



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: July 19, 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 Members Alexander Lew and Robert Gooyer.

Absent: Osma Thompson.

Chair Furth: Good morning, and welcome to the July 19th meeting of the Architectural Review Board in the city of Palo Alto. Would you please call the roll?

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: This is the time for oral communications. Anybody wishing to talk to the Board about a matter not on the agenda but within our purview is welcome to do so. I have no speaker cards. Does anybody wish to speak? Hearing nobody.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Any changes, additions or deletions? Oh, we have a speaker card. For number 2. Hearing nothing on that. 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: City official reports? Schedule transmittal? Staff?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Yes. We have the calendar here. I did hear from Board Member Furth, that you would be absent on August 16th, and Board Member Baltay would be absent on September 6th. I haven't heard from anyone else, so we should still have a quorum on those dates. We also have the future agenda. It looks like for August 2nd, we are just going to have the Public Safety building, and the other two items would move off to August 16th.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any comments? Great. It will be good to have those projects back, or that project back. All right.

Action Items

Chair Furth: We have three action items today.

2. **PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 375 Hamilton Avenue [17PLN-00360]: Recommendation on a Request for Approval of an Architectural Review Application for a Five-Level, 50' Tall Parking Structure, With One Below Grade Parking Level, Providing 325 Public Parking Spaces and Approximately 2,000 Square Feet of Retail Space Fronting Waverley Street. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Environmental Impact Report was published May 18, 2018 and circulated for public comments. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF). For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.**

Chair Furth: The first one is a public hearing. It's quasi-judicial, so we will disclose any conversations we may have had since the last hearing relevant to it. It's a request for approval of an architectural review application for a five-level, 50-foot tall parking structure with one below-grade parking level, providing 325 parking spaces and approximately 2,000 square feet of retail space, fronting on Waverley Street. A draft Environmental Impact Report was published and circulated for comment. May we have the staff report? Oh, are there any disclosures? Any conversations? None. And we have all visited the site. Staff?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Thank you. We have today the third hearing for the downtown garage and retail project. On the screen I have a couple circles around some areas to look at, chiefly on these images, because there have been quite a few changes there. There's some additional changes that the architect will go over. A few more images here. The architect today is actually here, which is great, and presented last time. We have a response to the ARB and are requesting to get a recommendation from the ARB to City Council. We have already scheduled a hearing for Council in September, I believe, so we are looking forward to that. In the process, we've had the CEQA, which was last year scoping. We went through pre-screening. We had preliminary reviews for this project in 2017, and then, we had our formal reviews by the ARB -- there's a few images -- starting with February 15th here, moving to June 21st, where we had three members, and then, today's hearing, July 19th. Back in early June, the Council adopted the Public Facilities' own changes that allow us to move this forward to the Council for their action to approve the setback modifications. That's September 17th. They would be taking action on the final EIR, which is being prepared. The final EIR has not been published, but will soon be. It does contain responses to the ARB comments on the draft EIR, and several of the sections on building, landscaping, cultural sections. There has been some responses regarding the historic post office, noting that we do have these 12-foot sidewalks that are sympathetic to the post office, providing that public realm. We have notes about the metal work, and a nod to metal work on Spanish revival buildings. We have notes about the heights, and we have the emphasis on the cyclist circulation and provisions, as well as the deletion of the tree...These were comments from the last meeting that three of you were at, at that hearing, and their comments on the EIR that were folded into the final. Key issues. This was pretty much presented at the last hearing, but we're just going to quickly go through this. Looking at the pedestrian path with the higher ceiling through the garage, so there's better pathways from Hamilton through to CVS, where at that store, we have increased bike and stroller parking, and now, a protective walkway down the lower right image for that bicycle storage area. Again, the three-foot setback, the four-foot encroachment, that was increased in the last rendition and maintained here. We have a better alignment with the AT&T building. It does reduce the parking count in the garage. We have corner enhancements. The architect will show you today some of the seating ideas there on the corner. We have a few modifications in the architecture with this new cap at the top. We also have a concept for a modified concrete treatment that the artist has put forward, so that is considered at this time. And, that is in addition to the tapestry that was proposed. In the last rendition, you had seen enclosure of the stair at the corner, as well as over the vehicle entrance on Hamilton. That has been approved by the Public Art Commission. The content of the art is not in the ARB's purview, but certainly placement on the building is within the purview. There was some discussion last time about where the plantings were, and there was a letter that talks about the viability of the landscaping. And I believe we have our landscape architect today to provide answers if you have questions. As far as the adjacent property owner and the operations, we've been corresponding with the adjacent property owners. There are some items there that were brought up and discussed in letters. We do have a formal parking space in the garage for 550 Waverley, which is per the downtown parking assessment. It cites one space. And, we are going to have a Waverley Street loading zone, and that's likely to be put in prior to completion of this project, to get the

ball rolling on that pattern of delivery. That's the conclusion of my presentation. The architect is here to present, and Holly Boyd is the project manager, and may have additional comments.

Holly Boyd, Senior Engineer, Public Works: Good morning. My name is Holly Boyd, I'm a senior engineer in Public Works, and I'm the project manager for this garage. We have a consultant design team here, including the landscape architect, designer and their architect. I don't have any additional comments, but I'm going to introduce Ken Hayes, who is the architect for the project. He has our presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Mr. Hayes? Good morning. You have 10 minutes. Once we get everything organized.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects: Good morning, Chairwoman Furth, members of the Board. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects. I'm joined today by the design team, Watry Design, with Michelle Wendler and Gordon Knowles; the landscape architect with Merrill Morris, John Potis, is also here in case you have questions for him. And then, Terry Murphy from my office is also here, who has worked on the majority of the documents in front of us. I know that Member Lew was not present at the last hearing, so I have a little bit of a review, and then we'll get into the changes. The program, the downtown garage is Lot D. We're familiar with that. Five levels above grade, one level below. We have reduced it to 325 spaces from the 338 formerly, but we were able to add 50 bike spaces as a result of that. The retail space has decreased a little bit per some modifications that we've made, down to 1955 from the 2188. And then, we are showing the future...Did I do that? I did. Back up. Solar photovoltaic system. I get another five seconds. Project site is at...

Chair Furth: It's an important project. Don't rush.

Mr. Hayes: Okay, thank you. The project site is a 29,000 square foot surface parking lot currently, on the corner of Waverley and Hamilton. The site is zoned PF. The AT&T building next door is also zoned PF, and so is the historic post office across the street. The other sites that are adjacent on Waverley are zoned CDC Ground Floor, P. The project is responding to the ground floor component, as well as the pedestrian overlay component. We have lane 21 at the rear, which is a one-way alley headed to Bryant Street. That serves as an exit for the project. You can also enter there. I want to point out that the sidewalks, both frontages are being expanded. The sidewalk on Waverley is going from about 10 feet to 16 feet, and the sidewalk on Hamilton is going from about 10 to 12, depending on how you count the benches that we have located on that side of the building. And, of course, the historic Category 1 post office is across Hamilton. At the February hearing, we heard some comments about some of the concerns on the site planning, the building edge at Hamilton Avenue, and how the building responded to the seven-foot special setback. We all know now that special setback has been eradicated for PF buildings, so that's not a requirement any longer. However, we are responding to it. Board members were questioning why we needed to have this pedestrian alleyway, so I have some comments on that. This was an awkward way through the garage, so you asked us to look at that a little more closely. And then, if there was a way to increase the bicycle parking, that would be something that would be very positive. We have responded to all of these at the June hearing, and I believe our response was well received. The setback along Hamilton, we've moved the building in three feet to better align with the AT&T building. That is about as tight as we can go because of the requirements for the parking stalls. We're at minimum on some of these parking stalls, but allows for the pedestrian alley. The pedestrian alley, Board Member Lew, is needed because of constructability issues, to avoid underpinning of the Thai Pan building, to allow our joint trench utilities to come in that way, and we need it for light, air, ventilation, in order to propose this naturally-ventilated parking garage, so we don't have to have mechanical ventilation for the floors above grade. And I contend that it's also a great way to give people choice on moving through the community when they come down the stair, which is at the intersection. You know where the intersection is. The pedestrian pathway through the building. The whole second floor has been raised a foot, so a little bit more light when you come in. This left-hand side is essentially all committed to bikes and bike signage and stroller parking. And then, a more deliberate pathway across the garage that is aligned with the pedestrian alley. That then also is coupled with the stair that comes down from the floors above, is also in that corner, and you can either decide to go in the alley behind Thai Pan and Congdon & Chrome

and Prolific Oven, or you can decide to walk straight out to Waverley Street through the pedestrian pathway. And then, this is the expansion of the bike area. It's increased by about 50 percent. Those changes were all well received in June. However, there were some comments on the elevations that I just wanted to go through and show the changes that we've made. On the Hamilton Elevation, we have this pattern of vertical fins that provide a varying view into the building as you walk past it because it will change. There was some thought that maybe they're a little too dominate, so we were asked to investigate ways to lessen the impact, maybe, of those fins. Make the pedestrian entrance, which is down in this area here, a little more prominent or inviting, and add amenities at this corner sidewalk and plaza there along Hamilton. I'm going to go to the large scale because I can't see it this far away. I apologize. The changes are, on the ground floor, we have added an additional bench, so we have shifted the entire built-in planter toward the stairwell, so now the planter goes to here, and that allowed us to pick up a bench right here. Now there are four benches along the frontage. We've reduced the fins at the upper floor in this center part here -- this cursor is not working real well. Anyway, you know where. And we've introduced metalwork railings that would be reminiscent of the metal work railings we have on the ground floor behind all the benches and the built-in planters. At the bike entrance, we've taken the board-formed concrete around to the bike entrance, and we've introduced open rails -- this is on the far left-hand side of the drawing -- open rails on the levels above to make it a little bit more transparent. And then, we've introduced a graphic and perforated metal, basically, that symbolizes bikes. So, there's an image of a bike there, and that image continues as you move through the building. At the plaza area, we've incorporated another bench into the stair as it comes down to the plaza. And then, we think any other seating opportunities there -- and this is in conference with the landscape architect -- would really need to be something that's promoted by the tenant that's in that space, and if they have tables and chairs they want to pull out there, perhaps that's a way to animate that space. Waverley façade, same thing. Look at the fins and add some amenities in the plaza. Again, I'm going to go to the large-scale elevation. I've already discussed the amenity in the plaza, which is the bench that we've added. In a similar way, we've reduced the fins down and created this railing that starts to form a cap to the building. We also no longer are wrapping the two corners with fins. If you'll recall before, we were wrapping the two corners with the fins. Now, we're not. The fins are merely infill and reduced in height? Lastly, this wasn't something that the Board commented on, but we've added a horizontal mullion at the retail transom, just to give it a little bit different scale and to increase the horizontality of that façade, with the canopy above. On the pedestrian alley side in the back of the building, really, it was a matter of, what's the selection on the plant material? I think we looked at a lilac vine, and we looked at the California grape, which I'm told is not going to attract winemakers, right? But, it might attract birds. The fruit is very small on the California vines, so I thought I would just preempt that question. There's really no change to that, although the planters are all now consistently drawn at the same height. The planters in the pedestrian way at the back of the building and the alleyway behind Tai Pan and Prolific Oven are all now at 36 inches, approximately. Those are all seed-free, drain-free type planters, as well. We have some new images right off the press from yesterday morning that are not in your set. This is a view from the, in front of the building, basically, on Waverley. We have the board-formed concrete at the lower levels. We have the terracotta-colored fins, the bronze metalwork, and the clear glass at the retail. You can look down the alley. This is from, obviously, across the street. It shows the corner stair element where, again, we have the bronze perforated metal that has tapestry on it, which is the public art. Tapestry has already been approved by the Public Art Commission and is an abstract representation of, not the flatlands, but the foothills that surround Palo Alto. It creates an interesting graphic on that screen. We have it at this location, and we have it at the far end, which you will see in a minute. This is a close-up of the stair. We incorporated a bench here, and then extended the planter over on this side, in front of the elevator. And then, the railings for the stair descend down and provide a backdrop to that bench so that no one falls into the stair that then descends down to the garage level. Showing some idea of furniture that could possibly be out there. And then, a photographic representation of the building from down Waverley Street, giving an idea of what it would like in the context. You don't really see the post office because of the trees. And then, on Hamilton Avenue looking the other direction. It's broken up quite nicely I think. It's a big building, but it integrates well. And then, this is the other location of the perforated panel and the, you know, this horizontal line here is picked up in that horizontal canopy that we have on Hamilton. This is just our rendering, showing you how that additional bench would look and how those benches occur there, with the metalwork behind. That metalwork then would match the

railings above. If you have a bicycle, you would enter here. Here's the perforated graphic of the bike and the entrance. As you come in, you'd be entering on the left-hand side, and this is sort of the drive-aisle side. You'd see this pattern of images of bikes, basically, that would be in this perforated screen to provide a secure bike area, but communicate what's going on there. We're thinking of a bright color in there, so that when you're in the alley coming from Waverly looking down, you can, actually, in the distance, can see the color in the garage. And then, the screen of the perf'd metal in front of the bike storage area. And then, this is looking the other way. You see the festoon lighting in the alleyway, the plant material, the special paving. The paving won't be contrasting like that. I think that's a shadow thing going on here, so the paving is more consistent. I apologize for that. More like that. This is the back alleyway, again, with an opportunity for a bench. There was a discussion, should this bench be moveable? Right now, we're showing it more fixed in this rendering. And then, the very rear. And I believe that's...This is just an explanation of tapestry. I think we covered that probably last time. That's my presentation. Thank you for the extra time.

