



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: July 5, 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: None.

Chair Furth: Good morning. Thank you, that's very responsive. Good morning, and welcome to the July 5th -- this is the dedicated board, let me say -- 2018 meeting of the Architectural Review Board in the city of Palo Alto. Could we have the roll call, please.

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Now is the time for oral communications. Is there anybody here who would like to speak on an item that's not on the agenda, but is within the Architectural Review Board? I have no speaker cards, and seeing no one, we'll continue.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Staff?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No changes.

Chair Furth: A little hard to change a one-item agenda.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items.

Chair Furth: This is attendance and future agenda. Okay. I need to say that I am going to be gone on the 16th of August. Could you tell us what you're thinking we might have for the next two meetings? Or three?

Ms. Gerhardt: If I could do them at the end of the meeting.

Chair Furth: Certainly. Just remind me. I think that's the first time I've not forgotten one of the first four items.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3223 Hanover Street [17PLN-00225]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a new two-Story 67,200 Square Foot Office / R&D Building. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Comment From June 28, 2018 to July 30, 2018. Zoning District: RP (Research Park) and RP(L) (Research Park with Landscape Combining District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Furth: Action items. Public hearing, quasi-judicial, on 3223 Hanover Street. This is a major architectural review to allow construction of a new two-story 67,000 square foot office/research and development building. We have an initial study that was circulated for public comment, is being circulated for public comment. The public comment period won't conclude until July 30th. The zoning district is Research Park with Landscape Combining District. The planner is Graham Owen. Mr. Owen?

Graham Owen, Project Planner: Thank you, Chair Furth. Yes, as you mentioned, this is 3223 Hanover Street. It's a major architectural review application for a new office building, 67,000 square feet, plus an additional couple thousand square feet for traffic-mitigating amenity space. The Board had previously reviewed this. Just as a bit of background, the Board had previously reviewed and recommended approval of a building on this site in March of last year, and it was approved by the Planning Director in April. This application was filed in July of last year. It's in the Research Park zoning district and there's a Landscape Combining District that runs along the rear of the property, which is adjacent to some R1 residential homes. The Board had their first hearing on this phase of the project on March 15 of this year. As you mentioned, we have prepared a draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration to look at the environmental impacts of the project. Just to frame the background for you, this initial study, we had done one for Phase 1, as we're calling it now, but we did do a separate initial study for Phase 2. However, when applicable, we have looked at the cumulative impacts of both Phase 1 and Phase 2, those in particular for transportation, air quality, etc. With the mitigation measures that are identified in the initial study, all of the impacts to the environment would be mitigated down to the less-than-significant level. This is the site plan showing Phase 1, which is the lighter color to the southern side of the site. And then, the darker-shaded yellow is the Phase 2 building, which would sit on top of the garage. Since the first hearing, the applicant has re-designed a portion of the parking lot to add additional landscaping and some seating. This is identified in the area just slightly below the center of the parking lot. This lines up with the grand staircase, as they call it, which is the approach from the parking lot that takes you up a staircase to the upper platform and the courtyard area of the buildings. This is the site axiomatic. This is showing the changes to the plan with the increased green space, which is essentially replacing one of the parking modules. Key considerations. Staff is looking in particular at Finding #4 and how it relates to the project. Finding #4 looks at the design from a functionality standpoint for circulation for pedestrians and cyclists, ensuring that the buildings and the site planning is arranged in such a way that it's optimized for those two modes in particular. Related to this is the design of the parking lot, which has had a lot of discussions with staff and the applicant, but also with the Board, as well. Pedestrian circulation both for the parking lot and the proposed garden pathway, which would now link the upper module and the lower module as it comes closer to Hanover Street. There's a new connection to essentially link the two sides of the site. Also related to this -- and this is further outlined in the staff report -- the applicant is proposing some proffered improvements to the bicycle path, which runs along the northern section of the site. This would open up the landscaping in that area, add some seating, as well as some beautification elements. One of the things in particular, we actually got some new information from the applicant recently about this, is that a portion of the Bol Park bicycle path runs along two lease areas, so half of the bicycle path is essentially controlled by this applicant. The other half is controlled by the adjacent lessee, which is, I believe Coulee [phonetic]. We didn't have an understanding until recently that there would be, essentially, some sort of arrangement so that both sides of that easement area or area that are controlled by two separate entities would be able to undergo beautification. We've gotten a little bit of clarity on that very recently.

As it relates to the site planning, staff is still concerned about the number of parking lot intersections. As you can see, there is a main drive aisle that takes you from Hanover Street to the back of the site, but

with the parking lot that's proposed, this is essentially a reflection of the way that the site sits now. It wouldn't be a re-use of the parking lot due to the grading that's proposed with Phase 2. Essentially, you'd be going from a lower level when you're closer to Hanover Street, and it would slope up and grade up as you get closer to the back. It's not a reuse; it's a complete regrading of the site in that area, despite the similar appearance between the existing condition as it is on the ground today and the proposed condition. We think there's room for improvement in this particular area, given that this is an older design, older concept that's essentially been on the site since the 1950s when the buildings that were previously there were built, back in the 1950s. With this, we have this understanding that the Comprehensive Plan supports parking lots that utilize green space to the degree possible, and also work for both pedestrians and cyclists. We think there is room for improvement. One of the things that we've discussed in the previous ARB meeting for this phase of the project was the possibility of re-orienting the parking module so that they are rotated 90 degrees. That's just one option. It's not necessarily the be-all, end-all, but it's one way of essentially increasing the amount of green space and the amount of shading in the parking lot, which has a number of benefits from a heat island standpoint, from a beautification standpoint, and also from a pedestrian circulation standpoint. This is a render, essentially, of the applicant's study of reorienting the parking lot that they presented at the first ARB meeting, so this is something that they considered. When they did their analysis, they found that they came up slightly short in terms of the number of parking stalls that would be on the site. We think that this concept warrants a little more study. We are in support of the overall idea of reorienting and adding additional greenspace, and we think that there are ways in which the additional parking spaces that they come up short would be able to be found somewhere else on the site. I've got three examples, briefly, from other sites in the Research Park where this sort of concept has been executed. When you're looking at these aerial photographs, they don't necessarily show the amount of green space that we're hoping to achieve, but in concept in terms of the design, this is more or less what we are going for or supporting. This is from adjacent to 3181 Porter Drive, which is currently under construction, but is the Stanford Genome Center. As you can see, there are five modules of parking, and you have a pedestrian half way that kind of splits the middle. This is from 1450 Page Mill, which was recently finalised [sic], as well as the site that's adjacent to it, where you can see the concept on a smaller scale. And then, I forget the building that we're looking at here, but this is on Cal Ave, so kind of on the western end of the Research Park. Cal Ave is this section right here, so you've got the homes that are adjacent to it. You can kind of see this curving path that actually goes all the way through the entire site. With that, the purpose of this meeting...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Owen: These right here, these are a couple of Comprehensive Plan policies that support the idea of additional green space in parking lots and designing parking lots in a way that really benefits and provides amenities for pedestrians and cyclists. Additionally, looking at alternative to surface parking lots, such as underground parking, for example. Staff's recommendation right now is to, first, conduct a public hearing to receive testimony on the draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, but then, to continue the item to a date uncertain so that the applicant can provide additional information and additional changes to the site plan, so that, in particular, Finding #4 can be met. That's the end of my presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there any questions of staff before we open the public hearing? I have one. This is a Mitigated Negative Declaration, but it doesn't contain mitigation measures because the needed changes have been agreed to by the applicant? It says?

