can to really get a high-performance project here. And in addition to that, the roofs are really set up to be PV ready. There's a small **photoable tayacaray [phonetic]** proposed with the project, but there's room to expand on that substantially. And then, again, the move to put a lot of the parking below grade has significant sustainability benefits for the project, including soil, groundwater treatment area, and permeable soil area, and so forth. Jumping back out to the scale of the neighborhood again, this is the east view of the project. You can see that the entrance into the garage is well screened by a landscaped berm here, so there's really no impact on the site from Hillview Avenue from the garage. Again, really, the project is enjoying this wonderful landscape setback as a foreground, and this spectacular backdrop of Coyote Hill just behind the building. A couple quick images. As you approach the building, along the pedestrian path up from Coyote Hill Road, across an outdoor amenity space toward the entry plaza, a view from the main entry plaza into the building. You see the sawtooth clearstory lighting from the roof, bringing light deep into the building, drawing your eye into the building. And then, as you walk through the building to the back of the site or to the east, and then down the steps towards the corner of Hillview and Coyote Hill Road, now looking back at the project, getting a sense of how this building is really interacting with the site and inviting a level of use and enjoyment of the site that we think really will make a wonderful project. At this point, I'd like to bring James Winstead up from the Guzzardo Partnership to talk a little bit further about the landscape design.

James Winstead, Guzzardo Partnership: Great. Thanks, Jason.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Just a second. We're about to run out of time, but I think it would be important to hear about the landscape design. So, another three minutes? Would that be enough for you?

Mr. Winstead: That's perfect. Thank you very much. [Spells name.] I'd just like to walk you briefly through some of the considerations that went into our landscape design. It's already been alluded to, the connections with that adjacent Coyote Hill open space is something that's really unique here. It's something we're pretty excited about and used as a cue for much of what we've done inside the rest of the site. What you see here, this is your first chance to experience that as you enter here from the bus stop. Again, we've used the planting to extend habitat in through the site. Quickly here, here are some of the key gathering areas and how we've located them around the building and site. As you come up those stairs from Hillview, they're on the right, and then again, as you come down some stairs from the upper parking deck, there's just some sort of quick seating areas there, giving you a little bit of rest in the landscape. And then, the main key gathering spaces located around the buildings, where they offer opportunities for indoor/outdoor activity extensions of the building activity into the site. We're really excited about that. That seemed like a great opportunity for users to get right outside and really enjoy the open space. And then, again, highlighted in red here are two second-story roof terraces, similar indoor/outdoor connection, and then, offering elevated views west to Coyote Hill and east over the Bay, out towards Mission Peak and some of the East Bay hills. Highlighted here are some of the... We divided the landscape design into three zones, if you will. Starting in the bottom left with the lighter green color, we worked with Stanford University biologists to identify existing habitat on this site, which paired down that lower left corner, and with him to develop a plant palate for how we've expanded that. The yellow-green you see there is an extension of that, around that connection to the open space. And then, we've used him to help us develop a plant palate for this area, utilizing not just California natives, but specifically site-local natives. California bee plant, California compass plant, two examples of that chosen for habitat value. And then, in addition to planting, worked in some stone boulder features and stuff like that, offering habitat for snakes and lizards and things along those lines. The middle green color that covers the majority of the site, we've extended the habitat through there, again, still using natives, but mixing in a couple non-natives that we felt were appropriate to, again, boost habitat value and extend some of the color and texture further through the season, and then, complementing the native palate. And then, combining those two areas more than doubles the amount of habitat on site compared to the existing. And then, the darker green color you see here on the building, we transitioned again to a little bit more of a formal architectural design around the building. All of this would be low-water use plants with the exception of a couple areas along the north of the building, and under existing large trees where we've got some shade and we have some moderate water use, drought-tolerant plant material. Of course, the irrigation design would be highly-efficient moisture-sensing and set up to receive recycled water when it's available on the site. Your arrival experience, it's going to be addressed off Coyote Hill. This is something that was a priority for us in the design, making sure you had a clear, concise, direct connection to the front door from that entry. We've used these columnar oaks and an accent light fixture that guides you down through that drive, and then, accent paving sort of marks your way there. You actually enter at Coyote Hill about five feet higher than finished floor, so you have the advantage of a little bit of a promontory look, right down into the front door. We thought that was a pretty strong connection that we were able to make here. Quickly, here is a diagram showing some of the shade and canopy on the site. On the left is the existing, and on the right is the proposed at a 15-year maturity estimate. We worked with **Melvin Arthenia [phonetic]**, our consulting arborist, and Palo Alto Urban Forestry to identify key existing trees for preservation, for not only native oaks and redwoods. And then, we designed a site plan around that. And then, the new plant material and the trees we've used is largely native oaks, Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, (inaudible) and Black Oak, and working in also California Buckeye and some other non-natives. Again, boosting habitat with that, and in the end, more than double the number of trees and more than double the total canopy on the site. I'll leave you guys with that. We have samples here if you guys would like to see them closer, and we'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Winstead: Thank you, guys.

Chair Furth: Somebody want to get the materials board? Let's go look.

[The Board briefly left the dais to examine the materials board.]

Chair Furth: Okay, so we've looked at the building materials, and Board Member Thompson has brought the paving materials and had some questions. Could you hold it up so the public can see it? I think we'll get where we need to go.

Board Member Thompson: Just some clarification on which paving blocks are going where.

Mr. Winstead: Sure: There's two lighter-color paver samples, and those would be both used in a blend at the plaza areas. Actually, the one in your right hand. Yep. Those two. Those two are blended in a single pattern at the plazas and arrival areas. And then there's the three other square-shaped, darker-gray colors, and those three colors are all used together in the auto corp [phonetic] plaza. You get a nice, rich texture, but the pattern helps conceal some tire marks and oil marks, etc., that's inevitable where you have auto traffic. The smallest chip, that's a sample of the integral color concrete we will be using for walkways, and then, the walls right around the garage ramp area, those will also have that same color. And then, not represented in physical samples, but the retaining walls throughout the rest of the site would largely be gravity block concrete block in a brown and gray color blend. I'll talk about it in a sec. And then, no higher than 30 inches in any situation, and then, planted against to hide them. And that last little sample you held up are these black/gray river rocks that we're using adjacent to the entry plaza that brings you in the front door, and then, straight through the glass volume, out to the other side on the east. Along the walkway we have river rocks with planter pots.

Chair Furth: Thank you for explaining that. I have no cards from members of the public, but is there anybody who would like to comment on this proposal? Seeing none, I'll bring it back to the Board. Any additional questions before we deliberate?

Board Member Thompson: Yes, I have one more. Where is the bird-safe glass happening, and where is it not happening on the elevation?

Mr. McCarthy: There's a smaller portion of bird-safe glass on this project along the north elevation. That's sort of a wainscot height.

Chair Furth: If you could refer us to the elevation page, if that's not too hard, that will help us.

Mr. McCarthy: I can show you on the screen if that helps.

Chair Furth: It will.

Mr. McCarthy: The skirt at the base here is the bird-safe glass. Part of the approach to bird safety on this project has been to very intentionally make the project more solid at its corners. It's a very deep floor plate. That's about a 180-foot wide building, so we think there's less likelihood of a bird seeing daylight through, across to the other side, and trying to go across the mid beam of the project. But, we did purposely bring more solid elements to the corners so we don't have a lot of conditions of glass to glass at corners. And then, we've added some amount of bird glass more as a spandrel screening element, as well, at the base of that double-height curtain wall. In addition, you'll see that the window openings are much smaller on the south, and on the east and west there's a significant amount of horizontal sun shading and trellis elements we think are likely to act as further deterrent.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, just to clarify. The horizontal glass that you have is going to happen at the floor level? It's sort of instead of spandrel?

Mr. McCarthy: Right, to the 36-inch height level on the ground floor of the north façade.

Board Member Thompson: I see. Okay. Nothing higher, necessarily.

Mr. McCarthy: That's right.

Chair Furth: Any other questions? All right. Robert, if you could begin.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I think the building looks very nice. It's well thought out. Everything else. The elevation, the way I see it here, really does have a nice mix of materials. I guess the biggest concern I have is that it seems like you concentrated on the east and the west elevations, sort of, I don't know, the north and south elevations just seem not to live up to the same quality, complexity or thought that the other two do. Like I said, all in all, it's a nice building, but I'm just disappointed that those two elevations don't meet the rest of the design.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for the presentation. The drawing set was very clear and very easy to understand. Thank you for that. I'm generally supportive of the project. The questions I have were, again, the bird-friendly glazing, and then, also, screening the parking lot from Coyote Hill Road. It seems like the existing parking lot is kind of exposed to the road, and I was curious about that. I did see some large shrubs, like coffeeberry and stuff, but I wasn't sure about the extent of it along the frontage and how visible the cars might be. And then, I also have a question about the grading. It seems like there's a lot of soil being removed. It seems like it's a challenge in the Research Park, is to get accessibility working on a hilly site, and it seems to me that's part of the reason why you had to lower the floor level down compared to the existing building. But, it seemed like the end result is you have to do a lot of cutting of the grade, and I don't know if you've run the numbers. It doesn't seem like it's a balanced cut-and-fill site. On the various second-floor terraces, I think those are located in good locations, relative to the use. The outdoor patio seating at grade, it seems like a slightly awkward location. In my mind, it seems like, when I was looking at the site, I would have oriented closer to the Coyote Hill, but it seems like there's more area where you've located it currently. I can support the material palette. I was wondering if you might want pigeon-proofing on your trellises, or some sort of bird, maybe some sort of bird deterrent up there. And I did want to acknowledge on the landscape design, and you've used a lot...I've never seen a project with so many oak trees. I think you definitely get a lot of credit for that, and also taking our native plant finding seriously. You've really thought about it and I think it's very well considered. Generally, I'm supportive of this. I would think maybe, for staff, I think on some projects, we've added the bird-friendly glazing requirement in the conditions of approval. The bird-friendly glazing thing, we have handbooks given to us by third-party people, but we don't have it in any of our design guidelines, and I don't know if Stanford has it elsewhere in their own design guidelines. I'm hesitant to put it in. Also, the guidelines that we have are kind of vague. They give general principles, but not a lot of specifics. For example, they're saying they're only proposing the fritted glass in lower locations, but as I read the guidelines that I have, they want it on the wall façade. I think the façade I would be most concerned about would be the north façade because it's a large amount of glass, and they planted a lot of trees, very desirable habitat trees, there along the north façade. That's where I am. I'm generally supportive of the project.