Chair Furth: You're welcome.

Mr. Hayes: It's much better when you don't have to rush.

Chair Furth: We'll extend the same courtesy to the public. Any questions?

Board Member Gooyer: I have one question. Ken, on the Hamilton Avenue side, the concrete portion, depending on which one you look at, the square openings are either there, or not there. Which one is it?

Mr. Hayes: It's...

Board Member Gooyer: On this one, it doesn't really appear to be there, other than just...

Mr. Hayes: They are depressions, so they're not see-through.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, at one point, they looked like they were completely all the way through. They're openings.

Mr. Hayes: They're not openings. There was an issue with the sheer wall, so they are recesses in the concrete.

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, okay.

Mr. Hayes: They're recesses.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Mr. Hayes: But they are there.

Chair Furth: Anything else before we hear from the public?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. Architect Hayes, in the same thing Robert's talking about, I've noticed the Art Commission seems to present images of irregular, rounded shapes on that same wall, rather than the recta-linear squares. Do you have an opinion, as the architect, what's appropriate for the architecture of the building?

Mr. Hayes: It's a very good question. We've gone back and forth on this. I like the interest in the proposal by the artist. I think that that is a concept that your public art coordinator, Elise DeMarzo, is also supportive of. I could see it working. I'm not sure what the, you know, how we're going to accomplish it, if that's something that we want to go. But, I also don't mind just the simplicity of what we have here, with the vines growing on it. I don't know if we have the vines with the other concept, whether or not

you're going to read through that, this undulating façade that picks up on that tapestry kind of pattern. I'd be interested to hear your opinion. I'm a bit on the fence, I think, in terms of which way to go. I don't mind the simple version if we're going to have the vines.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I have one speaker card, Elizabeth Wong.

Elizabeth Wong: I represent Waverley Post, which is the owner of 5560 Waverley, the building adjacent to this parking lot. If there are not enough people in the audience, it's probably because they never received notification of this ARB meeting. The only reason I'm here is because I received an email, and I checked my mailbox yesterday, and there was no notification. I have several buildings in town and I did not receive a single card. I wanted to talk about a few things concerning this building and the (inaudible). One of the reasons why I spoke so adamantly against the fins is because this is a view of my property, and you will see from these windows, I can see the post office, which is amazing, an amazing view, and that the fence totally blocks the view. I thought it was, you know, for the people in the parking lot, it would be a lost opportunity to see the beautiful building that the post office is. Amy, would you show them the next one? I also wanted to voice some of my other opinions. I have a neighbor that is building a 50-foot underground, three stories. There's going to be a basketball court there, and (inaudible) walls, and I don't see why this building could not have 40 feet underground and include three levels of underground parking. I think that we don't have space in the city for parking spaces, and it's an opportunity to build a garage that will stay there forever. I would like to see...It would have been my preference to see the art going horizontal instead of vertical because it's really hard to see vertical in a very small area of downtown. I wanted to also add that I had no conversations or correspondence with anybody since the last ARB meeting. I don't know who they talked to, but they did not include me. I also wanted to ask you if the panel, on the top of the fourth floor, are they solar panels? And, what is the height of that solar panel? I'm interested in knowing that. Basically, those are the things, I think. There is another view that you can see the post office really, really well. Can you see the next slide? This is the kind of view that you will lose, and if you had an open parking space, parking, you know, four or five levels of parking was open, it would be a less-massive building with a splendid view of the (inaudible) area. Thank you. Oh, one more thing, and that is the access to the back of my building. That is a big, big issue, and it will not go away. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there any questions of Mrs. Wong? Okay. Anybody else wish to speak on this project? All right. Any comments from staff?

Ms. French: You know, when we continue a meeting, just generally, to a date certain, we do not send out additional notice cards. It's a City expense that we don't go to the trouble to do, because it is a date certain and...

Chair Furth: At our last meeting, we announced that this would be heard on this day.

Ms. French: Correct.

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

Board Member Gooyer: Want me to start?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I think this is an improvement over what we've seen, and I think the third time definitely helped. It's interesting. There are a couple of things. The various changes that you made, I think, are all in the right direction, and I think, as far as I'm concerned, this is approvable at this point. There are some items that, I guess, are still somewhat in flux, but it's all just sort of, throw out my opinion. The tapestry as it's shown on here, I happen to like that. I mean, I know it seems like it didn't

really work at Stanford, but I think because, first of all, this is also, you could see through it, and I think it just makes a unique...If nothing else, it's almost, you look at it, you go, "What the heck is that?" It draws you to it a little more. But, I do find it strange that, if this is done, I mean, it doesn't make any sense to me to put the original design skin on there, and then, take that down and put up the tapestry, so we just do one in lieu of the other completely. Secondly, I happen to like the framing for the solar panels. I think it helps the building rather than hinders. I'd like to see, even if they don't put the solar panels on, I'd like to see the frame up there to counterbalance what's going on at the base of the building. I think it actually is a help to it, especially with the new design of the railing on top. It just gives it a nice, finished top floor to it. Like I said, I could approve the project, or forward it on at this point the way it is now.

Chair Furth: Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Ken, and thank you, staff, for all the hard work on this project. I can also recommend approval of the project today. Previously, I had three major reservations. One was the four dead-end aisles, dead-end aisles inside the garage; the narrow alley between the Tai Pan restaurant and the project; and, also, before, I think you were encroaching as much as six or seven feet into the special setback, and I felt that was sort of short-sighted. I understood the logic of it, but it really seemed short-sighted to me given how hard it is to regain right-of-way space in the future when we actually...If we ever need it. Anyway, I think the building is handsome. It is big. I understand Ken's design strategy, and I think that you've done a really great job with giving that approach. I do want to throw out there that there is a different way of designing a big garage like this. In Beverly Hills, there are two garages, public garages. One's at, like, 345 North Beverly Drive. It has a Williams Sonoma on the ground floor and it's three stories. And then, they have another one, which is 9510 Brighton Way, which is five levels. That has ground-floor retail and it's on Rodeo Drive. They look like buildings. You would never think that they are parking garages. They would be more expensive than what you're showing today. They may be out of the budget of this particular project. But, if you just walk down the street, you wouldn't think that they are a garage, and they blend in. And I think as a good of a job as you've done on this project, it's still going to look like a big garage, especially the Hamilton façade. I think you've done everything that you can do on the Waverley façade. I think the retail helps. It's going to be big, and I think we should expect some criticism of the bulk from it. If you think all the criticism we've gone over, like, the 636 Waverley project, this is going to be a pretty big shock to the system in Palo Alto. I think we should be, we're going to have to be prepared for it, and it's responding to a need for parking. I mean, that's the way I'm looking at it. There were a lot of good changes in the last revisions, the photovoltaics structure, the columns, the changes to the fins. I think those are all really important, and I think that they do help. Okay. The only things that I have on my list now that I think are completely addressed is the concrete color, which I think you're calling out as natural. My understanding is there isn't really such a thing as "natural" concrete. Even sidewalks are colored with lamp black [phonetic]. I think we need to see something, and I would prefer to see something warmer, a warmer color than cooler color. I can understand the logic of trying to match the concrete to, having the gray-colored concrete to match the All Saints Church. But then, at the same time, I'm thinking churches should be separate and distinct from the rest of the fabric. I did look at the 636 Waverley building and the color of that in context with all the warm colors on the block and it seems off to me. It seems like it stands out too much from the neighbors. I think that the Board should discuss some provision for placement of signs for the retail storefront. That's mostly because your awning is really high. You don't have a lot of space above the doors, the transoms. Yeah, you can hang a sign, or a provision for blade signs on the columns. Something. I think we have to do something. I'm also concerned about graffiti on the board-formed concrete and I want to know if you're proposing to put the coating, like a graffiti coating on the concrete. Or if the City is going to paint it afterwards, or if you're going to use chemical cleaners, which never completely remove all of the paint. And then, I did want to address Elizabeth Wong's comment about the fins. If I look at the site plan, I think that, even if the fins were removed, I don't think it's going to help the view through the garage because there's that stair, and the elevator, and the sheer wall. I think the other thing is that I think the way Ken has designed the fins now, I think looks good. We have another garage over at the Hoover Building at Stanford, where the fins are four feet apart, and it doesn't work at all. It doesn't look good. I think they do need to be fairly closely spaced. I would say that there is an

alternate. Like, we have the Bryant Street garage. It just has a grid. It looks more like a window frame and not fins. I think that works, actually, pretty well. But, at the moment, I think I'm recommending no change with regard to that. I did visit the site this morning. I do think there is an issue with service vehicles unloading in the mornings for the CVS store and the restaurant, and then, later in the day, for the Apple store. I think that is an issue. I think loading it from the street side is feasible in the early morning because there's generally not a lot of cars parked in the morning. And I do see restaurants (inaudible) Emerson Street that have restaurant loading in the morning, in the street. They just block the street, so I think that can work. But, I think we do have to resolve all that, and I don't see a lot of details in here. Anyway, that's all that I have. I can recommend approval of the project today.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Through the Chair, could I ask a question of the architect, please?

Chair Furth: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Architect Hayes, I have a question for you about the concrete sheer wall and what you explained were decorative penetrations. I originally understood those to be windows through the sheer wall, so you'd have a glancing view, a frame of the post office. Is that a possibility, to do that, still?

Mr. Hayes: We can certainly investigate that more. That was the original concept, but in working with the structural in Watry's office, it presented some problems for them to be able to get the lateral forces to transfer down the sheer wall.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. The openings are very small. It seems that the sheer strength would not be dramatically affected. Thank you. I find myself able to recommend approval of this project. I think the changes have been for the good, and I'm very pleased with the way it looks now. I'm very appreciative of the architect and staff for modifying the façade a little bit with the top cornice line. I am concerned that the building is much better with the photovoltaic canopy on the top. The reality is that the canopy is something like 56 feet up, so it's higher than the current sacred 50-foot height limit, and this is going before City Council for a vote. I'd like to give them some ammunition, that the Architecture Board thinks the building is significantly better with the photovoltaic canopy, fully understanding that it's higher than the current 50-foot limit. We still think it's an improvement on the building and should be retained. At least put it really loud and clear to everybody what's going on. My second and only other issue is regarding that concrete sheer wall. I think it's much better if you have rectilinear openings through it that people can see out of. Perhaps also modify the color, or just take into account what Alex was saying about toning down the coldness of the gray concrete. I think the metal covering on the stairs will be a nice feature, having the public art there, and I'm all in favor of keeping it there, but I don't think it needs to be extended to the concrete sheer wall. I find the rectilinear grade somehow sinks in with the building as an architectural element. I think it's a loss not to have those peekaboo windows out to the post office that we were originally discussing. I'd like to recommend that, I guess that that concrete sheer wall come back on consent, or just a recommendation to staff to check the color of the concrete and see if we can't get openings through it. Aside from that, I'm grateful to the staff for all the work that's gone through, and the architects for getting this building to where it is now. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: Can I just interject one item? I agree completely, and that's why I asked the question about the openings in the concrete wall. I think it would be much better if the openings were there. And I also know, having dealt with enough structural engineers, that they're going to scream and moan and everything else, and then, if you put your foot down, it's amazing how it gets done. I don't buy it, that it has to be that way. I mean, I accepted your answer because I know you probably asked the structural engineer and they said, no, no, I need that wall solid. But they don't. It's amazing how...I've always gotten my way if you really push a little bit.