Mr. Owen: I'm not sure I understand the question.

Chair Furth: Often when we get a Mitigated Negative Declaration, there's a list of mitigation measures and a mitigation and monitoring report. This doesn't have those. And it says that you find the project could have a significant impact, but it won't because of revisions to the project made to or agreed to by the project proponent. I was just wondering what those were.

Mr. Owen: Sure. Mitigation measures need to be agreed to by the applicant. It's part of CEQA. It needs to be a voluntary thing where the applicant acknowledges and understands the mitigation measures and agrees to them. In terms of the MMRP that you referenced, we didn't put it together in time. But, with the final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, we certainly would. But all the mitigation measures are included in that document.

Chair Furth: Okay. I was just not finding them easily sorted out.

Mr. Owen: I apologize for that.

Chair Furth: I could read the entire thing more carefully and that would work. All right. Any other questions? Essentially, they are the standard tree protection, etc. There's nothing particularly...?

Mr. Owen: Some of them are. Some of the tree protection, for example, the need to do a bird nesting survey. Some of them are specific to the project, and as I mentioned, kind of the cumulative impact of Phase 1 and Phase 2. For example, air quality was something that was studied thoroughly to ensure that there wasn't a significant impact to sensitive receptors in particular, based on the phasing of the project. Some of them are your more standard mitigation measures, but a lot of them are specific to what we're dealing with across two phases.

Chair Furth: The air quality issue is dust control during construction, or other things?

Mr. Owen: It's more about diesel, diesel emissions from construction and construction vehicles.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: For your information, we do have on page 30, are the mitigation measures for the air quality.

Chair Furth: Right. I saw those.

Ms. Gerhardt: And then, on page 42 is mitigation measures for trees and other biological impacts. They're just at the end of each chapter, you would find the mitigation measures.

Chair Furth: I see them. What about traffic? Do we have anything? Where are they? Under Traffic, I'm sure.

Mr. Owen: From a transportation standpoint, no mitigation measures. There were no potentially significant impacts to transportation. One thing to keep in mind, the Phase 1 building, when we were doing the study for that, there are relatively few new trips associated with Phase 1 because it was a replacement of square footage. But even with those included in the background of the analysis, which has been done with this project in Phase 2, nothing gets triggered in terms of your LOS or other thresholds.

Chair Furth: Right. And then, I had one other question about the traffic analysis, which talks about trips and projected trips. Is a trip in and out, or just in or out?

Mr. Owen: I can look that up real quick. Hang on one second.

Chair Furth: They talk about gross daily trips on page 108.

Ms. Gerhardt: The traffic analysis is looking at both directions because there is the AM and PM peak hours.

Chair Furth: But, I mean, if I'm counting trips to and from the site, if I drive there and leave there, is that two or one?

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't know if it's one continuous trip or not, but it is certainly counted both directions.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, if they say...I'm just doing very rough arithmetic. If they say 741 gross daily trips, that means 370 vehicles going in and off the site every day.

Mr. Owen: My understanding is that each direction is a trip. Because you have a work-based trip, somebody going from home to work, and you could have somebody that's going from work during lunch to, you know, to lunch, essentially, and that's another trip. And it's another trip when they go home.

Chair Furth: Got it. Yeah, because not all of these are peak hour trips. Okay, thank you. In fact, 205 of them are peak hour trips. All right. Shall we let the applicant speak now? And you will have 10 minutes. Good morning.

John Marx, Form4 Architecture: Good morning. I'm John Marx. I'd like to thank Chair Furth and the members of the ARB for coming here this morning to listen to our story.

Chair Furth: Oh, I'm sorry. Well, I did get the first four items, but I forgot the disclosure section. It says this is a quasi-judicial hearing. We need to disclose outside communications.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose that I did meet with Architect Marx and his partner, **Bob Geanola [phonetic]**, prior to this meeting, just to discuss the project. I did not discover or learn anything different than what's presented.

Chair Furth: I did, too. I had the same meeting, and again, I don't believe I learned anything that we have not already discussed. All right. And we've all visited the site.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: I have not. I did not get time to visit the site.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Thompson: But I looked at it digitally (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Four of us have seen the site on site and all of us have carefully looked at the various graphic representations of it. Thank you.

Mr. Marx: Great.

Chair Furth: And just for the record, you need to spell your name because our transcriber will do what she thinks best, otherwise.

Mr. Marx: I'm John Marx. [spells name] I'm here filling in for Bob Giannini, who is traveling in Africa. But I'm also the design partner and personally designed the project itself. Bob's kind of the front man. He gets to come and wax poetic about the project. One thing just really quick before I start in is we'd like to mention that we believe there's no significant traffic impact, but we also, to the comment earlier, RTMs do reduce peak hour traffic by 30 percent. Just as a little side note to that. What I'd like to do is recap the project, and then, also, update what we've done with the surface parking concept. As you know, here's the project location, Stanford Research Park, adjacent to Barron Park on Hanover. This is what was entitled in 2017, which was Building #1 with two levels of underground parking and an access road. What we've done is we've added, as you know, Building #2, and a parking lot on the lower level. We have then created the same style of architecture. This is something that we're quite happy with. It's got a

delicate human scale to it. We see it kind of as a jewel in the forest, and we've done this through a number of different measures. We've got setbacks and overhangs and balconies, and there's these pavilions that run on a butterfly theme that give us kind of a special, unique and memorable character. And, of course, we're trying to create something that's poetic, as well. And, between the two buildings then, the street and courtyard graze a line, and there's a one-acre park that's got a 145-foot width to it. And we think it has a generous scale. Now, one thing to point out is that we are missing...You can see the buildings and the way the pavilions work. We're missing the big heritage oak tree that's in there, and also basically the wall of trees that exist. Otherwise, all you would see are the trees and you wouldn't see the building, so we took those out of the rendering. It won't be that sort of sparse from the street standpoint. What we did was...I'd like to recap the discussion items from the first hearing. Most of the project parking is below grade and the remaining surface parking yielded a landscape ratio of 66 percent, which is above Palo Alto's 50 percent requirement. And then, also, the project is offered to upgrade the City's Bol bike path. Then, we were encouraged to consider the following, which is extend the project's landscape concept into the parking area; add landscape people areas and bench seating; and also, to compartmentalize so it didn't seem like one big parking lot. That's then the response that we had, that you've seen, which is to create this green space at the end. This illustrates it really well. What happens is down in the parking lot itself, we've created a 60-foot wide by, I think it's maybe 100 or 120 feet long, landscape space. It's a significant space. It's got two areas to it. One area is a natural area, which is a bit of a habitat area, which is a bit of a, a little bit of a wild area landscape-wise on the right, and on the left there is the seating area. What the seating area does then is tie you into special paving that marks this connection across the access roadway, and then, up the grand stair, then under the walkway under the building, and then, to the main courtyard. These are some of the landscape images. You can see on the upper left, there's the paved area that's going to have bench seating and some of the different kinds of seating arrangements, and then, on the bottom row is the natural area feeling to the right. So, in the end, we get a composition of elements, which is very nice, where you do get a continuation from the upper courtyard, through the drop-off area, down the grand stair, and into the landscape area. At this point, though, we'd also like to point out, in response to the neighbors' comments from Barron Park that recently came up, is the...all of the elements that we had in to mitigate the impact of the building to the residents are all being installed in Phase 1, in essence. We don't believe that there is anything additional that we will need to do because, in a sense, it's already been done. And, there are five elements to that. The first is the landscape element that goes along...let's see the mouse...Anyway, that goes along the eastern property line. That consists of a line of large and mature hedges that are put in from Day 1 and Phase 1. And then, also, there is a 200-foot long concrete wall, along with berms. These are to mitigate the lights of the cars as they come up, and also somewhat the sound of the cars as they come up. In addition, we had regraded originally from a 15 percent grade down to around a three percent that goes up to about 7 1/2 percent, that takes you around from the lower level to the upper level, to mitigate the idea of the engine noise as the cars go up an incline. Also, Building 1 is about 90 feet back from the property line. The requirement is 50, and as you know, we've turned that building at an angle to mitigate the impact of it, as well. The new building, though, which the short end is what faces the residential area, is 235 feet back from the property line, so it's a substantial distance back, which diminishes the scale of it, which you may not be able to see anyway due to the trees and the hedges and the wall. But, in addition, we've also in that Phase 2 building, have automated mechanical night shades. On that eastern elevation at night, those shades will come down and they will moderate the light inside the building. We believe those things that have already been approved should address any concerns, I think, that the neighbors might have. I think the last thing is also to talk about the trail head and the Bol bike path. What we've done is all along that edge, it's kind of like the last part of the landscape, we've created the trail head on both ends of it. This the existing conditions, which is a bit nasty sort of feeling, kind of neglected, I think, from the previous property owner. What we would do is we would open this up, we would take down the fence, we would make it feel like it's just part of this wonderful landscape, rather than fenced off and feels like it's being protected or keeping you out. We would create these little landscape areas at the beginning that have boulders in them for seating, just kind of a place to pause for a moment. Also, we would develop a new lighting scheme, so at night, it's not going to be as harsh. It will be friendlier, kind of low-key, with bollards to give it that more friendly landscape lighting. I think with that, that's our talk.

