



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: August 2, 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, Osma Thompson and Robert Gooyer.

Absent: None.

Chair Furth: Good morning, and welcome to the August 2nd, 2018, meeting of the Architectural Review Board in the City of Palo Alto. Would you call the roll, please?

[Roll Call]

**Oral Communications - see below**

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Are there any agenda changes, additions or deletions?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: None.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything from us up here? All right.

**City Official Reports**

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

Chair Furth: Let's take a quick look at the upcoming -- that's item number 1 -- at the upcoming schedule. We're going to have absences. I will be away on August 16th, Peter will be away on September 6th. Does everybody else plan to be here? Nods all around. Yes? And we have the tentative agenda items for August 16th, 429 University, where the applicant has asked that I not participate, in any event; 2609 Alma Street, a condominium project; and preliminary façade revisions at 656 Lytton, which I believe is Lytton Gardens. Okay.

**Action Items**

**2. PUBLIC HEARING: 250 Sherman Avenue [17PLN-00256]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review Application for a Proposed Public Safety Building to be Three Stories Above Grade With 45,400 to 48,000 sf of Floor Area Above two Basement Levels With Usable Floor Area Within the First Basement Level, Five Surface Parking Spaces Within a Fenced Area and 143 Below Grade Parking Spaces (Including 12 Stalls in Tandem Arrangement), as Well as two Operational Site Buildings Accessory to the Public Safety Building, Landscape Improvements, and a Public Plaza. City Council Approved the Environmental Impact Report and Public Facilities Ordinance**

**Amendment on June 11, 2018. Zone District: PF (Public Facilities). For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.**

Chair Furth: We have one public hearing item today. It is at 250 Sherman Avenue. It's a consideration of a major architectural review application for a proposed public safety building to be three stories above grade with 45,000 to 48,000 square foot of floor area above two basement levels with usable floor area within the first basement level, five surface parking spaces within a fenced area, and 143 below grade parking spaces, as well as two operational site buildings accessory to the public safety building, landscape improvements, and a public plaza. The City Council approved the Environmental Impact Report, which we all received a while ago, which was combined for this and the adjacent parking garage. And, the Facilities Ordinance Amendment on June 11, 2018, a second reading on that ordinance, perhaps. The zoning district is Public Facilities. Staff?

Amy French: Good morning. We did oral communications, right?

Chair Furth: You're right. I miss that all the time.

### **Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: Is there anybody who would wish to comment on a matter not on the agenda? Oral communications? Seeing none, okay, I've got to check these off on the list. Yes, this is actually agenda item number 2. All right.

(inaudible)

Chair Furth: That's item 2. We will look forward to hearing from you. All right. We're back.

Ms. French: Well, moving along. We've got a Public Safety Building design that has been six months in the making, and the applicant heard the ARB and responded. Here is the path that we have traveled from Spring of 2017 with the scoping, the pre-screening and preliminary reviews, followed by October of last year with the first formal review on this building, coupled with the parking garage, which has since been approved by the Council in June, as well as the Environmental Impact Report, June 11th. That was certified. And, here we are, our second formal hearing for the Public Safety Building. We look forward to going to Council with this application in the fall sometime. We had some issues back in October. I put a couple images on the screen showing the issues. I have a couple of slides here showing before and after, to help the public and the board with the compare and contrast. Key move is the employee vehicle ramp now faces Birch. I'm sorry, faced Birch before and now faces Jacaranda. And we have a warmer material palate. The architect will display those here and will talk about those. Before we had a large plaza and there was some different functionality. Now we have a smaller plaza. This was at the ARB direction. And the community meeting room is now a one-story element. We now have greater articulation. Here's bird-friendly glass at the upper floor, and we have human-scale features there. I'm going to turn it over to the applicant team. Just one note. There's been questions about timelines for construction. The parking garage is going out to bid very soon, in the fall, so, as noted last time with the parking garage, that construction will take place first, and then, maybe 2020, at some point -- Matt can weigh in on this -- the Public Safety Building would be started.

Matt Raschke, Public Works Department: Hi. Thank you, Amy. I'm Matt Raschke, senior engineer with the Public Works Department. I'm the overall project manager for both the parking garage and this Public Safety Building. As Amy mentioned, we're going out to bid with the parking garage towards the end of this month. It's just resubmitted for its second building permit plan check, so we're expected that to go into construction and probably break ground at the beginning of 2019 and be finished in the first quarter of 2020. And then, the Public Safety Building in this project, we would expect we could get started on the construction as soon as that garage is functional. Here in the audience today we have the police chief, Robert Jonsen; assistant chief Patty Lum; fire chief Eric Nickel; deputy chief McNally and Blackshire; and

also Interim Director of Public Works, Brad Eggleston; and Charlie Cohen, the Communications Director for Public Safety. If there are any questions, we may bring them up to answer any of the operational questions about the new facility. We're, I think, very pleased with what the architect has come up with, with this new design. After the October meeting, we went back to the drawing board and re-thought how the building would look. We think they took your comments to heart, and I'm very pleased with how the new design came out. With that, I'd like to introduce Michael Ross with Ross Drulis Cusenberry Architecture to give his presentation and describe the features of the building. Mike?

Michael Ross, Ross Drulis Cusenberry Architecture: Good morning.

Chair Furth: Good morning. You have 10 minutes.

Mr. Ross: Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here and to be part of a design that is very important...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, I realized that Matt introduced you, but could you introduce yourself for the tape?

Mr. Ross: I will. Can I have the keyboard?

Chair Furth: And it seems a bit silly, but spell the name so that our transcriber gets it clearly.

Mr. Ross: My name is Michael Ross, and I'm the project principal at Ross Drulis Cusenberry Architecture. We've been working on this project for quite a while. [Spells name.]

Chair Furth: We'll let her take her chances on Cusenberry.

Mr. Ross: I believe all those names are on the record.

Chair Furth: They are.

Mr. Ross: It's a pleasure to present this design. I want to let you know that we took your comments very seriously, and in the simplest sense, they landed. We got it. I believe the revised design that we're going to present this morning substantially addresses many of your comments. First, I'd like to acknowledge the work of other people, and I want to thank the Palo Alto Police Department, the Fire Department, the Office of Emergency Services, the Department of Public Works, the Planning Department, and Nova Partners, for their invaluable feedback, as well as your own, that supported these design changes that I'm presenting today. I'd like to acknowledge my team back in Sonoma. There's a lot of very thoughtful, engaged architects who are working on this, including Mallory Cusenberry, who can't make it today, who is on vacation. Thank you for this opportunity. The revised design addresses many of the ARB's prior comments. The architecture was made softer, more open and warmer in color. The vehicle ramp was relocated from Birch to Jacaranda Lane. Design modifications were added to create a more human scale presence at the street level. The communications tower was integrated into the building design. A warmer materials palette was proposed. The building form was articulated to reduce its prior blocky-ness, and the entry plaza was reduced in size to allow for the introduction of a single-story element, the multipurpose room, allowing it to front Birch Street. A few of your comments we, for a variety of reasons, chose not to incorporate. The screened operational yard remains. That fronts Park. The Police Department considers this to be an operational imperative. Why? Because it includes oversized vehicle parking, bicycle patrol, evidence vehicle garage, emergency generator, and some other specialized police operations functions that benefit from being at ground level. And because of disengaging the multipurpose room from the building form, the plaza became smaller. To remind everyone, this project is composed of three primary elements. The 55,000 square foot site includes approximately a 47,000 square foot Public Safety Building over two levels of parking; the screened operational yard; and the site utility building. Those are the three primary architectural elements and they are settled into a landscape that surrounds and softens the site. The Public Safety Building Site is currently one of two City-owned lots, which together hold 310 exposed surface parking spaces. The site is bounded by a three-story multifamily residences along Park; two-story commercial buildings along California Avenue; the 65-foot-

