



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: August 16, 2018
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Members Alexander Lew, Osma Thompson and Robert Gooyer.

Absent: Chair Wynne Furth,

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, I call to order this meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Roll call, please.

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, next item is oral communications for any member of the public who would like to address something that is not on the agenda. Having no speaker cards, we'll move on to the next item.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Vice Chair Baltay: Agenda changes, additions or deletions. I would like for us to postpone the review of the Board minutes because I want to wait until we have a full board, and I don't think we've received the minutes yet anyway. And then, I would like to announce that I will be recusing myself from 429 University and Alex Lew will take over as Chair at that point.

City Official Reports

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

Vice Chair Baltay: Do we have any questions or concerns? Then moving right along.

Study Session

2. **656 and 649 Lytton Avenue [18PLN-00214]: Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of Proposed Revisions to the Facade of an Existing Multi-Family Affordable Senior Housing Facilities and Other Minor Site Revisions. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: PC-2649 for Lytton Gardens I and PC2698 for Lytton Gardens II (Planned Community). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at Claire.Hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org.**

Vice Chair Baltay: We're going to address study session item 656 and 649 Lytton Avenue, request for preliminary architectural review of proposed revisions to the façade of an existing multifamily affordable senior housing facility and other minor site revisions. Environmental assessment is that this is not a

project. The formal application will be subject to California Environmental Quality Act review. Staff report, please.

Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning, Board members. The project before you today is a project at 649 and 656 Lytton Avenue. The site consists of four parcels with two existing structures, Lytton Gardens I and Lytton Gardens II, which are both planned communities with senior affordable housing. A quick overview of the project. The application before you today is a preliminary architectural review application to assess modifications to the existing Lytton Gardens I and Lytton Gardens II facilities. I'll provide a little bit more detail about these in a moment, but generally, the modifications include changes to the material on both buildings from wood shingles to fiber cement board; through wall heating and air conditioning units in Lytton Gardens I facilities or units; parking modifications; minor landscape modifications; and some exterior lighting. The existing material is a wood shingle. The applicant notes that for maintenance, combustibility and durability reasons, they are proposing to replace the existing wood siding with fiber cement lap siding. The materials board that is in front of you includes a sample of the new materials proposed. At the Lytton Gardens I facility, the applicant is proposing new packaged terminal through-wall air conditioning/heating units, and the units on the outside would be painted to match on which it's located. In the below-grade parking garage at Lytton Gardens I, the parking would be modified to create three new ADA compliant spaces from five existing standard spaces. This would result in two fewer spaces than currently exist. At grade, they would remove two existing non-compliant ADA parking spaces that block a portion of the drop-off/pick-up zone. Landscape and lighting modifications, they would generally revise the walkway configuration and add benches and bicycle parking at the corner of, I think it's University and Middlefield. Some of the exterior lighting would also be replaced. Some key considerations for you guys today: Your thoughts on the proposed material changes and material quality; consistency with the Downtown Design Guidelines; and thoughts on the parking modifications. We ask that Board members provide initial feedback to the applicant. No formal recommendation is needed at this time. And, following the hearing, the applicant may elect to file a formal application for architectural review. Thank you so much.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do we have the applicant here? Good morning. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please. You have 10 minutes.

Glenn Wood, SGPA Architects: Good morning. My name is Glenn Wood. [spells name].

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Wood: Good morning, Board members. I'm here to represent the applicant for the Lytton Gardens project, which consists of two buildings, a larger affordable senior building and a market rate senior building. I'm going to keep my presentation pretty short here because I know you've looked at the packet and read the staff report, but I would like to point out that we've made a few changes to some of the visuals and things from what's in your packet. If you guys could follow along on the screen a little bit as I go, there's a few changes in some of the visuals. The primary modifications we're making is to upgrade the siding on the entire building from the cedar shakes to a fiber cement horizontal board. We've tried to work a little more on the visuals to make them a little more realistic because there are a lot of trees and landscaping around these buildings. We wanted to try and let you visualize it in a little bit more context than what was in your original packet. We're also upgrading, making some modifications around the pick-up/drop-off area and some of the interior courtyards, and upgrading the landscaping and modernizing it. The applicant's main goal for this is to visually enhance the entire building and upgrade it, but also to keep the building properly maintained and to choose materials that are easy to maintain. The applicant does have concerns about the combustibility of the cedar shakes, especially considering that it's a senior population living here. They also have maintenance concerns and sustainability concerns on the existing wood shakes. I have a team here, including the landscape architect. She'll come do a really brief presentation right after me, a little more detail on the landscaping. I have Joann from SGPA, who knows a little more about the background of the project, and I have Karim and Doris, the applicants. They can answer questions about the history of the building and background of changes that have been made in the past, if you have questions about that. What I wanted to do here, just to kind of finish my