Chair Furth: Do we have questions of the architect before we go further? Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I actually had a question on your elevation. I was going through your drawing set and noticed that you have two types of glass frit. You have a linear glass frit and a polka dot glass frit.

Mr. Marx: Oh, yes. Yes.

Board Member Thompson: I couldn't identify in your elevations where the polka dot glass frit is happening.

Mr. Marx: Oh, yeah, sure. Okay, so, if you imagine in the office building, people might put their desks up against the perimeter glass. Those areas, in order to mitigate the look you would see from the outside of the desk being pushed up to the outside, from 30 inches down to the floor, there is a dot frit. What that does is moderate clutter that you might see that may or may not...I mean, these days with benching and all this kind of stuff, people tend to keep their desks and things away from the windows. But, you never know. It could happen. That's the dot frit. And then, it's a little hard to see, but on the outside, we've got these glass spandrel bands, and on the second floor at the top and the bottom. Those things... Actually, I think, actually at the end, we've got a...There it is. Okay. At the top and the bottom...Up here, and down here, if you can see that, which would be up here and down here, all along the building that you see from the street, this would be the horizontal frit. We wanted to change the pattern. The horizontal frit is a much more pretty and part of the design theme, where the dot frit tends to just go away. We wanted the horizontal frit to be, sort of this ethereal glass scale element that gave it character.

Board Member Thompson: Does the dot frit only happen where the windows open, or...?

Mr. Marx: No, the dot frit would be all along the perimeter on the second and the first floor, where people might put their desks or furniture up against the wall.

Board Member Thompson: Oh, so it sort of wraps around.

Mr. Marx: It wraps around the whole building, yeah.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. And then there's these big windows that open on the second floor, right?

Mr. Marx: None of the glass is operable, but there are doors on the upper level and the lower level. But, those would not have the dot frit on them, the doors. In essence, when you look at the elevation, I would say that 95 percent of it would have this dot frit from zero to 30 inches from the floor. Again, that's to mitigate clutter.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Marx: Because it is so transparent, the buildings.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. That makes sense. This elevation really looks like the window is open, though.

Mr. Marx: Oh, yeah. Well, part of that is on the front, the front that faces Hanover, we created, we call them little bowtie bay windows. Those are the ones that have wood trim around them and they come off at a little angle. It's a little bit like the butterfly theme and a little bit like a bowtie. In the elevation, the rendering, they look like they open, but they don't actually open. Unfortunately, in modern buildings, the mechanical engineers prefer that the building be ventilated with mechanical systems.

Board Member Thompson: And then, I had one more question. Is there roof access in this? It sort of looks like there is a railing at the top.

Mr. Marx: There is limited access for... There's no public access. There is limited access for maintenance and things like that.

Board Member Thompson: Is that using the glass, the linear glass frit, or is that a different kind of railing...?

Mr. Marx: No, what we did on the front, what we did is we've got that kind of overhang cornice that's there, that's decorative. We wanted to keep the front very decorative and use little metal pieces to make it look pretty. The glass band itself is below that. It's down here. And then, this is just a metal system to make it look attractive. There is a guard rail up there.

Board Member Thompson: It's a metal guardrail...

Mr. Marx: Metal guard rail. Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: Is it, like, steel cable and (inaudible)?

Mr. Marx: Yes. It would have a solid top and cable rails. It's just a little, delicate thing. It's not a heavy thing. It's just trying to add a little gracefulness and it complements this kind of canopy/corniche element that we have on the Hanover elevation.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. And just to clarify, that's the same kind of railing that you're using at the balconies that pop up?

Mr. Marx: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry. Thank you.

Mr. Marx: Yeah, sure.

Chair Furth: Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Hi. On a different track. About the bicycle path, my understanding is that half of that bicycle path is on a neighboring property, so to speak. What are your plans to ensure that the path can be built on both properties?

Mr. Marx: I don't know. That's...

Allison Koo, Sand Hill Property Company: I'm Allison Koo with the applicant. [spells name] Thank you again for having us today. I actually just secured a couple days ago an agreement with the neighboring property that has been signed by them, so that we can ensure, at our cost and our design fees, etc., that we would work with them. All of our landscaping. They have a wall in place, so that wall will remain, but the landscaping edge and the lighting, etc., will all be coordinated and designed, integrated into our site and our design. They are agreeing to that, and we will work with them to make sure that they are part of the design and understand what's happening. That's now in place, so there's no uncertainty about working with the neighbor.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Robert, no questions?

Board Member Gooyer: No.

Chair Furth: Alex?

Board Member Lew: [no audible response]

Chair Furth: All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Marx: Thank you.

Chair Furth: All right. Who would like to start? Staff?

Mr. Owen: Quick, I don't believe we've done the public comment period.

Chair Furth: Sorry, yep. (inaudible) comment cards, but I have a public comment person.