high county courthouse across the street on Sherman; the recently-approved California Avenue parking garage, which will go out to bid in late August or in September; the new Visa building on Ash, a handsome building in its own right; a new 29,000 square foot office building on Park; and, therefore, the Public Safety Building will become neighbors with and familiar with an evolving context. It's going to become part of a new ensemble of buildings that are emerging out of this neighborhood. This image depicts how the proposed Public Safety Building has been designed to be compatible with this evolving neighborhood. You can see that it settles nicely into the context. It's 50 feet high, lower than the county courthouse, approximate height of the new California Avenue garage. And, it has aspects that relate to the context and heights of the other buildings around it. What's very important to understand in the design is that interlaced into this is the whole concept that this is a standalone, 24/7, survivable building with very specialized needs. The prior design may be over-emphasized, the defensiveness of this, and we've designed this building to be more open, approachable, human scaled and civic, and still meet the specialized needs of the building. This is a view from Birch and Sherman, and we believe the building balances openness with security, utilizing a three-part layering of façade elements. The base forms a full perimeter, continuous pedestrian realm, which is defined by a board-formed terra cotta-colored concrete base with openings, landscape and passive seating elements integrated. Above the building base is a two-story tile-clad precast concrete wall system, which references the building heights along California Avenue. The third-story element is a glass and white porcelain tile façade with interior aluminum air foil louvers for the control of light, privacy and glare. You can see that the building is much more open, it's glassier, and it allows natural light to penetrate deep into the building. If you see the patterning of the interior air foils, which is basically oversized plantation shutters, they mimic and reflect the scrim across the street of the California Avenue garage, the terra cotta that has this horizontal and vertical patterning. But, this has a very important function for the occupants of the building. This is a view down Jacaranda from Birch towards the single-story multipurpose building, which is now on the corner and that reduces the scale and massing of the building, and creates a more harmonious fit, I believe, with the street scape. As you view down Jacaranda, you will see that it's a series of offset concrete walls of the same terra cotta color, and as they're offset, every offset is set with a planter box, so they are softened with plants that will allow the security function to be maintained but, at the same time, provide for a pleasant walking experience as you walk near it. Jacaranda Lane will remain open and lit in the evening with soft lightings that will be mounted on the security walls. This is a view down Birch at a more discreet level. Combine the Public Safety Building and the California Avenue garage, widens the public realm between the two buildings on Birch Street. What you see here are the passive seating low seat walls that are in front of the multipurpose room. What are not shown are skateboard, sort of defensive mechanisms for this bench. It looks too tasty for a skateboarder in this view, but we are aware of that. But, what you see here is because we've widened this realm between the two buildings, it allows us to create a street scape with ample areas of passive seating, canopy street trees, planters, and it provides a pleasant place to walk. It continues. The whole idea that the building is seated actually on top of a concrete lid of this two-story garage belies the point because it's actually seated into a landscaped frame. This landscape frame has multiple functions, is doing a lot of work for the Public Safety Building. It's planters, seating, vehicle security barriers. The wall that you see here, where it says "Public Safety," is actually ten feet high above the planter, so we've deepened the planters to allow for larger trees to be planted because it's very difficult to get the adequate root clearance when you have a garage below it. The Public Safety Building's entry court serves as the foreground to the building's corner entry. The entry is framed by a single-story canopy element. If you remember before, there was a much more monumental entry proposed for the building. The corner entry addresses both Birch and Sherman streets, and upon entering the building, the viewer will be able to see all the way through the building. There's a layering of transparency starting at this point, where you can see through the north, over the top of the California Avenue buildings beyond. This layering of transparency is actually one of the guiding ambitions of the design that you see inside with the light well that is evident from the roof. This canopy datum creates a defining element that is parallel to Sherman and it de-emphasizes views to the upper floors from the sidewalk. This is a diagram of this landscaped frame, which is the pedestrian realm that the building springs from. What's interesting about it, this terra cotta color, which is the board-formed concrete, has a number of vertical inflections, one at the entry, which signals the entry to the building, and two symbolically at the communications tower, which signals and symbolizes the building's connection to the region and the larger communications network, which it is a hub and importantly part of. Carved into this are more discreet

pedestrian-level and pedestrian-scaled elements. This depicts one of them near the public entry. The pedestrian experience is enhanced by these because they provide the passive seating, the overhanging street trees, and landscaped areas. The landscape design, as I said, softens the building's edges. The understory plantings will emphasize the use of native and flowering drought-tolerant plants. Extensive street tree planting will be provided, including the use of alternating London Plane and California Sycamore trees along Sherman, which is similar to what we're planting in front of the Cal Ave garage. Chinese Elms, we planted along Birch, which match the front of the Cal Ave garage trees. A Coast Live Oak or Valley Oak specimen tree will be planted at the corner of Jacaranda and Birch to screen the entry to the garage, and the planting palate has been specifically designed to provide a diverse mix of plant types, leaf textures, sizes and colors.

Chair Furth: Excuse me just a second. You've gone over time, but with the permission of the board, we'll...

Mr. Ross: I apologize for going over time.

Chair Furth: Take what you need.

Mr. Ross: Okay.

Chair Furth: You're the only agenda item today, and you're a big one.

Mr. Ross: A few more minutes and I'll be done, but thank you for the extra time. I appreciate it. I'm not presenting this metaphorically; I'm presenting it as a building. But, metaphorically, we are very thoughtful about this building because there's a lot of relational concepts that guided our design, that we wanted to create a sense of welcoming, which we believe was missing in the prior design. But, at the same time, theoretically - and actually, we had to create a building that was also providing protection to the very important functions that support the police department's mission inside, and we did. And we wanted to create connectivity, and connectivity happens, particularly across the Birch Street realm, where we widened it. There's this vertical and horizontal and plant world connection that happens between the two buildings, and we want to create a diversity of material types and form and articulation and texture, and we believe that the materials that we propose do that. And, we wanted to provide a sense of support in terms of people know that this building exists to provide public safety services to the wider community and the region, and that the building has much more going for it than simply roof, walls, glass and places to park. It is a three-part composition when we start describing materials. The three-part composition in our mind is a mixture of public, the context that it's in, and the mission. Each one of these elements has a material. This is how the materials are provided. The terra cotta-colored board-formed concrete forms the base. The second floor is basically a tile-clad precast concrete element. The third floor is a mixture of ballistic glass and porcelain tile. The ballistic glass, by the way, is bird-protected glass. There are painted steel detailing and acrylic modified plaster soffits and other features. And I have samples of that right here. This is a view from the California Avenue garage. It will be actually across the urban forest that we are planning in between the two buildings and will become softer with the years. The Public Safety Building will be a 24/7 building and the building ante will be softly illuminated, signaling readiness, availability and service to the community at all times. We believe the soft lantern effect will be an important part of the design. Also, you can see how the louvers above, again, reflect the scrim and the patterning on the California Avenue garage across the street. This is a view from the air from across the proposed garage towards the entry on Jacaranda Lane. We believe the building is going to be a good neighbor and compatible with the neighborhood. After many years, and hopefully with your approval, we can get this building underway, to provide public safety services from a new headquarters, from a new building that will last for 75 or more years. Thank you for this opportunity and the extra time to speak. I'm available to answer questions at any time.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Before we do that, I should ask, do any of us have conversations that we need to report? Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yes, I do. I had a meeting with the Police Department, Public Works, Planning Department, on November 8, 2017.

Chair Furth: Anything that emerged from that meeting that hasn't already emerged on the public record here?

Board Member Lew: Yes. I don't believe so.