presentation, was actually to show you some of these visuals that we've been working on, just to try to help to, help you to see what some of the changes are going to look like. I apologize; I have to flip through some slides here to get to it. This is what the current conditions look like. The proposed elevations as you have already in your packet. And then, here at the end, we spent some time to show how the building, a little more realistically how the building fits into the existing trees and landscaping on this sheet. And then, let me move forward. This one, we worked hard on upgrading this visual to show the drop-off area, how that will appear with the upgraded landscaping and the improvements that we're making there. Here's another view of the pick-up/drop-off area with the improvements shown. And we have these updated visuals of the courtyard area showing the landscape, which Jacque will go into more detail with. I think I'll just leave it there and let Jacque come up and talk a little bit more about the landscape. We have some physical samples of the fiber cement board if you'd like to see that also. You've got that. All right. Okay, well, thank you. I'll be here for any questions that you might have for me. Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, you have 10 minutes total, so please come to the microphone. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Jacque Keller: Yes. My name is Jacque Keller with Keller Mitchell. [spells name] We were brought on the job to, they really wanted to save water. We looked at areas that didn't make sense for lawn. They have a lot of lawn right now, so what we're trying to do is on the street sides, put in a lot of drought-resistance plant material. The other thing we were really cognizant of is there are so many trees, we saved as many trees as we could. There are a few trees that we had to remove that were ailing or didn't make sense from an ADA standpoint. We had to widen some of the walkways. And we did give a few more...Let's see here...As you can see on the left-hand side, we created a central space so that we could have some more dining for the seniors. We removed the fountain and relocated it because it was in a strange spot. Again, we kept most of the trees in that central courtyard. We did remove a few. And we're just refreshing the landscape with drought-resistant plant material. We used permeable paving wherever we could so that we could reduce the run-off. And we created this drop-off area so that it was safer, and yet, it was a challenge because we had to keep the existing redwood trees. Wherever we have redwood trees, we decided to remove the lawn and add in mulch in lieu of the lawn. We tried to remove the lawn as much as we could where it made sense. In the central area, we have a little bit of lawn, but seniors do not use lawn the way children do. If you have any questions, I'm certainly here to answer them.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. If that's the conclusion of the applicant's presentation, do we have any members of the public who would like to address this project? Oh, absolutely. Please continue.

Mr. Wood: I apologize. I didn't mention the wall units, and I had heard that that was a question that the Board had. The applicant is proposing the wall units because it's a, in an existing building, it's very difficult to retrofit it with a full AC and heating system with ducts and everything like that. The wall units are very energy-efficient and less expensive, and the current building does not adequately, have adequate heating, and it has no air conditioning. This would provide both heating and air conditioning to the units in a very sustainable and cost-effective and low-energy way. I think that was the last item that I thought I could address. We'd love to hear your comments and see if you have any questions for us. Thank you very much.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do we have any members of the public who would like to address this project? I see no speaker cards. Very well, then. Does anybody have any questions? Robert, you were asking earlier.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I think it was answered, but is either one of these two facilities state licensed, as in OSHPD, that sort of thing? Because it's a medical facility?

Female??: [off microphone]

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, that's fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you please come...

Female??: [off microphone]

Vice Chair Baltay: Perhaps the applicant could come to the microphone and answer that question.

Mr. Wood: Karim, the applicant, he could probably answer these.

Vice Chair Baltay: If you could please state your name and spell it for the record.