Chair Furth: Okay. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. Thank you for the presentation. Like much of what we see from the Stanford people, it really is well put together, well thought out. You guys are a good group of architects and designers, and we really appreciate that. I'm concerned, though. There's two issues here on the big scale that bother me. I wonder if we could pull up, please, the perspective northeast from the road, image. It's sheet 1.14. [Locating image.] From the corner of Coyote...That's good, right there. I'm fairly familiar with this site. I drive through the area frequently. I spent some time walking around the other day. And it's quite true what you say about people using public transportation, coming in and out of

buses. A lot of it is centered around that corner. This view is what the public, what Palo Altoans see of your building, primarily, and this seems to me like the last thing you guys thought about as architects. It doesn't have, as Robert put it, the interest and the complexity of design that the entrance on the other side of the building has. In fact, you've set up this access through the building, a split building with a recessed entrance on one side, which you celebrate very nicely. You've got that opportunity on this side, and yet, you instead offer this fairly long, arduous-looking staircase, meandering up the hillside with the ADA-style ramp coming across the other direction. There's none of this celebrating. This is the front door. This is modern technology. This is cutting-edge research. This is what the world offers us. Instead, it looks like a fire staircase going up the side of a building there. Instead, I just see the ends of a trellis way up high. It's not inviting, it's not welcoming, it's certainly not celebrating what we're trying to achieve here. I just feel like it's a lost opportunity for talented architects. Maybe you just lost your focus a little bit and put so much focus on the other side of the building. And I get it. That's important. But, I think you have the opportunity to do it on both sides of the building successfully, and I think you really have to address both the view of the building from this particular angle, and you have to re-think the pedestrian experience once more. Most people coming not by car are going to be coming from this point of view, this angle, and that's not a staircase I'm going to look forward to walking up on a hot summer day, or a rainy day, or anything else like that. Secondly, on the building design, I'm bothered by the 12-foot-tall mechanical screening concentrated at the front of the building. Well, I say front, but this side of the view. You can see it here, sticking up high, but there's got to be a better way to re-think your rooftop mechanical to cut that screen down a lot. I just can't imagine you need a full 12 feet there. I understand that code allows substantial height for screening, and we want to screen that stuff, but if you could re-think a little bit just how you do your mechanicals and get that down to six feet or something, where it won't be so visible, that would be a huge help. I want to reinforce that I think overall, your design is great, your material palate is attractive and well-thought out, and I echo the comments of my colleagues. But, I really feel that you didn't get it right on the most important public corner of the building. I'd love to see you take another stab at supplying that same creativity. If I could now shift gears to the landscaping. Whenever I fly in from out of town, I come across, and wake up finally and look out the window, and you're seeing these golden-brown California hills. Until you see a golf course, and all of a sudden, there's a patch of green. That's what I see here. What you have done is landscaped thing right up to the property line, and it feels like a very competent, workman-like landscaping plan for a typical urban project, many of what we see from Guzzardo. But, this is a special site. This is on the edge of one of the nicest natural areas we have. I don't see any sense of inspiration, any sense of, "Hey, let's take this to the next level. Can we do a landscaping that really, like, we spent time out on Coyote Hill, and we thought about how those trees naturally cluster." They don't naturally grow uniformly across the site. There's something more to it than that. I'm not a landscape architect, but when I look at this, it just feels to me like you sort of plopped trees in a fairly distributed pattern. There's one corner of the site that you tried to sort of allude to with natural grasses and stuff, but it's not really...There's no inspiration for great design. This is just working with the team, doing a good job. I'd like to think on a project like this, we're trying to get to...This is world-class, cutting-edge research, and yet, this is just workman-like landscape design, in my opinion. I'll address the Stanford people as well on this. If you gave them a little more room to work by putting more of the parking underground. I understand it's not required to do that, but if you were to do that, you might find that it's not as expensive as you think. The parking you've put there needs a lot of grading and a lot of site work, and that would give a lot more room to let the site naturally integrate with Coyote Hill. Coyote Hill is right behind this site, and if you didn't have the parking lot with the required landscaping and screening on it, you would really free up landscape architects to do a world-class, something that you see in the magazines kind of architecture, which is what we really want. You also have the opportunity to take the storm drainage system, and not just to bury it in some sort of spaces next to the parking area, but rather, celebrate it. Again, do something that people see what it is, we show what it is. We show that we're not just meeting minimum standards, but we're taking them and going way beyond it. You guys are good landscape architects, and I'm sure if you're...A little more space, a little bit of effort on the creativity, you can do a lot better than this. That's sort of what I'm pushing for. I see this as a really special site. It's a spectacular setting, and I'm hoping we can get a real inspired design response to match to that. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Hi, there. Again, thank you for a really good presentation, and I appreciate my board members' comments. I think, you know, a lot of really important things have already been said. Yeah, I will echo some of the things, maybe rephrase a little bit. The entryway was also one thing that I had thought about. Currently, not that the existing architecture is something (inaudible), but currently, there is some facing of the street with the existing, and it's true that this corner, there is an entry architectural feature that might be missing. There's a lot of opportunities already embedded in the architecture, the celebration of the outside, and I think the architecture can utilize things like sliding glass doors, having some inside-outside relationships that I think have begun in this design. Like, even in the terraces. Currently, there's just like a three-foot swing door onto them, but there might be some really nice opportunities, not only on the terraces, but on the ground level, to sort of integrate this inside-outside concept that you guys have been talking about. That might help with the entry and bring some natural air in. But, I do appreciate the attention you paid to the orientation. I feel similarly about the bird-safe glass. There are products out there, films that are invisible to the human eye that birds can see, that maybe you might consider as bird-proofing. That way, it doesn't affect too much. I mean, I'm not sure the details of all these products, but I've seen presentations. There's a way to keep your aesthetic and still actually be responsible to the environment and the birds around. I would encourage you to look at that. I like most of your material palate. I'm not too jazzed about the terracotta panel. I understand you're attempting to create a foil from your Prodema, and something different, but I think part of the reason the other façade, like the south façade, doesn't seem to appeal as visually is because this material isn't fighting for your design in the way I feel like it could. Not to say to change the material, but maybe something else. Maybe a different shade, a different color, a different texture. Still keep terracotta. I appreciate the thermal properties. Those are important. But, aesthetically, right now, I don't know that it's fighting for you in the way that all these other materials are. I had a question about bio swales, but I think that may have been what Board Member Baltay was talking about, celebrating storm retention. I think a good, important thing. The project is really lovely. I think you've come a long way. I think it's really close, actually. There's just a few more things, I think, that could have a good look at, and I think you can get there. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. It's a beautiful site. I hadn't been there for a while, and I spent some time looking at the other buildings in the area. One of the things that struck me about Xerox PARC, you know, legendary, intellectually, is that when you get there, what you see is a parking lot. A lot of parking lot. I would hope that we would avoid that in this case. It does seem to me to be a pretty building. I don't have any adverse feelings about the materials. I do share the point of view that the southern perspective doesn't look good. I realize you're not planning to put pedestrians through there. It's apparently bicycles, cars, deliveries. To a certain extent, it's the back side of the building. But, you do have a drive going through there. There will be people going through there. And I'm not sure what would make it better. I do think the landscaping it's drawing is not doing it any favors. This is probably for staff. I know we have parking lot shading requirements, and I know we tend to get a lot of these little rectangular, let's push it out and stick a tree in here thing. Which doesn't work very well when you're right next to Coyote Hill. It seems very checkerboard. It's not that I don't think you can have formal plantings near wild areas, or semi-wild, long-ago converted to European grass areas. But, I do think that it's particularly unfortunate here. I also think the very low landscaping adjacent to the building is not doing it any favors, and I don't think the trees are enough. I think that needs more landscaping attention to meet our standards. Otherwise, I must say, the landscaping is heavenly as a whole-hearted engagement with our notion, the City's requirement that we have landscaping that's good habitat for non-humans. I also like the sort of smears of color that you've added along the stairway. It's not quite burly marks [phonetic], but it's exciting. I do also think that that's a very uninviting staircase and not one I would want to head up. I think it will become inviting. I mean, theoretically, you're walking through wonderful plants, but it will become inviting if it has seriously attractive to seating that I can see from below, so I know it's going to be there. Maybe you have a water fountain. Definitely you have a place I can pause in the shade. But, I think that that element, which is important, needs to become an attractive thing to walk up or down, which it isn't yet. Both physically attractive so that I'll feel confident that if I need to stop part way, I can do that. If I see somebody I want to talk before we get together with the people already in the building, I can do that. It's a lost opportunity as it presently stands, and I also think it doesn't meet our standards for those things. I'd like to hear from you in a minute or two about the

drainage as it works on the site. I am very fond of visible bio swales. I think they're really...It's good to see visible solar-generating equipment, and it's nice to be able to tell that the architect thought about which way am I facing. It's really useful to be able to see, this is how we handle drainage. I'd like to know a little bit more about the contamination on this site and what that's requiring of you. Looking at where the site is, I'm guessing it's contamination from this site to the site, but I don't know. Maybe it was up the slope the other direction. On bird safety, I think it's important that the birds be safe. I'm not sure how best to get that. And then, the other thing I've been thinking about is, when you sit in the seating area, I, like my colleagues, wish that you could pull the parking further back from Coyote Hill's reserved area, so that it could flow. And it may be that we don't understand how what looks like a quite degraded area is going to be planted in a way so that Coyote Hill seems to flow down into this property. I think that's what you're saying it's going to do, and if that's so, I think that's a good thing to do there. But, you have such a narrow border on the parking area that that's quite a challenge. What I was going to ask you is, have you made sure that when you're seated in the area that looks toward the parking lot and Coyote Hill, the landscaping assures that I'm looking at landscaping Coyote Hill, not a bunch of gleaming automobiles. I'm looking at 1.12 and it looks like I'm going to look at a bunch of automobiles, but that may be because I don't see all the slope and the landscaping on it. And then, the final thing -- and this was partly a question to my colleagues -- we have cars driving up and down across that pedestrian pathway, and maybe there's just nothing to be done about that. I mean, maybe you put in bollards to narrow and slow it. I'm looking at 1.09, where I come down from the parking lot...

Board Member Lew: You're talking about the entrance plaza.

Chair Furth: Yeah, right. And it looks like we have cars going up and down. It's a bit of a tight curve visually. I'm concerned that that sets up a lot of conflicts that I don't think, in this plan, seem to have been addressed sufficiently so that we have good safety. We've raised a lot of questions. Are there questions we'd like to ask of the applicant? I would like to know about the drainage on site. Is it possible to use bio swales? Any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I have a question about passive ventilation and other kind of ventilation techniques for the underground parking garage.

Chair Furth: Okay. Anything else you want to ask the applicant about?

Vice Chair Baltay: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Sure. We'd like to hear from the landscape architect. Anything else? Okay. If whoever is appropriate could talk to us about the on-site drainage, the possible use of bio swales, passive ventilation as a technique used or not used in this building, and just a response to our comments on landscaping. That would be helpful. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: You'd also asked about soil contamination and environmental...

Chair Furth: Oh, tell us a little bit more about the soil contamination issues you're working with and around. Maybe you want to start there.

Board Member Thompson: Oh, I had one more question on protected trees.

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon, Osma?

Board Member Thompson: A question on protected trees and...

Chair Furth: Oh, sure, we can talk about that. And their removal. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Griego: The prior occupants for the last five decades of the property were Xerox PARC and their subsidiary, DPECS [phonetic]. They utilized in their first floor an on-grade HVAC system, chemical

storage, an acid waste neutralization system, and they have an outdoor utility plant that you probably saw when you toured. It's pretty substantial. It's actually massive. As part of their facility closure process as they leave the site, they are doing all of their measures to characterize the site and try to leave and return the site to us in as clean of a condition as possible. There was a necessity to do some Phase II soil sampling, and there was one hit that demonstrated VOCs exceeding the commercial screen levels. The site is not under a DTSC order today, and it is our norm when we take back a site to fully characterize the site through a Phase II soil sampling program to determine the extent of an issue. As we sit here today, it is not characterized fully, and it can't be until the building is demolished. And then, if there were a more extensive problem, we would turn in the results to the DTSC and work with them to figure out what we do. We hold ourselves and our tenants to a standard in which we remediate to a residential standard, which is higher than others would be required to do in a commercial setting. That's the norm here. Hopefully, that answers the question, but there are some unknowns as we sit here today, but we know we have to do a full characterization process.

Chair Furth: This is not one of the sites we often deal with, where they're in the midst of a plume moving across the entire site. This is site-specific contamination from specific operations that may not have migrated a great distance.

Ms. Griego: Right. That is our going-in assumption.

Chair Furth: That is what we hope.

Ms. Griego: Yes.

Chair Furth: I have seen your leases. You're right.

Ms. Griego: We're hard core.

Chair Furth: They put quite a heavy burden on the tenant to clean up.

Ms. Griego: Yes.

Chair Furth: Yeah, thank you for that. Drainage, bio swale? Protected trees?