Ann Marie Macrae: I'm one of the residents, and I wanted to just say a couple of things. First of all, thank you to Allison and the architects. They've been very helpful. Thank you to you all for looking after our interests. I feel like I rely on your expertise. Our issues have been to try and mitigate noise and light, and to preserve the look and the landscaping. I've been here previously, and your comments have been very helpful. I just wanted to say two things specifically, looking at the map, the plans and the diagrams. Thank you for agreeing Phase 1 that we'd have automated shades, and for putting that in for Phase 2. I thought it was worth perhaps logging that I had suggested there are shades, and shades, and if we could, at the relevant time, specify that they be some sort of black-out shade, because not all shades are going to serve the purpose of stopping light leakages effectively. The other thing is, I think it specified a moment that there would be...One of the faces of the building would have shades. But, looking at the angle of the building, different residents see different sides of the buildings. Just to specify, for example, east side or west side doesn't necessarily help all the neighbors. I just wanted to flag that up, that where a façade faces the residents' side, perhaps that could be taken into account and expanded. I don't think there is an issue with that, but just put it out there. And then, the other thing is, I thought it might be helpful, because the bike path has come up today, for you to be aware -- and perhaps I could help link this together -- that there's a Bol Park bike committee. I happen to be on that committee, and we're working with the City. I come to meetings on that. That's an ongoing process. I'm not chairing it. I've chaired a subcommittee of that. But that would probably be a helpful thing because I know there's ongoing discussions about landscaping, and so-on. So, it would seem to make some sense to me to try and tie in what's going on in this with that. I don't know how that is dealt with, but just so you're aware, because I know sometimes there are so many fingers in a pie that you could be trying to landscape your bit, and other people are on it. Almost to be aware that there is a Bol Park bike path committee. I just thought I'd let you know. I'll certainly flag this, you know, what was being said up to the chair of that, but I know they are working with Palo Alto City on it anyway. That's what I really wanted to say. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Last year, we spelled your surname Macray. Is that right?

Ms. Macrae: No. [spells name]. Macrae.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Macrae: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any questions? All right. Now is it time for us to deliberate? Who would like to start? Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Good morning. Thank you for the presentations. I had a lot of time yesterday, so I could really put my thoughts together. This design is beautiful, interesting and engaging. Unfortunately, the core issue of haphazard site planning remains. It makes it very difficult for me to make the necessary findings for approval. Taken as a whole -- that is, considering how the Phase 2 project before us impacts and is impacted by the previously-approved Phase 1 project -- the entire development would be better --

much better -- with the new Phase 2 building located either at the lower parking level area, or at least situated farther from the Phase 1 building and configured so that the outdoor plaza between the buildings is a more coherent, positive space shaped by the buildings and landscaping around it. The location and configuration of the central roadway creates a significant site planning problem as it separates the buildings from the surface parking and creates the difficulties in parking lot layout. The applicant is correct in that the drive aisles are best oriented in the direction of pedestrian travel, yet the Planning staff is also correct, in that the parking lot layout as presented requires numerous and potentially hazardous pedestrian and vehicular intersections. The crux of the issue is that the central roadway is in the wrong place relative to the new buildings. The development would be much more functional if the new building and its associated parking were on the other side of the drive aisle, in the location of the proposed surface parking. Alternatively, if the objective is to create a campus-like arrangement with both buildings oriented towards and accessed from a central plaza, the main roadway could be located closer to the eastern edge of the site -- that's where the bike path is -- and the below-grade parking expanded to be entirely below the upper plaza. While some might say that the cost of expanding the subterranean parking are too high, the existing topography, which actually inspired the Phase 1 parking and planning arrangement, needs to be changed dramatically just to build this new parking garage. The overall work involved in expanding the underground parking will not be unreasonable given the scope of the entire project. You might even find that some of the excavation spoils from the parking structure can be used to regrade, that build up the eastern side of the site where the surface parking is proposed, restoring the natural topography and reducing off-falling. In fact, the upward sloping central roadway, which is a clever site planning arrangement because it eliminates the need for internal ramping in the parking structure, is a design technique best located at the edge of a development, rather than at the center where you have many pedestrian and vehicular crossings. As lovely as these renderings are, I believe that they show the new building as if it were set in a large parkland. They are, in reality, much closer to each other, especially for structures of this size. The Phase 1 building was originally designed and approved -- at least to my understanding -- in part because it could be seen, experienced and understood from an approaching distance across a landscaped plaza. Placing the Phase 2 building in its proposed location negates this effect. The Phase 1 building is something of a bejeweled butterfly, with its walls of glass and wing-like eaves meant to be seen across a sea of wildflowers. The proposed Phase 2 building is similar, yet its location is derived from the orthogonality of the parking structure below, and it doesn't work together with its neighbor to create a coherent and delightful outdoor space. Simply put, again, the new building is just in the wrong place. I appreciate the effort, time and expense that has gone into this proposal and understand the applicant's frustration with the planning staff's recalcitrance regarding the surface parking layout. However, we are creating buildings and campuses to last for decades and generations. We owe it to ourselves, to our community, to future scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs who will occupy this building, to get the design right. The building is just in the wrong place. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. Actually, that made my job a whole lot easier because I was thinking of the same thing. The initial design worked with the entire site. I liked the architecture, the initial design. I also like the design of the second building, but the two of them don't work together. It's obvious it was a Phase 1 and a Phase 2, not that when you get done, you won't really know whether it was all built at one time, or it was done phased. Unfortunately, the ideal situation with a Phase 1, Phase 2, is that when you get done, they all work together. These really don't. The Phase 2 building literally is just placed in a convenient location over the existing parking garage. I agree that the underground parking garage should be expanded. It's a little different taking an existing site and having to dig down via shoring and everything else two or three levels, but this basically is a matter of building a garage, and then covering it with dirt, so to speak. I mean, that's a very simplistic way to put it. The initial higher area was developed because of the parking structure, and I think it should be increased and not this ocean of hardscape next to it. Other than that, I really have to pretty much agree with my fellow board member, that I like the design, but I don't like the planning of it.

Chair Furth: Alex?

Board Member Lew: Okay. I disagree with my fellow board members. I think that the applicant was up front about Phase 2 from the very beginning, and my recollection is that the Board members -- the Board collectively -- wanted to see sketches of Phase 2, to make sure that they understood the larger picture. We demanded that, and the applicant provided it, and it was all very clear. The parking lot was shown, is my recollection, so my take on it is that the decision was made by the Board, and I do stand by that decision. I do not support putting a Phase 2 building down near the bike path. I think it's actually much better having it up above the garage. That's for the bike path users. It makes it much more open. It doesn't shade the bike path. It's much more compact, much smaller footprint. And in terms of having a campus, I can't imagine one tenant is going to want to have the different user groups going up and down the stairs all day. That doesn't make any sense whatsoever. If the Board wanted all the parking underground from the very beginning, I think we should have said so. And I think something has changed, I will acknowledge something has changed, in that I think our comp plan does sort of encourage underground parking in all districts, where it didn't really use to do that before. It was more, like, downtown, and some of our urban districts did that. We really didn't have a lot of bad lines with regards to the Stanford Research Park. I will acknowledge that that has changed. I think the architecture is handsome with all the deep overhangs, balconies, the bay windows. I think that's all good. An issue that has come up before on another project in the Research Park is bird-friendly glazing. Our comp plan has changed. Our comp plan calls for developing guidelines for bird-friendly glazing, and we don't have our own code for that, or guidelines for that. There are other guidelines from other cities, and we have some references provided to us by, like the Audubon Society, but they're not really implemented yet. Generally, I think they recommend fritted glass everywhere, and I can imagine that that's an issue with the architect and prospective tenants. That's my understanding, is that they want everything covered. The shading can help, is my understanding, and also, colored glazing. Not having clear glass can also help. I'll leave it to staff to see what, just for consistency, that we apply the same logic that we've been using on other projects in the research park. With regard to the landscape design, I'm curious for a few more details. I did review the planting list and have looked at the diaromatic planting plans. The thing I'm curious about is the, I think there is a hedge being proposed along the edge of the parking lot near the bike path, and I'm curious as to the height. I'm thinking just to screen the cars, but not have, like, a 10-foot-high walled hedge. I think that would be better. In the staff report, there were comments about the bike path lighting, and I think there were recommendations by the lighting designer about that, recommending bollards. I did look at all the bike paths from this site, all the way down to Los Altos. There's Bol Park around Gunn, and then, there's the Hetch Hetchy trail that crosses into Los Altos. And as I say, it's completely inconsistent. There's a little bit of everything, and a lot of places where there's nothing. In a lot of other bike paths in Palo Alto, they're using a bell-shaped, pole-mounted light so that it doesn't cast light into back yards. I would imagine that's not quite such an issue on this particular site. I've seen bollard lighting in other cities, and I think that that can work. It seems a little inconsistent coming from the other bike paths that we have in Palo Alto, just in terms of maintenance of fixtures. That might be an issue. I know in the past, the City has tried to keep the number of different types of fixtures down to a minimum, if possible. I do welcome the changes, the upgrades to the bike path. I'm also curious as to the fence, if you're proposing to keep the chain link fence. Okay. That would be great. Excellent. We were proposing to move it. On the parking reserve --