Karim Sultan, Covia: Yes, sorry about that. My name is Karim Sultan. [spells name]. I am the vice president of affordable housing for Covia.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Sultan: You're welcome. Our buildings are not licensed for OSPD. The Lytton II facility is licensed RCFE as an assisted living facility, half of the building, but not as OSPD.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

Mr. Sultan: Thanks.

Vice Chair Baltay: Anybody else? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I have a question about the fiber cement panels. We have three samples here, and then we have some colors. Are we to assume that these are not the actual color and that this is painted on the fiber cement?

Mr. Wood: Yeah, we have submitted a color board that shows the actual colors we're proposing.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, we have a copy, it was just a question on these physical samples, that these are not actually the color. We should imagine this material with these colors.

Mr. Wood: Yes, that's correct.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: And I have one question for, I don't know who, the applicant, I guess. I've been aware of this building and living with it; I work very close by. It seems to me there's fairly new cedar shingles on the building just now. Can somebody address what the history of that is?

Mr. Sultan: Yes. There were shingles done in 2014, so those are about, the earliest that have been done. There were some shingles done a couple years before that, and the most recent was about four years ago.

Vice Chair Baltay: But I remember just within six months or a year, seeing scaffolding and men working on shingling it. Could it be that the project continued on for some time?

Mr. Sultan: No. The last major exterior work that was done was the new roof and that was done about two years ago.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Okay, so, this is a study session, so we'll all be offering some comments, and then I'd like to offer the applicant the opportunity to ask questions when we finish that. Osma, why don't you start us off.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Well, hi. Thanks for your presentation. I'm familiar with this building. I grew up in Palo Alto. I would say my first reaction is a question on maybe the choice of choosing the horizontal grain versus a vertical grain. And even not just the grain, but the level of detail that is currently existing with the cedar shingles. There is a sort of sense that once we move to something new, there is a chance that that extra layer of detail would get lost. And I appreciate the color palate that you've brought forth. I think it will work with the landscape pretty nicely. But, I'm a little, reacting a little bit to, you know, fiber cement is really, really smooth, and in terms of the joints of where a panel ends and begins, I think there's a lot to sort of study, and maybe also consider something a bit finer grain in detail, or potentially a slightly different application that still maintains the vibrancy that the shingles actually give because of how detailed and how many edges you see. It sort of works with the landscape really well because the landscape is very detailed, and you have these small details. I would say that's my initial reaction. I'd like to hear what my other Board members have to say.

Vice Chair Baltay: Robert, do you want to follow up?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. Yeah, same with me. I've seen this building for, my God, as long as it's been there, probably, and I've always liked it. I just - there's a nice warm, soft feeling about that building with the wood shakes, or shingles, and unfortunately, using a Hardie plank type product, to me, just makes it look like, you know, half the new apartment buildings or hotels along the freeway that are going up, it just detracts from the quality of the building. I understand completely why, you know, this is a revolution... Well, I shouldn't say revolution, but, I mean, it's a good product. That's why it's used on a regular basis. It's almost indestructible, but it still takes something away from the quality of the building itself. Unfortunately, there aren't too many other alternatives for something that, instead of - as you mentioned in the correspondence - goes from an eight to 10-year lifespan to a 30-year life span. It's very understandable. I'm not really thrilled about it, but I guess this is an example of the old adage that the landscaping will hide most of the building, so it softens it up. As far as the through wall units, those are horrible. I hate those things. And especially the way you've applied them, just wherever they needed to be randomly. About the only way I've seen them successfully done is in many cases where...In fact, some of the literature that we've received from you is where the unit is integrated below the window so the whole entity becomes, you know, you've got the louvers across the full length of the window, even if it's a little bit bigger than the unit. And then, it blends as one large unit. On this particular situation where they just pop through the wall based on their necessity on the inside, I just cannot accept that. I think that needs to be better thought out.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. With regard to the Hardie shingle, I would say it's probably the most environmentally-preferable choice of material for this particular retrofit, so I can accept that. And I think, as my other Board members have mentioned, it doesn't have any subtlety. We've seen several projects, we have several projects in Palo Alto with it and they've been painting them sort of bright colors, and it loses...It sort of fights with the cedar shingle subtly, right? It seems like they're trying to do two different things. I'm encouraged by the perspectives that you have here on the screen. I think they're showing a subtler color than what ended up being printed in our set, and it seems like they are a little more subtler than what's on the color board. I would encourage you to try to do a more subtle colors than what's on the board. The board's pretty close. It's pretty good. There are several places on the building where there are existing panels meeting on an outside corner with shingles. I would suggest to pay close attention to those so we don't have two different colors and two different materials visible from the street. That's pretty...It's a pretty awful design detail. Also, when I walked around the site, I saw a lot of exterior conduit around exterior stairs and things. If you guys could clean that up, that would, I think, look a lot better. It seems like there have been a lot of modifications to the building over time and it would be great to clean that up a little bit. I think also with the change in the shingles to the