Mr. Winstead: Can you guys see the mouse hand moving around on the screen?

Chair Furth: Yes.

Mr. Winstead: Okay.

Chair Furth: We have small screens.

Mr. Winstead: Yeah, it's kind of far away from me, too. Just quickly, I can walk you through where the stormwater treatment is typically located, and for the large part, it's distributed around the site, which lowers the burden of infrastructure to get the water there. And then, we've worked it into the grading so there's no unique retaining conditions or anything like that, to satisfy the depression that you need for the treatment areas. Right here, that takes some roof water. There's one here that catches the upper parking area. There's one here that catches some of the water from the side of the building, and one up here near the signage area that catches most of this stormwater that comes off the road. Another one here, and the last one down here that catches most of the water coming down hill off of this. On this site, yeah, you know, divided them up where they seemed appropriate, again, to lower the infrastructure required for them. And then, again, our approach here was to plant right through them and blur the edge of them and let them almost become indistinguishable from the rest of the landscape, which we're trying to create something that was more, again, as was talked earlier. You know, like, this line at the back of the site between the open space and ours, that would be mostly invisible by the end, when the project is

done and the planting is mature. And then, bringing that around through the frontage here so that, there happens to be stormwater treatment underneath the plant material, but it's really just integrated into the overall landscape vision there.

Chair Furth: Does the stormwater, explain to me a little bit more what your facilities are. How you're treating it, where it's going. Is it all percolating back in on site? Is it going into storm drains? What's up?

Mr. Winstead: Gravity flows into the basin, flows through the soil and gravel, and at the bottom, it is then treated by the plant material that's growing in there, and then it's released out into the stormwater system as clean water.

Chair Furth: Further questions in this area? Did staff have a comment? Okay.

Board Member Lew: I have questions about the screening of the parking lot from Coyote Road.

Chair Furth: Right. The question about what one would see driving up or down Coyote Road with respect to the parking lot.

Mr. Winstead: Sure. This area here, I think, this parking as you come in along the entry drive from, like, maybe these cars here would probably be the only ones that I think would be close enough to be of concern. I'm sorry...

Chair Furth: From Coyote or from...?

Mr. Winstead: From Coyote, right here. Those are the closest ones to Coyote Road, would be this, I think it's nine or 12 cars there. That's too far away for me to see right now. The planting we have in here is actually going to be quit substantial, and there's a little bit of a grade change, as well. I don't think that these would be at all visible to the passerby. I mean, if you're looking for them, of course you can find them, but the visual impact there I think would be quite minimal. And then, there was also a comment, I think, as you're sitting out on these gathering areas, looking up the hill, you are, in plan, you're looking over the parking lot. This is relatively a significant slope, and then, again, it will be substantially planted. I don't think you would have any sense that there's cars up here unless you know already that they were there. The cars will be screened by the plant material that covers the actual car, and then, beyond them, into the open space above. Any visual impact there will be almost negligible.

Chair Furth: There was a question about which are the protected trees that...? First of all, what basically kinds of trees are they on this side, and which ones would be removed?

Mr. Winstead: The trees typically being removed that are not protected, there's sweet gums that are along the roadway, there's existing eucalyptus and Monterey pine, many of which are well past their, sort of healthy lifespan, just to begin with. Of the trees that could be considered protected that are being removed, there's an existing oak approximately here on the site, and an existing redwood approximately here on the site. The oak was looked closely at, and actually went out again and took another follow-up look by our project arborist, and it is in extremely declining health. It's not going to be around, so it's being removed by the project. Similar for the redwood that's here. It had declining crown and it was in very poor condition.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Board members, if I may, refer you to page L5.0.

Mr. Winstead: That has the (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Should have mentioned it. Okay. I had a question. Did you refer to columnar oaks?

Mr. Winstead: Columnar oaks.

Chair Furth: When is an oak not an oak, when it's columnar?

Mr. Winstead: There's a bunch of oaks. In this case, it's Hungarian oak, is the one we're using there. If you think of the native oak, they're much more kind of sprawling in form.

Chair Furth: They are.

Mr. Winstead: It grows, I don't know, almost more like, you could think of, like, a columnar maple, which is a little more common. It's very upright in form. It's like a red oak in leaf, so it's the five-pointed kind of leaf instead of the sort of leathery kind of leaf on the native oaks.

Chair Furth: But you do have native oaks as well, no?

Mr. Winstead: We do.

Chair Furth: That you're adding to the project? Could you show me where...? I just want to know that 50 years from now, we'll have something spreading.

Mr. Winstead: Yeah, for sure. Can we flip this page to...? We have the plan...

Chair Furth: We don't want you to think we didn't look at your plans. We did. We don't always get it.

Mr. Winstead: This is just the presentation, but if you go through the actual application packet, we have the full planting plan in there.

Chair Furth: Right. Right. You do.

Mr. McCarthy: I can't actually read this from here. Sorry. Do we have some middle...?

Chair Furth: Four-point-on is probably the one with the key, but it does take a magnifying glass.

[Locating slide.]

Chair Furth: We don't need to spend a lot of time on this. If you can spot the oaks, that would be great. Or you could just reassure me that you have agrifolia, or whatever, going on.

Mr. Winstead: (off-microphone) Definitely. We have agrifolia, (inaudible), valley oak, (inaudible). I think those were the four natives that we had. And we have California (inaudible).

Chair Furth: So we have something nice and brown in July, huh?

Mr. Winstead: But it's spread around with everything else.

Chair Furth: That's a wonderful tree.

Mr. Winstead: We have considered that in the design.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there other questions of the landscape architect?

Board Member Thompson: If I can ask a question?

Chair Furth: One of the comments here was that we, were these plantings really going to integrate well as you look up the hill? Are they going to not look like a golf course? I was partly asking staff. To what extent to our own parking requirements make it look like a golf course? Could you comment? Both staff and the applicant?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think on the parking lot landscaping, we do many times use these sort of finger islands, as we call them, to bring trees into the parking lot, to provide more shade in that manner. That's certainly something that we could look further into to make those a little more, not so formal. That's a detail we could look at. The other question I had is related to the stormwater. I was hearing from the board members about celebrating stormwater. I just would like some clarification on that, and maybe the applicant could use some clarification on that, as well. Are we asking for these stormwater features to potentially happen in the front of the property, if that's physically possible?

Chair Furth: What I understood was visible bio swales. Were their functions clear.

Ms. Gerhardt: Just visible by anyone using the site.

Chair Furth: I think it's usually people on the site who see them, and it's usually different plantings because they get wet. But, I should let Commissioner Thompson speak for herself.

Board Member Thompson: Usually, they sort of, you know, visually, they look, yeah, they're sort of different planting, in the sense that they're sort of this remediation planting what's there. And then, I think also topographically, it's sort of sunk in a little bit, so you know not to walk there. There's kind of an understanding that this is special, and different, and it's not like all the other landscaping.

Chair Furth: I think we've seen them elsewhere in the Research Park. I'm trying to think over on...Another project, right?

Mr. McCarthy: Can I just add a comment to the discussion? I think part of the issue is that these drawings graphically look like this bright-green putting green coming up to the edge of the property line, and that's not really what we're proposing here. I think if you look at the character of the landscaping that's represented in the renderings, it is a very naturalistic composition, it's very wild grasses, shrubby, shaggy landscape we're proposing. This isn't a manicured site by any means. And to James's point, the bio swales sort of happen naturally in that composition. They are, in a sense, also shaggy, wild grasses. That's more of our approach to the site in general, that it isn't this very manicured element, but it does need landscaping. You see the substantial landscape setbacks, and we think we're treating them very elegantly, but not, in a sense, in a very romantic or, I mean, not a very engineered way, but in a more naturalistic way appropriate to the context. I don't think the site plan diagram helps explain that because it does have this sort of bright green shock value to it, but the character that you see here really is more about a natural environment and native species, plantings. And then, I don't think James really spoke to it, but there are substantial redwoods that we're preserving on the site, and they really do ground this project and give it a wonderful scale, we think, and a beautiful, sort of framing of the architecture in a way that, without those, we would be sort of lost, I think. Those are certainly an important thing that we haven't really focused on. Those are located here, kind of mid-beam on the building's north façade, so that helps, we think, break down the scale of that façade. And then, over at the, sort of northwest corner of the site, a substantial cluster of redwoods are preserved there, as well. And then, some of the, sort of wild oak pieces at the southwest corner are also maintained. Those aren't substantial, but they're still certainly of beautiful character.

Chair Furth: Two more questions. One was about the southern elevation that's in 1.15, and the other one was about the conjunction of automobiles and pedestrians that's shown at the main entry in 1.11. Which, to me, seems not ideal.

Mr. McCarthy: What we think we've done fairly well here by the numbers is collect the majority of the parking underneath the building, or immediately adjacent to the building. There is that upper deck of parking. It's not a substantial amount of the parking, but there are two walks...I'm trying to find my cursor again. There's a walkway crossing here, and then, a second walk across the entry plaza there. We think they're well marked. We think they're separated in a way and announced with planting and paving changes to help make them safer. We can certainly look at some additional signage or elements to

further that. We were trying to make those pathways, as with the other connecting pathways through the site, celebrated, in a sense, very comfortable, demarcated from driving surfaces with accented materials.

Chair Furth: I suppose what I'd like to see is a design where people didn't really like to drive through this, so they're going to the upper parking lot. They came off Coyote, and if they were going to the lower parking lot, they came off Hillview, so you didn't have as many people driving across it. To me, it still looks too attractive. We tend to think that wider...We tend to like these as narrow as possible so that people have the feeling that they need to sit down. Or slow down, rather, I should say. I find myself a little...I don't feel comfortable with this in terms of its...

[crosstalk]

Mr. McCarthy: We actually felt with the garage entrance as close as it is to Hillview, that for the people who are heading to the garage, they're likely, even if they're coming along Coyote Hill Road, they're likely to go around to the Hillview entry because it's a fairly graceful access point, once you come in off of Hillview. We think that the garage positioning, which is taking advantage of the natural topography of the site, will help facilitate or reduce traffic across the site. Obviously, that's a concern we all have. We have to have a certain width of lane for the fire emergency vehicles, of course, so that's an important agenda that we have to balance these concerns with, as well.

Chair Furth: You think you're at the minimum width already?

Mr. McCarthy: Yes, we are.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any further questions of the applicant or staff?

Board Member Thompson: Could we talk about passive ventilation, or just more operable openings?

Mr. McCarthy: Just briefly about the garage, I think you were asking about the garage originally. It is a mechanically-ventilated garage, so there is a coiling screen door at the east entry that will be the intake area. There are three ports that will have fan-driven exhaust for ventilation of the garage. There's not a lot of traffic in the garage, so the fans are hardly on. At peak loads, they might turn on briefly. As far as the building itself and designing a high-performance R&D facility, we would love to see everyone really embrace natural ventilation. The design team developed the SLAC visitors entry building, if you know that project, where we were able to use natural ventilation. It's a very different use, though. They can wear shorts and tee-shirts and enjoy a little bit more casual environment, and once you get into lab or R&D program, it does typically require mechanical ventilation and a little bit more robust systems for that. It becomes highly onerous to make a building that's both mechanically ventilated and naturally ventilated, so it usually becomes prohibitive unless you can start dropping off some of the mechanical systems to take advantage of those natural ventilation systems.

Board Member Thompson: There are no operable windows? There's just doors?