Chair Furth: I'm trying to judge by facial expressions how many architects are out there and how many engineers are out there [Laughter.] Getting a lot of audience reaction.

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: It's a few more rebars, Wynne. That's all.

Chair Furth: That's what I figured (inaudible). Sorry about the terrace.

Board Member Lew: Wynne, I'd like to interrupt for one second. There's the internal joke, like, if you're having a meeting with architects and engineers, the engineers show up 10 minutes early and the architects show up 10 minutes late. That's reflective of, I think, structural design, as well.

Chair Furth: I see. And the extroverted engineers are the ones who look at your shoes, right. Okay. I think it looks like a handsome building. I'm really pleased. I share Elizabeth Wong's sorrow at the loss of that view of the post office, but it's going to happen with this building program. I'm grateful that you did carve out the corner on Waverley so that as people come down that street, to have a bit more of a glimpse of that beautiful building across the street. That beautiful civic building across the street, but as a Depression project, with a feeling that civic buildings should look good, they should look like we care about our common purposes in our public buildings. That they shouldn't be as cheap as possible, but they should be the most satisfying we can do. And in this last set of drawings, I have the sense that this is a huge structure, it's a parking structure, but it's also a handsome structure, and we can be proud of it. I think a really important thing with a building of this size is what the experience is walking by it, or even driving by it, close up. I think it's going to be good. I think it's going to be a big improvement over our current experience. We do sit up here and carp a lot, but we also do appreciate what you're doing. There's going to be a much better bicycle and pedestrian experience. I am not going to be locking my bike in the midst of the ivy. I'm not going to be dodging cars backing up into me because there is no pedestrian path at this point that doesn't involve cars backing up into you. I really like your new, walking through the lower level. I'm really glad that we discussed and you were able to raise that floor level underground. I think that this is really, for all the fact it is housing for many, many cars, a pretty multimodal project. I agree that we need to think about where the signage is going to go. I'm delighted that we have a public art element here, and it looks like a beautiful one. On the concrete color, I do not like that cold gray. I don't think -- and I don't know if it really is cold -- I don't think that it's the concrete across the street in the church that we should be picking up on. I think it's the other civic building, which is the post office. I want to know that it's going to enhance that. Which one am I looking at?

Ms. Boyd: Yes, they have.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

[Laughter]

Chair Furth: I saw it, I looked at it, I looked at it in a bigger context; I still don't like it. I think the context is the post office. I do think that this is wonderful for us in terms of a City building and solar panels because we have been not happy with retrofitted solar panels on parking garages. We have thought that they looked horrible, to use a technical term. These finish the building. They make it lighter, they make it soar, they make it float, they make it ecologically more optimistic. They're great. I really like the altered railings up on the top. Again, I think those are great design elements. I have the sense that this building, when it's built in full, can make us proud in the same way that our post office does, while we reflect on the changes in the way the world is organized between the point when the post office was the most important thing we had, and when the parking garage still was. Fifty-six feet -- or whatever -- is a lot of height, but the building next to it is 75, so this is one of the very few places in the city where I think, downtown where I think you could do this and it wouldn't be a bad thing. I was very concerned about pulling it back as far as possible. I think you've done that. And I also realize that by having the wider sidewalk, you give a sense of bigger pull-back, even though the building façade is not further back. I very much appreciate the wider sidewalks. What else did I want to say? I agree that the windows would be much better. I am concerned about loading and how that's going to work. While I know that this building is much more deferential to the 550 Waverley building than a standard, you know, if we continue

development pattern along that street, all the way to the corner, which has zero setback. This is a different situation. It's a deep building, and it's a tall building, and I am persuaded that moving it back isn't going to work. And I'm almost ready to be persuaded that that will be an attractive place to walk through. I am persuaded that it will be a much better place for people working there. Our code says we're supposed to have seating areas and what-not, not just for customers, but for employees, and we're all used to the sight of workers on their breaks, sitting on stand pipes, or curbs, or boxes overturned, and I'm glad that we're going to have seating. In one of the drawings of the seating proposals, it shows what I think of as architecturally lovely, but not comfortable seating. The Timber form Colossus, I can't tell how tall that is, but it looks a little short. I hope it's at least 30 inches, or thereabouts. I'm looking at sheet...

Male: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Male: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Microphone.

Chair Furth: Please.

Mr. Hayes: That is John Potis with Merrill Morris, landscape architect.

Mr. Potis: Thank you. Benches are 18 inches high and are similar to a chair.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, could you introduce yourself for the record?

Mr. Potis: My name is John Potis, landscape architect with Merrill Morris Partners.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Potis: The benches are generally 18 inches high, and that's about the same height as a chair.

Chair Furth: I thought was a chair was, a chair seat...Isn't a chair seat 30?

Mr. Potis: Thirty would be the table height.

Chair Furth: Fine, good, lovely.

Mr. Potis: [crosstalk] is generally about 30 inches.

Chair Furth: You're right. I just measured my seat this morning. It's 12 foot six. You're right. Great. People can sit down in them. And they're both the same height? Timber form is just photographed to look lower? You have bench options for the alley passageway.

Mr. Hayes: There are benches in the alleyway, which would be these Timber form.

Chair Furth: (inaudible) way?

Mr. Hayes: And then there are benches on the Hamilton frontage, and those are integrated, cantilevered off the architecture.

Chair Furth: Right, and as photographed... You present these to us as options in Sheet ARB 4.2, and as photographed, the Timber form Colossus looked really low. Is that an illusion? They're both the same height?

Mr. Potis: We're getting the image up, but it might be that the Colossus looks lower because it's a longer bench in that image.

Chair Furth: Could be.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, it will be seat height, they will both be seat height, whether they're...

Chair Furth: My point is...

Mr. Hayes: ...integrated.

Chair Furth: ...of course, that I want a bench that I can sit down on and stand up from, even if I am not in peak health. Which means, occasionally, you need something to lean on.

Mr. Potis: Yeah, with sitting up, generally, having an arm on the bench, or a...

Chair Furth: Exactly.

Mr. Potis: [crosstalk]...And with the other...

Mr. Hayes: Can you (inaudible)?

Mr. Potis: The Colossus would not normally come with an arm. The Colossus, it's a big hunk of wood, so I think of Palo Alto trees. Even though it's a dead tree, it's a nice hunk of wood. But with the other bench, you can get arms, and also, the other bench, I thought would be more complementary to the built-in benches. But, again, I wanted...

Chair Furth: I mean, I love great big hunks of wood and all that. And we have lots of people to whom they will not need any assistance. But, take a look at the CVS clientele. You've got a lot of people who need help getting up and down.

Mr. Hayes: The benches in front of the building on Hamilton do have arms.

Chair Furth: I understand that they do, but I'm in favor of universal design. Okay. I think that's all. But my overall feeling is pleasure that we have, I think, gotten to a building which will be pleasant to experience, that will enhance alternative forms of moving about, and that will meet the City Council's project, which requires, says we need a lot more parking in this area. I also hear commentary which leads me to think that we should consider a subcommittee. I am prepared to vote for this. I think there are some items that need further work, and I would suggest that a subcommittee is the appropriate way to do that. I'm happy to delegate it to two of you. I don't think my participation is needed. Any issues, I think, would be -- unless you want to talk about it now -- signage placement, concrete color, and the piercing or not of the sheer wall on Hamilton. Was there something else? Oh, and loading. How loading is going to be handled. Or do you think that's not necessary? Colleagues? I'm actually asking if you're supportive of that approach.

Board Member Lew: I have a question for staff. Wynne was asking about loading. Is that actually part of ARB purview? Because that's something in the street right-of-way. I think in discussion in the past, I think that's been excluded from our scope.

Ms. French: Correct. Yes.

Board Member Lew: We can make a statement to the Council, right? We can make a recommendation, but it's not our...

Ms. French: The Office of Transportation would be reviewing where exactly that would be placed...

Chair Furth: So, what I'm thinking...

Ms. French: ...in relationship to the parking.

Chair Furth: ...about is that we're required to find that it's functional. If there's something about the parking garage itself in relationship to these public alleyways that is making it dysfunctional for loading, then it would be something we should be thinking about. If we don't think there's anything to be done with respect to the building itself, that we're satisfied it can be done elsewhere, then I agree with you.

Ms. French: Could I interject? With the architectural review findings on circulation, if you would like to wordsmith that to note loading space, with the provision of a loading space on Waverley, something to that effect, the details of where that loading space along the block is something that would be worked out. But having a loading space, period...

Chair Furth: Allows the building and the adjacent buildings to function...

Ms. French: Yeah, we'd like to think of it...

Chair Furth: That's helpful. Thank you. Not actually an issue I raised. Further discussion, or does somebody want to make a motion, which we can then discuss?

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm happy to make a motion. I move that we recommend approval of this project with the following conditions. Or, actually, before I even go into conditions, in the findings we need to make, I'd like to insert a sentence regarding the importance of the photovoltaic panels. Staff, could you help me locate where the best place to put that would be, please?

Board Member Gooyer: I think it should be more than just a sentence. I think they really do help the overall design of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah. I agree. Do we have draft findings in here, Amy?

Chair Furth: Yes, we do. They're on pages...They're not highlighted the way they usually are, so they're a little harder to find. They start on page 17. Oh, wait a minute. Yeah. Actually, they start earlier, it's just that they're laid out in a very different way.

Ms. French: There is, on packet page 20, is the...

Chair Furth: On page what?

Ms. French: Packet page 20.

Chair Furth: Right.

Ms. French: There is the ARB Finding #6.

Chair Furth: Right, but they start earlier, right? They start...

Ms. French: Correct.

Chair Furth: It's very odd because we've got...I have a hard time finding #1.

Ms. French: We do have a fair number of comp plan policies for this project, so #1 actually starts on the top of page 14.

Chair Furth: Oh, at the top [crosstalk], right.

Ms. French: Packet page 14.

Chair Furth: Right. I think it's Finding #2, that the project has unified and coherent design.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah. I would like to see us add...

Chair Furth: A bullet [crosstalk]...

Vice Chair Baltay: ...in that, in Finding #2, that the photovoltaic panels on the top of the building significantly aid in making the building a harmonious transition in scale, mass and character with the community.

Chair Furth: And say, "and supporting structures?" Photovoltaic panels and supporting structures?

Vice Chair Baltay: That's great. You're good with words, Wynne. Help me figure that one out.

Chair Furth: I think it (inaudible) 2-a, or third bullet? I'm sorry. Never mind. Wrong place. Yeah, you're right. It goes in 2-d. So, the photovoltaic panels and supporting structures...

Ms. French: Is the focus the supporting structure for the...?

Chair Furth: It's the whole thing. Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well...

Chair Furth: The building looks unfinished without them, is my problem.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex...?

Board Member Lew: I think my inclination would be to just say, just have it include the structure and not the panels themselves. Because we got all sorts of state acc...Like, we have two solar shading accents, and I'm thinking it may be better if we just...

Vice Chair Baltay: I agree with you, Alex.

Chair Furth: Because the structure (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: It's the structure that we're after. We just need to use those words.

Chair Furth: Okay, the photovoltaic support structures?

Vice Chair Baltay: That's the...

Chair Furth: I'm thinking of them as finishing the building, but you said something else.

?: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Provide an elegant top to the building? Top, bottom and middle. Did the architect want to comment why they're good?

Mr. Hayes: It terminates the top of the building. It gives it a cornice.