Hardie shingle, it seems like you might have places where it will clash with the fences, the existing fences, so pay attention to that. It seems like some of the fences are stained and others are not, so maybe there's a way to make those a little more consistent. When I walked around the site, I was wondering if it made any sense to highlight the entrance more on Lytton. Maybe it doesn't make any difference for the residents of the building, but I lived in the neighborhood, and I actually never knew the entrance was on Lytton versus University or Middlefield. And with regard to other, I think staff asked for comments on the entrance parking, and I don't really have any comments on that. I think it's hard to deal with ADA as it is, so I'm sure you're probably just doing what can actually be done by code. I think that's all that I have on this one. I generally am supportive of the project. I am supportive of the changes to the landscape. Removing the lawn, I think is key. I also saw, when I was looking at the site, some of the redwood trees are maybe, like, just a couple feet off of the building. That's kind of a no-no, generally. I mean, normally, if you have something like redwood trees, you would try to keep it at least 10 feet away from the building. It seems like there are some issues with the existing landscape that should be addressed at some point. And then, I think as Robert was mentioning, the HVAC, the packaged terminals. Yeah, that's not my preferred aesthetic, but it seems to me that for senior housing, the HVAC system is really critical. I notice it with, like, my parents, as they get older, they're more sensitive to that. I can accept them. I think the other option I would say is the mini split, where the units are up on the roof. But then you have to have a way to get the refrigerant lines down to each unit, so if you don't have a place for that, then they go on the outside of the buildings, the conduit lines. That's not attractive either. I can live with them. Okay, thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Okay. I think I'm a little bit less sanguine about the whole project myself, so I'll start with the siding, as well. My looking at the building is that those cedar shingles are almost brand new. The reason they look so discolored right now is because you never put any finish on them. You put the shingles up and left them alone and they're just starting their weathering process to turn brown. It's a shame that they weren't protected more, and I think shingles can last a lot longer than seven to 10 years on a building. If you look all over town, we have many, many houses that are beautiful, lovely buildings with cedar shingle siding. It's an important traditional material in our community, and to change away from that on a building like this I think is a real loss, especially when you've just invested a significant amount of money fixing them. I'm really bewildered as to why you want to tear them off and start over. I'm also concerned that there's a, there's a real environmental impact. Those shingles come from the very best cedar trees. The grain lines are tight and perpendicular. We cut down a lot of them to make the shingles on that building, and now, three years later, you're proposing to throw them away? It just seems to me a travesty to do that. An enormous amount of resource went in. We need to respect that, and you should be, I think, keeping those shingles and preserving them, and putting some effort into maintaining them. I think they will give you a long life. I just don't understand why you would want to put new shingles on, and then, a few years later, throw them away. And I think it's a significant aesthetic change to the building, putting Hardie plank horizontal siding. You've also proposed the least expensive Hardie plank. There are several versions that are thicker, with deeper shadow lines, which would look better. In my mind, it's just a very inexpensive building material that's used more on less expensive, less prominent properties, and this is not that. This is on an important corner, right next to downtown, and a lot of people know and love this building. The shingles were a big part of putting that building into the redwood grove that it's in, so I just don't support changing to horizontal fiber cement lap siding. I very much appreciate your concerns about fireproofing and wanting a more durable material, and if you are determined to change, I believe there are several new products on the market that might give you a little bit more sense of detail and fineness. We've come across in my firm sort of a siding material made out of fly ash cement. Boral is the company who makes it. You might investigate that. It's fairly new on the market, but it's similar price to Hardie plank. It has more variety of choices of patterns, and it might just look better. I think this material is just too thin, it's too simple and inexpensive-looking, and it's a real step down. I just can't support stepping away from the cedar shingles you have to do that. Your application is a study project that's not detailed out, but again, when you take these two boards and they're angled slightly because it's a bevel, and you try to join them at a corner, you just can't do it. You have to have corner boards, vertical strips there. That dramatically changes how the building looks. Your renderings just don't show that. It's a series of colored planes. When you start to detail it out and really think about it, it will look very different. The corner boards - the three or four-inch