Jim Inglis, Stanford: I'll just jump in on the natural ventilation question, because we had recently a project over at 1450 Page Mill. We had a tenant who wanted to up roll-up doors so that they could bring in the fresh air. What happens is, if you don't wall off the whole area that you're opening up, you will waste a lot of energy. There's very few hours per day that you can actually run that in an energy-efficient way. We had our energy modular actually go through and do hour by hour, and it's surprisingly few hours per day that you can have that open. Once you wall that whole thing off, you've really impacted what you can do in the space. You can't have that open space. That's part of the issue, too. Just controlling the energy efficiency. We found that to be very challenging.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. McCarthy: If I could add just a couple of comments in response to some of the conversation about the corner and the north façade. Again, we appreciate all of the comments and we're certainly concerned about all these issues you've raised. We think we've done an adequate or excellent job. Some of the issue is in what the renderings show versus what the design shows. So, just to make a point about this entry stairway. There are trees planned around the seating element at this intermediate landing. We think this is going to be a very inviting and pleasant walk, in addition to the ramp that's proposed. We purposely are trying to make the site occupiable and useable and bring people across the site. And, yes, it's a very challenging topographical challenge we have here for this site, to address this grade change, but we think we're doing it in a way that is celebrating the natural and enjoying this natural topography, rather than sort of running away from it. We're bringing people into the site and able to use it, we think.

Chair Furth: When I look at the plan, it says concrete wall/seating bench. Which, to me, indicates, at least when I look at the drawing, that it doesn't have a back, it doesn't have anything I can put my hands on to push up from if I need help. So, I would not consider...It's good to know about the trees and the shading, but I would not consider that the kind of attractive, I could stop and have a brief conversation; I can sit back and...

Mr. McCarthy: That's a level of amenity we can certainly add.

Chair Furth: I don't think that's a big ask.

Mr. McCarthy: No, no. I just wanted to, you know, defend the, you know, taking occupancy of the corner is going to be challenging. It's a tough grade change.

Chair Furth: We believe you thought of it. We just always think we have other ideas.

Mr. McCarthy: I appreciate it. We will amplify the amenity on the deck there. Was there also a comment about the south elevation that you had a question...?

Chair Furth: Yeah. When you look at the elevation that you provided us, it looks pretty grim.

Mr. McCarthy: We do see this as an R&D facility. There is an ample amount of daylight and views we're trying to harvest here, but we're also trying to be judicious about openings here. The materials are very rich and elegant and a high quality. I understand...

Chair Furth: I'm concerned about this six-inch or eight-inch or 10-inch tall landscaping.

Mr. McCarthy: I'm sorry. I gotcha. Again, these renderings may not fully represent the natural character of the landscaping and the wild grasses that are proposed here. But, I appreciate those comments.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Gooyer: Could I ask one quick question? Your comment that, well, it's an R&D building, so it's basically appropriate for that? I mean, that's the way you're coming across, to me.

Mr. McCarthy: No, I don't mean it in that way. In some...

Board Member Gooyer: I mean, if that's the case, you could put a Butler building there and it's good enough. I mean, you know, and I'm being a bit facetious, obviously, but that's what it sounds like. You've said it now a couple of times; it's an R&D building, so it's what's going on inside, and it's technical, and all this sort of thing. But, we're looking at it from the point of view where somebody walking by who doesn't know what it is, is still going to go, "Wow." Either a mediocre building, or an attractive building.

Mr. McCarthy: I didn't mean that in any way to be demeaning of it. We are very deeply interested in...

Board Member Gooyer: Then you need to be careful how you present that.

Mr. McCarthy: ...architecture for R&D as being celebratory. I apologize for any tone that (inaudible).

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I mean...

Vice Chair Baltay: I want to, given what you were just saying about, sounds to me like your intention is going to be to tweak the design of that staircase to somehow make it more inviting. I'd like to come back and say that if you could somehow focus so the stair came to that middle entry point of the building on Hillview, I think your design would be a lot more successful. You wouldn't have as much of a grade change, and you have a clear visual cue where you're going to, which is an entrance. Sort of similar to the main entrance on the other side of the building. You could even bring the skylights through to make an internal area there. There's a lot of opportunity to take what we're saying a little bit deeper, and it's not just tweaking a staircase. Your concept on that corner is not quite right. I really encourage you to take that seriously. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay, any other questions before we...

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I just have one more comment on the south elevation. My concern wasn't the landscaping as much. I do think it's wise to keep your glazing minimal on that side like you have. But, I think, yeah, in terms of the material, it does feel kind of like a big, blank wall, in many ways. And I think part of the reason I expressed my distaste for the terracotta is because I think of, it's because mainly of its use here. But, I think there's opportunities to sort of make that wall a bit more interesting, even just keeping the glazing as you have it, but maybe thinking about a different way of using that material.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, shall we see if somebody has a motion to make, and if we can get consensus on it?

Board Member Lew: I have some comments on findings, first. On page 29 of the packet, Finding #4 about pedestrian and bicycle safety, I think I would add, for staff, I think I might add that one of the curb cuts on Coyote is being removed. And then, also on Hillview, I think the existing sidewalk is being replaced and a planter strip is being added, so there's more separation between them. And then, also, they're adding an accessible route where there is currently none on site.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, Alex, adding an accessible what?

Board Member Lew: Accessible route. Like the ramp. And under Finding #5, which is our native plant landscaping, I think the draft language says the project's landscaping includes drought-tolerant species, and I would add that it includes primarily native plant species. And more on the planting plan. I think the landscape architect has called out the native plants, but there are actually more native plants than they've called out.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Okay. That's all that I have on the findings.

Chair Furth: The request from staff is that we recommend approval. I have heard a number of comments. Does somebody want to try a motion? Don't all leap up at once.

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we continue this project to a date uncertain, subject to the comments we've made at this meeting.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Discussion? Alex?

Board Member Lew: (inaudible)

Board Member Thompson: That seems pretty reasonable.

Chair Furth: Want to speak to your motion?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I wish I could give you a precise list, but I think we've had a pretty wide-ranging and comprehensive discussion. No, I have nothing else to add.

Chair Furth: I am concerned that we have not pulled ourselves together sufficiently to give clear direction. I could be wrong. Are you all clear over there? Do you have everything you need? A simple yes or no will do.

Male: Yes.

Chair Furth: All right. Staff would like some direction?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, staff would like some direction, if the applicant does not need it. I do have a list of things that I was writing down. Maybe you could just clarify for us. We were speaking about the corner of the building, the architecture, but I didn't hear really any specifics on that.

Chair Furth: The first question is, do the majority of us feel that that corner needs more work?

Board Member Gooyer: I don't think it's only that corner. I think it's just the, you know, the building is 85 percent there, and it looks like there were areas where they concentrated on it, and it's not a four-sided building.

Chair Furth: Your concern would be the southern and western facades? Elevations?

Board Member Gooyer: Basically, the southern and northern sides. And then, obviously, how they connect at the corners.

Chair Furth: I heard a concern that birds, we weren't sure how to address bird safety, but wanted to be sure that it was adequately addressed. That sort of thing.

Ms. Gerhardt: I do have bird-safe glass further in my list here. But what I'm hearing then is that the street corner of the building is sufficient; it's more the back corner, the southern side?

Chair Furth: I think we should talk about intersections, perhaps. It's the corner of Coyote and Hillview and the view from that corner, and the way that that part of it works or fails to work. With suggestions that the staircase be both more attractive and inviting, and it direct the walker to the center of the building, rather than the corner.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. And I did hear about the other, there's a stairway that leads from the street corner, adding, maybe there's a, in the middle of the staircase, sort of halfway up, it sounds like there's some benches, that enhancing that area. And then, where does the staircase end? Maybe it can end at a different location that's more directed at a front entrance.

Chair Furth: There's an argument that that would strengthen the design. While we're at it, I didn't stop to look to see what the seating is along the frontages along road, but I would be concerned about that.

Board Member Gooyer: From a presentation standpoint, it might be helpful...And I understand you want to show the building at that corner, so you've taken out the trees that theoretically would be there. Maybe you need to make a separate one that says this is what it's actually going to look like with the trees in place when they're accurate, and some of the, you know, what's going on underneath those trees, and not worry about the building. And then, show us one what the corner looks like.

Chair Furth: And then, does anybody else share my concern with the intersection of the pedestrians and the cars at the entrance to the building and the parking lot? Everybody else is fine? So, you don't need to worry about that.

Board Member Thompson: I think, following up in general, just having the renders be more representative of your design intent, so that we're able to understand exactly what you guys are going for.

Ms. Gerhardt: On the southern elevation, I think probably the perspective, again, could it be enhanced to show more reality of what that landscaping is going to look like? But then, there were some comments about material uses on that side.

Chair Furth: That was a comment from Osma. Does anybody share that concern?

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I mean, this is sort of the classic building where, at least the design looks like it was designed for three sides, and the fourth one is just sort of, well, that's the back side, it's not that big a deal. You even call it the service yard. I mean, it just shows that in your whole concept of thinking, this is definitely the back side of the building and it's not that critical. I'm not saying it has to be magnificent, but I think it has to...Because if you put this next to the other three, I mean, if you're in the profession, you understand it, but if you're a layman, you might not even equate that those two buildings are the same, or those two views are of the same building.

Mr. McCarthy: It might be helpful if I could reiterate what I think you felt was successful here on the west and east façade, was that there was sort of a significant level of scale.

Board Member Gooyer: Right. When you compare this façade to that...

[crosstalk]

Mr. McCarthy: ... and dynamic composition...

Board Member Gooyer: ...south façade, it's not even close.

Mr. McCarthy: We can take some more of this character and apply it to the south and the north facades, so there are some more level of scales and interest. Is that a safe way to interpret?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, definitely not the other way around.

Chair Furth: I think you're getting a lot of nods in the affirmative on that.

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Mr. McCarthy: If we can do that, we'll also look at the height of the roof screen. We heard that comment. We do think we're going to be able to lower that, probably not to six feet, but we've been pushing on that height already. That's promising, we think. And then, we will look at the entry walks and stairs from the corner to see how we can make that more amenable, or adjust the renderings to show the landscaping that might not be of the character that we're really proposing here. Sometimes that's a difficult thing to get to look right.

Chair Furth: And we're not pushing for more glass on the southern frontage. We appreciate the fact that it's the south.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me ask. One of the things we've had various conversations over the weeks as far as the whole idea of a bottom, middle and top, and the south and north facades really don't have that, any consideration, and the other two do.

Vice Chair Baltay: Robert, I want to be clear that that guideline is really from the El Camino Real design guidelines.

Board Member Gooyer: I understand that. I'm not saying that it has to be. I'm just curious. Okay, then, forget about it. Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: No, a good building has, that's one technique to handsome building, but I don't know if we want to start setting that as a standard.

Board Member Gooyer: No, no, no, I'm just saying because the two other sides really emphasize that, that there should be some...Okay.

Board Member Thompson: I think, in general, it's a breakdown of scale, I think is appreciated.

Ms. Gerhardt: I just wanted to continue down my list. We talked about celebrating stormwater, and that may just be a diagram that we need to put in the plans to show where those features are.

Chair Furth: We just want to see some juncus.

Board Member Lew: You want to see some what?

Chair Furth: Oh, juncus is typically what people plant in these areas. Something of a joke. Just that the planning cues use, that there's sometimes more water.

Ms. Gerhardt: There was conversation about the finger islands. Is that something that we're concerned about? In the parking lot?

Chair Furth: No. We thought it's a difficult constraint for the landscape architects to work with.

Board Member Lew: If you go up and down Sand Hill Road, all the oak trees that are planted along, they're all planted in a grid. When I worked at the Stanford planning office, somebody was kind of suspect about it, and they went out there with a tape measure and measured all of them, and they figured they're actually all perfectly spaced. But you don't notice it at all when you're going down the street. That's partly the tree species. If they were palm trees, you would notice it, but you don't notice it when they're oak trees.

Chair Furth: Over time they create their own spaces. Well, I think we have probably said as much as is going to be useful. Can we vote on this? The motion was made by Board Member Baltay, seconded by Board Member Gooyer. All those in favor say aye? All those opposed? Passes 5-0.