Chair Furth: Okay. And we've all visited the site. Yes, we have all visited the site. Okay. Any questions of the architect? Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure, I have a question. Does it mention police anywhere on that building?

Mr. Ross: No. It may have on the, next to the door. The signage program will have a directory and who occupies it, but right now, it's titled the Public Safety Building, Palo Alto Public Safety Building.

Board Member Gooyer: Why is that?

Mr. Ross: Great question. You actually see it because it's a combined services building that includes fire administration, the Office of Emergency Services, and other services. In many of the communities that we're working in right now, that's the preferred terminology. In Palo Alto, it's showing up again. City of San Francisco's new Public Safety Building, police department headquarters, it's the Public Safety Building. That's the name.

Board Member Gooyer: The reason I bring it up is that there is a friend of mine from Europe visiting at the moment. His comment was, if I needed the police department, I wouldn't even know where to go.

Mr. Ross: Duly noted. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. Is there seating on Park Avenue? I understand there's a landscape frame, but it's a little hard to understand if there's actually seating...

Mr. Ross: On Park?

Board Member Thompson: ...where the bike path is.

Mr. Ross: Right now, on that area, it's heavily landscaped with low seat walls. There's not formal benches, but there is low seat walls that form the vehicle ramming barriers along that boundary.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so it's not formal seating?

Mr. Ross: It's not formal seating like I just showed you for Birch. Right now, landscape comes down to a 18-inch-high wall.

Board Member Thompson: I have one more question. In this view, I was a little unclear what's happening with the air flow. I understand you said it was trying to relate to the parking garage on the other side, but in the other renders, it looks like it's just a straight grain, and in this render, it's showing these block (inaudible). I kind of want some clarity about what's happening with the louvers here.

Mr. Ross: With your permission, I'm going to hand you a piece of the louver. The louvers are mounted like plantation shutters. Whole sections of them move, open and close, and it's a very easy way of doing it. We will be mounting this to allow for individual control of the light in these offices. If you want privacy, you can just move them and they all close, or if you want partial. That's what you see there.

Board Member Thompson: I'm sorry, what are the dark block-outs? Are those people closing --?

Mr. Ross: They're partially closing portions of it, so instead of having an eight-foot-high ganged louver, there is being depicted three sets of louvers that could be individually opened and closed.

Board Member Thompson: And it's up to the department to decide --?

Mr. Ross: It's up to the office user to decide.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so there's no guarantee that this pattern will show up at all. It could potentially all be blank, it could potentially --

Mr. Ross: It will be flexibly reconfigured based on the user within.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Ross: Just like if there was Necro shades or some sort of shade in these offices. One office may want it open; another office may not. It allows the user to modify their work environment.

Board Member Thompson: And just to clarify, what's the grade of modification? Is it three tiers up and--? Is it, like, every four feet, and every four feet?

Mr. Ross: Every window set will have, between the mullions will have its own independent group of louvers. It's not like 16 feet of louvers all moved at one time. It will be broken up according to the window pattern.

Board Member Thompson: And also down and up in the same --

Mr. Ross: Correct. Correct.

Board Member Thompson: In three tiers, or--?

Mr. Ross: It's being depicted as three tiers right now. What we finally end up with, I know it won't be one. It will probably be two or three.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. That helps. Thank you.

Mr. Ross: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, thank you. I'm sure it's in your drawing set, but if you could explain to me the materials for the fascia of the roof on top, and then, the soffit immediately underneath it.

Mr. Ross: The soffit immediately underneath it is going to be the modified acrylic cement plaster. The fascia we are proposing to have clad in either a pre-cast piece that is similar in color to the second-story tile, or the tile itself. I prefer the pre-cast.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I'm sorry, I have one more question. You also have a different soffit and different fascia, as well, right? On the entry?

Mr. Ross: Yes. The painted steel, which is in the, there's a dark painted piece of metal in there that Commissioner Furth has right now. That's the color of the painted steel. Single-story element that wraps

from the corner entry parallel to Sherman. On the underside of that, we're proposing to either have a wood material like the Visa building, or the cement plaster. We're open to your feedback on that.

Board Member Thompson: All right, thank you.

Board Member Lew: Okay, I have a couple questions for you. Is there a provision for lighting the alley?

Mr. Ross: Yes. The alley is going to have wall-mounted fixtures up on the eight-foot-high concrete wall that goes down. They are going to be down-lights, night sky compliant fixtures that will illuminate the ground plane.

Board Member Lew: Great. I don't think I saw them on the lighting plan but they might be there.

Mr. Ross: And that's a good catch. You are correct. The lighting plan did not show those, but it shows a similar fixture, I believe it's E-2.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, yeah. I did see those. Thank you for that. I think if I understand the utility plan correctly, there are backflow preventers on Park, in the planters.

Mr. Ross: Yes.

Board Member Lew: I was wondering, can you actually do that in a raised planter, or do they need to be at grade?

Mr. Ross: We're going to have to penetrate our wall system, the garage wall system, in numbers of places, including a very sophisticated telecommunications system, where multiple ducts are going to be going through the walls. The fire sprinkler system also is going to penetrate, and then, it will go up through and be hidden in the landscape. It's one of the, I think, most under-designed infrastructure elements in America, is backflow preventers.

Board Member Lew: They are big.

Mr. Ross: They're big.

Board Member Lew: Really, really big.

Mr. Ross: Yes.

Chair Furth: They provide truly informal seating.

Board Member Lew: On the Park Avenue elevation, is there a large elevation of it? I saw the perspective of the, a perspective, but I didn't really see...I only saw a very, very small elevation on Sheet A-303.

Mr. Ross: Yes.

Board Member Lew: The perspectives were useful, but I didn't see an enlarged elevation in the set.

Mr. Ross: Currently in this design presentation, we didn't include it.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Mr. Ross: It's largely the landscape screen back wall of what you see here that wraps around, heavily landscaped in green.



Board Member Lew: Yep. And, the porcelain tile. I was wondering if you had considerations about the size of the tile and the pattern of the tile. I think the perspectives are showing a...What do we call it? Not running bond. Just a grid tile. But, I was wondering...Obviously, you don't have a contractor bidding, you don't have exact materials, but you have a design concept for that.

Mr. Ross: I would prefer, actually, a horizontal offset sort of pattern, like oversized subway tiles, basically. I think that would support the design of the building. What you see here, these two larger pieces are indicative of the warmer palate that we're proposing, as compared to the gray before. Also, remember, we're talking about specularly. Well, this is resonate with the tile that's on the large wall across the street, so there is some sort of internal consistency with the design and how we're thinking about the two buildings.

Board Member Lew: Okay, thank you. That's all the questions I have at this time.

Chair Furth: Okay. And we will get to the speaker in just a minute. A member of the public who wishes to speak. Take me through the proposals for signage on the building. I see the one on Park, but I can't believe that's all that would happen.

Mr. Ross: Currently, right now, on every side there is going to be a sign, so people understand that this is a place to go. As you can see here, we're proposing on Sherman that Public Safety...

Chair Furth: This one is Park. Not Park. This is Sherman.

Mr. Ross: Sherman. That's Sherman, and what you see there is...

Chair Furth: Oh, I'm sorry, that's Sherman. I was thinking this was...It's the corner.

Mr. Ross: It's the corner of Park and Sherman.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Ross: And, so, what we're proposing to do on the corners is to have signage. Not all the signage is indicated. Let's see, if we go back...

Chair Furth: For example, where is it going to be on that corner?

Ms. French: Can I jump in just for a second? There will be a separate sign program package for this building.

Chair Furth: I understand, but...

Ms. French: I just want to make sure.