Chair Furth: Okay, provides an elegant cornice. Effective?

Vice Chair Baltay: What I wanted to do, Wynne, was use language in the findings...

Chair Furth: All right.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...and (inaudible) this super structure is important in helping the building achieve a harmonious transition in scale, mass and character with the adjacent...

Board Member Gooyer: There you go. That sounds good.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...building.

Chair Furth: All right. Let's say it provides a cornice, and. Then we've got the facts and the [crosstalk].

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm trying to give Council what they need to hear, that this is the language they wrote. This building does...[crosstalk].

Chair Furth: And then, can we add a sentence? Yeah, because it has a lot to do with the height. And can we add another sentence, that the 75-foot height of the adjacent building...?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think that's already here.

Chair Furth: All right.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's bullet point number 3.

Chair Furth: Perfect. Some of these things, I have read them, (inaudible) my marks, but I don't remember them all, obviously. Okay. Do you have something, staff, that will work? Are you clear on what we're saying?

Ms. French: Yeah, I think you noted under 2-a, the third bullet, the photovoltaic supporting structure on the top of the building.

Chair Furth: It should be 2-d. I'm sorry.

Ms. French: Oh, 2-d, okay. The photovoltaic supporting structure on the top of the building provides an elegant top, and there's something about significant, and some other verbiage.

Vice Chair Baltay: And it's important in helping the building achieve, then use the language from the findings. Helping the building achieve...

Chair Furth: Harmonious transitions.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...harmonious transition and mass-scale character with the adjacent building.

Chair Furth: Perfect.

Vice Chair Baltay: Then, I'd like to make a condition that the openings in the concrete sheer wall remain as openings, as we've been originally shown. It's not a, come back to us on consent. Just make them openings. I believe that can be done. And I'd like to have a second condition, that the color of the concrete come back on a consent calendar after the architect has given a little more thought to how to tone down the harshness of the colored concrete. And then...

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Baltay, are you asking that to be on consent or on subcommittee?

Vice Chair Baltay: Subcommittee, I think. I'm sorry, I misspoke.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Assuming the rest of the board is up for that. And then, the signage. Is that something we can expect to have come back at the same subcommittee?

Ms. French: Once we receive an application for staff architectural review, we can bring that to the subcommittee.

Chair Furth: I think our problem is different. The question is: What is a location on the building that any signs could go. I think that's the way we want to think about it now. Not the content of the sign.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: The other choice we would have is we could, could we not recommend that a master sign program be included as part of the project? That doesn't mean it would happen. I think we were saying...

Chair Furth: [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: There's usually a sign for the garage itself. I mean, we name the garages.

Mr. Hayes: There is a master sign program in the drawing set for the parking-related elements that the City has adopted. For the garages.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could that just be expanded to include the commercial...?

Chair Furth: It's retail...[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: We're just talking the retail store.

Vice Chair Baltay: Just expand it to include the retail signage, too. It can't be that hard just to say you're going to have... [crosstalk].

Mr. Hayes: We can locate, yeah, yeah, we can locate, you know, options for where the signage could be incorporated.

Chair Furth: Perfect.

Vice Chair Baltay: It will help everybody if you do that. At least that's the base [crosstalk].

Mr. Hayes: And the tenant will want to see that, too.

Vice Chair Baltay: Those are the only conditions I'd like to add. I do not think we should put anything about loading...

Chair Furth: All right.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...on the architecture board. So, that's my motion.

Ms. French: Could I ask a clarification? The openings in the concrete, you said that would not go to subcommittee, that's just a ...?

Vice Chair Baltay: It would not go to subcommittee.

Ms. French: ...would be a condition.

Vice Chair Baltay: We're just saying that should be one of the conditions of approval, is that the openings be retained as openings.

Ms. French: Okay, thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Any discussion?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, there's no "if possible" on that condition. It just says it.

Chair Furth: Keep in mind we are a recommending body. Any other comments before we vote?

Ms. Gerhardt: Do we have a second?

Chair Furth: Yes. Robert. I always forget to summarize that. Okay, on a motion by Board Member Baltay, second by Board Member Gooyer, to recommend approval as previously stated. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed. Hearing none, it passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0.

Chair Furth: Congratulations. Thank you. We'll take a five-minute break.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: Excuse me, I just had a question about our last project. How many square feet is that parking garage, above ground?

?: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Well, I do, but I can't tell.

Ms. Gerhardt: It should normally be on the front page. We can take a look.

Chair Furth: Okay. All right.

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [18PLN-00054]: 2nd Hearing for a Request for Architectural Review and Conditional Use Permit for Shake Shack Restaurant to Allow for Exterior Facade Improvements and to Allow for the Sale of Alcoholic Beverages in and Existing Tenant Space at the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.**

Chair Furth: Well, we will go on to our next item, which is a public hearing on 181 [sic] El Camino Real, which is to say the Stanford Shopping Center. This is a request for architectural review and a conditional use permit -- not from us -- for Shake Shack restaurant, to allow for exterior façade improvements, and to allow the sale of alcoholic beverages in an existing tenant space at the Stanford Shopping Center. It is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. This was formerly the Wells Fargo Bank building next to P.F. Chang's restaurant. Does anybody have any conversations to disclose? We have all visited the sites. Staff? Thank you. You can proceed.

Samuel Gutierrez, Associate Planner: Good morning. This is at the Stanford Shopping Center. We went to hearing previously and the Board had some comments and concerns, so the applicant and I worked on

that and came up with some different designs that addressed some of the comments and concerns expressed by the Board previously. So, let's start the presentation here. Just to go back, the Stanford Shopping Center has a wide variety of retail tenants, restaurants, some kind of day spa uses, hair salons, etc., so they have a wide range of different facades throughout the shopping center, typical of a shopping center, especially an outdoor one. As we move on, this is the existing conditions here. You can see the Wells Fargo ATMs on the upper left photo there, and you can see that the building has a bit of a point to the right, under the triangular building. It is somewhat visible through the tree line during the fall seasons. You can see on the lower left, the photo there, I circled it. From Quarry Road, it is mainly blocked by that plaza with the trees, but the Wells Fargo -- and with that ATM existing there -- that is somewhat, again, visible from El Camino. It is partially visible from the public right-of-way, but it is also partially obscured by the planting that's there at the site. As we go through, we can see that the changes from before are that we do have new public seating -- I'll go into that later -- landscaping has been modified, and, just to hit some key points for board members who were not here before, the change of use from financial services to eating and drinking use -- a restaurant -- does change the parking because they are utilizing the outdoor patio, where the Wells Fargo Bank did not utilize that. They did use it as a refuge; now, there's actually seating there, though the Stanford Shopping Center does have a large excess of parking, so it's not really an issue. Moving on to the Board's concerns here, last time this went before you, there was concerns regarding the landscaping. There was lavender being used before, and there were concerns about bees being attracted and that not being compatible with an eating establishment. You have people sitting outside and bees buzzing around. Also, some of the landscape choices were not drought-resistant or indigenous plants, so the applicant did prepare an updated revised landscape plan that includes native drought-resistant plants. He did remove the lavender to address the bee issue. The other concern was the durability of the cedar wood that was proposed the first time around, and the Board suggested using an alternative material, or painting the brick façade. The applicant now has proposed two options in this submittal before you. There's one with the painted brick façade option, and there's another one with a wood option with an alternative wood. It's an Accoya treated wood as opposed to the cedar that was proposed before. The Board did say that there should be more focus on the triangular portion, the point of the building, for public seating, since it was observed that people lacked seating in that area. The applicant did prepare their site plan according to that and are proposing four new benches. That's shown on the site plan. And, the Board members were not supportive of at the time -- two of the three -- were not supportive of, there was a burger logo on the new trash enclosure. The applicant did remove that. Moving forward, we can see here the landscaping. This is just a general site plan. That did not change, just the planning scheme, so they did not increase the landscape area or decrease it from before. Here, we can see the landscape options. They are California native plants and they are more drought-resistant than the previous selection that was before you. Moving on, this is the first façade option with the painted brick. You'll see that it is painted throughout on this side. This is the side that would face Quarry, and it was partially obscured by that mettle of trees. Here's the same side with the Accoya wood. You can see the difference here. It's the lower portion of the façade. It now has wood. Here's the parking lot side that you can see from El Camino through the trees. Again, this is the painted brick option. At the back-of-house side -- as I would like to call it -- where the trash room doors are, there on the right, you'll see that it's painted light gray, the brick. The brick continues...Actually, it would be the left. That's painted an ash color. There's actually a sample up there for you. Here's the same side with the Accoya wood option, very similar to the previous option that you've seen before. Moving here to the public seating, this is the zoomed-in area of the site plan. Highlighted in yellow, you can see the location of the new benches. It is made of aluminum, looks very modern, nice. It has a back and arm rests. There are the options there. There's also a spec sheet available for you. We are recommending approval of the project with...Excuse me. Let me start over. There was a modification to the conditions of approval in the submitted staff report. Condition number 4 -- yes -- that was handed to you, and that's available for the public. We did specifically state that the four new benches, the public seating condition, would require it to be of that **Metro 40** style, or an equivalent style and quality because they are proposing a nice aluminum bench, and in case that does not happen to be available at the time of installation, they could go seek an alternative that's very similar. That is a change that's brought before you.

Chair Furth: And that's condition number 14.

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: And with that change there, we recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any questions of staff before we hear from the applicant? Would the applicant like to make a presentation?

Justin Kyle, Architect: Ready to go? Good morning. I'm Justin Kyle with Michael Hus Office of Architecture in Austin, Texas. Do you need me to spell my name for the record?

Chair Furth: That would be nice.

Mr. Kyle: Okay. [Spells name.] Sammy gave a good overview of the project, in general. The reason why we're here today is to address the concerns the Board brought up at the last discussion. The, I guess, major element that we've been looking at is one of the questions of providing adequate seating for the area. We discussed the benches. We coordinated with the Stanford Shopping Center to find the bench specification that they would like and provided four different options for this bench location at the areas in general where the Board recommended at our last discussion. Then, overviews on the landscaping requirement, looking at drought-resistant plants, based on recommendations that we found using research on the Palo Alto website, as well as working with other members without our design team that have done work in the California area, and the Bay Area specifically. These are the specifications that we came up with. Of course, we can modify as needed per the Board's recommendations. For the big item here, we were looking at the façade options on the exterior of the building. Per the Board's recommendation, we looked at an alternative option versus the wood, but we also kept a wood option within this package because we do feel, as for the design, it is the best design option for this project. It gives a human scale to the project. It also brings a warmth into it, and at the level of interactivity between the patrons and at that level of the building. This wood is not a cedar, it's not a teak. We're looking at, not a composite wood, it is actual wood, but it goes through a process, an acetylated process. We have more information and documentation I can discuss here in a moment. Doing some research on this, we looked at, this product is not only a good fit for this area, but it's also a product specifically made for exterior cladding. It is typically used either in a cladding orientation, as we're showing it here, or for decks, pool decks specifically, as well. It's a product made to be UV resistant, to be weather resistant, to be pest resistant, and all the resistances required for an exterior cladding orientation. You can see in this design that we're showing here, there's not much of a change from what we showed initially, so this sticks close to that initial proposal. But, the wood specification is a different specification. As a second option, we did look at more or less the same design. The main element here that we're changing is that instead of a wood over in the back-of-house area here, we are suggesting a slim glazed brick condition. I do want to highlight that for the glazed brick cladding, as well as for the wood cladding, we're not going to be removing any of the brick in the areas where we do have existing brick, where we're having it remain. This is more or less a rain screen condition where we will be creating a floating façade that's going to go in front of the original façade. Also, the reason why we're doing a lot of these movements is because we'd like to reinforce the branding of Shake Shack. It's the reason for the painted brick, it's the reason for the corrugated metal, and the reason for the wood, or for a feature tile element on the outside, bringing it in line with all the other Shake Shacks that have been designed in other areas. But, also, bringing in the wood as an option specifically here, to address local context and to be more in line with Palo Alto design in general. Here is the view from the other façade. You can see for the wood option, we are still carrying the wood and certain portions here, not only in the larger brick areas, but also as a treatment on the mullions of the storefront, as well. For the glazed brick option, I decided to go with the existing brick throughout, either keeping it remaining in the conditions where we will have an existing brick wall, or to bring in new brick where we would be removing existing storefront from Wells Fargo and infilling those openings with the existing brick specification. Still suggesting a painted option