#### **MOTION TO CONTINUE TO A DATE UNCERTAIN PASSES 5-0**

Chair Furth: Thank you very much for your presentation. We look forward to seeing the building again. Five-minute break and we'll go to our next item.

[The Board took a short break.]

#### **Study Session**

3. **565 Hamilton (18PLN-00067): Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of a Proposed Three-Story, Approximately 29,900 Square Foot Mixed-Use Development Comprised of Ground Floor Office and Residential, Second Floor Office and Residential, Third Floor Residential (19 Residential Units in Total) and Below-Grade Parking Level. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: CD-C(P) & RM-40 (Downtown Commercial and High Density Multiple-Family Residence District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Haleigh King at Haleigh.King@cityofpaloalto.org.**

Chair Furth: Good morning. We're back in session, and we are on item number 3 in our agenda, which is request for preliminary architectural review of a proposed three-story, approximately 29,000 square foot mixed-use development, with ground floor office and residential, second floor office and residential, third floor residential, 19 residential units in total, with below-grade parking. The environmental assessment is that this is not a project. I will let staff explain why not. Involves the demolition of three existing residential structures. Oh, this is not a project because it's preliminary review. Sorry. I was thinking you were saying the whole project. The zoning is combined. These parcels have two different zones on them. One is CD-C(P), that's industry and commercial downtown, commercial pedestrian overlay, or something, and RM-40. Our project planner is Haleigh King. Ms. King?

Haleigh King, Project Planner: Good morning, members of the Board. My name is Haleigh King, and I am the project planner for this preliminary review application at 565 Hamilton. As Chair Furth mentioned, this is a preliminary review, so no formal action will be taken today. The purpose is for the Board to provide feedback to the applicant for the project direction as it's presented to you. The project site is located on the corner of Hamilton and Webster, at the eastern end of downtown. Currently, the project site is three separate units with split zoning. The applicant is proposing to merge the three lots to create one 22,000 square foot lot and maintain the current zoning, which is CD-C(P), Commercial Downtown with Pedestrian Overlay, and RM-40, that corner portion there. The proposed building would be mixed use residential and office on the CD-C side and multifamily residential on the RM-40 side. Office space is proposed at approximately 7,000 square feet, with a total of 19 residential units. Access to the underground parking garage would be provided off of a Webster Street entrance, where 39 spaces would be proposed where 66 is required. The current underground parking configuration would be...The applicant would be requesting parking adjustments through TDM plans, as well as payment into the in-lieu parking for the portions in the downtown assessment district. The project went to an HRB study session last Thursday for the main purpose of soliciting feedback as it relates to the historic resource as seen in this image at 530 Webster. It's that Garden Court apartments. So, the HRB looked at the context of the building adjacent to that. Some of their main comments were around a landscape buffer between the two sites, potential privacy impacts from the upper floors, light intrusion, and looking at a better transition in scale from the 530 Webster to the subject site, including potentially stepping back upper floors. Some key considerations for the Board today include setback requirements. The code gives some discretion to the director, with a recommendation from the ARB for some of the RM-40 setbacks along Hamilton and Webster. It is pertinent to note that there's a 17-foot special setback along Hamilton for both zoning districts. And then, a 25-foot arterial setback for the RM-40 portion. However, that is where the discretion would lie for the Board and the director as it relates to contextual criteria. Again, we're looking for general project direction as it relates to the context design criteria and pedestrian overlay. Again, no action is requested today, but we're here to get your feedback for the applicant, for the direction of the project. Happy to answer any questions. The applicant does have a presentation prepared, as well.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of Haleigh? Haleigh, just to clarify, the arterial setback is on Hamilton, or...?

Ms. King: Correct. Hamilton.

Chair Furth: On Hamilton.

Board Member Lew: I have a question about the setback. I did look at the zoning map for the special setbacks. I thought my understanding was that there was a seven-foot setback on Hamilton. And then, I looked on the corner, it seems like the corner does require a 17-foot one. Is it separated by the zoning? Is it CN versus, or CD versus the RM-40? Or is it actually a line drawn on the map?

Ms. King: It is actually the property. We looked at our just-filed and it does, for some reason, the seven-foot setback stops at that 555 Hamilton and switches to 17 at 565.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Chair Furth: All right, we'd like to hear from the applicant. You have 10 minutes for your presentation, which will start when you're ready to go. If you could introduce yourself and spell your name for our transcriber.

Roslyn Cole: Sure. [spells name].

Chair Furth: Thanks. You have to speak very close to these microphones for them to pick you up.

Ms. Cole: Okay. I'll try to speak very closely. Good morning. My name is Roslyn Cole, and I'm a principal with Aidlin Darling Design, and I'm very happy to be here this morning to get your feedback on our project. The site that we are sitting at, at the corner of Hamilton and Webster, is a very intriguing site because it sits at the end of the commercial businesses along Hamilton, and then, the beginning of where the residential neighborhoods start to the north, the east and the south. It is a true point of transition. This has informed a number of our project goals, which have been what we have been designing to. First of all, this point of transition is very important to us. We wanted to create a seamless building that would really work to transition between the commercial neighbors and the residential neighbors. We're looking to create a design and massing that fits within the existing context and pays particular attention to respecting the privacy of the neighbors at 530 Webster. One of our goals is to create a biophilic design to not only protect the existing natural environment, to really provide new opportunities for the residences and the pedestrians to have more ability to reconnect with nature. We're interested in creating a building with a strong sense of permanence and timelessness, and to have a building with the materiality that fits within the neighborhood context, is honest, natural materials, and that really works to the scale of the human body. Shown here is the site plan. As Haleigh mentioned, there are a number of mandated setbacks, and then there are also a number of things that we really put upon ourselves that have set our building footprint. We have our 17-foot setback along Hamilton. Our neighbor is at seven feet, so we're set 10 feet back from that neighbor. Along Webster, we have set the primary face of our building 20 feet back when there's this zero to 16-foot setback required, to align our building with the 530 Webster. At the first floor, our building is set back even further, an additional five feet. Along the northern edge, we have a 10-foot landscape buffer between us and our northerly neighbor, which actually grows to 18 feet towards the front of the site. And then, lastly, there are a number of mature redwood trees on the adjacent parking lot site that we have pulled our building back significantly to respect both the canopy and the root structure of those trees. For the first-floor plan, the office space has been pulled to the far west, adjacent to its commercial neighborhood, and does not take up the full width of the CD-C parcel lot, in order to provide transition to the residential portions of the building. The building is a courtyard building, so we have a central main courtyard that is for the enjoyment of the residents, with an adjacent exterior space for the use of the offices. This is very visible through a translucent lobby that fronts onto Hamilton Street. So, the passerby's, the pedestrians and the vehicular traffic can look in and see the green, but it still provides the privacy for the residences to use that space. As Haleigh mentioned, below-grade parking is entered through Webster Street. Early on in the project, we looked at locating this on Hamilton and on Webster and were directed by Planning and Transportation to locate it on the quieter street. We pulled it away from the corner, and then, 30 feet away from the adjacent neighbor, to enter into that below-grade parking. On the second floor, the office space directly stacks above the first floor. And then, the courtyard is ringed with residential units on this floor. We have put as many residential units on this floor in order to provide more open space on the third floor, where we have opened up to the Webster side to create a shared terrace for the use of the residences. This serves to break down the

building in scale, which you'll see in the elevation, along this more residential side. It also provides views to this terrace from the ground floor, which is consistent with our biophilic goals. This is the below-grade parking, which is shown in your set. It can house 39 cars, as well as 19 of the long-term residential bike parking and single required long-term bike parking for the offices. We have an alternate below-grade parking plan that is still under consideration at this point by the flood plain administrator, which would allow us to use mechanized lifts in the below-grade parking area, which would bring our count up to 59 and serve to park us fully on site after our 10 percent reduction is met. This is still under consideration. Moving to the material palette, these are just some images to represent the direction that we're headed in. We are looking for a very solid base on this building, so we're proposing the use of a board-formed concrete, which has a texture quality to it when seen adjacent to the more smooth plaster and landscaping, which we have fronting each of these walls. These walls pull away and have areas of translucency, such as at the lobby, which is represented by something similar here, where you're able to look through a space and into the courtyard and the green beyond. On the second floor, we're proposing cement fiber board panel, which is a very durable material. It works well with the adjacent stucco buildings but provides a scale through the texture of the material itself, as well as the jointing that is more relatable to the human scale. Shown also in this image here is the underside of wood soffit and wood panels. We are using, and proposing to use, cedar wood judiciously through this project, at the underside of our eaves, at the upper terrace trellises for the shared terrace, to create an outdoor room, not dissimilar from this upper-left. And, just to add that layer of warmth to the overall palette. This is a streetscape elevation along Hamilton. We have held our building at 40 feet. We had the ability to go up to 50 feet on our CDC parcel, but have chosen through our studies to really keep the building at a consistent 40 feet. Shown here against its 50-foot neighbors and a 70-foot tall church is very modest and low-lying in this context. Turning the corner, the building serves as a transition between the 50-foot tall adjacent commercial neighbor, and then, stepping down to the residential neighbor here. You can see in this image, you can start to see the opening and breaking down of the mass of this upper level, which creates two glassy wings that are enclosed, with a much larger terrace between. Our neighbor, which is a C-shaped building, has similar-proportioned side wings as proportioned in this upper level, which creates that C-shape at the third floor. Shown here is the Hamilton Street elevation. You can see that the office space over on this side is very glassy. We're proposing the use of metal brise-soleil to passively deal with the solar gain along this side, as well as an upper balcony that delineates the upper limit of that space. The building itself is broken down into a tripartite massing to bring down the scale. So, again, on the ground floor, we have the board-formed concrete and glazing looking into the lobby. The central section of the cement fiber board panels is more solid with punched window openings. And then, the upper level is intentionally very light and transparent. Turning the corner, the datum of that upper level of the cement board, the solid panel, starts to align with the existing building at 530 Webster. And then, here again, you can see this wide opening at the center where you're seeing sky, and then our two more glazed wings. We are trying to get as much depth within this façade as we can within our 17-foot setback. As shown here, we have the office space with the metal brise-soleil to provide a sense of texture, as well as a shading element. The balcony, and then the projecting eaves, to really try to provide a little bit of variation. And then, there's the depth, the visual depth as you look into the courtyard. Here on the corner, you can see the material wrapping the corner. Here, the scale starts to be broken down. We have two residential units on the lower level that have cedar wood privacy screen, and then, an opening and a central space. And then, here, shown from Webster, you can see where that datum starts to really align with the adjacent building, and the top component of the building, the third floor starts to break down. We met with the Historic Resource Board last week, and one of their questions was about how our windows might relate to those at 530 Webster. We've added this section to show our relationship to this building. We have a significant privacy screen between our two buildings, located here. On the first floor, that privacy screen basically does not allow any gaze over to the adjacent site. On the second floor, the screening is intended to grow up to the point where we can basically also screen our views across, and where they're looking at...

Chair Furth: Hi. You have hit your 10 minutes...

Ms. Cole: I have one more slide.

Chair Furth: ...plus, so why don't you show us your last slide, and wind it up. And then, we can ask questions.

Ms. Cole. Okay, thank you. The third floor looks over. Lastly, just ending on this slide, I just want to say we're really happy to be here today. It's a very intriguing site. It's an interesting problem, and we look forward to your comments. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your presentation. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak?

Chris Meany, Wilson Meany: Hi. Chris Meany and Brandy Bridges, both with Wilson Meaney, developers of the site. We are not going to use up the time, but are here to answer questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have two public comment cards, comment cards from members of the public. Jeff Levinsky and Roberta Ahlquist? I can't quite read it. Why don't we start with Mr. Levinsky. I should also note that we have two letters, one from Nielson Buchanan [phonetic], and the other one, I do not have to hand. Does somebody have a copy? I've read it, but... The other one, from Beth Rosenthal [phonetic]. Talk about those in a minute. Go ahead, Mr. Levinsky, you have three minutes. Can you spell your name for the record?