Chair Furth: Excuse me, Alex. Did you say they are proposing to remove it, or that they are not?

Board Member Lew: The applicant is...

Chair Furth: You're in favor of it being removed.

Board Member Lew: I'm in favor of removing the chain link fence.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: The bike path further down is much more open, and I think other parts of the bike path are a lot nicer than this particular section. And then, for staff, I was wondering if maybe we could use a different word for the parking reserve. They're proposing additional spaces above the

recommendation, and I'm thinking maybe we should just call it, like a design alternate, or something. An approved alternate plan that they could implement. Because parking reserve is in our code, and it means something very specific, meaning that you're not building all of the required parking. I'd like to keep that separate from the option here. On the parking lot, I think I do agree with the applicant that having the parking aisles to the building is better. If any of us go to a grocery store, that's how parking lots are arranged. You walk down the aisle to the building. I think the difference on your scheme is that once you walk down an aisle, and then you want to walk to, like, the building entrance, that's where I think your layout is different than a conventional suburban building, and I think that's maybe the weak point. My recommendation would be to strengthen and simplify the walkways along the main aisle. As you have it now, they're crossing the aisle. And then, the other one closer to the building is sort of zig-zagging around the parking. I think you only need one. I don't think you need two. I would think that the one next to the building would be the one I would focus on and just let the other one be landscape. And then, with the parking count and what-not, I would, if you need more parking spaces, I would be inclined to put them in the main -- what do we call it? -- in your feature area, the area that terminates the grand staircase. Like your bench seating, and the landscape. If you need more parking spaces, I would be inclined to put them there and remove spaces between...You have in your parking reserve, right? In between the garage entrances, you have some parking spaces? My inclination would be to keep that, try to keep that free of future parking. (inaudible) for site lines. Cars sort of pop out of garages really fast, and I would rather keep that, have a clear site line and keep that all open. I think it would be a nicer experience if, as you're coming into the building, that you get a nice, clean view of the building and the landscape. I just don't see why it should be cluttered up there if you have other areas for parking. In my mind, this is a minor revision. I'm not looking for a major building change on this particular scheme.

Chair Furth: Anything else?

Board Member Lew: That's it for now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Osma.

Board Member Thompson: All right. Hi there. This is my first time taking a look at this project. I did do a lot of research. I read the meeting minutes from March 15th of this year. In general, I was hoping to request that...The elevations in general were a little hard to read in terms of the material, but also the difference between existing and new. I think the way that you have shown them graphically have them sort of blending together, and it's sort of hard to pick apart. I understand that because this previous building was approved, that maybe the architectural nuances of this new building wasn't brought to the forefront as much because it was assumed that it would have this direct relationship to the existing. But, even some things like the rhythm of the butterfly eaves is different. It's wider in this new one, and it's just a little unclear what that middle element is that's not a butterfly. That's sort of relating to the butterfly on the other side. I think you know what I'm talking about. Across the courtyard. I guess I just wondered, that change in rhythm, I just wanted to see that more, and maybe understand spatially what's happening in your courtyard. In general, just having a little difficulty understanding those architectural details, like how the balconies interface with these fritted glass shades, and corner details of the glass shade, and the metal. Those are hard to understand. I did read that all elements that are glazed are in shade, but it's a piece of clear glass that's getting shaded by a piece of fritted glass. It was hard to believe that all elements would be in shade, so maybe more documentation of how this building is shaded. I am going to talk about building stuff first, before I get to site stuff. And also, the windows. I thought they were operable; it turns out they are not. I understand mechanical engineers can be pushy about that, but we should push back. I'm assuming this Phase 1 building project is also completely enclosed in, but maybe there's an opportunity in the second building to have parts that are more naturally passively ventilated, that you can sort of get your mechanically to give some back. And look at life cycle costs. There are benefits to these things that can benefit the project and the building. I would encourage that. I also agree with the member of the public that discussed the blackout shades from multiple angles. I think that is really important, not just for neighbors, but also light pollution at nighttime. I agree with that. Moving on to the site planning. It's funny because, yeah, I did see the existing plan, which was actually looking at the Phase 1 plan that showed no parking, so I understand