Chair Furth: ...it's helpful when you're approving a design to know where the spaces potentially are so that we don't find ourselves unfortunately constrained.

Mr. Ross: And right you are. Currently, we're proposing to mount the words "Public Safety" vertically next to the doors, and on the glass will be Palo Alto Police Department, Fire Administration, and other users. There will be a monument sign out on Birch, on the corner that hasn't been shown yet. And then, down Jacaranda, there will be some directional signage because we don't want people to go into the staff garage if they think that there is public parking there. There's going to be more instructive-type signage that happens. But the building will be signed on all sides. And to echo Amy's comment, we will be coming back to you with a formal sign program.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I appreciate that, but sometimes we find that the only space left is space that doesn't do very well. I trust that won't happen here. Could you take me through the seating as we go all the way around the building? I'm not quite clear what passive seating is.

Mr. Ross: Well, as compared to picnic tables, where people come, that sort of thing. Passive seating is, there's just an area where you can sit down, enjoy the trees, take a rest before you go across the street to pick up your car, or things like that. The public plaza hasn't been designed for active, you know, pedestrian things. There aren't going to be chess tables there, or things like that. It's basically the forecourt to the Public Safety Building, but there's still areas to sit in the shade and enjoy the world, socialize, and things like that.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Ross: Well, all of the seat walls provide opportunity. You can see right there that there are insets, that low benches have been carved into the planters in places.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Ross: Yes.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Ross: Yes, they are. There are carve-outs into this wall. We couldn't provide -- to go back -- we couldn't provide 100 percent seating along the street without sacrificing root depth.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Ross: I'm just giving you a little overview of the logic behind it. We're proposing to carve into this landscape zone and provide seating in regular areas.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: Microphone.

Chair Furth: Which, of course, also doubles as a skateboard barrier. And then, we go around to Park. Is it the same basic element?

Mr. Ross: Park is going to have this same basic element, that there is going to be 18-inch-high seat walls, and if the landscape perimeter is higher than that, it will step down. There will be places to sit, and it will jump back up again.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, backs for some of those, or just all bench-style with no back?

Mr. Ross: Currently all bench-style.

Chair Furth: Okay. And then, on Jacaranda?

Mr. Ross: Jacaranda, there are no seat walls until you get up to the corner and by the live oak tree. Jacaranda is too narrow, and I don't think it would be safe.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Let's see...In terms of lighting, one of the things we think about, as you say, it's a 24/7 building, and one of the things we think about is spillover to adjacent residential properties. It looks to me like you're far enough away from the housing on Park that not to be an issue. Is that what you concluded?

Mr. Ross: That's exactly what I concluded. The other thing that we took to heart is the utility yard, which is front-facing...

Chair Furth: Closer.

Mr. Ross: It's closer. We've now screened it with canopies over the top of the oversized vehicle parking areas, and the lights are underneath that, shooting down, so they will be looking on top of basically a mute roof. It will be screened by a series of trees. I really believe that we have addressed the issue of light spillage for the residents.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions before we open this to the public? Thank you. We have a speaker card from Roger Smith. I don't think you need to spell your name for the record, and you have three minutes.

Roger Smith: Thank you. I'm Roger Smith. I've lived here for 54 years. First of all, I'd like to say thank you for all of you taking your time and effort and expertise. It's what makes our city so great. I also have three daughters, live here with their families. I was co-founder of Friends of the Palo Alto Parks. In 2006, I attended the Citizens Police Academy, and part of their program, they took us through the police building. At that time, I think there was one person that was arrested, was sitting in a hallway, and it was bad. It was bad building. And I've thought for the last 12 years, how in the world haven't we been sued? It was so inadequate and an embarrassment compared to other communities. I also founded a group called MAM, Mothers Against Murder, so I deal with a lot of the police departments in the area. Anyway, in 2012, I attended a meeting at Escondido school, and I said at that time, please, get the police building done before I die. And I was 71; I'm now 77. Four years ago, I was the main signer on the TOT tax increase, and I spent a fair amount of time, effort and money getting that passed, because we were going to get the police building. And here we are, four years later. Also, which most people don't pay attention to, we have 14 openings in the police department. It is hard to find good police officers either transferring in, or coming out of the academy. If I were an applicant and I came and saw our police building, I wouldn't even think about coming here because it's a reflection, in my mind, of how we view the police and our safety and our community. I have a daughter that lives at 425 Grant, which is near this program. She would be here today; she's supportive of the program. I would encourage you to please, please approve this project as it's presented so I can see it and benefit from it during my lifetime, and my three-year-old granddaughter can benefit from it for the next 74 years. Again, thank you for taking your time. I really appreciate what you all do. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Anybody else? Okay. Anything that staff wishes to say? All good?

Ms. French: I think we're good.

Chair Furth: All right. Who would like to start? Okay, Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could I get the architect to put up again the renderings, one of them of the front entry of the building, please? The close-ups of people walking in.

Mr. Ross: Sure.

[Finding requested rendering]

Vice Chair Baltay: That one is great. Bravo. I think you've really got a civic entrance to a civic building. I know I was critical in the past, but to me, this is good.

Mr. Ross: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: This is a good design, it captures the feeling of a civic building. It's serious, it's important. It's also a new design. It's not copying the past. Hats off to you guys.

Mr. Ross: Thank you very much.

Vice Chair Baltay: Looking at the building in greater detail, my biggest concern really has to do with the choice of materials, and I think it's not really quite as defined yet in the plan set. I'll put out some of my ideas or thoughts and we'll see what the rest of the board thinks. I think it was Alex who mentioned the shape of the porcelain tiles that make up the base is important, as is the patterning of the expansion joints, or whatever you're showing in this rendering. It's just not specified at all, and I certainly would like to understand more how that's going to work. I am concerned about the terra cotta-colored board-formed concrete. I'm wondering if you couldn't get some kind of a brick material or a tile material. There's a little bit more texture to it. Somehow the concrete, especially on the back where the communication tower is, that's a very tall piece of concrete. I understand that the color makes it feel warmer and the board-forming is more attractive, but it's still a large piece of concrete. I have some reservation about that. The color of the fascia of the roof, which I asked about earlier, I think could be more of a contrast to the rest of the building. Maybe you could consider that again. It seemed to me that you guys hadn't quite fully resolved in your own minds what the design should be. And then, when I look at -- Perhaps you could change to the elevation along Sherman Street, of the building. My drawing 3.02.

Mr. Ross: This drawing?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, no, keeping going on, please. The overall elevation of the building.

[Finding requested rendering]

Vice Chair Baltay: As I've been looking at this, I'm feeling that the proportions aren't quite right for the banding. I don't want to tell you a design difference but, to me, if you were to somehow reduce the height of the upper band, the glazed portion, maybe by raising the terra cotta piece somewhat so it's not right at the floor. Or, lowering the roof soffit a little bit. Maybe it's not quite integrated into the structure the way you have. But, to me, the proportions are about 50/50 on the second and third piece of the building, and it's, to my eye, just a little bit awkward. I'd like to see the glass portion be a little thinner. And you might also, once the terra cotta gets bigger, I had sketched on my drawing a series of punched window openings on the right-hand portion of the middle chunk of the façade. Behind that, I believe you have, it must be a locker room or a bathroom, but if you could have small punched window openings even high in those spaces, I have to believe that policemen would appreciate having a little bit of natural light in those rooms, and they could be quite secure, being high up and small. I think that would be a little bit helpful to the overall massing of the building. My last comment has to do, not so much with anything you can do, but we've chosen to put a police station in a busy downtown area. The result is that we have, along Park Avenue and half of Sherman, at least, a 14-foot-tall façade of building with no windows or no activity that normally relates to the public. I agree that your landscaping is thoughtfully done. I think the benches are a great amenity. I lament the fact that we don't have a storefront there, or an office, or something that is people going in and out. I understand that the needs of the police department preclude that from happening. I find it unfortunate. Thank you.