Jeff Levinsky: I can spell my name. Thank you, good morning. [spells name] I'm here to talk mainly about the parking problems. First of all, they talk about using in-lieu parking. The in-lieu parking has various rules associated with it, and I'm not sure this project qualifies for in-lieu parking, whatsoever. The first rule is about, would the parking have to destroy a substantial or historic structure, and the answer is no. The second rule is for sites under 10,000, that this is not. The third is for sites over 10,000 but of an unusual configuration. This is pretty rectangular. The fourth is where it precludes curb cuts. They're going to have a curb cut. The fifth is where there's some physical constraint which precludes provision without extraordinary expense. No argument has been made what the expense would be that would be required to provide the on-site parking. Another problem is right at the beginning of the in-lieu rule, it says that the City is supposed to have a pool of in-lieu parking spaces that it sells. There is no pool. So, until we have one, any payment to the City won't necessarily create any new parking spaces, so it will create a problem that violates the Comprehensive Plan's concerns about preventing buildings from creating parking problems. There was mention of using a TDM to reduce the parking. Properties in the downtown assessment district are not eligible for TDM's. They can't use that to reduce their parking, so could only reduce the parking on the residential side by, say, 20 percent, which would be, I think, a couple, maybe two or three parking spaces is all you could reduce legally there. There's another problem that we've mentioned before, which is that when you reduce parking on site, you're reducing the number of accessible parking spaces that will be provided, as well, because that's based on a formula, essentially. And when you take away that accessible parking spot, where is someone who needs that spot supposed to go? Right? To tell them they have to go two blocks down into the City garage doesn't help somebody who needs an accessible parking spot. That's why we put them right next to the elevators and the stairs. One other thing that I'd like to mention here is that I agree with the comments made that it would be better to have a good transition between this building and the other on Webster, and in looking at the slides and so forth, I hope you all suggest ways that they could make it more compatible, not only about privacy and so forth, those issues, but also so that the one remaining building that we're going to have of that style and so forth isn't overwhelmed by what this building style looks like. That's it. Thanks very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Roberta Ahlquist?

Roberta Ahlquist: This building is going to replace three small buildings which were used for below-market-rate housing, a stucco two-story building, which had, I believe, five or six units, and a four-plex, which were studios, and a one-story shingled house that was recently, that a professor from Stanford was recently evicted from. These are nine, 10 units of below-market-rate housing in Palo Alto, and being replaced with office. Palo Alto City Council just said we have plenty of office, we need no more office, we need housing. None of this is below market. It's a multimillion-dollar project. The plane of light on

Webster is out of scale. This is out of scale for the neighborhood. The church has all kinds of activities, night and day, daily. I live nearby. This is not enough parking. My concern is that it's way out of scale, that we don't need the office space, it's high-income housing. In the spirit of the recent housing overlay for Palo Alto, I would advocate that you reject this proposal and require in any proposal that below-market-rate housing exists, and that you look at the houses that exist there currently and notice that they're perfectly fine, serviceable housing. And to have that below-market-rate housing be replaced by a way-out-of-scale, out-of-context, too-dense proposal is something that we in the neighborhood do not advocate. Also, just a comment about being vigilant about developments that occur around the downtown. You have to almost be a development cop to keep track. There's no way unless you just happen to drive by or are in the neighborhood, of even knowing that these kinds of proposals go forward. I'm sure you're going to hear from many more neighbors when it's clear that they know about this project. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else wish to speak on this item? You have another 10 minutes to respond to anything you'd like to raise. Anything further you'd like to say? Or you can just wait for us to ask questions. If you could re-introduce yourself for the tape.

Mr. Meany: Chris Meany. We are, as Roslyn said, it's still under advisement about whether we can do the mechanized lifts in the garage. That was our original proposal. We're just looking for clarification of that. That would allow us to do all parking on site.

Chair Furth: And that's because you're in the flood zone?

Mr. Meany: Yeah.

Chair Furth: And so, your approach would involve...?

Mr. Meany: Putting the...

Chair Furth: ...water barriers?

Mr. Meany: Water barriers, and putting the electrical components above the flood plain level.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That's helpful. Any questions of staff or the applicant? Or the public? Okay. This is a study session, so it's more informal, and we won't be taking any action today. This is an early chance for us to look at the proposal and give them our comments before they have made more elaborate plans, though I'm sure they have spent considerable time on this. I had something for staff, which is that when... First of all, have all of us looked at this site? When I was looking at this site, I was startled to see a two luxury flat project that, of course, we didn't see because it's two residential units. I think it's 513 and 515. I just sent you an email with a picture from its frontage. Can you get that up so we can take a look at it? Did we all see that? Because it's going to change the context. I just emailed it to you.

Ms. King: I don't know that I noticed that.

Board Member Lew: You're talking about the one down the street, the luxury duplex that's been in the news?

Chair Furth: I am. The luxury duplex, self-described luxury duplex. And I'm sure it's true. It's 515 and 519 Webster. It's designed by Fergus Garber. We'll get it up so the public can see it, but that's a picture of the sign in front of it, which has an elevation.

Ms. King: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Okay, I'll try again. And this, of course, does not come to ARB. I'll mail it to you. Okay. Let's start with comments. Who would like to begin? Volunteers? Okay, Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning, and thank you. Very quickly, I have a question about the existing buildings to the left on Hamilton, where you're saying that it's 44 feet tall. The immediately-adjacent parapet to that commercial building labeled "Solomon" on the front. I think you could just check those numbers. It seems to me much less tall than that. You want to be sure because that's visually important to how your building relates to it. This is a study session. It doesn't really matter right now. But, I recommend you just be sure you have an accurate understanding of the site. Let me throw to you then that this is gorgeous architecture. You've got some really interesting spaces, especially that third floor open area overlooking, is it Webster Street? But, I'm concerned that you're just not quite hitting urban design standards that we're looking for. I can throw out two pieces to it that are, have been sort of gnawing away at, trying to understand and get a grip on it. Because it is an attractive-looking building. You have residences on the ground floor at grade, and you're creating some sort of privacy screens to make that work. And yet, what you see around downtown mostly is porches and slight elevation changes, and an effort to, yes, we have residences, and yes, they're in a more urban area, but also very pedestrian-oriented. We're constantly striving to get more pedestrian connection and activity -- light, eyes on the street, Jan Jacobs [phonetic] kind of thing. And yet, what you're doing really doesn't do that. You're sort of turning your back on that. You're saying this is a private luxury development, we've got a beautifully-made screened fence, you can't see us and we can't see you. That's because you're at-grade right across the street from a busy church. You want to do that, perhaps. But, I don't think it's good urban design. I don't think it's really responding to Palo Alto, to the nature of being at a transition zone where, really, everybody around you, they do porches, they do more, sort of micro-scale things that people...Yes, you probably don't sit out there too much, and your neighbors are probably not walking by every day. It's a little bit too urban for that. But still, it's done. You've just not done that. And then, I come to the design of the building as a whole, and Alex has repeatedly pointed out, when you have these very long facades of buildings -- which is what you'll have here; you must be close to 100 feet -- you just accentuate that. Your roof is a single, strong line. Very powerful architectural feature. In some places, you know, perhaps the site we saw earlier than this, out in Coyote Hill, it would really be stunning. But here, you're just accentuating again that this is one big development, rather than a small scale of houses. A textured fabric. An urban character where you differentiate what's an office from a home. And you're not doing that. You're creating a dramatic architecture, but I don't think it's got the scale and sensitivity that's appropriate for a residential mixed-use core downtown area kind of space. Those two things have left me really eager to hear what everybody else on the Board thinks. I guess I'm just uncomfortable with your overall design concept, more than even the execution of it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I appreciate what Board Member Baltay had to say. I also had a comment about the façade on the ground. Part of our findings is that it needs to be pedestrian-oriented, and right now, it's just not, in many ways. I mean, I appreciate the green wall, or I guess it's a concrete wall that has greenery on it. I actually had a hard time trying to find any windows, or entrances, or anything that might relate to the pedestrian experience on that road, which I think is extremely important, especially as it is transitioning into a residential neighborhood. So, in that sense, I would encourage you to explore some more architectural things you can do to encourage pedestrian activity. I agree, there are many parts of the design that you have that are really stunning. I think the wood especially provides this great flash of high-quality material. I take a bit of an issue with the middle band of cement fiber board. I don't think it's doing you any favors. I understand that you sort of want a foil to your wood, so you're creating something dark and dense, but as it stands, you know, I can see a precedent image that you have in your material palate with the cement board. I think that image works because it's partee [phonetic] is that it's the solid thing, and then you're cutting into it, and the cutting into it is your wood. But, you're not using it like that in your project. You're kind of using it as a wrap, and it just doesn't work as a wrap. I think you can find another material that can accomplish the same thing, but is nicer to experience and look at like the wood. The wood is really nice to experience and look at, and the cement board is just kind of this opposite thing. I'd also encourage you to look at that. I think maybe it's partially the scale of it, that it just looks very big, and I can see that you're trying to use the paneling to break down the scale, but I think you can do more in terms of texture and in terms of scale on that. And I agree with Board Member Baltay also, the roof. The roof can also...I appreciate the clean lines and stuff, but I don't know

that it's appropriate for this area. So, yeah, something to look at in terms of the roof and changing them. I didn't hear much talk in terms of what kind of systems you might be using for sustainability. I did hear about the brise-soleil on the southern side. That's really great. I think just to develop more conceptual ideas in terms of how air is passing through, thermal comfort. You do have a lot of glassy areas. You have some shading, but I think a little bit more conceptually in terms of how this project is operating sustainable would be good to see in your next presentation. And I did notice a lot of trees on site. It would be good to know what's happening with those trees right now, what you're proposing. That's also something to look at because it seems like it's quite wooded right now over there. It would be good see. Yeah, those are all my comments for now.

Chair Furth: Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I agree with Peter that, I like the overall concept of the design, the style, that sort of thing. But also, I was thinking the same thing where, if you walk in on Webster, it looks like you're passing people's back yards, so to speak. Now, that was done in the 50's or 60's, and again, I realize that it really doesn't do much for the person walking by. And, this is a downtown area. I like porches, balconies, that sort of thing there, people sitting outside. Sometimes all it takes is one or two people to do it, and all of a sudden, more people do it. So, like I said, the concept of the design, I like, but I think the bulk needs to be, or the perceived bulk needs to be reduced, and also, somewhat more, maybe segmented is the wrong thing, but make it look like there are three or four smaller pieces, rather than one large piece. Even if the portion on Hamilton that abuts the neighbor, which is the commercial portion, can stay probably of that scale, because that is what it is. It's commercial and not residential. I think the rest of it needs to, you know, do it more of a traditional residential approach. You come in from the outside to the residence, rather than around the back or through the hallway. That sort of thing I think would work. I think it's a good start, but, like I said, based on that. One of the big problems I have with a lot of these things is that -- and one of the speakers said the same thing -- it's all fine and dandy paying an in-lieu fee, but it's just a mythical, theoretical thing. You're not buying spaces. If it was an in-lieu fee because you're buying these 20 spaces, then it would be something. If I'm renting a place here, or buying a place here, and I'm told, "You really don't have any parking spaces here, you have to find a space," or, theoretically, "you're allowed to park in the adjacent parking lot down the street," that's not going to do it for me. I mean, even if it's down stairs, or whatever the case is, I want to be able to at least park on my property. Now, maybe the deal is one is on the property, one is not. That's one thing. But not where it's hit or miss. I just don't think that's going to work. The mechanized systems are getting much better, so I think that's worth looking into. Just make sure that...You are going to need some accessible spaces in there, so, I've seen, unfortunately some projects come in where they put the mechanized units in, and it's eliminated every...You can't really expect somebody in a wheelchair to use one of those things. Other than, that I think it's going in the right direction.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: I do want to acknowledge that we've got a great developer and design team on this project. I think of the architect projects that I've seen in San Francisco, are really some of the best buildings in the Bay Area. Really top-notch. Likewise with the developer's projects that I've seen in San Francisco. Really amazing. Staff asked us to comment on the setback on Webster. I just want to explain that the intent of the seven-foot special setback on Hamilton and other streets downtown was, the intent is to widen the streets, and we have widened the streets in many locations, but not on this block. You can see on Hamilton, those streets have been widened from Ramona to Cowper, and you can see the seven-foot differential there. And then, on Webster Street, I'm not clear as to what the intent is of the 17-foot, but I think it was meant to be a transition zone between residential and commercial.