that there's this, sort of balance here. Our Comprehensive Plan does encourage to put all parking underground and out of sight, and I tend to agree with that, whether it's in downtown or in Stanford Research Park. I would be a proponent for that, changing that up. Bird-friendly glazing...Sorry, I made a note here that I also agree that at least we would need to look at that because there is a lot of glazing in this project, and there's a lot of products that can mitigate that. Sorry, going back to the site planning. I think a lot of my Board members have said a lot of stuff, and I agree with Board Member Baltay and Board Member Gooyer in most parts because I think it would benefit the site to remove that surface parking and use it for more landscape. In terms of the location of the building, I could go either way, but I really take main issue with the parking and how it affects the site. Those are all my comments.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for your presentations, thank you for your diplomacy with the adjacent property owner. I think it would be a tremendous benefit to the community and the city. It may not be particularly lovely, but that is an intensively-used place to walk. It's a recreational facility for the Research Park, and you see lots of people using it at lunchtime to walk, as well as people using it, of course, to get from one place to another. That's commendable. I'm sorry that a neighbor is not yet willing to tear down that wall because it would be lovelier, but I think you could do a lot. I look forward to seeing more details on how you would interact with that wall with the very large lighting, (inaudible) light or lighting fixtures glued to it here and there. And certainly a good idea to consult before we get this back again. I hope staff will consult with the Bol Park bicycle path committee, the Bol Park committee, and I'm sure the applicant will, too. I went back, you know, you gave us a very beautiful site plan with your first application. I'm looking at Sheet MP21 dated January 27, 2017, and we spent a lot of time talking about -- this came unglued here -- this big landscape space. It is quite true that we knew that this was not the full FAR for the site. I noticed that the minutes keep referring to it as the RAF as in Royal Air Force rather than Floor Area Ratio, which makes it hard to read the minutes. It's a little confusing. But I don't agree...Minutes miss a lot. I did not go back and look at the tape, and my colleagues' graphic memories tend to be better than mine, but I'm pretty good at words. On page 22 of our minutes from last time, Mr. Giannini is speaking, he says *[reading, not verbatim, from minutes of 3/2/17 meeting]* *There are no future plans to develop. We don't have a tenant at this point. Asking us to provide additional FAR, so at this point, the application is for just the replacement square footage. We seriously thought about it. So, for example, in the upper tier, the garage is being designed so that it can handle the weight of another building, and this is possible. Then you'd have a small campus with two buildings and a courtyard in the center. There would be landscaping left...blah, blah, blah. I think the challenge for us would be to show that when we do increase the FAR from 25 percent to 40 percent -- i.e. build the second building --the project wouldn't suffer. The building could go on the lower meadow or could go on the upper terrace. We honestly don't know that yet.* So, I do not see this thing as a done deal. I don't think we specifically approved the location in any particular space. Having said that, my concern is about having two acres-plus of asphalt on this site. That is a big deal. I should indicate that I have spent some time researching over the last few years urban heat islands, and I think at least we can agree that they are a phenomenon. That by having...probably all have the experience, by having parking lots made of asphalt or having parking lots generally, you get undesirable local, and commutatively, larger than local effects on temperature at a time when we really don't want to increase it. Highly reflective cars may change that eventually, but they haven't yet. And there's all the time when there isn't parking there. That's one strand. That strikes me as too much of the site to be developed with this material. Secondly, I'd like staff to tell us a little more before we come back about the functional parking needs of this site. I know we have our code, and I know we have our new comp plan, and I know that we have a good TDM, which is anticipated to significantly reduce peak hour traffic. Well, peak hour traffic is mostly commute traffic as I understand it, which is a serious parking demand. And if that's the case, then the parking that we're requiring would seem to be excessive, and I would be in favor of a modification, an evidence-based modification of that, which our code allows for. So, on the first level, I would not be willing to approve the existing dedication of this much space to an asphalt surface parking lot, and as I understand it, so-called cool surface parking lots don't do much better. I'm essentially saying I think more of the parking either needs to be reduced overall, or more of it needs to be underground, and I don't have an opinion as to which is better. I think it's a site design issue. And it's interesting to me that of late, of course, every site is different, and when we have somebody with a smaller site, what they are saying to us is, here is our hexagon study that went out and did parking surveys and showed a bunch of empty parking

lots. Yours is a different project. It's a different set of users. But, I am concerned that we are requiring too much parking, and I'd like staff's opinion on that. I'm certainly not in favor of approving a parking reserve for additional parking beyond the code minimum. That seems to me to fly in the face of what we're trying to do, both in terms of transportation and land use in this city at this time. I think that the building is too close. I think that it needs to be moved over to preserve what you've done, and to have something that truly makes a campus that's integrated, as opposed to putting the building on behalf of a previously-approved and designed garage. I am hopeful that by extending it towards the bay, you could get a better design, we could get less asphalt, you could have a quite spectacular green space, and you could have a significant plaza area that would let you really look at the beautiful building that you designed in Phase 1. That's where I am. And it might well be better if the building was down at the edge. I do think it needs to continue to be up towards Hanover, as you said in your original discussion of this, to keep it away from the neighborhood, to keep it close to the street. Both of those things make sense on this site. I don't think the site plan works. For me, the focus of how it doesn't work is way too much asphalt. I think in total, it might be about 2 1/2 acres, which on a 10-acre site is way too much. There are other approaches. Oh, I wanted to ask, what's the...? I believe you told us last time, and I've forgotten, what's the solar generation plan for this site? Is there a proposal to generate electricity on site, or not? If you could come to the...

Ms. Koo: This project will be achieving LEEDS Silver, but we don't have solar panels on it at this time.

Chair Furth: And is that because this design really wouldn't support them, or it makes no economic sense, or you are opposed to the concept?

Ms. Koo: We haven't looked at it with solar in mind because we were able to achieve so much other efficiencies around the building design. In this particular building, this size, we just felt that the way the building was designed with efficiencies of light and all the other things we're going to achieve, to be able to achieve LEEDS Silver, we didn't have that plan in mind yet.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Because one of the other ways to prevent an asphalt parking lot from being a heat sink is to make it a power plant. And if you looked at some of the parking lots that Graham showed us in the illustrations, that's what they were. They have big solar canopies. Those present their own interesting aesthetic issues. Personally, I think solar cells always look fairly beautiful except on City buildings when they are badly designed, but we don't do that anymore. But, I would not be apt to approve a plan that has this much asphalt. I know that after 15 years, we expect 50 percent shade, but you're still leaving better than an acre of asphalt absorbing heat in an area where we have long, warm summers. We're at...

Board Member Gooyer: Just a couple of things on the parking, as we talked about. I don't think any of us is saying that it has to be all underground. I think it's just the way the approach was done on this one. Having been around the business for a long time, and in the 70s and 80s, having done a lot of shopping centers, the perpendicular aisles to the store was basically so somebody could zip in, run straight down directly to the store, back out again. The intent wasn't safety, anything else, it was strictly to get from Point A to Point B as quickly as possible. If you're going to be in this building, working all day, I don't think taking two minutes longer to get from your car to the building is that big a deal, and I think the parking lot ought to be rearranged. There is a safety issue the way it is done right now. It encourages people to walk right down the middle of the drive aisles to the building. Also, when you're sitting inside the building and you look out, rather than seeing green, you see the perpendicular aisles of all the parking spaces, so you're forced to look at a parking lot in its worst situation. You're not really helping the occupant of the buildings' vision, either. I think that parking lot, no matter what it is, needs to be redesigned completely. I think doing that will automatically eliminate the sort of heat sink, and I think will reduce the amount of hardscape. Also, the fact that it's just...I mean, it's nice, or it used to be the whole idea is, if you were required to have 200 parking spaces, you put in 300 parking spaces, everybody was happy. I'd rather have it to the point where if you have to put in 200, I'd say you don't put in more than 200, and hopefully you put in 180 and you save 20 parking spaces, make it landscaping, and see if sometime in the future, just like we did on a previous application, especially if you don't have a tenant

yet, if you tell somebody, okay, here is the building, you've got 180 parking spaces, nobody is going to go, you know, I would have taken this space but I really do need those extra 20 parking spaces. Somebody is going to go, okay, I have 180 parking spaces, I'll just have to see what I can do. I mean, you know, we now have the TDM process and everything going, with the specific intent of lowering the amount of parking spaces to facilitate a greener environment. Like I said, they don't have to be all underground, but the way you're approaching it is not the way we want the future of Palo Alto parking to be. Secondly, as far as...I said it the first time when we were here, that I couldn't imagine that you had no clue whether you were going to put a second building on that area, or not. If these two buildings had been designed at the same time, they would have never been laid out the way they are right now. This is definitely a well thought-out design, and an also. That's the part I don't like. I can't imagine that from a planning concept, you didn't come up with various designs that said, if we did this all at one time, we would do it like this, and then, design it accordingly in a Phase 1, Phase 2, which I don't think was done. Like I said, I have a hard time approving it the way it is right now.

Chair Furth: Osma, did you want to say something?

Board Member Thompson: Oh, yeah. I just wanted to bring up the garden stair option because we haven't really talked about that at all. I actually had a question on it that I forgot to ask. On the conceptual plan, it doesn't have it shown. It has...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, which sheet are you on, Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Sorry. I'm on L0.02D.