here throughout, for the wood option or for the glazed brick option. These are from the interior, and various details for (inaudible) options. We have also prepared an additional presentation using some of the marketing materials available on the Accoya website. This is just a quick overview of the product. I understand you all have a sample, as well. This product, you can see all of the logos here. Very resistant to insects, very resistant to UV, resistant to water and to decay, and, in general, kind of a wonder product for an exterior application. It's also non-toxic and recyclable, and the wood, original species that it's sourced from, are sustainably harvested, as well. Here's the process. I would recommend reading through this, as well, to get a better idea of what is going on with the process. They're not necessarily injecting the wood with different chemicals. It's going through a process that changes an aspect of the wood to basically remove the bad agents within the wood that lead to warping, to waning, to insects, as well as general decay of the wood. As a result, the wood becomes much harder and much more durable, much more long-lasting. There's an outdoor state [phonetic] test, you can see in this graph here. I know it's small, but this top line here is the product that we're suggesting. You can see throughout the lifetime of other woods and exterior wet conditions that they start decaying much more quickly, especially cedar. Here, it takes a downward trend pretty dramatically. You can see the wood we're recommending for this application is going to be lasting for a good amount of time, and as long as we are maintaining the finish using a clear seal -- which we are suggesting here -- it should retain throughout the entire lifetime of the project itself. Other diagrams here. You can see other tests, that swelling. You can see all the other woods here, through water impregnation studies, that only the Accoya stands as not having any kind of waxing or waning or cupping throughout its lifetime. This is to address specific concerns brought up by the Board at the last discussion, worrying about how this façade -- board and batten façade with this Accoya -- will look over a longer period of time. You can see that there would not be as much movement between the individual boards with this specific type of material. And then, a couple other examples. You can see with finishes on the wood over a period of time, that the typical pine or cedar does tend to look much worse over time, but the Accoya actually stands alone as not having the same amount of decay as the other wood options. And then, the last page is more information on sustainable harvesting of the initial species that they use for this wood product, and for other environmental impacts, showing it being a good, environmentally-sourced and green product to be used in this application. That about covers all of the concerns brought up by the Board last time, unless you'd like me to speak more about the design in general for the Shake Shack.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of the applicant? Thank you. Any comments from staff?

Mr. Gutierrez: No. none.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I will close...Any members of the public who wish to speak?

Vice Chair Baltay: I have one question for the architect, if that's okay.

Chair Furth: Sure.

Vice Chair Baltay: I remembered last time you presented a design where you had a groove of some kind cut at an angle in the face of these wood strips. Is that still present in the design?

Mr. Kyle: That is still present as part of the design.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you explain that, please?

Mr. Kyle: Yes. Let me pull up the original presentation. It's a bit difficult to read in this render. You can see that there is a line here that we showed to highlight this detail. That line follows a path along the façade. I can pull up the elevations, too. Here. And the line you can see present here, as well. What that line is indicating is a batten condition, where we have these fins coming out from the face of the T&G application on the wall. Those battens will have a detail where they'll be a little more proud at one point, and then, cut back slightly, and then, be slimmer at another point. Creating more movement on the façade in general. You can see at the top of the line here, that's where the fin would come out a little bit

more proud from the face of the building, and then, below that line, that fin gets cut back just slightly. It creates kind of a notched condition coming in on a kind of cross-elevation there. We have that movement along this façade here, with this line. We have that movement along this little portion of the wood. And you can see, as it wraps around to the other side of the building, that we're showing those notches, as well. And as an extension of this concept, where we have a wood fin condition on the front of the storefront, that that line would continue, so we would notch in that fin here, and here, and here, as we go up along the storefront. I believe we do have the detail of that, as well. Let me see if I can find it. [Attempting to locate.] Or, we can also send that detail, as well, for a little more clarification, what that notch would actually look like.

Vice Chair Baltay: I believe it's Detail 3 on A501.

Mr. Kyle: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you for the explanation.

Mr. Kyle: Not a problem.

Chair Furth: And I had one question. The existing Wells Fargo bank and the P.F. Chang's portion of the building on, what I guess is sort of the northeast side, have vines all over the place.

Mr. Kyle: Yes.

Chair Furth: Have a lot of vines. And they'll remain on the P.F. Chang's portion of the building. Tell me your thinking about not having them on any portion of your building, particularly the portion of that frontage closer to El Camino.

Mr. Kyle: I think for the long-term life cycle of the building, we are expected that ivy to grow back onto the building. We're showing for clarification within our renders no ivy currently as kind of the condition of the building, what it would look like on opening day. Over the course of five or 10 years, we expect the ivy to grow back, eventually. You can see we are showing the ivy in our renders, on the columns themselves.

Chair Furth: You are on the other side, yes.

Mr. Kyle: Yes, yeah, with the expectation of it growing back. For the initial renovations that we're proposing, we will be removing the ivy back to the P.F. Chang's side, but then, allowing that ivy to grow back onto the building.

Chair Furth: I think in your drawings it says it's going to be California pipevine on the columns on the southern frontage. The one towards Quarry, not towards El Camino.

Mr. Kyle: Okay.

Chair Furth: And I think it's Virginia creeper on there now, not ivy.

Mr. Kyle: Well, we can change that specification so it...

Chair Furth: I like it, is my point.

Mr. Kyle: Okay. You like the California pipeline, or the...?

Chair Furth: No, I'm fine, I don't care what you do.

Mr. Kyle: Okay.

Chair Furth: I just think that that's an attractive element of the existing building. It weaves it into its site nicely, and if it didn't interfere with your corporate presentation of self, I'd like it. Thank you. That's helpful. Any further questions of the applicant or staff? All right. Peter, do you want to start?

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure. Thank you. I made a note on my drawings. It says I prefer the wood look, but will it last? I think, to me, that whole question comes down to whether this wood idea of yours is going to come off, or not. I guess at some point, I'm willing to give you the benefit of the doubt and see what happens. I'll be honest with you. When I look at the detailing and look at everything I know about wood construction, this is going to be a disaster. But, maybe there's something about this new wood...

Chair Furth: Tell us how you really feel.

[Laughter]

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, your detail shows the end grain of the wood, the fin, up there, exposed to the elements. The end of the grain of the wood exposed to the elements. That's just an absolute no-no in wood design. Maybe it's just a detail you haven't followed through on. It says you're going to glue these boards to the ledger to hold them on. It just doesn't work. You can't just glue it and expect it to stay. That's detail number 2 on A501. I am concerned that your details are full of language that says use this wood or some other weather-resistant wood substance. I think it should be this stuff, if you're going to do it. I'm assuming that's what you are after. And I'm intrigued by your idea of notching the wood back, now that I understand it. It's a neat idea. I think that might be effective. But, the big picture is that, when you just paint the brick dark like that, it just looks overbearing, and I don't think that's the right answer. I think it's fine to try the wood. My other thought or concern had been, initially, I had been hoping you'd be able to get more seating or public amenity type space where the prow of the building is, where you have a field of landscaping. That was originally lavender, and now it's some other native grasses. But, I had been hoping that would actually be a place for benches, or more public gathering. It's really a shortcut place for people to cut across, going around the corner into the restaurant, or waiting. It seems like you've done, is just put a few benches on the side of the walkway, rather than giving a little bit more space for it. I don't know if it's possible to do that or not, or if that's something you considered, but I want to hear what my colleagues think about it. Those are my two big issues on this, the wood, and whether you can get more seating at the prow of the building. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Sorry I missed the last meeting for this one. I did review the minutes for the meeting on June 21st, and I do agree with my board members about the wood. I think there was some discussion about maybe staining the brick instead of painting it, and then, the plant list. I'm on board with all of those previous comments. On the project, I can recommend approval. I think my preference is Option 1 with the Accoya wood over the glazed tile brick. I have not used it before. I am in the process of refinishing all of the stained wood on my house, and it's pretty nasty stuff, keeping it clean. Every two years...

Vice Chair Baltay: Don't look at me, Alex. Talk to the guy...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ...yeah, with an army of, I'm using trisodium phosphate cleaners, which is not environmentally friendly. I'm using OxiClean and oxalic acid, and it's pretty...To get it to look really good, it takes work every two to three years. And that's just semi-transparent. It's even worse with the clear sealers. That being said, this is cladding on a retail. I would imagine that Stanford Shopping Center has fairly high standards. They're not going to let you not maintain the façade. It's just the skin, it's a retail skin design. They change over time, so I'm fine with Option 1. On the seating at the pointed corner, I think I understood that from the minutes. And then, I did look at the site, and there seems like there's a spoke right there at the corner. I'm not sure that it's actually quite so feasible. I think that might be an

issue. I think, ideally, I think, if I'm understanding your comment, you want something integral into the building. I get that, and I think I would support that, although I don't really know what it is. And it doesn't seem like there's that much space there. I think, generally, my take on it is that the path between your site and the Bloomingdale's isn't really landscaped very well. I did go around the whole shopping center. It seems like they've been removing some of the landscape, maybe to save water or what-not during the drought. It seems like it's not quite as nice. To me, I would rather have an improvement there, and it could be on the corner of the building, as well. I'm open to recommendations from the rest of the Board. Do you think removing the lavender was a good change? We had another project, a big project, the Jewish Community Center, where they actually had to take out all the lavender that was put in all the planter benches because it was just crazy. People could not sit there. So, I think that was a good choice. I did want to...I think the revised plan, this is really good. You've got a few plants, say, like the pipelines, the aristolochia, is a great plant for attracting pipeline swallow-tailed butterflies. They're not really native...The butterflies, I don't think are in our area. They're sort of more north in San Francisco and Berkeley. But there are a whole contingent of people in San Francisco who are trying to bring them back into the city, a couple hundred of them, to reestablish that butterfly population in San Francisco. I don't think that was necessarily your intent, but for staff, if we are trying to do that, the butterfly proponents like The Xerces Society and what-not, that you should have the host plant as well as the nectar plant. And then, the key thing is no pesticides. There's more that we could do if the intent is really to provide habitat. It's not just picking the plant and putting it on a planting list. And I think it's not going to work for you, if I'm looking at your color board here with the very, very dark...We have buildings here on Hamilton where there's existing brick, and they stained it darker. To me, they look better than painted brick. I would imagine that it would be very hard to get something as dark as you're showing here, but I think that stain is environmentally preferable because you would be using less stain over time, which allows the brick to breathe and has less flaking. Those are all my thoughts on this particular project.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I sort of had the exact same initial reaction that Peter did. I like the wood, but my God, there's no way I could support that. I was willing to accept the brick, but just having read what apparently this stuff does, or how well it holds up, I'd be willing to give it a shot, doing it that way and go with, I guess it's Option 1, or the wood option. I agree, the shopping center has fairly high standards, so if it goes to hell in a year or so, they'll let you know. Also, it's a first-floor type situation. You're not worrying about scaffolding, or whatever, if you do, for instance, have to replace the whole thing. But, like you said, I do agree that the detailing on that is something, my God, you would never do with wood, so I'm willing to accept that. I think what we should do is make it so that we mandate this particular manufacturer or product -- whatever you want to call it -- rather than just saying approved alternate, or whatever, which is very typical in the industry, obviously. And just make it this. I think that's worth a shot. The planting and all that, I agree with my fellow members. As far as the seating, what I've seen when I've designed restaurants, or whatever, if people want to sit outside, it's amazing, over a year, they sort of migrate to what works for them, and after a while, if everybody wants to sit there, the planting goes away and chairs appear. I'm not too worried about that aspect of it. I'm willing to just leave it the way it is.