Mr. Ross: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I'm having a hard time with this building. The whole concept, I guess, with the thing about saying "police" and everything else, is that you were trying to make it a little bit friendlier, inviting, that sort of thing. And yet, the plaza is completely sterile. I mean, I understand Wynne's concept about seating. It's like, I'm sorry, but to me, a planter wall is not seating. I'd like to see in that entryway some benches, or whatever, and they could...I don't know. They could be concrete benches, or something that actually looks like a place that's designated to sit on, not just park your butt on a planter. And that's the same thing all the way around the building. It seems like you're fighting yourself as to what do you really want. You want this building to be standoffish, where it's protection, that sort of thing? Then you'd have it the way you have it now. But I thought the concept was, what I've

heard in the past, is to try and make it more inviting. That's why you have a plaza in the first place, is to bring people in there. The whole idea about, I think it would be an ideal situation for a community, you know, enrichment. If you want to have your lunch in front of the police station, or something, in the sunshine, in a plaza, this isn't inviting to do that. Along with that, it's the same concept of, as you said, the board-formed concrete, I agree with Peter, is that that's got to go. I mean, that's about as institutional and stay-away-from-me, don't-touch-it; it has a rough finish on it. Brick or something else, I definitely agree needs to be...I understand you want a hard, you know, easy-to-maintain surface, but not this. It's just really standoffish. Again, it's that whole concept of why I'm having trouble with that. Thirdly, from just a design/volumetric standpoint, you know, the term "undulation" has been brought up quite a few times. To me, this looks like a shoebox. You know, there's a couple of small ins-and-outs, but very, very little. Now, I understand the functionality of it, and you have a certain amount of...You're limited as to what you can do on the inside. But, I would have liked to see some pop-outs or something that makes a little bit...Which is what you have in your very first design. You had some undulating surfaces, where you changed surfaces based on the pop-out, not so much just a straight band. And then, it's been bothering me also - and I hadn't thought about it until Peter mentioned it - the fact that the perfect 50/50 balance on that, I agree, is awkward. I agree that, I think maybe the middle band should be larger and go up, and just...Even if the windows get smaller. That really isn't going to change the function on the inside. Instead of a window going all the way down to the floor, which is probably not a bad thing if you're going to have desks, or whatever, in there anyway, if that comes up, say three feet, and the window just starts there and goes up to the ceiling of the other one, I think that would help a great deal. Like I said, it's come a long way since the last time. It really has. And I appreciate that, and I can understand the things you didn't want to change, why you didn't. I mean, the service yard sort of thing has to be there, no matter what. That's just a reality of life. I don't have a problem with that. Like I said, there are some things here that with fairly minimal changes, I think could go a long way. I'll leave it at that for right now.

Mr. Ross: Thank you for your comments.

Board Member Thompson: Hi, there.

Mr. Ross: Hi.

Board Member Thompson: This was my first time looking at this project. I don't have the benefit the other board members do, of seeing what it used to look like, even though I did see a glimpse in your presentation. I will start in saying that there are things that I agree and disagree with, with what my board members are saying. My fellow board members have been saying. For me, you know, the words that you wrote in your analysis sounded really great, but they don't really match your design. I saw that you were attempting to reduce blockiness. It's still very, very blocky. I saw that you were trying to add more human scale. I don't see really anything that's actually done that. You know, for the board-formed concrete, I actually don't mind it. I think it's pretty creative. And I also disagree that the middle band should get bigger. In my opinion, the middle band is the thing that is creating the wall that is making this such a box, and I think that's really where you need to focus your energy on in terms of making this a more welcoming place. If you look at the context, the building across the street, across Sherman, has a wall that's similar to this. I don't know if you know what I'm talking about.

Mr. Ross: The Visa building?

Board Member Thompson: It's the one that's on the diagonal.

Chair Furth: Courthouse.

Mr. Ross: Courthouse.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, yeah. It's similar because it does have similar color, but there is still a design, and there's still pattern in that wall, and I don't see that. And I think, just thinking about, you

know, you have this parking garage on the other side that is doing this really interesting...I don't know if you've seen their wall that has all of these different tiles. They're doing something really exciting on that side, and your band in the middle has a lot of opportunity for that, but it's not doing that. In fact, it's sort of...I don't know. It's probably the part of this building that I struggle with the most because it's yearning for something more, but it's still just this flat wall that makes it really uninviting, very blocky, not human scale at all. And then, in terms of the air foil louvers above, I think it's a little optimistic to think that, with that level of detail in terms of operability, I can't even imagine myself trying to operate that on a day-to-day level. I would recommend maybe thinking about relating to the garage on the other side, making something that's a bit more fixed so that you actually have the lantern that you want at nighttime, instead of probably...It might be nothing at all times. I think that's a design opportunity that has the opportunity to be really interesting, but I think the way that it's designed right now, it can't achieve that in any way. In terms of the public plaza, I saw in previous meeting minutes there was a lot of conversation about the plaza, so I don't necessarily want to put too much emphasis. But, on first glance, the plaza is barely a plaza. It's very small. I agree with Robert that there isn't much design in terms of creating more community there. I also take a big issue that there isn't a lot of public amenity on Park, and given that I'm a bicyclist, given that I take the Cal Train there, there is a lot of street activity on that side, and I think there should be something that relates to human scale, whether it is just a more...something that's treated differently in the planting frame that you've designed. Which I like. The planting frame is really nice. I think I hit everything I want to say. Oh, yeah. Undulation. There is a lot of opportunity to do that, not just in the material choices, but I think even in the massing that...You know, the roof line is a really hard, hard line, but I think I would encourage you to explore that a little bit more. I don't want to be too prescriptive in encouraging you to, you know, change your roofline at a diagonal, or something. You have a lot of good context there. I think that does a lot of undulation. There's that building on Birch, you know, that has the arched windows, and there's just a lot of work off of. I felt like that middle, that middle band is supposed to be of context, and I don't think it's doing that right now.

Mr. Ross: Can I respond just briefly, just to...? As a point of clarification, the middle band is actually referencing the height of the California Avenue. We set the top of that wall to be similar to the heights of the buildings that are just to the north of it. All the Cal Ave buildings are much lower. And the articulation that was talking about, the different levels don't stack up. It's not flush. They are offset, so you're getting articulation that way, as well as the difference in the material types along the band. And to your point, the middle section can be more textured and things like that, but the current design is just proposing something quiet, which at times is architectural in its own right. But, thank you for your comments.

Chair Furth: Let's finish our comments and then we'll...

Mr. Ross: Certainly.

Chair Furth: ...have some discussion and have some more opportunity for you to respond. Osma, more?

Board Member Thompson: Just really quick, to that point. In terms of representation of your design, I think there are a lot of things that aren't clear, like that. If those are points that you want us to see, it would be really great to illustrate that, and maybe also to find someone else to render your drawings. Because I think there's a little difficulty in seeing exactly what you guys want in terms of what you're trying to achieve.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Well, I am closer to recommending approval of the project than my other Board members. I think that the revisions were well thought out, particularly that corner entrance and the staff driveway garage entrance. I think those were really, really critical improvements that you've made. Overall, I just want to say, I do have reservations about putting the Public Safety Building here, right near all of the businesses. In the future, thinking ahead, to me, it would be better to have other, like, more mixed-use building here. I do agree that this is...The location is great because it's right in the middle of town. That makes sense. The things that I'm looking for in this that I think could make the

project better is, one is the, is more information on the materials. I think we've talked about it before on tile patterns, tile size. I'm more supportive of the board-formed concrete, but I'm open to a change if the other Board members think it would be better to have a different material. On the 10-foot wall along Jacaranda, I was wondering if you would consider, where there is the pedestrian access, pedestrian walk from California Avenue, if there's some sort of terminus there. If it's a gate, or maybe if you shift the recesses that you have, just so that there's something, as you look down there, that there's something that draws your eye down the walk, to terminate the walkway. On the entry canopy soffit, I think you were looking at, you were showing drawing wood, and then I think you mentioned that it could be plaster, as well. I just want to question you, like, we have, we have the Walgreen's building here on University Avenue, which has a simulated wood stain.