[Others locating document]

Board Member Thompson: I'm also looking at this conceptual site plan, where it doesn't exist. The curb type is different, I guess because the sidewalk has lengthened. I just wanted to ask about, you know, in the old one, we have, like, a triangle curb, where you can just go straight and up, but in this new version, it's sort of one of those curbs that has a wall, and you have to go in and out to the right and left, which I know works in terms of an accessibility standpoint. But, it seems like in terms of flow, it might be less desirable. But, yeah, I think I'd just like to know more about that stair.

Mr. Marx: Where is it that you're...? What page is that?

Board Member Thompson: It's L0.02D.

[Others locating document]

Ms. Koo: This was put in to address a staff point about trying to create the most efficient way for people to get from the bus stop -- which we're relocating to be closer to the site -- to the building in the most efficient manner. The way the site is sloped and the way the heritage trees are in place right now along that landscape area close to Hanover, there's so many trees, and the root systems, we've looked at this extensively and we've done, actually a couple of very extensive studies on it. The root system in the trees are in such a place that you actually cannot get a ramp in there without disturbing or affecting those trees. In order to put a stairway, or something, a pathway, it...Is that what we're talking about? What?

Mr. Marx: You flipped your...

Ms. Koo: Oh, sorry. Sorry about that. So, in order to get a pathway that's there that doesn't trigger ADA issues, because that's the whole point of, you can't get that in there, we've designed a really nice, meandering landscape pathway that's not necessarily an ADA trigger. But, it's something that people can still effectively use to get from the bus stop to the building, because there's no way to get all the pathways that you would need to get in with that sort of landscape issue right now.

Chair Furth: Are you telling me...? I'm confused. Are you saying that the path as designed both accommodates existing trees and provides access for most people from the bus stop, but does not have to meet ADA standards?

Ms. Koo: It's a landscape issue.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Ms. Koo: It's a landscape addition.

Chair Furth: Because it has steps, it's defined as a non ADA...

Ms. Koo: Yeah. It's integrated...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Koo: ...and designed as a landscape feature.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Ms. Koo: We've looked at it in every possible way. It's just impossible to actually put...

Chair Furth: Full-scale ADA.

Ms. Koo: Yeah, there's no way to do it in that way. But, the whole point is that, actually, if you go back into our circulation plan, there's actually very easy...The site is designed circulation-wise to address how somebody would get efficiently from walking from the bus stop to the building, because actually, the most logical way is that a pedestrian would hit the driveway and enter right straight into the first garage opening because that's at grade, versus climbing up that...The hill is very steep, so instead of going up the steep to that other opening in the middle of the courtyard, they would actually walk down the created pathway through the first garage entrance, a straight path. And if you recall, the garage was designed with a beautiful porte-cochere entrance in that garage area that takes you straight up via an elevator to the courtyard.

Chair Furth: That's what I would do if I were using a wheelchair, or otherwise had difficulties walking.

Ms. Koo: Absolutely. Yeah. And it's designed that way. That's the logical way that people wouldn't have to strenuously go up slopes.

Chair Furth: Unless they were racers, right. Okay. Any other questions? Osma, did you have any additional questions?

Board Member Thompson: No, I'm okay. Thanks. Thank you.

Chair Furth: As far as I can tell at the moment, I don't think there is support for parking beyond, I don't think there's majority support for parking beyond the code requirements. Is that right? Anybody disagree with that?

Board Member Gooyer: Right. It should be no more than that.

Chair Furth: Are you okay with that, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Not necessarily.

Chair Furth: Okay, so Alex might support additional parking.

Board Member Lew: I'll explain why.

Chair Furth: Sure.

Board Member Lew: If you hear from the so-called parking experts, they say that, I think their prediction is that office density -- people -- is actually going to increase. They also think that other uses will decrease, so there very well could be a need for more parking, even though we have TDMs and other programs to reduce the parking requirement.

Chair Furth: Thanks, Alex. Alex, when you say other uses will decrease, what do you mean by that?

Board Member Lew: Like retail. Other land use types.

Chair Furth: (inaudible-crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: Okay. Then I will not attempt to summarize much beyond that. Peter, did you have any questions?

Vice Chair Baltay: Not really, no questions. I think I was very clear that I just don't think the building is in the right place. As an example, the reason you can't get the ADA ramp you were talking about, that staff was asking, coming in from the corner into the building, up to the plaza, is because the building is in the wrong place. It's too close there and doesn't leave you enough room. You have two really beautiful oak trees there, and you put the building in the parking lot right there. Of course you can't fit the ramp anymore. But, when you say it's just not possible, it's not possible because the building is in the wrong place. I feel like a broken record, but that's really my big take on it.

Chair Furth: All right. I think it's probably helpful to the applicant to understand where we are at the moment, based on what we know today. Alex is ready to approve the project with additional tweaks that would not be a big deal. Peter is not. Peter believes the building needs to be relocated to have a site plan that would meet our code. Osma, do you want to summarize where you are?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. I'm not ready to approve the project at the moment. I think the large amount of asphalt is my main issue. And then, I'd really like to see more detail on the architecture and how it relates to the existing building. I need those two things. And then, also, the sustainability measures, like bird-friendly glazing, pushing your mechanical engineer to give you some passive ventilation, and so on. Shades.

Chair Furth: Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: With me, it's the same sort of thing as Peter indicated. In today's world, I think any walkway coming up to this building, no matter where it's coming and where it's going through, ought to be accessible and not say, well, this one is, this one isn't, because we couldn't get it to work. Not in a site that was a virginal site and you started from scratch. I don't want to hear that. To me, any walkway, to go back to what the law says in the first place, is that you're allowing anybody who has a disability to be able to enter the building from any walkway. I don't see it. And as he indicated, one of the reasons is the placement of that building. Now, I may not go as far as Peter as far as the location of the building, but there's no way I could accept this today the way the parking lot is designed. That alone I think will not do it, but if you're going to do some redesign anyway, I think placement of the building is necessary. And again, it doesn't all need to be underground; that's not the point. It's just a matter of the way it's done now is, it looks like an afterthought, and that really bothers me, considering you only came for the original application a year ago.

Vice Chair Baltay: I want to be clear that my thought initially had been that the building should be where the lower parking lot is, and that's based on the idea that you have two separate facilities, users, tenants, etc. And if the objective is to have one continuous campus, obviously that doesn't work, and I don't want to be seen as pushing for something that doesn't meet your needs. That's not our objective here. As I've looked at this over the past week, it strikes me that if you just took the new building and moved it further towards the surface parking lot and expanded the underground parking underneath it accordingly, it's not actually that big of a deal to do that. You're already digging up the entire site. You're already building a new road. It doesn't have to be in the same location as the current roadway. All these things, you don't have to stick to the existing topography that strongly. That would solve so many problems. It would give so much more ease to the whole project if you could just shift it a little bit to get your parking underneath, or most of it underneath. And I don't want to be designing the building from up here, but when I look at it as an architect, I would be saying, why couldn't you push it around a little more? It feels so much that you just designed this in a series of steps that, each one led you to a difficult conclusion than the next one. Again, you could move the building a little bit, expand the parking underneath it a little bit, and probably make it all work.