Chair Furth: Thank you for coming back to us. I think this is a safe place to do an experiment with vinegar-soaked wood. That's what they're saying, right? Acetic acid, under pressure. I think it's a very safe place to do this. I think it's got low visibility, I think it's got Stanford Shopping Center's administration keeping track of what's happening, and you. I'm happy with that. I like your plant palate better. I spent the last week surrounded by a lot of butterflies, and I will say, the more you can attract, the more your customers are going to want to be there. It's a magical part of life, and rare these days. But, coming back. I'm glad you're going to add the benches. They should be specified as back benches, the back version of that in condition 14, staff. I believe that's what you intend, and what we want. And as to whether we specify Accoya or Accoya equivalent, how does the applicant feel about that? Are you okay with specifying the specific material?

Applicant: Yes, we are okay with it. In terms of insulation and pricing, it definitely works for us.

Chair Furth: Okay, because we don't put this in Public Works contracts because we don't want to be messing with the market. But, if this is -- improperly -- but if this acceptable to you...

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, if I may, we could specify that certain type of wood and we could say that it should come back to subcommittee if it needs to be changed.

Chair Furth: Fine. I wouldn't bet on your chances given the opinion of the architects on the Board about wood. I think you persuaded them (inaudible), but I'm sure we could always be further educated. I'm ready to entertain a motion. Oh, and I just wanted to say, since Alex got to talk about how great pipeline is, my experience with Salvia Gregi is it's a great butterfly and hummingbird habitat. Even in small areas.

Board Member Gooyer: One minor item on the wood. I'm a big of fan of alternate, but the problem is, if this is fairly unique, there may not be an alternate, or somebody thinks their product is sort of like it, and we go with that. This isn't a massive proportionate part of the project. I don't see any problem with specifying this one particular brand as compared to saying (inaudible) alternate.

Chair Furth: Well, since it's acceptable to the applicant, I'm fine with that, too. We're asking for a change...Well, would somebody like to make a motion?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: Peter, I also do support your comment on the exposed ingrain of the wood, and I think we should...

Vice Chair Baltay: I wasn't intending to get into those details, Alex. I think the more you did, the more we're going to find. How were the wood boards attached to your aluminum mullions between the windows? You don't show that detail, but you're going to find that challenging. Just another one. I'm ready to move that we approve the project as presented.

Chair Furth: Okay, is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: I would ask for a friendly amendment, to add, in condition number 14, that the new benches shall be the metro-style backed bench by Design Works, or an equivalent style and quality.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's okay with me.

Chair Furth: And then, also, the staff-recommended condition, where would that go, staff, about the material? With Option 1, right? We have to say Option 1?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, actually, we should make part of the approval that we're thinking Option 1.

Chair Furth: Option 1...

Vice Chair Baltay: Option 1 is preferable.

Board Member Gooyer: With the specified...

Chair Furth: ...with the applicant's specified...

Board Member Gooyer: Come on, Peter...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: You guys are such skeptics. Based on experience, I'm sure Accoya product...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, we would need to add that in as a new condition.

Chair Furth: Yes. Anything else, folks?

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, do you want to dive into those...?

Chair Furth: Any further conditions?

Board Member Lew: No.

Chair Furth: All right. Is that amendment accepted?

Vice Chair Baltay: Those are acceptable amendments.

Board Member Gooyer: Accepted to me.

Chair Furth: Okay. Moved by Board Member Baltay, seconded by Board Member Gooyer, to recommend approval of this project with the modified conditions as we just specified. All those in favor say Aye. Any opposed? It passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much for coming to us, and congratulations. Look forward to seeing your project.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: We're back in session, and it is item number 4.

4. 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 79,076 Square Foot Office/R&D Building. This is a Designated Project Under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. Environmental Assessment: An Addendum to 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

Chair Furth: This is our third public hearing today. Again, it's a quasi-judicial hearing for 3406 Hillview Avenue. Staff is asking for a recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a site and design review, to allow the demolition of an existing 62,500 square foot research and development building and construction of a new two-story, approximately 79,000 square foot office building. This is a project under the Mayfield Agreement, which entitles Stanford to a more focused review than would otherwise be the case. An environmental review is in the form of an addendum to the Mayfield Development Agreement EIR. Does anybody have any conversations or site visits to report? We've all visited the site. More than once. All right. Staff?

Graham Owen, Project Manager: Thank you, Chair Furth. As you mentioned, this is a site and design review application for a 79,076 square foot office building. This is also an application for architecture review, so we're going to be looking at both the findings for architecture review and the objectives for site and design. This is the third hearing, as you mentioned. Since the June hearing -- which was the most recent hearing -- there's been several changes to the application. In terms of the square footage, it's actually been reduced in terms of the gross floor area, so this is actually...This needs to be corrected in this slide, but it was previously an 82,030 square foot office building. From a gross floor area perspective, it's been reduced in its total gross floor area by about 3,000 square foot. What this has done is, even though the building envelope hasn't shifted, 3,000 square foot has been fully allocated from area where you could have office R&D use to specifically dedicated employee amenity space, which is exempt from gross floor area, and also from parking.

Chair Furth: Exempt from the calculations, but there's no change in building mass.

Mr. Owen: Correct. You got it. As you mentioned, this is a Mayfield-designated project and is subject to the Mayfield Development Agreement EIR and mitigation monitoring plan. First hearing was held in May and the second was held in June, June 20th. That should be corrected in the slide, as well. At the June hearing, the second hearing, there were a couple of comments. The first comment, and probably the most impactful, is the comment about the upper parking module, just the total area of the space that's dedicated for impervious cover, and it's a relatively close adjacency to the open space, which is next to the site. There were comments about the site and design review findings and objectives and how those comport with the asphalt that's proposed adjacent to the open space. One of the most impactful comments, I think, was that that area in particular should be further studied and the impervious area

reduced. The second comment was with regards to the staircase, which was proposed previously at the corner of Coyote Hill and Hillview, and just the comment that this staircase and the landings that make up the staircase should be reoriented so that they are facing directly to the employee entrance just off of Hillview Avenue. Third comment was that we wanted to have a little bit more information about the rooftop photovoltaic system and what was actually proposed. This is an aerial photograph. We're all familiar with the site at this point, but just for the public, it is located in the Research Park at the corner of Hillview Avenue and Coyote Hill, in the RP-5, Research Park 5, zoning district. Adjacent to the site is SAP to the south, VMWare across Hillview Avenue to the east, and then, PARC - Palo Alto Research Center - to the north. And then, you have Coyote Hill proper to the west. This is the revised site plan showing the two biggest changes to the site, which have happened since the June hearing. As I mentioned, they've reoriented the upper parking module to reduce the total amount of impervious cover and asphalt, with the idea of putting 19 parking spaces into a landscape reserve. This has involved a couple changes to the geometry of the upper parking lot. In particular, it went from a two-way module so that you could have cars going in either direction, to a one-way in either direction at the top, for the upper module only. What that does is it reduces the total amount of asphalt that's closest to the open space to the west, and makes it so that all the parking stalls that are in that area are oriented, I believe, at about 60 degrees, as opposed to the 90 degrees that was previously proposed. The applicant has indicated that with this change, putting 19 spaces into landscape reserve, plus the 10 spaces in addition to the 19 that are reduced by virtue of putting more of the gross floor area actually into amenity space, which is exempt from parking, total reduction is 29 spaces. This results in a net zero increase in impervious cover on the lot. The second biggest change is the reorientation of the staircase. It was previously proposed, as I mentioned, at the corner of Hillview and Coyote Hill, and now it's mid-block....Excuse me, kind of right at the center of the site frontage along Hillview, so it more directly ties into the employee entrances proposed at the front. This is showing the evolution of the upper parking module: As it was originally presented with the October submittal, and then, how it was submitted at the June hearing, and then, also, how it is presented today. So, showing the evolution of that area and how it's changed. One of the other comments that was raised at the Board hearing in June was that we needed a better rendering or a better understanding of the front elevation, so the applicant has provided an additional rendering, showing that area, along with the updated location of the staircase. Key issues. Nothing has really changed in terms of key issues that we've raised previously. These are the things that we think are most important with this application. The hillside context, you have a hill that's adjacent, and with that comes the site and design review objectives of trying to maintain ecological balance, having the project utilize sound principles in environmental design. Ensuring that the project is in accord with the comp plan, and that it's going to be operated and constructed in a way that's orderly, harmonious and compatible with its surroundings. In addition to this, we also have the architectural review findings, which you're all familiar with, and which apply to the project, as well. With that, we do recommend approval of the project. This is the third hearing, so we are asking for a recommendation on the project. One thing I wanted to point out is, I provided an **adapt places** [phonetic] memo, which clarifies the intent of staff's new condition of approval, Condition #6 with regard to landscape reserve. This modifies the language but does not modify the intent. It just clarifies that if we do see a request from the applicant to utilize those 19 spaces which are proposed in landscape reserve, that they would need to accompany that request with a parking demand study, indicating that it's required for their use. With that, I'll leave it at that, and let the applicant take over with their presentation. If you have any questions, let me know.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there any questions of staff before we hear from the applicant? Okay. Just so the record is clear, we also have at places a document from Stanford Real Estate Office, headed transmittal, dated July 12, 2018, from Jim Inglis and Lisa Liu to Graham Owen, concerning the 3406 Hillview site and design. It contains a response letter dated July 12th and a revised drawing set. Applicant?

Jason McCarthy, Studios Architecture: Good morning. Thank you. My name is Jason McCarthy, I'm a principle with Studios Architecture, and I'm pleased to be here to represent the project on behalf of the design team and the applicant. As Graham noted, we're all very familiar with the site, but, having said that, because context is so crucial to this project, it always helps to reframe. The proposed project is at the corner of Hillview Avenue and Coyote Hill Road and, as we've mentioned, the significant influence on the design really is Coyote Hill Road and its wonderful presence. Rolling grasses, the oak-studded hillside,

is really a truly unique site, and we think a very important site in the Research Park. Also important in this context is that we are deep in the heart of the Research Park and we're putting forward what we think is a very forward-looking design, a new vision of what research and innovation should be. A design that's inviting use and enjoyment of the outdoor spaces and the site itself, so we think this project is a truly unique opportunity. To quickly recap some of the many comments we've had and, I think, design enhancements that we've developed through our dialog with you. We really, truly appreciate all of the comments to date, and we feel that we've taken them to heart, and sincerely feel that the project is much richer for this dialog. Just briefly to note, the south elevation, which we revised for the last hearing, there were a number of enhancements to increase the amount of wood, and really, just in general, tie that south elevation more into the overall context or concept of the project, so it's more consistent in detail, material and scale. We were also asked to look further at the mechanical screen area. We were able to lower the roof screen height several feet, and we demonstrated through a number of site sections that it's really minimally visible from various angles, and we think it's really a part of the overall composition of volumes in the project. And then, thirdly, we were asked to revisit the bird-friendly aspects of the design. We did go back and look at a number of guidelines and made further enhancements to the amount of bird-friendly measures that we were taking, and we think, overall, are presenting a very bird-friendly project. Regarding the site, you asked us to consider the screening of the parking along Coyote Hill Road, in the frontage there, and we think we've done a number of measures to enhance that planting. We really feel strongly that we've got a good buffer between the roadway and the parking. And then, further, you asked us to contemplate that stormwater features and whether or not they could really become a featured element. We've embraced that comment and have added the Juncus plants and larger stone features to really highlight those as a part of the design, and as an integral enhancement or feature to the overall landscape design. We'll focus the bulk of our presentation today on the items that Graham noted, significantly the approach at the eastern entrance, and the stairway to the Hillview Avenue approach, and the parking. For that, we'll have James Winstead with The Guzzardo Partnership lead our presentation.