Mr. Ross: Like Chastain, that...? Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I think that particular one might be the minimum metal. Anyway, some of them look better than others, so I would just recommend that it maybe come back to the Board. I'm supportive of, if you're trying to get a wood aesthetic, I'm supportive of that. I just caution you that we've had building code issues with those, that they do need to be fire, I think they have to be fire rated. On the landscape plan, I think you're showing Japanese Maples along Jacaranda, inside the wall, and I think you're also showing them along Birch...

Mr. Ross: Chinese Elm, yeah...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: Chinese Elms, and then, the Japanese Maples. And I would want more information on that. A Japanese Maple could be a little five-foot accent tree, or it could be a 15- or 20-foot tree that can be green, or it can be red, or burgundy. My concern is that we're removing all the existing trees on Birch, so it's going to be full sun, and that tree is usually more like, likes to be sort of under the canopy of an existing tree.

Mr. Ross: Okay.

Board Member Lew: I'm a little concerned that they may not do well there. On findings, if we were going to get that far today, I think I have some comments for Finding #4, where I think we could add that the sidewalk is being added along the Jacaranda alley, and that wider sidewalks are being added on Park and Birch. And, under Finding #6, Unsustainable Design, I think I might add that the...You have concrete construction for the building?

Mr. Ross: Yes.

Board Member Lew: The concrete construction provides thermal mass?

Mr. Ross: Yes.

Board Member Lew: And the courtyard design would provide daylight to the middle of the building. That was really important. Just lighting a building is actually the biggest energy use in a building like this, especially if it's occupied all the time, every day. And then, to respond to some of the comments made by other Board members, I think I'm okay with...I had the same reaction to the second floor/third floor proportions, but I'm not, it's not a critical concern for me because you have that canopy between the first and second floor. We react to it because we're seeing it on these oblique overheard aerials, but I think the reality is, if you're just walking down the street, the canopy is what you're going to see. The trees that are proposed there are Sycamores, which grow really quickly, and they are going to block out any view of the second and third floor very quickly. I mean, they replanted (inaudible) and Mountain View with Sycamores and they are huge after just, like, three years. I mean, it's amazing how quickly they grow. I'm not concerned about that at all. But, I did have that reaction, too, I think, with Peter, with just

window patterns and tile patterns. I think, in my mind, it's approvable today, but as I look at it, I think that there's one more step you could take to make the building even better. That's where I'm at on the materials and the window pattern. I think I would echo Peter's comments about fascia's and all of that. I had the same reaction. It's approval, but just a little tweaking could make it really stand out.

Mr. Ross: Thank you for your comments.

Chair Furth: Okay. You should feel free to sit if you'd like.

Mr. Ross: Okay.

Chair Furth: Or stand. Whatever. I would say it was a great pleasure to see the revisions. Some of the things that particularly, I think, made this a better project was the preservation and strengthening of the alley grid down there, so that Jacaranda becomes a much more useful, attractive alley for its usual purposes, and the relocation of the garage entry that went with that. That was such a problem before and I think that your solution is very creative and accomplishes a lot of what our goals are here. I do have a question for staff. One of the major uses of the alley presently is trash bins. If we continue this, I would like to know what we're going to do to get them out of that space, so that this functions as designed. I like the community room location. And, I'm sorry, I did have a question for you. What's the floor level of the community room as compared to the plaza? Is it higher? Lower?

Mr. Ross: Essentially the same.

Chair Furth: Okay, thanks. I think it's important for that community room to advertise its presence and its use, and one of the things in the many revisions of City Hall I've seen in the last 20 years, I think the conversion of the former HR department to a meeting room that, basically it's a glass box, really enlivens that space and really makes it work, both for the people within in and the people outside it. I would be in favor of optimizing the visibility of that community room consistent with your other goals of a secure building. And I couldn't quite tell from the drawings and elevations how that presently works, but I think that should be optimized, and I actually think that that should be signed as something, so people can find it. I mean, it's a great amenity to be delivering. Let's see. I like the landscaping frame, and I like the fact that if you're going to use louvers, they're split so that you can use them in different ways. When I looked at this, I was puzzled as to why the third level was so tall. It looked oversized to me because I read it wrong. I didn't understand that the windows came down to floor level. And windows coming down to floor level in an office use, in our experience, create problems, whether it's the good view of the wastebasket, or the fact that it's difficult to put furniture against them. I'm puzzled by that decision. And I don't have an opinion of what would make the best balance of the banding, but that did...I kept thinking of this for very, very tall people. I went over and looked at the site again this morning, and I tend to look at these things at 6:30, but I was looking at them later today, with different light. This building orients towards the courthouse and Page Mill, not California. Basically, we're creating a civic center in our secondary downtown, an historically separate city or town. Mayfield. And it used to be that the courthouse was just plunked down there, and with budget constraints and security hardening, it's become ever less attractive. One of the things that this building and the garage will do is give it more sympathetic context to its height. It does have decorative elements, which I never even noticed. All the way down Birch, people use vertical rectangles as design elements, for fenestration, and also, that's what makes the decorative element on the courthouse building. And it makes me realize that the middle tier, to me, is in need of some kind of relief, and some kind of element that makes it more interesting in terms of light and shadow. I'm glad that you're introducing seating. I think it's great that you're introducing it into landscaped spaces that tuck off a sidewalk. I mean, you can imagine that there actually is a place where two people with strollers to sit and talk, which I think is an important issue this close. I do think it needs to be clear that these are places for sitting, not just for perching, and that we're inviting and urging people to come sit and be there. I am interested in... I mean, I'm deeply affected by earlier exposure to White's essays on urban spaces, so I want to know, where is the shade? Where are the pedestrians going to go? Where am I going to sit, where I'm going to talk, walking in and out? You know, standing there with my...People don't stand there with briefcases anymore, but my backpack, and chat



with somebody. Where is it if I want to sit down and talk a little bit longer? I just want it to be clearer that it's comfortable, that it's welcoming, and that we're not afraid of people. Of course, we're afraid of some people, and after an earthquake and other times of great difficulty, this building needs to stand and be solid and function. But, it can do both. It's been interesting, the long struggles we've had with this plaza, which original we know was, went through many changes in the 60's. I think we need more detail on materials. We would not approve a building under ordinary circumstances without much more specificity. And the same with landscaping. And on the landscaping, of course, we're looking for something...Your illustrations include a butterfly. We're looking for pollinator-attracting plants. And I think the presence of flowering plants is going to be important. Some of the buildings in the city have what I think of as industrial landscaping, which is not very interesting. It's sort of the much, much later equivalent of oleanders down the freeway. Lovely plants, but maybe not the best use. So, when we do get a more detailed landscaping plan - and I think we need one - I'd like to be sure that there are things that smell good, there are things that bloom, there are things that are, it's pleasant to be near, and of course, they are things that the City can still maintain. I mean, my neighborhood has benefitted tremendously from upgraded traffic circles. You're shaking your head.