boards vertically at each corner - on a building like this, which has so many corners, it will really change how it looks. The same thing when you come to the bottom of all these overhanging balconies. These boards are really thin, and you're proposing that we just look up at the bottom of this, and that's it? Again, you need more detailing, typically a belly band, some trim, some detailing. I'm asking you - I think the Board will be asking you - to just up your level of design on this to really think through all these details, to make this a suitable building for the prominent location it's in. Regarding the air conditioning units, I share the comments of Robert, that they're just not acceptable the way they are. They need to be much more carefully integrated and designed into the project, so his idea of perhaps integrating them with the trim around the window, or as Alex suggested, if you get a mini split system, and perhaps you could run the conduits in some sort of concealed trim piece on an inside corner and put them up on the roof - It just takes some more thought, I think, to really figure out how to integrate and make changes to this building. The overall impression I have looking at your application is that you're basically playing with colors. That's sort of the palette you've given yourself, and I think that you really need to look at the details just a whole lot more carefully, to prove to us that you can justify changing the material and the siding. If you really are determined to do it. On the entrance off of Lytton, I'm concerned that you haven't really addressed...I've driven by that building once or twice a day for the past 10 years, and I can't tell you how many times a delivery truck tries to pull in, gets blocked by a car, clogs up the traffic, and I think it's because there's a lot of deliveries and service-type stuff going in through that entrance, and you have just a very narrow drive-through there. It's very confusing, and I would think you might want to just reconsider a little bit. Is it possible to make it wider, or to make sure you don't have anything but residents dropping off there? Ubers, and taxis, and residents dropping off people. Because right now, it just functionally doesn't work, I don't think. It's too tight. And as I look at your renderings, you seem to even have a series of bollards that reduce that one narrow spot to, it must be just the width of a car, at best. It's very easy for that to clog up, to block up traffic on Lytton, and to make it not useful as a real entrance to the building. I think the other changes on parking are fine if staff is supportive of that, but I think that that entrance off Lytton could be improved somehow. Once you're doing all this work on the building, you might try to find a way to make that better. You've heard from us. Does anybody else on the Board want to add anything? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I think your point about the cedar shingles is really valid. It seems like we've all been sort of responding a little bit to the material choice, and also just recognizing that the existing is very warm, and very detailed, so, in terms of the renovation, there is a lot to live up to in that sense. It would be a real shame to lose all that. I think that's a good point that you made.

Board Member Lew: Just two (inaudible). One is that the, on the corners, I do support your comment about more details. There are ways of doing the corners where you don't have the corner board.

Vice Chair Baltay: Have you tried it with Hardie shake, Hardie plank, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, we did on low-income housing. There are metal corners.

Vice Chair Baltay: Exactly.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: And they look like metal corners.

Board Member Lew: Yes. But you don't have to have the corner board. And some of the metal corners are better than others. And then, the other thing is on the cedar. On really high-end houses, each shingle is, like, hand-dipped, right? Because you need to do both sides. You can't just paint it after it's installed. It's pretty labor...I mean, I think that's the issue, is the cost of the finishing versus, you know, leaving them untreated, and then, having to deal with the problem later. There's the issue of, like, first cost versus maintenance cost.

Vice Chair Baltay: But they just finished putting the money into the shingles already on the house. It's a shame to put them on the building and then not finish them whatsoever. That doesn't matter to our application here.