James Winstead, The Guzzardo Partnership: Thanks, Jason. Yes, good morning, guys. We're happy to be before you guys again, talking through some of the questions of this project. The first change I want to talk to you guys about is the east stairway entry off of Hillview. Quickly here, you can see from left to right sort of the chronology of who we've approached this and feedback we've gotten from you guys in this room. You last saw the middle picture, second slide. We really started to think about the user experience as you walk up these stairs and started to include landings with some seating and interactive opportunities. And then, from conversations with you guys last time, we've gotten now to the current plan, which you see on the right, where the stairway has shifted south, down, roughly mid-block, where it then also aligns off the central spine of the building and really brings you right up to that second employee entrance there. Quickly here, this is a comparison. The last time you guys saw this picture, this was the primary slide showing that stairway from the corner. With this shifted now to the south, we've been able to get most of this view over to the native palate that we're using on this project. Again, that's **bringing down [phonetic]**, really inspired by some of the open space. You know, the adjacency, just context within the whole Research Park really didn't have a landscape, so it would be the front part of this view. We think this actually represents, you know, a visitor, or even just a passerby, kind of first experience of this site. Try to get a feel for how it would actually, just the building's presence and how that could feel. Tree placement has been carefully selected in this whole area, as well. It's really kind of framed that eastern façade of the building and let that read as a presence on the street instead of sort of, maybe lost in the trees in some of the previous ways we had it. With the stairway shifted now to the center point, it's really giving us a great opportunity tie the whole stairway gesture into that upper plaza that we have at the building. That offers opportunity to extend building activities, even down into the stairway, just as a part of how the building lives, in addition to providing that nice, clear hierarchy of wayfinding to that front door, the secondary door. It also ties in with the accessible path that cuts sort of diagonally through the space, and then, this new location actually gives the opportunity to tie the start of each of them together, so the stairs and the ramp start at that exact same point at the lower plaza there. And then, each of these plazas is provided with built-in seating, like you see here. You have some at that middle landing, and then, down at that street side plaza, where you've got some seating right there at street level. And then, new oak trees planted in this area to provide comfort and shade throughout this whole zone. Planting design through the whole area, again, would be a continuation of the native palate

we're proposing here. And then, south of the stairway, starting to work in some larger shrub material and a little bit denser tree plantings, to get a little bit of a buffer between the entry experience here and the auto court nearby, or the ramp down into the garage. But, again, we think this whole expression, tying together nicely, is a really great improvement to the whole eastern façade of the project. And then, here's a view again, as you can kind of see it as you potentially come up the stairs. I'll pass it back to Jason here real quick.

Mr. McCarthy: We hope that this additional view helps really demonstrate that both the realignment of the stair and the architecture together are working in great symphony, we think, to really clarify wayfinding and the identity of the project. I think the realignment of the stair brings focus to that eastern plaza, and you can see that the architecture in its scale, massing and articulation also helps draw your eye to that entry plaza. There are a number of articulated elements there, the horizontal sun shades, and entry canopy. And then, of course, the wood volume as a framing element with the roof deck on top of it. We see this as a very active corner, and again, a building that's inviting participation and enjoyment of the site on many levels. I'll also use this slide to briefly comment on the discussion about photovoltaics. You had asked us to be careful with what we're going to see from the street around photovoltaics. What we have proposed for the project is a very low-slung system. It's a ballasted photovoltaic system that sits directly on the roof, so it's not mounted on a raised platform or frame. It's directly on the rooftop, and it's a very low height, so we don't believe this will be visible from nearly any angle on the project.

Mr. Winstead: Great. Back to the, the second main change that we're here to show you guys today is adjustments to this upper parking loop. As Graham mentioned, this comes with two changes to the parking quantities; the conversion of building area to amenity space reduces the total parking count by 10. And then, from there, we're proposing to put 19 of the remaining stalls into landscape reserve. Those 19 occur, I don't think you can see the cursor, but they're along this western edge here. There's 16 here, and then there's three right up in this zone here. This reduction in parking really freed up what we were able to do with the configuration of that upper parking loop. The shift to the one-way traffic, it's much more efficient as far as how much asphalt you need to serve these remaining cars, and it gave us the ability to pull the whole thing away from the property line, from 30 to 50 feet. It's about 30 here, and then, it pretty quickly gets to 50-ish through most of the rest of this area here. The second piece of this is continuation of the stairs that we talked about in the front, bringing them through the building here and using that same pattern for the stairway that brings you up to this upper parking here, similarly furnished with some seating at the landings. A second little landing here with some seating right at the auto court, offering you a chance to, you know, sit in the shade if you're waiting for ride share, perhaps a shuttle. But, back to this upper. The one-way pattern, it will also bring this formal pattern from the building up, and then, let it sort of terminate, so there's much more informal, sort of irregularly-laid-out parking lot. We actually thought that with the one-way traffic and the sort of irregularly shaped landscape islands and the dense tree planting, it actually started to feel more like something you might find at, like a state park, or a trail head parking lot, as opposed to a formal, kind of office lot parking. And then, so, with the conversations we've had with you guys here, and then, some of the changes we've made to the site, as Graham mentioned, we have been able to, what we think is provide a building that gets more use out of this site, which then comes with more parking, and have been able to include all of that into this project with no net increase in impermeable area. And then, that is with the inclusion of further outdoor amenity spaces that really let users get out, interact with each other, and really, just get a chance to interact with the surrounding landscape. I think that's it. We're all happy, obviously, to clarify any points, or answer any questions you guys have.

Chair Furth: Any questions of the speaker? Go.

Board Member Lew: I have a question for Stanford. For the parcel in back of this particular property on Coyote Hill, it has the agricultural conservation zoning. I'm wondering if there is a leaseholder for that, or is it just...? Is it vacant?

Tiffany Griego, Managing Director, Research Park: You're asking about Coyote Hill, specifically? Or which parcel?

Board Member Lew: It's the hill, as I understand it. Like, in back. Hillview, right? This is Deer Creek? I guess it's the hill.

Ms. Griego: Yeah. I can tell you what I know. I don't know all the facts about the site, so we need to check. It's in the county, and I think it's subject to the Williamson Act. But, what else...? I'm sorry, I missed the balance of the question. I am not the right person...

Chair Furth: Was there a leaseholder (inaudible)?

Ms. Griego: Oh, no. I don't think so. No.

?:(inaudible)

Ms. Griego: I don't think so. I don't think there's a leaseholder. I've never heard that. Not the right person to answer that, though. I can ask around.

Board Member Lew: I do understand that a lot of that area is part of the county, but it's on our zoning map, so I'm thinking that there is one parcel that's in Palo Alto.

Ms. Griego: It's county. It's definitely county.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Chair Furth: Okay, staff will check on that.

Board Member Lew: I think it's not, it's not a critical path item for me. I'm just curious.

Chair Furth: All right. Is there any member of the public who cares to speak? Do you have a...?

Ms. Griego: Our civil engineer thinks that parcel you're pointing to is in the city, so we need to confirm that. I'm sorry, we need time to do that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is there any member of the public who would care to comment on this item? Before we close the public hearing? Volunteers? All right. Okay, yes, we can do disclosures again. Any conversations or site visits you want to comment on? We've all seen the site. I went back to look at it again. I'm sure some of the rest of you did, as well.

Board Member Lew: I did look at the site yesterday and I did see that there's a large mock-up in the parking lot. Also, I missed the last meeting on June 21st, and I did review the minutes for that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I'll bring it back to the Board. Alex, you get to start.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, I can recommend approval of the project today. I did read the comments from the Board about the upper parking area and the idea for landscape reserve, and I think I do understand that our purview for that is limited. I just had a couple points. One is that the parking, most architects and developers are saying that the office density is going up, generally. Not for all uses, but generally, it's going up, and the tenants are asking for more parking. And, our parking ratio hasn't changed in a long time. I think we just have to be really mindful of that, and I don't think it's the ARB's purview to start tinkering with that. I think we have a director and the Planning Commission for that. With respect to the parking reserve, in the past, we've shown it in the plans, like, what the full build-out would be, and that would be part of your entitlement. It's not like you would have to come back to us to get some sort of new approval for the parking lot. And as I understand the drawings, that's not in here. I haven't seen it, and I think it should be in here. And if I understand the minutes correctly, I think some of the Board members were saying that they could not make the finding if the parking went to the edge of the property, closer to the edge of the property, and it seems to me that you'd still be in the full build-out with all the spaces. You would be pretty close to the existing parking boundary. I'm a little bit troubled with that. I think that I can make the finding that there's a buffer in there. It seems like we have, like, our zoning map tells us a lot of information about what we should be doing. We have 50 to 100-foot landscape buffers around Barron Park, we have -- That's incorrect. We have 50 to 100-foot setbacks, landscape setbacks in Barron Park. We have, it's a 210-foot landscape setback on (inaudible) and 50-foot elsewhere, you know, on all the main streets in the parking lot, like Page Mill Road. And, the zoning map does not really specify anything here. In my mind, it's all Stanford land. Most of the time, there are lease lines. Sometimes there are parcel lines. But, at the end of the day, if there's a parking lot here, near the boundary line, what difference does it make? It's not visible to the public. It seems like there's no leaseholder, so, to me, it...I don't really quite get the point of having a buffer. It's all Stanford land. It's all part of the same entity. That's where I am on the parking. I do think it should be shown in

the set. I do support all the landscape revisions and the building revisions. I think those all look good. And, I think there was some issue about the roof screening. I can support the roof screening and the solar panels. Also, I don't think I completely understand all of the proposals that you're showing for the, the changes that you've made for the bird-friendly glazing. I think I understand some of it, but I'm not sure I got the full extent of the changes. I was mostly concerned about the large amount of glass on the Deer Creek façade. Oh, and one last item. Near your driveway entrance on Hillview, so, I think you've got a backflow preventer, stormwater treatment, and gas meter, and all that. I think I'd like to see, or just maybe an enlarged drawing that could be reviewed by staff. I've seen some other projects where it really hasn't been resolved very well. And I don't want to name particular projects, but where all of that stuff really wasn't very well coordinated, the landscaping and utility stuff. When I've gone out there, it seems like if somebody had planted a hedge, or something that could sort of mitigate the bright red backflow preventers. You do have enough space, I think it all can fit. But, it I would like to just make sure that that gets coordinated. That's all that I have.

Chair Furth: Alex, excuse me, which corner was that?

Board Member Lew: This is Hillview, the driveway entrance...

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: ...and right against the neighboring property, which is SAP.

Chair Furth: Right. Oh, sorry, Hillview.

Board Member Lew: I think it's all right here in this corner.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Board Member Lew: All of [crosstalk] right there in the corner. And I mention it because the SAP, I think, is just all lawn, so there's nothing screening it from their side.

Mr. Owen: Chair Furth, if I may, just to answer the earlier question about the adjacent Coyote Hill. The answer is, a portion of the open space area that's immediately to the west is in the city. And then, once you go up and over and onto **the loo [phonetic]** side of Coyote Hill, a portion of it is in the county. It's right on the city border. But our zoning is for our own city and it's...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: And it applies to that parcel.

Mr. Owen: Yep.

Chair Furth: And as I recall, there was considerable dispute about how far the Research Park development should go, what sort of development potential it had in the current zoning, and the Williamson Act contract are a holding pattern. I think I got here just to hear the dispute in '98. But not follow it. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I can approve the project at this point. I'm still not a big fan of the north elevation, but I think in the overall scheme of things, it's acceptable. The landscaping has come a long way. I think the modification of the front entry -- or rear entry, whatever you want to call it -- I think is an improvement. I could accept the current plan with the landscape reserve, and then, agree with the modification to the condition of approval #6. I agree with you on some of the things, like with the backflow preventer, but invariably, it seems like in the past, I've run into things where you do it a certain way, then the fire department comes in and goes, no, we want ready access, and all of a sudden, they strip everything around it, so it's a never-ending battle where you've got two or three city agencies arguing with each other. So, just do the best you can on that one, I think is basically all we can say. Like I said, I can approve it at this point the way it is.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Robert.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Alex, can I try to dig into your mind? Do you have any experience with this landscape parking reserve on other projects over the years? How does it work?

Board Member Lew: I was trying to think of a....last night, I was trying to pull out examples, but I didn't have enough time. I think intent is that it is approved both ways, right. So, off the bat, it's landscape, but then, if they ever need it, they can convert it without having to submit another ARB application. And the key thing is, really, is it's really useful for people who don't think they need to build all of their parking, right? We get landscape, and....My recollection is that we did something in the medical center on Welch Road. Yeah. There's two new buildings off of Welch Road, and I think they, they were able to remove the parking from the front yard. It's all just a large expanse of landscape instead of having the parking on the front of the building.