Mr. Ross: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Well, it's part of the budget. And for some reason, we found budget to maintain our hideous traffic circles after years of not doing it. And if we can't maintain it, then we need to talk about that. But, there are...These are your thoughts, and we'll see what happens when we come back. I tend to look at these buildings very much as an experience to walk by, and to work in, and it seems to me that you've accomplished a lot for the people who will work in it. I like your entry, and I think we're close to having something where, if I'm walking, I'll think, "Oh, great, now I get to walk this block. This is an attractive block to be in." I had a question for staff. What about public art?

Mr. Raschke: Peter Wegner was selected as the public artist. He's held a community meeting in the Cal Ave area to gather information. He's met with the stakeholders in the building, the police department, fire department, office of emergency services, and currently, I believe he's weighing all that and looking at the design. It's still going to be evolving, I take it, from today, to come up with an appropriate art piece.

Chair Furth: And what sort of work does Mr. Wegner do?

Mr. Raschke: Some of his most nearby pieces are in the night school of business. A combination of things. One that I really admire is titled Monument to Change as it Changes. If you haven't seen it, I would encourage you to go over to Stanford and take a look. It's a, kind of reminiscent of an old train station flip board, the way that the train schedule would flip down, but instead of words, it's colors and patterns that change. I think right now it's set up to about an 8-hour cycle of fascinating changes and cascades. Also in that complex he has a landscape piece that represents, like, the variables in economics. The bench seating in the courtyard is, like, X's and Y's. You really don't notice it so much from the ground level, but the users in the buildings can look down upon it and see these shapes. And then, one other piece in that campus, the night school of business, is another electronic piece that is, just flashes, like, adverbs. And I don't recall the name of it, but there are three really great pieces there. He's done a lot of major installations.

Chair Furth: These would mostly be freestanding or attached to the wall?

Mr. Raschke: Two of those are attached to the wall and the one is on the ground.

Chair Furth: But we don't know yet what his thought would be here.

Mr. Raschke: We don't have any idea what he's going to come up with, but he's very thoughtful and very contextual. I think he's a great artist for this project. We're just waiting to see what he comes up with.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Oh, I would like to know more about, not the sign program itself, but where the signage is likely to go, so we understand those possibilities. I think I have an answer to my questions about light spillage. I think that's it. This is not a critical path holdup towards this building - this Board - because we have a big construction project to be completed. But, that doesn't mean that there isn't a sense of urgency about this. From my point of view, I think we need more specificity on materials, we need more specificity on landscaping, including seating. I am interested in knowing how much bicycle parking there is, and where it is. I see it in the drawings; I should have looked more carefully, but I will concentrate on that. Because I think we typically under-park things. It seems to me we need to continue this, but I would like to know what my colleagues think.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can I follow up, Wynne, on something?

Chair Furth: Mm-hmm.

Vice Chair Baltay: I wonder if I could get the architect to come up with, put detail drawing 6.02. That's the cross-section of the building on the front. I'd like to follow up and sort of react to some of the comments from my fellow Board members. Next detail than that one - 6.02.

Mr. Ross: I don't have the entire set. I don't believe I have that. I just have the summary.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, well...

Mr. Ross: I have this one.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay.

Chair Furth: Can Amy put it up?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll refer to my colleagues, then, to look at detail 6.02. The point I'd like to make is that what I'm seeing is the third-floor glazed band is set almost exactly flush with the beige tile below it, and it strikes me as an opportunity to create a window sill at the top of the base tile and recess the glass back from that and create then some more texture to the top of the building. You could put that glass in and out, perhaps, as Osma was asking for. You might consider taking the louvers and putting them on the exterior of the building and fixing them at an angle that you'd like for the architectural purposes. You might be able to take the roof fascia and lower it down to be even within the concrete structural beam, to help with the overall height of the building. It seems to me that that sectional detail cries a lot about, just a little more refinement to how the second and third levels are interacting. That would, I think, go a long way towards some of the comments we've made. I don't want to prescriptively design what to do, but that struck me when I noticed that the glass was flush with the tile below it, that that only enhances the boxiness. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Is there a skateboarder on section, illustration 6.02?

Mr. Ross: It is.

Chair Furth: I see. Glad to know they are welcome. My personal sense is that I would like you to know how pleased I am at the direction in which this building is moving, and we are not, generally speaking, telling you to start all over again. This is a building that's going to make it. But it does...

Board Member Gooyer: I like the way you look at me when you say "start over again."

Chair Furth: I could look otherwise. I was just referring to the fact you're having a difficult time with this building, and appreciate your memory for the earlier design. Listening to you all, it seems to me we're talking about continuing this to a date certain or uncertain, depending on the applicant's desire, for more details on materials, for more details on landscape. I will tell you, I'm puzzled by your vine selections, but

that doesn't mean they're not great. I just don't understand them. I never thought of potato vine as really adequate for a building of this scale and weight. That there are additional comments from some of us that the middle band along - always forget the name of the street - Sherman is too much, with too little interest. We want to be sure that it's good pedestrian amenities along Park, but we've never really seen that frontage head on. I'd like to know about signage location. What else would you all think we needed to think about, ask the applicant to think about?

Board Member Thompson: I'd like to see more steps made towards the previous direction that we gave, in reducing blockiness and increasing pedestrian amenity, like, pedestrian, human scale elements. And that's not just at the base of the building, but that's throughout the entire building. Because as much as it might be that the Sycamores will grow, you know, anything could happen, at any time, and this building needs to stand even without its landscape and still look good, despite it.

Board Member Gooyer: And I think, I still think that, we've talked about the undulation, and I heard your comment about, well, it does, you know, a couple of inches one way or another is not undulation, as far as I'm concerned. And, you know, I'm well aware that, obviously, you need a certain criteria, but popping something out, you're not going over a property line, or anything else. You can do some undulating and still fit all the requirements that you need. I do like the idea of possibly, maybe on one of the facades, the louvers go on the outside. These things are awfully massive to be on the interior anyway. I mean, if you're using them just for, you're saying it's ballistic glass, so it's not really for a safety issue, but something like that on the interior, I could see what's going to happen. Somewhere along the line of some cost-cutting, somebody's going to go, you know, we could put some venetian blinds in there that will also take the light out and not have this. I'm not saying that's going to happen. All I'm saying is that there are some variations that can happen to get the boxiness out of there. And, just as another item, I see the four police officers in the back, obviously going, oh, my God, we wanted to get this thing approved today. But, we're also looking at this, this is a building that's going to be around for 50 to 75 years, probably, and taking the time now to get it to what we feel is the best possible, I think will be a benefit in the long run. I've gone through this in another community where we went through all this, and now, the police chief thanks the board for having taken the time and the effort to make sure that we got the most and the best quality design that was available. Like I said, I think it's jumped a tremendous amount since the last time. I think it's well on its way. I'd like to have you fine-tune it to where, you know, I think it becomes much more a better finished product. As to your comment about relating to the adjacent buildings, I could see if there was a building that abutted it, then you could say I'm trying to relate that band to that. But, if something across the street, I think the average person is going to look at the building and see it as an entity, rather than, oh, yes, I could understand where you were trying to relate to the building across the street.

Board Member Lew: Just for the record, I could recommend approving the project today, with things coming back to the subcommittee. The things that you listed, to me, are, I think, relatively...What do I want to call it? They're easily...

Chair Furth: Superficial.

Board Member Lew: They can be addressed and still move forward.

Chair Furth: They're not about the core.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: And I guess, I don't know if others agree with me that there's a value in -- to the maximum extent possible -- signaling the presence and use of the community room, so that you can see when it's occupied. I mean, if there are people meeting there, doing civic engagement, you can see that when you walk or drive by.