Ms. King: Just to clarify, on Webster Street, there is no special setback.

Board Member Lew: It's just a...

Ms. King: It's just a, yeah, zero to 16 foot contextual.

Board Member Lew: Right. And then, I think my comment on that is, I would be willing to reduce that setback to make the courtyard larger if the proportions of the courtyard worked better. Having a larger courtyard, I think I would accept that, mostly because, it's kind of at the north...it's not perfect north. Kind of north-facing. It's kind of shaded. Alternatively, if they had something more like a porch on Webster, along Webster Street, I would support what's being shown today. We used to have something in the Comprehensive Plan that really encouraged residential units to have an individual presence on the street -- balconies, porches, or whatever -- and we have our new comp plan; I don't know if it's still in there, I haven't checked, but we used to have that there. And on projects in the vicinity of downtown, the Board in the past has tried to encourage individual porches and identifies to make it more interesting, and to...One, is to make it more interesting for the pedestrian on the street, and also, two, is just to have more life and interest for each unit. I think I'm in agreement with my other colleagues on the Board about the façade. I think my main concerns are that on the glass lobby on Hamilton, is actually the quality of the glass. We've had other people try to propose and build these see-through lobbies, and when I've gone out there, in reality, you're not seeing anything through two layers of reflective glass. It's possible to do it with low-iron glass, or whatnot, but if you're just using regular glass, you're not able to see all the way through to the courtyard. It's pretty blurry, given the reflections of the Low-E glass. I think I agree with Board Member Thompson on the cement board. I'm a little hesitant about the cement board. Your drawing showed all the glass as being white, but in reality, it's very dark. And you may end up with, if it's like a gray cement board with very dark gray windows, it may not be so attractive. I would really encourage you to try to figure out a way to make the building more compatible with the neighbors, which are fairly warm colors. I do like the wood soffit. I do like that you're trying to align the cornice line with the next-door project on Webster. I would agree with Robert on trying to segment the façade, if possible. I'd be willing to entertain the proposed design that you have if the materials are really stand-out. I've seen your other buildings and I know that you can do it. If anybody can do it, you guys can do it with regard to the materials and design details. I have a question for staff. Roberta Ahlquist had commented about BMR units, and I was wondering if you would just outline some of our requirements. I think with court cases, right, if they were proposing rental units, we can't make any requirements for BMR, for BMR units, I understand. If it's ownership, and the City can, I was wondering if you could explain that.

Ms. King: Yes, that is correct. The current project is proposing to be rental units, therefore, they aren't required to provide BMR. However, they do have to pay an affordable housing mitigation fee, impact fee, yeah.

Board Member Lew: If I recall correctly, would that be, would the amount be in our final submittals?

Ms. King: Yeah, we would have an estimate...

Board Member Lew: It would be an estimate of that.

Ms. King: ...of what that would be, yeah.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Ms. King: And then, to follow up on your second point, yeah, if they are proposed ownership units, that's when it triggers, I think it's a 25 percent BMR requirement.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for that. On the parking does staff have any comments about Mr. Levinsky's comments about the rules for the downtown assessment district?

Ms. King: Yeah. For the in-lieu option, it does talk about, it's not physically feasible for this site, the fact that it is in the flood zone, we would consider that as satisfying that criteria. And then, the CDC portion is in the downtown, but again, the residential portion is not, so they wouldn't be able to buy spaces for that site. And you can only buy it for commercial. Obviously, residential would need to be provided completely on site.

Board Member Lew: Okay, great, thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay, this is a study session, so I'll give you my thoughts, and I hope we have a little more discussion. Thank you for your presentation. It was well done. I need to judge this building by our standard that says this needs to improve and enhance the residential experience for people in the building, and next to it. In terms of context, I regret the loss of existing units which are lower in, probably quite amortized by now and have lower rents, but that's not our jurisdiction. What I am concerned about more is the loss. It's interesting that you talked about this being biophilic, because what I'm concerned about is the loss of the large-scale street-fronting landscaping, the depth of that that creates the nature of that corner, that's beautifully maintained. And then, in the back yard, you have this crazy, wonderful..."landscaped" is not the word. Green-and-growing space. It's got orchids, it's got banana trees, it's got a whole bunch of other stuff that I can't remember. It's spectacular. And then, next to you, if you remove all these existing buildings, you have 530 Webster. And 530 Webster, since I spent years in exile in Southern California, to me, looks like this little bit of Southern California bungalow court moved up here. It's got parking garages in the back. I don't know as much about the Northern California tradition, but that does exactly what we say we want housing to do in a downtown area. It has front doors that are visible from the street, that are protected from the street, because they are set up a bit, and they open onto a courtyard. And the landscaping, again, is spectacular. People have wonderful pots that they obviously pay attention to. Admittedly, it's green carpet in some of the higher-use areas, but the overall impression is inviting, it's romantic, it's charming, and it generates oxygen like man. I mean, that is a lot of planting per square footage. When you go around, its other frontages do not create that same sense of beauty, and fun, and play, and pleasure. To me, that's what exists there. That's what needs to be protected. It's got the City's parking garage, and admittedly, that parking garage has more interesting landscaping elements as it gets to the street and over the building than most of our parking garages, but it's still a parking garage. You've got the mammoth Methodist Church, which is heavily used for concerts. So, you are going to have hundreds of people walking in the dark, on that corner, back and forth across that street. You need more than the minimum to accommodate the flow of what happens there. I was particularly interested, not in how this compares to the required setbacks, but how it compares to the existing setbacks, because I think this needs major landscaping that is street-friendly. One of the things about the design about 530 is it's generous to the community. This design, with its interior courtyards, which increase the perceived mass and volume of the building, is not generous. And looking through a glass lobby with my nose up against the door, saying, "Oh, look at their private green space," is not at all the same. I think we need ground-floor units that engage the street. They need to be set back far enough to do that. They need to not be walled off. We have some other buildings in town that use that walled-off approach. They don't flourish, and neither does the street. If you can go look further down Webster opposite Webster House, you'll see an unsuccessful example of this. Not to (inaudible) any particular building. I do think it's completely appropriate and necessary for it to look like it's built now. I'm not expecting you to evoke a past era. I mean, which one would you evoke on that corner? It needs to be your good, contemporary design, but you need a different project, in my view. I think it needs to flip. I think more of that green and open space needs to engage both the street and the units. I was having a little trouble identifying the commercial as commercial, so that concerns me, the two different uses. We keep expelling all our psychotherapists from their small buildings, and I don't know what, you know, this is at least not going to be huge plate tech. I don't know how you plan to use it, but I hope it looks subtle. Clearly, this is non-commercial. It's not clear when I look at this building how I get there. That's a problem. We support this kind of interior courtyard, and I think we're almost always in favor of upper terraces unless they look over somebody else's back yard. When they're on a high-impact street like El Camino, and you cannot have attractive, useful -- Who wants to garden on El Camino? Very few people. You have to pay people to do that, and they wear ear protectors. This clearly is a street where people like to garden when they have the chance. So, I would urge you to rethink this so that we have a building that is, in fact, got some rampant landscaping, and not the more industrial landscaping that this might involve. I'm also interested in knowing how -- and I'm sure you've thought this through, but I would like the drawings to show us -- how the street tree canopies interact. Because when we go up, we sometimes get problems. So, if we have spreading trees that we have back in order to accommodate buildings. I would like to know that those trees, which are much needed there, can be. The other buildings pull back a bit from the corner, I think, in reference to the -- I think they do -- the

heavy pedestrian traffic. I don't think that Hamilton drawing is quite accurate, but maybe it is. I'd like to know that it's going to acknowledge the fact that people accumulate on those corners as they wait to cross the street, chattering about what they're going to or what they're coming from. As I was saying, 530 Webster is not going to be well served by 515, 519 Webster, which is the project that's going up without benefit of our comment. It has a challenge with the church, which I think is obviated a bit by the fact that that's a sociable neighborhood use, it's a community resource. So, your building needs to treat that building like a favored, like an aunt you're fond of. You need to take care of it, I think. Okay. That's my rant.

Board Member Lew: Could you clarify your criticism of 515 and 519 Webster Street? I don't understand your issues.

Chair Furth: Well, it's only based on the drawing, and it could be completely inaccurate. But, if you look at the materials, they appear to be brick and highly reflective glass, and black canvas, and metal railings. I cannot figure out how they make the buildings around them resonate well. That's what concerns me.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, architectural compatibility.

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Chair Furth: I know nothing about how they work, whether the use is appropriate, what they're going to cost. I'm thinking about the palate, the materials, and again, I'm just looking at a sketch. Maybe when it's all done and landscaped, we'll all think that's a real enhancement to the neighborhood. Oh, and I would be very much in support of your efforts to get the water barriers approved so that you could have appropriate parking. There's been a real sustained effort to make parking work in these neighborhoods. You do have the advantage of a big garage that handles things like the church concert because it's an evening event, but I think for your own users, it will really make things better for people if they have enough parking.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm wondering if we could discuss perhaps what Alex brought up, about the setback on Hamilton, both because we've given very conflicting information, one about more landscaping and one about possibly reducing the setback, and I find that intriguing. I wasn't aware if it's possible. Maybe staff could start by telling us, is that an option, to bring the setback back to 10 feet? We're doing that with the parking garage down the way on Hamilton. If the purpose of the setback was just for future road widening, and the road is not likely to be widened, I think it would give the developers and architects more latitude if it could be done. Is it feasible?

Ms. Gerhardt: Related to special setbacks, that has been in place for some time, and we have been consistently applying that to all projects. We have not done variances into those special setbacks as of yet. We've put some monument signs, some fences, things of that nature, but not actual structures. So, without changing the zoning code, I think it would be best to respect the special setback. But, we do have some leeway in other areas that Haleigh can probably express.

Ms. King: Yeah, along the Webster Street frontage, that's where you've got the zero to 16 foot setback to work with as it relates to the context of the neighborhood and the street.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm just thinking that the 16 feet on Webster is pretty important to line up with 530. But along Hamilton is where it actually would help the commercial building to be out of line with the other ones, and just to have a little more latitude if you want a front porch, if you want any kind of detail or texture. Give them something to work with. Maybe more importantly is for other Board members to chime in how we feel about that, because Wynne's request for increased landscaping there is opposite of that, I think.

Chair Furth: You don't have to hear it that way. If the building is open to the street instead of being cut off from the street -- as it presently is -- then it's front-yard landscaping.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, I think the question is, are we trying to create front yards with urban residential development, or...

Chair Furth: I have a front yard in my urban residential development.

Vice Chair Baltay: Maybe more comments would help.

Chair Furth: Not big, but the rhododendrons are lovely.