Chair Furth: And I tend to think, as a layperson, that if you could separate it out by extending the garage so that more of the parking is underground, a lot of things would fall together. I think my thinking is informed by a project that we really struggled with on Park, which was a fairly large parcel for -- nothing as big as yours, but significantly large for this city, outside of the Research Park. And we struggled, and struggled, and struggled to make it work, and it didn't. Finally, the applicant flipped it and put the parking underground, and all of a sudden, their project became spectacular, and I think they believe still a good investment for them and their tenants. Again, I don't think all the parking needs to be underground, but I do think there needs to be significantly more green space, and the way you get that is to put more parking underground and less on the surface. Anything else we would like the applicant or staff to be able to talk to us about the next time we hear this? Okay.

Board Member Thompson: I think that summarizes it.

Chair Furth: All right. I guess there were a lot of people comfortable with the idea of wanting blackout-style screens.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I don't think that's an issue.

Chair Furth: Okay. All right. They seem to be. So, yes, we need a motion to continue this item to a date uncertain.

MOTION

Chair Furth: Would anybody care to make that motion? You can just say so moved.

Board Member Gooyer: I move we continue this project to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Is there a second.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Hearing none, the motion passes 5-0.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your time and your information and your hard work. [Short pause] I'm sorry, is there anything you'd like to say to us in addition, after hearing our discussion? We're happy to?

Ms. Koo: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Okay, we'll strike our previous motion, we'll do this informally, and please come speak if you'd like to.

Ms. Koo: I do appreciate the comments. We are talking to a tenant right now and they are looking at the whole site. We do appreciate the consideration and the thought that this would be looked at for one group and not necessarily be split between two. Hopefully that will be something to be taken into consideration when we come back with our revisions based on your comments. We do want a campus-like design, and I think having far-apart buildings doesn't necessarily work for tenants. We will take your comments into consideration, but we do need to hopefully design for this one group that we are working with right now. The only other thing I wanted to consider, I understand the comment about the asphalt. We do have right now over 60, almost 63 or 64 percent of the parking is covered underground because that amount is included in the underground that currently exists. Only 30-some percent is actually above ground. Hopefully that is taken into consideration as well. I do appreciate your comments on the solar, so maybe there's an option that we can come up with some solar solutions to create less heat in that area. I mean, I think that's a lot of comments for us to absorb today, and we'll hopefully be able to come back to address those.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything else anybody wants to say since we un-continued the matter? All right, we'll consider the motion re-made, unless there's any objection. Thank you. Could have gone through the whole song and dance, but I think we're good. Nobody left. No harm, no foul.

Study Session [not addressed]

Approval of Minutes

3. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 17, 2018.

Chair Furth: Approval of minutes, draft minutes from May 17, 2018. Any comments, corrections?

Board Member Lew: I have some minor comments that I will forward to the staff.

Chair Furth: Clerical errors? Fine. Would somebody care to make a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of May 17, 2018?

Board Member Lew: I'll make a motion to approve the minutes for May 17, 2018.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Alex, second by Robert. I forget to say that for the transcriber. All those in favor, please say aye. Opposed, no. Carries unanimously.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Furth: There are no subcommittee items today. Do we have any scheduled, still? I can't remember. Is anybody on any subcommittees, except somebody who's going to report back to us about some planning issue?

Ms. Gerhardt: We don't believe we have any subcommittee items at this moment. We were going to go back over the future agendas, if you'd like.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: You have in your packet July 19th. The last address there should be 3406 Hillview Avenue. All three of those items were continued items, so you'll be hearing them. They were at the middle of June, is when they were heard last. And then, for August 2nd, it looks like we potentially have the Public Safety Building coming back, 250 Sherman. Also, 2609 Alma Street is a four-unit project that expired, so we are redoing that application. And then, 656 Lytton Avenue is a prelim project that would be coming to you in August.

Chair Furth: Not a trivial agenda.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: Any comments, questions or announcements for Board members?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think I'm going to be gone September 6th. I just connected that that's a Thursday. I'm not sure what my flight information is. I was thinking the other day that it would be really neat if we could get the architecture board to organize a public symposium. We get one project that has been approved, and been built, and it's in the public eye, and it's visible, and has a cooperating architect, where we could all go to the building, invite members of City Council, Planning Commission, general public, Planning staff, and get perhaps the architect and maybe the architecture board to discuss how the process went to get it approved, to look at the initial drawings, the final approved drawings to build structure. Just sort of go through what we do in a public way to show everybody, but also to learn from it and see how the process went. If you organize this to happen, say, once a year, it might be interesting for everybody, and positive, and also feel good and give architects a chance to do something.

Board Member Gooyer: I think it's a great idea, but trying to get all those people together in one spot is probably going to be...

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I mentioned this to Bob Giannini when he came over to talk about this building we just discussed. He was very enthusiastic regarding his new building on the corner. It's 500...I always forget the address. On the corner of University and Waverly. It's a very interesting building, and it would be really neat to see where it started. Especially that building. They started with a very Victorian type approach to it based on his clients, and I wasn't...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ...arts and craft. Arts and crafts style. It changed dramatically.

Vice Chair Baltay: And I think it's ...

Board Member Lew: And the Board got a lot of criticism about requiring that change. But I think actually everything worked out for the best on that project.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: And I think a lot of people don't understand how drastically some of these buildings change from the first time we see them to what actually gets built. They just automatically assume that we just sit up here and pretty much let anything go through.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, well, that's part of what I'm saying. If you put this out as a Saturday morning at 10 o'clock thing, or a five o'clock on a Thursday, and we get some City Council who would want to go, and make a little bit of PR about it...I bet we could get the applicant. Bob Giannini could do the legwork of getting the staff arranged, and the building, and do all that part of it. It just struck me as an interesting idea to come...I don't know. I don't have anything beyond that.

Chair Furth: [crosstalk] having Peter work with staff and somebody on a proposal like this. You proposed it. Anybody want to work with him on (inaudible)?

Board Member Gooyer: Why don't we get it started (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Well, no, we're going to have to start it. I don't think staff has a whole lot of extra energy at the moment, or extra time.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think the first thing to do, if we want to do this, is to decide that, yes, this is something the architecture board supports and thinks is a good idea.

Chair Furth: I support it.

Vice Chair Baltay: Secondly, it might be just to decide what building or which project we think is the right candidate for it.

Chair Furth: Why don't we ask staff to put this on our agenda, maybe not for the...I guess the next meeting is not too overwhelming, is it? The one after that gets a little heavy.

Ms. Gerhardt: The next agenda is the continued items.

Chair Furth: Right, so, if you could add this, talk to Peter about what an appropriate title for the agenda item is, and we can do some leg work. Happy to work with you on this.

Ms. Gerhardt: And it sounds like for the agenda, we would be, you know, discussion about creating a committee for this type of thing, and maybe what projects might want to be discussed.

Chair Furth: I think the agenda item would be something like that. We'll talk. But enough to let us talk about the specifics, not just (inaudible). Enough to let us talk about specific proposals, not just creating a committee. We won't do any more today since it's not an agenda item. Thank you, Peter. Thank you, staff.

Board Member Lew: I have an item.

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Lew: The North Ventura...

Chair Furth: Oh, thank you.

Board Member Lew: ...study has been pushed to September.

Chair Furth: This is becoming your standard progress report. Look forward to seeing how it goes. I know it's not a simple project.

Board Member Gooyer: Shall we adjourn?

Chair Furth: Anything else? All right. We are adjourned. Thank you.

Adjournment