Board Member Thompson: I would agree with that. I think right now, the way the images have rendered it, I wouldn't have known that there was a community space there. I think to give that presence, and also just to continue more street activity.

Chair Furth: And I always find it...You know, we have wonderful community rooms, great ones in the Rinconada Library that are quite isolated in the courtyard. But, I find it exciting to see people sitting, talking. It's a really thrilling part of civic life, so, to the extent that's visible, I love it. And if it's impossible, I understand. But, if it's an option, I think it would be a great gift to the community. Materials details, landscape details, livelier and engaging plaza, which I think is a sort of under-developed rather than... You don't have a different vision. Clear signaling of the presence of the community room, and then, you've heard concerns that something that's not quite right or engaging enough about the upper two levels, but not everybody agrees with that. My feeling on that is that it could change and I would not be distressed, and it would be good to have some additional interest on that long wall along Sherman. I realize that one of the things I like about the building so much as you've revised it is it is much more suitable to the location. It is much more...One of the things I like about the Mayfield development is that it's light, somehow. A lot of those buildings float. And then, we have the poor courthouse, which I may be unhappy about because of unhappy times spent there, on jury duty. A little more playfulness would be okay. And perhaps we'll get that from the public art.

Board Member Thompson: I think I'll also add, even if you can't add another plaza on Park side, but just to detail Park Avenue to accommodate more pedestrian activity, make that more pedestrian friendly.

Chair Furth: By pedestrian activity, you're thinking...?

Board Member Thompson: I mean, at the moment, it's really hard to see where, if there are any benches on that side. Even if it's not just a bench, but maybe there could be, I don't know, some kind of cove, or some kind of thing that makes it part of the pedestrian scale, instead of just a wall.

Chair Furth: I've always [crosstalk] ...

Board Member Lew: They've widened the sidewalk, and their bump-out - what do you call it? There are coves, right? There are two or three.

Board Member Thompson: It's just not very clear because those look like drive aisles. I don't know if they are.

Chair Furth: Clearly, we're not understanding it.

Board Member Lew: Are you making a motion?

Chair Furth: Unless somebody else would like to. If we continue this, do you want it to be to a date certain or an undetermined date?

Ms. French: September 20th would give enough time, I think, for all concerned.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Then I move that we continue this matter until September 20th.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Furth: All those in favor? Opposed? None. Thank you very much.

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

Chair Furth: I trust...Actually, I trust you don't feel too discouraged by this. I found this all very encouraging. This isn't the level detail of materials or landscaping that we would ordinarily approve on a private project, and they're going to be important, and we look forward to seeing your revisions.

Board Member Thompson: I think also, a really quick note, that the garage on the other side, they kind of took this opportunity to make part of it really special, and I would just encourage you that, you know, with all the notes that we've made, don't be afraid to make something really, really special with all that, as well.

Mr. Ross: Thank you, and we are the design architects for that garage.

Board Member Thompson: Great. You got this.

Chair Furth: They know how to do it. And that went through three iterations also. Before we all declared victory. Which we did.

## **Study Session**

### **Approval of Minutes**

Chair Furth: We have two sets of minutes, June 7th and June 21st. Any comments or corrections on June 7th? Alex?

Board Member Lew: Okay, on page 22 of the minutes...

Chair Furth: Hang on.

Board Member Lew: ...it's - this is really minor - it's the, the transcriber spelled out parti phonetically. [Gives correct spelling]. It's a French word.

Chair Furth: Yes, it is. Yes, yes, yes, I saw that, too. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: Can we vote on the minutes separately?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Board Member Lew: Because I'm going to abstain from June 21st.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Motion to...May I have a motion...?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes from the meeting of June 7th.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Baltay, second by Gooyer. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Approved unanimously.

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

Chair Furth: What about the minutes of June 21st?

Board Member Thompson: Could I abstain from that, as well? Because I also wasn't there.

Chair Furth: All right, so there are only three of us. Any comments or corrections?

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we approve the minute from the meeting of June 21st.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? All those abstaining.

Board Member Thompson: Me. [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Okay. Abstentions, yes. The abstainers are Lew and Thompson. Okay.

**MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0-2.**

### **Subcommittee Items**

Chair Furth: Any subcommittee items?

Ms. French: None.

### **Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Furth: Any Board member questions, comments or announcements? Alex.

Board Member Lew: I have two. If you guys paid attention to the Council meeting, they made a big change on Monday with regard to the office cap. Also, I have a comment on the North Ventura plan. The start date has been pushed back from September to October.

Chair Furth: Okay. That's sort of become a ritual. And the change in the Comprehensive Plan cap, take us through that, Alex.

Board Member Lew: I'm not going to.

Chair Furth: All right, but they reduced...

Board Member Lew: There was a citizens initiative...

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: ...to change the comp plan and to have the office cap. In R&D. To include the entire city, whereas before it had excluded things like the Research Park, and some of the areas. It was really focused more on the downtown cores. And then, the cap was reduced, the previous cap was reduced back down to our, is it 50,000 square feet per year?

Ms. French: I'll jump in here because there are several different caps, right? There's the 50,000-annual limit of office and R&D. There's the citywide cap that the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in November of last year, continued on that 1.7 million for the entire city and not specific to certain areas.

Chair Furth: That's 1.7 total, or additional?

Ms. French: Total until 2030. That was the thing that happened on Monday night. There was the choice between going to the ballot and letting the voters decide, or, the Council adopting an ordinance that put it into place immediately, without the need for second reading. The 850,000 square feet cap for the entire city until 2030. That is what happened. They adopted it as an ordinance at the meeting on a 5-4 vote.

Chair Furth: And what is the City's present office space inventory? I'm just wondering, how much additional office space is that?

Ms. French: Backing out the numbers of pending and approved, it's more like 605,000 square feet left until 2030, of office and R&D space. Because we have pending, you know, approved and pending in the pipeline projects, that we're kind of backing out of that to see what amount is really left over. Now, on another note, Wednesday night, last Wednesday night with the Planning Commission, there was a vote to reject a staff-proposed ordinance that had responded to Council direction back in January of last year with respect to removing the cap downtown. So, the rejection was of an ordinance that said let's remove the cap, because now it's a citywide cap. Well, the cap is still on the books for downtown. They have about 25,000 square feet. And that's commercial cap, not just office and R&D. It includes retail, hotel, all those things.

Chair Furth: I'm sure we'll understand it eventually.

Vice Chair Baltay: And to be clear, the new cap, which averages about 50,000 square feet per year, includes the Stanford development, the research area by Page Mill...

Ms. French: Correct. The citywide cap, as well.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's going to be a significant change.

Ms. French: Stanford Research Park.

Chair Furth: That's like a building, right? I mean, we're getting buildings close to 40,000, aren't we?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Chair Furth: And it's an acre...

Vice Chair Baltay: It's basically one...

Chair Furth: It's a commercial acre.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...one new building like that a year...

[crosstalk]

Ms. French: Yeah, if you're having larger...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Except to the extent they are replacing existing square footage. It's the increment that we're talking about. Is that right? Or is it...? Is it incremental or total?

Ms. French: It's both. If there's a conversion from not office R&D to office R&D, that counts. If there's a new space created for ops and R&D, you'd probably say that counts.

Chair Furth: If I have a 30,000 square foot building - this isn't hypothetical, this is true - and I want to replace it with a 45,000 square foot building, is it...? We only count the 15,000 towards this new cap?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Furth: This is about increase, not about total inventory.

Ms. French: Increase.

Chair Furth: Okay. Got it. This may change the workload of this Board. The work opportunity of this Board. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: We want housing projects.

Chair Furth: Yeah. Bring on the housing. Okay, I think that's it for today. Anything else for you? We're all done? Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

Ms. French: Thank you.

### **Adjournment**