Board Member Lew: For me, it's the design quality. We have very small setbacks in a lot of the downtown areas, but they're designed really well. I think that's the issue. We don't want something blank, or uniform, or monotonous, right? We really want high-quality planting that's interesting at a pedestrian scale. I would support, if there were some sort of entry porch features, I would support those in a reduced setback on Webster Street. And I think I would be...Like Board Member Baltay, I would be interested in a commercial building coming up forward to the seven-foot setback, if it were possible. I don't think it's...I think that special setbacks have been enforced strictly, so I don't think that it's feasible.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have one location on 3200 El Camino, which is a commercial site adjacent to the research park that had a fairly hefty 50-foot special setback.

Board Member Lew: With a hotel.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, we have maybe one precedent, but it's just something that has to go to council for that kind of conversation.

Chair Furth: I'm not arguing for variances, obviously, but we have a housing directive from the council, and we have a housing project, and this might be the time to ask them, to show them what this is doing. I certainly would think that balconies, entries, steps, and all those kinds of things could work. I mean, I'm not holding up where I live as a model of urban design, but it's highly functional, and it's attractive, and it has no curb cuts, which is one of the nice things about this design. It doesn't have a bunch of driveways. We have knee-high walls, which are not very far setback from the...They should be set back further so you could have bigger plants there, but they work. And then, we have another, I think nine feet before our porches start up, eight, nine feet, and then we have porches. That also gives us a sense of shelter. But, you can do much better design than we have. But I do think it's possible to have a unit that's at ground level. After our last debate, I measured mine. It's 18 inches above curb, but it's set back, and it's buffered by as much landscaping as I want. A really dense Japanese maple, and...I look out my windows and I could be in the country because that's the size of the trees. So, I don't know how to make it better, but I want it to engage the street.

Board Member Lew: I have a quick question for staff. Because of the number of units, will this project have to go to the Council?

Ms. King: No, because on the CDC portion, there are only six units, and the threshold is nine for a site and design. And then, the RM-40 portion is just subject to major ARB.

Board Member Lew: Great. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I think I agree, in most part, with Chair Furth, in, like, adding balconies, adding some sort of residential scale to the façade. The project could benefit greatly from that, especially given the material palate that you're developing. Minus the cement board, but, you know, we'll see. And I think it's true, I could support the office coming forward if that was even allowed, but in terms of the setbacks that you have, I agree that integrating really thoughtful landscaping is actually a huge benefit

to the residents. I mean, as it is so many times in open settings, buildings are just pushed up against the sidewalk, and you have this tiny strip, and it just doesn't feel like enough. I think the greenery really gives a breath of fresh air, and I think given that you're aiming for a biophilic design, I think you can definitely use that to your advantage. So, I definitely encourage more greener in the front, as much as possible.

Chair Furth: One of the problems is your own property sets a really high example. You have very beautifully-mandated landscaping there. It's of an era, it's a different era, but it's impressive.

Board Member Lew: One last comment. Could you comment on units 15 and 16, which are on the third floor? Sixteen is the one I would be most concerned about. It's just because it has very limited window area, surrounded on three sides by other units or the neighboring buildings.

Ms. Cole: These two units, 15 and 16, have a different feel than the other units. They don't have the two sides of glass when it comes to looking into the courtyard and then back to the street, or to a property line. What we've done for unit 15, basically it's a one-bedroom unit, and we've provided a green space for each of these in front so they have their own yard component to them. They enter into that piece and they have kind of a frontage of that, which has privacy. And then, 15 has a window to the redwood garden inside.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: And 16 just has the one window out to the courtyard area?

Ms. Cole: Yes, it has a whole wall of glass, basically, along that side. The way we've laid it out is a living room and a bedroom, and then the kitchen and the bathroom is in the back. I'm sorry. We also do have skylights for those two units, so they have light coming in, but they don't have a window in the back.

Chair Furth: Could you say that again? I didn't quite hear you.

Ms. Cole: These two units will have skylights because we are on the top level. They will have light coming into the back of the units.

Board Member Lew: Would it make sense to have units 15 and 16...Let me phrase it this way. Did you consider putting 15 and 16 on where you have the shared terrace, along Webster Street? It would also maybe allow more, possibly add more sunlight to the courtyard if that were only a two-story massing. Have you already considered this?

Ms. Cole: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, no, I think we're running into zoning issues...

Board Member Lew: Okay, got it.

Ms. Gerhardt: ...because there are two different zones for this project.

Board Member Lew: Right, and different floor areas. Okay. Got it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Such fun, working in our code.

Board Member Gooyer: It was a good idea, though.

Chair Furth: We all thought of it. It's just that we don't allow it. Colleagues up here, this covered terrace on project north concerns me. I have this vision of this dark place where whatever is green is not going to thrive.

Board Member Lew: You're saying the first floor...

Chair Furth: Yeah, I'm looking at...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...Level 1 plan. That doesn't seem to be likely to work. I feel like I've been in a lot of those spaces and it never exactly works.

Board Member Lew: Why don't we...

Ms. Cole: That's under the story above, so it actually is intentionally covered.

Chair Furth: Exactly. I got it.

Ms. Cole: Okay.

Chair Furth: I just don't think it's a very pleasant space.

Board Member Lew: Could we just phrase maybe for next time that we understand how all of the open spaces function? What do you call it? The useable...? Common, open...Common and private useable spaces?

Chair Furth: To what extent is this being driven by our zoning requirements?

Board Member Gooyer: Like a cross-section, or something.

Chair Furth: Because, of course, I'm pushing for relocating open spaces where they're shared with the street, as well as the unit. Which may or may not be permitted under our code. But, I do like the roof terrace. And I would be in favor of...Oh, could you add this issue of the setbacks to our study session next meeting? And it's affect on these kinds of projects? We have a study session at our next meeting to talk about the various ways that the code advances or frustrates residential and mixed use and transit-oriented and public facility, other zoning districts in the city. Anything we want to say to the applicant before they go off? All done? Come join us.

Brandy Bridges, Wilson Meany: I would. I just wanted to mostly thank you for the feedback. We're early in our process. It's very preliminary. But, having this feedback early is just so important. Board Member Gooyer, I completely agree with you on the residential parking. It's essential that we find a way to keep the residents parked on site, and we are definitely going to be pursuing the parking lifts, finding a way to elevate that electrical so we can hopefully park the entire project on site. That's something that we desire to a great extent. With the market rate housing currently on site, there are nine units. We know housing is so important to Palo Alto, so the new project would have 19 units. We would be paying into the in-lieu fee, and we think that that's a great thing to at least increase the housing stock, while recognizing the issues with regard to losing older units. We recognize that issue, but we're excited to at least be able to increase the number of units on site. We do think of 530 Webster as an aunt. I used to live at 530 Webster, so I love that property, and I completely echo your thoughts with regard to how beautiful the landscaping is. We're hopeful that by pushing our setbacks back to match the setback at 530 Webster, that we can have, you know, that's a good 20 feet. We're about to bring our landscape architect on board to start developing the landscaping, so I think we'll definitely have him come down and take a look at 530 Webster, and work really hard to integrate something, so that we do keep the fantastic landscaping. Because we want that corner to feel residential, and part of feeling residential is feeling

green. I mostly just wanted to thank you for your comments today and let you know that we're listening, and we'll also find a way to integrate a more residential, pedestrian-friendly, kind of openness to the street. We'll find a way to do that. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your presentation and your comments. That concludes our public hearings for today.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 15, 2018.**

**5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 1, 2018.**

**6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 15, 2018.**

Chair Furth: I hope this time we have read the minutes, all 170 pages of them. I just wanted to say to staff that the minutes that we're looking at involve some big public projects, and it was tremendously useful to have those. I know it's expensive and difficult to have these verbatim minutes, but even if it's embarrassing to see what we actually said sometimes, it's really helpful to understand what we thought was important. I appreciate that effort.

Board Member Gooyer: Transcribed word for word.

Chair Furth: Well, sometimes some pretty creative words in there. I have a bunch of clerical errors. I'll give you my copy, but I need them back because they're about things we're continuing to. Is everybody willing to vote on all three of these at once? Okay. Would somebody like to make a motion?

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we approve the minutes for February 15, 2018, March 1, 2018, and March 15, 2018.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Thompson: I have a quick question. If I already emailed my comments, do I need to say, like, subject to...?

Chair Furth: Were they clerical errors?

Board Member Thompson: Mostly. There's, like, spelling, but it changed the word.

Chair Furth: If it's a clerical error, if it's a mis-transcription, you just need to tell staff about it.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. I can still approve.

Chair Furth: If you change your vote, that's a different matter. We do refer to a male speaker as "Ms." all the way through one set of minutes. He would not like that. Okay. All those in favor?

Board Member Lew: We need a second.

Chair Furth: Oh, sorry. I was thinking Osma was the second.

Board Member Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Thank you for catching that. All those in favor say aye? Any opposed?

**MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.**

## Subcommittee Item

- 7. 620 Emerson Street (17PLN-00331): Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Landscaping on the Roof. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: CD-C(GF)(P) (Downtown Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).**

Chair Furth: We will have a subcommittee item, 620 Webster [sic] Street. That is review of the rooftop garden at Nobu, and that's Alex and me. Alex and I.

## Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Ms. Gerhardt: I just wanted to go back to the public's comment about having a difficult time finding pending projects. We're definitely trying to do more and more about that, about putting information up on our website. The planning website has been re-done recently, so there is a whole projects page that people can go to. It shows pending projects and approved projects. On that page you will find our buildingeye software, which is a graphic representation of the entire city, showing dots where all of the different permits are happening. We welcome people to take a look at that and be involved in the process.

Chair Furth: Do we post preliminary reviews on the property?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's a good question. I believe there should be a board on site. I'd have to verify.

Chair Furth: I don't remember...

Ms. Gerhardt: Actually, no. We would. Because anything that has a public hearing like this, we would do the posting and the mailing for those.

Chair Furth: That's good to know. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: When you asked me to remind you about our retreat study session, and that you wanted to add height limits.

Chair Furth: Right. How are you advertising? How are you proposing to describe that study session at the moment?

Ms. Gerhardt: I had it more as just a discussion about architecture at this point. We had talked about the distinct portions of a building being the base, middle and top, so wanted to have a conversation about that. There was a question about height requirements and sort of where we're measuring that from. And then, what was added today was about the setbacks, and maybe what could go in a setback, what can't, and discussion about, are they the right setbacks.

Chair Furth: Shall we just call it a study of the interaction of the zoning code and architectural design? What do you want to call it? I want the conversation to be able to go in directions that people want it to (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: I thought we were asked to provide staff with feedback regarding the El Camino Real Design Guidelines and base-middle-top regulation on the building. If we broaden it to this extent, it probably just means we have a bunch of talk and nothing comes out of it.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, it might be too broad. Too many things.

Chair Furth: Okay. I would feel frustrated if we couldn't talk about height limits.

Vice Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Wynne. Several times, we've had issues come up with the El Camino Real guidelines requiring a base, a middle and a top. If you try to apply that consistently up and down El Camino...

Chair Furth: Okay, but we've had it come up.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...staff has asked us for guidance on how we interpret that.

Chair Furth: Okay. Should we limit it to El Camino Real?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. I think if we focus on that, we'll be able to provide a real guideline to staff.

Chair Furth: Okay. Then, let's talk about the architectural review of projects on El Camino Real.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm happy to discuss other things, as well, in a different setting, maybe.

Chair Furth: All right. Let's keep it focused on El Camino Real.

Board Member Thompson: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: But, let's call it architectural review of projects on El Camino Real so that if somebody wants to talk about setbacks, or materials, or noise levels, or whatever, they can. But we're going to keep it...We particularly want to focus on top-middle-bottom, and judging by our recent discussions, height. Okay, anything else before we go to the subcommittee? All right. We are adjourned. Thank you.

## **Adjournment**