Board Member Lew: I know, but I think, too, it seems like the quality of shingles varies, so it does seem like there are some areas that have newer shingles, but that's not true for the entire building. I walked around the whole thing and it seems like it's in varying condition.

Vice Chair Baltay: Does the applicant have any questions or concerns? This is a study session, so it's informal. This is your chance to get feedback from what we've said. I'd love for you to have the opportunity to ask any other questions.

Mr. Wood: I don't know if I have questions, but is it okay if I kind of summarize what I heard from you all? Is that okay?

Vice Chair Baltay: Please do.

Mr. Wood: Okay. Because I think they are all great comments, and I really appreciate that. Our goal is, of course, to provide a building that is to the level of the beauty and quality of, you know, what that site deserves. And we do understand that the existing materials show a certain softness and scale and quality, so I agree with your comments there. I think what we can do is we can, within in a fiber cement product, within the Hardie products, we could see what other options there are for thicker boards, or other variety of things. We could also look at other fiber cement products, as you mentioned. We're happy to do that and see if there are any products for around the same price point that might be more subtle or might have a little more softness to it than the Hardie products. And we can look at the detailing, and maybe there are certain detailing that doesn't add much expense, but could really upgrade the quality of the building and the aesthetic. I think those are all good comments, and we will take those to heart and go back and look at that some more. As far as the wall units, grouping them with the windows makes sense, so we have to see how it works with the functioning of the unit on the interior a little bit. We can't just completely ignore the interior if there is a wall or something there. Also, these are small units, so furniture and things does matter when we locate these things. But still, we will take that comment to heart, and we'll really try to group them with the windows and create, like, a more organized façade with the wall units, do something better with that. We'll study that some more. For the drop-off, we can look at that. I'm not sure how much room we can create with all the existing landscaping that's there, but we'll certainly look at that, too, because it's good to know that there is traffic backing up in that area, and we'll see if we can come up with some ideas for that. We'll talk to Corinne and Jacque and the design team and look at that. And then, I also, there's a comment about the colors, and I think generally what I'm hearing is, you know, a warm color palette that complements that neighborhood and complements the landscaping and the trees, is what you're looking for. We'll probably stay with something similar, but maybe we'll...I heard somebody say that maybe keep, make sure the colors stay in the subtle ranges, and nothing too strong or too bold. We'll keep that in mind and we'll go back and look at that. I don't have...I can't think of...I mean, I kind of...I feel like I understand the comments in general well enough. I don't have any specific questions. Do you have any questions?

Ms. Keller: No, I just wanted to...We did struggle with that drop-off quite a bit. We were really concerned about keeping the redwood trees. If we could remove a redwood tree and that would help that drop-off, but...We put bollards there because there's quite a bit of pedestrian traffic, and we made the drop-off as wide as we could while still respecting the tree. Those were the (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, then.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, if I may. There was also some conversation about the entrances, and Board Member Lew had a comment about the stairways, if we could elaborate on that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: I think some of the lighting around the exterior staircases. There's just, there's a lot of stuff that's been tacked onto them over time.

Ms. Hodgkins: I do want to just add a note. The protection of the redwood trees is somewhat important to the...The project is likely going to be exempt from CEQA as currently designed. As soon as they start removing protected redwood trees, it may significantly increase the timeline if they have to prepare an environmental document related to that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Claire. Okay. Anybody else? I think that wraps us up on this item, so I'd like to move right on to the next item on our agenda. Thank you.

Mr. Wood: Thank you.

3. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2609 Alma Street [18PLN-00074]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of two Existing Residential Buildings and two Carports, and Construction of two Three-Story Buildings Comprised of Four (4) Condominiums, Including one (1) Below Market Rate Unit. Environmental Assessment: Addendum to the Mitigated Negative Declaration Prepared for 14PLN00253. Zoning District: RM-30 (Medium Density Multiple-Family Residence District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Phillip Brennan, Phillip.Brennan@cityofpaloalto.org.

Vice Chair Baltay: Next item is a public hearing regarding 2609 Alma Street, a recommendation on an applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of two existing residential buildings and two carports, and construction of two three-story buildings comprised of four condominiums, including one below market rate unit. The environmental assessment is that this is an addendum to the mitigated negative declaration prepared for the earlier project on this site. Staff, do we have a report?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. Good morning, Board. We have a slight staff change here. Philip Brennan is moving on to another jurisdiction, so Emily Foley will be taking over this project. Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Emily, welcome.