Ms. Gerhardt: From a staff perspective, I would agree with most of your comments. We have certainly done landscape reserve in the past for uses that don't think they need all of the required parking. They are usually kind of dashed in on the site plan, so that the Board is aware of where they could go in the future. Also, with this particular project, though, we have actually enhanced it slightly with the new condition by requiring a traffic study prior to this landscape preserve being constructed as parking.

Board Member Gooyer: I just want to add the same thing. I've had two situations where it's been used, and in both cases, it was actually a request -- same thing -- from the applicant, and it turned out that, at this point, one is, like, eight years, and the other one is more than 10. Everyone likes the way it is and have never questioned that they want to bring it back. When those were approved, it was sort of a, we'll let you build it this way, the build-out is, you know, the opposite way; if you ever decide you want to do the build-out, you'll need to come to us, tell us you're going from one to the other. But that was the extent of it. It didn't have to go through a new approval.

Vice Chair Baltay: That was the gist of my question, Alex. Do you know if these people, have they come back and done the parking and moved the landscaping on these projects? How often does it stick the way we approve it up front?

Board Member Lew: You know, it's not very common. The landscape reserve isn't really common. I would have to go back and look and recalculate.

Vice Chair Baltay: My take on this is that I really want that. I think the parking lot needs to be farther from the open space and the property line, and this is a mechanism that we're finding that seems to be a good compromise to make it work. That's why I can support the project. It will be disappointing to me if that ends up becoming parking. I understand that that's the process we're working with right now, but it should be clear going into the future that surface parking in these hills, close to open space preserves, is something that I, at least, think is problematic. Other than that, I think the project is looking good, and I can support it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Could I see that first slide, which shows the context? It shows this side...I think it's Xerox Park across the street, across Coyote?

Mr. Owen: Correct. One second.

Chair Furth: I guess it's Sheet 1.2. I mean, there's a bunch of them that show it, but...So, this is a 6.5-acre site, right? About that. And the park side is even bigger, and it's a little misleading because it flows into the next one. But, the thing that's striking about this whole thing is how much asphalt there is. If you look at Sheet 1.2, it's even more dramatic. The pattern of development up here is buildings surrounded by great, big, asphalt parking lots. Acres and acres and acres of asphalt. And it's interesting because I can remember all the excitement about VMware and all the wonderful, special features of that building, and then, look at the parking lots. This is so different from most of the sites we see because usually we're really focused on the building, it's using up a very high percentage of the surface area, and that's not true here. It flips it. And I think that's why we spend so much time thinking about surface parking, about landscaping, about large-scale circulation patterns, because there are a lot of choices. And because this may have been seen as terrific environmental design when it was built across the street, but it wouldn't be now. We would not be building those great, big, asphalt parking lots. And that's a change for us. It's a change for the property owners, it's a change for the tenants, and our response is driven, in part, by a change in our Comprehensive Plan, and we're just in the first stages of that. And my thanks to Stanford for its very thoughtful letter to us on this issue, and my thanks for the really helpful drawings and illustrations; my thanks for the revised design, which I think is a significant improvement; and my

thanks to staff for the recommended condition. In time, the City will be changing its parking standards to become consistent with its Comprehensive Plan. We're required to do that. Oh, and use laws need to be consistent. Maybe just our land use designations, but I think more than that. But this is, we're sort of in an interim stage here, and this issue is coming up on all the projects we're looking at. This is a recurring theme. Those of you who have to follow us, know. I like the building. I like the altered access from Hillview. I think it works better. I think by now, the southern elevation looks quite attractive. I don't know if you're just doing pretty drawings, or if it's just a much better building, but it looks good to me. Seriously, it does look good. I think by moving the walkway, you not only center that entrance and say this is how you get to the building, but you provide a better landscape opportunity over in the corner. I don't think I have anything to complain about. Not that we seek to complain. I think Alex's point about struggling with utilities to get them to make commitments early on is an important one. I know from experience -- as I think we all do -- how difficult that is, but to the extent it's useful in interdepartmental discussions, the ARB strongly supports getting this up early so that Stanford's good design doesn't get damaged in a very visible section. I don't think that utilities always have to be hidden, but I do think they need to be thought through. And I will follow Alex's good example and not name names. Or sites. I think that the redesign of the parking lot looks like a significant improvement. I like the change use of streets. I like your more, I guess you called it relaxed curbed islands. I support the project with the condition as recommended by staff. That's approval #6. Would somebody care to make a motion, or is there further discussion?

Board Member Lew: I have one more question for Stanford. There's an existing barbed-wire fence along the back of the property line. What are the thoughts about that? Does that need to be retained?

Male??: (inaudible) replace that.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Great. Thank you.

Ms. Griego: We will replace that.

Chair Furth: With what?

Board Member Lew: Is it possible to not replace it and just remove it? Or no?

Ms. Griego: I don't think so.

Mr. Inglis: We could (inaudible) property line...

Board Member Lew: Jim, if you could please use the microphone for our...

Jim Inglis, Stanford Real Estate: [Spells name] We typically use something to the effect of black chain-link fence because it tends to really drop away and not be noticed. We don't put them any higher than we think we need to, so maybe five foot, or something like that. Just to maintain the property line. It helps the landscapers and so forth, and make sure people don't start blending one way or the other. Tenants nowadays are getting a little bit more careful about security and so forth, too, so, that would be a typical approach for us.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Oh, I did...While Alex was saying that, I thought...I did very much appreciate Stanford's letter, which is a slight modification of the one in our packet. But I did want to say that, it talks about under-parking, and it talks about standards and changing standards. It's important, I think, not to confuse zoning standards and land use standards with on-the-ground reality, in both directions. I mean, when Graham is talking about reducing the square, the FAR, the gross floor area of the building, but it's not reducing the gross floor area of the building; it's reducing the capital G, capital F, capital A defined term in the code -- floor area -- which, in turn, reduces the parking, which is a great requirement. I think it's our challenge for the next months and years, is to figure out what's an acceptable environmental load in terms of transportation -- and we've got a guideline from the Comprehensive Plan -- and then, given that, what are the implications in terms of on-site parking provision, and to what extent does our energy go elsewhere. I don't think we know what under-parking is yet, and all of this in the general Comprehensive Plan assumes that our ways of life will change in many ways, in particular in this regard. Having said that, does somebody want to make a motion?

MOTION

Chair Furth: I will make a motion. I move approval, that we recommend approval of the project as submitted, with condition number 6 modified as set forth in the memorandum from Graham Owen, Planner, dated July 19, 2017 [sic], and with the further condition that the boundary fence on the west side of the parcel be replaced. Do you want to say anything more specific than that, Alex? You want to...? Their choice?

Board Member Lew: When you finish...Is that all?

Chair Furth: Is there anything else I left out?

Board Member Lew: Well, I think that the Board should get a copy of the full build-out of the parking layout.

Chair Furth: I disagree. Because I want the staff's condition where they'll come back.

Mr. Owen: Just to clarify, the way that we've written it, it would not come back to the Board.

Chair Furth: I understand.

Mr. Owen: Okay.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, let's see. What are we saying? Alex, you're saying...The staff's condition is about demonstrating the need for the parking. Your condition is about understanding what the parking would look like, fully designed out. Is that right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Normally, landscape reserve would just be dashed in, so it would be green...

Chair Furth: This is about as specific as we get.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. It's just dashed in so that you know the area that it would likely go.

Chair Furth: And it is here.

Mr. McCarthy: It is dashed in lightly. It's very hard to read on the screen here, but...

Chair Furth: But you gave us (inaudible).

Mr. McCarthy: ...there's an outline there, yeah.

Chair Furth: It's on this sheet.

Board Member Lew: I've not seen it.

Chair Furth: This one?

Board Member Lew: I'm not saying it's not there, but I....[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Maybe you could take us through it and point out which line is which.

Mr. McCarthy: Let me see if I can find it in the overall plan here.

Chair Furth: We should probably have consensus on which line we're talking about.

Mr. McCarthy: You can see here...

Chair Furth: Yeah, it takes out a few trees.

Mr. McCarthy: It is difficult...

Chair Furth: It doesn't?

Mr. McCarthy: ...to discern, but you see the dashes, the shorter dashes are contour line.

Ms. Gerhardt: It is lightly shown on sheet L1.0.

Chair Furth: And does it or does it not take out trees?

Mr. McCarthy: No. The trees are planted where the future parking islands would be.

Chair Furth: So, they would still remain.

Mr. McCarthy: Yes.

Chair Furth: Any further questions on this?

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question, then. If it's going to be fully expanded, is it going to go to the October 17 or the June 18 version?

Mr. McCarthy: Even in the expanded version, we've moved that western boundary further from the property line by virtue of narrowing up the traffic loop and going to a diagonal entrance.

Chair Furth: Graham, would you color in the reserve line on the third view on this sheet and show it to us? Mark it up and pass it around.

Board Member Gooyer: Is he going to do that for all of us?

[Laughter]

Board Member Lew: Okay. And just to following up on this. Okay, I'm okay with that. And then, I would say also on Sheet 1.9, which is our site summary, that we should put in the 19 landscape reserve spaces under parking. It's there. There's one, it says, like, build later. Right? Yeah.

Chair Furth: What are you looking at?

Board Member Lew: I would just add it to the...Well, I guess it's fine. My recollection is that we've shown it, we've added it in. Basically, what I'm saying is, if somebody is looking at this, that you added that, and under the total, you get 264.

Chair Furth: Here we go.

Board Member Lew: It's a small point, but I think that's how we've done it in the past.

Board Member Gooyer: It's more semantics (inaudible).

Chair Furth: I think we're okay.

Mr. Owen: We can have that be revised in the...

[crosstalk]

Mr. McCarthy: It's noted here, landscape reserve.

Chair Furth: We have clearly documented the border of the landscape reserve. We know that the trees are going to be retained if that gets built. We know what the process is, which does not involve us. If Stanford decides to proceed with that. Can I get a second to my motion?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Are there any further discussion? All those in favor please say aye. Opposed? Hearing none, it passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much for your proposal and your hard work, to you and to staff. Look forward to seeing the building, and the gardens.

Study Session

Approval of Minutes

Chair Furth: We have no minutes.

Subcommittee Items

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: Board comments, questions or announcements. This was a small project. Stanford is proposing 2.5 million -- is that right? -- square feet of additional academic space? And the comment period on the revised recirculated Environmental Impact Report closes on July 27th, so if anybody has comments on that, that is the deadline for doing it. No minutes, no study session, no subcommittee items, nothing needs to be...Do we need to appoint a subcommittee for the parking structure? Where did we end up? We do, don't we?

Ms. Gerhardt: We don't know the date as of yet, so I think we said we would do that as we start to know those dates.

Chair Furth: I would be happy for two of you to volunteer to be on that subcommittee.

Board Member Gooyer: For the parking structure?

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll do that.

Chair Furth: You want to do it, Alex? Would you?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, that's fine.

Chair Furth: Alex and Robert. Unless there's a...

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Chair Furth: ...if there's a date/scheduling problem.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. We'll note that and just make sure they are available.

Chair Furth: Yes. Thank you. Yes, Alex?

Board Member Lew: On Sunday, July 27th, at two o'clock, there is an event at the Rinconada Library. I think they have a 60th anniversary, and there's going to be an exhibition and presentation on Edward Durrell Stone, the architect of the library, City Hall and the hospital. And also the architect, Group 4, who renovated all of our libraries, is going to give a presentation, as well.

Board Member Gooyer: When is that?

Chair Furth: Great.

Board Member Lew: Sunday, July 27th, from 2:00 to 4:00.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: And I think the exhibition will be there for...I don't know how long. More than just the presentation.

Chair Furth: Anything else, staff?

Board Member Lew: And the North Ventura CAP is, I think, scheduled for September, I think they were looking at September 19th for the first meeting.

Chair Furth: We will be short-handed for two meetings, but I think we'll have enough people, and we will all be here for the Public Safety Building, which is coming back. Right? Somebody stopped me in the cafeteria...

Ms. Gerhardt: The safety building is August 2nd.

Chair Furth: Right.

Ms. Gerhardt: And so, yes, we would have everyone.

Chair Furth: A full complement. Which I'm sure we will need. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

Adjournment