Emily Foley, Project Planner: Good morning. As previously stated, this presentation is for 2609 through 2617 Alma. The proposal is to demolish four rental apartments - it's two duplex buildings - and construct four ownership units, including one below market rate unit. Each unit has a two-car garage. They vary in size from two to four bedrooms, and about 860 to 1,300 square feet. This project was previously approved in September of 2015. However, the building permit was not pulled within the allotted amount of time, so the planning entitlement did expire, so we are reviewing it again. The associated parcel map to subdivide the four condominium units was recorded at the County and is still valid. There were no major changes to the architecture. However, in 2017, the Affordable Housing Code changed, resulting in the need to provide one below market rate unit, which, as previously stated, the proposal is doing. The project is located on Alma Street in the Midtown neighborhood. The lots along Alma Street are in the RM-30 zoning district, and the parcels in the rear are R-1 single-family. There was one neighbor comment received after publication of the staff report, which was provided to the Board when it was received. It had a question about the relationship between the height of the building and the RM-30 district compared to the R-1 single-family houses behind it. However, this was addressed at the time of the original approval. The design of the building steps up from the street and steps down in the rear. It complies with the daylight plane that is required for RM-30 when it abuts to R-1 zone in the rear, so it's two story in the front and the back and the three story is in the middle of the property. Here are the elevations showing that. Along Alma, you see the two-story form. The side elevations show how it steps up towards the middle. This is Building A; that's in the front. Building B is in the back. This one shows the daylight plane on the west and east elevations, showing how closer to the single-family homes it is lower.

Additionally, the building materials include wood siding and various colors of stucco to break up the massing, as well. The staff recommends the Architectural Review Board recommends approval of the proposed unit based on the findings and as subject to the conditions of approval. You may ask me any questions. Additionally, the applicant is here and has prepared a presentation.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Why don't we hear from the applicant? If you could please state your name and spell for the record.

Chris Kummerer, CKA Architects: Thank you. My name is Chris Kummerer. [spells name] My company is CKA Architects in Menlo Park. Happy to be in front of you again. And, thank you, Emily, for the thorough presentation. We've worked the planners hard on this project as we...I think she's our fifth. Thanks for jumping on the project. The presentation was great, so I'm going to keep mine brief. You've seen this view of the project. I'd like to quickly go through our history, just so you understand the amount of scrutiny we've had, and hopefully we've been thoughtful about responding to the comments we've gotten along the way here. We started, in 2013, at the DRC, and then, brought our project preliminarily here in 2014. It was a much larger volume and we got some good feedback from you folks and revised the design to be smaller, and tried to be more sensitive to the neighbors. That redesign came back in 2015. We were continued again to October of 2015. And then, that was approved. As a part of this, the environmental study was also approved, so we did, because we're in the, I want to call it a toxic plume; I forget the name of it. We had a full environmental study done, and limits of grading were established, and what-not. That was also approved. Then, the building permit was set to issue in September of 2016, but the property was sold. Our new clients took over and had a miscommunication with the building department. They thought they were extending the permits for a year, and it was only six months. We ended up back in this loop, so, here we are again, to try to get this reapproved. Thank you for spending the time. I'll try to go through this quickly. Here's our site. I think you've seen it. It's a pretty blighted property. Two low-rise 60's buildings. There they are. The one to the right is not part of this. Here's our neighbor to the left on Alma, and here's our neighbor to the right. This will remain and is not a part of our project. This is worth noting. This is what we started with, and here's kind of our design process. This is a three-story building all the way, front to back. This complied with the zoning but wasn't very sensitive to the neighborhood. With the feedback we got, we took this - here is the rendering of that version - and we were given direction to use the width of the lot instead of the length, separate our vehicle and pedestrian entries, and just reduce the bulk in general. This was the ensuing design, which I think was a lot more sensitive. As a part of this, we worked with the neighbors, too, and if I remember correctly, it was with Lisa. They were very generous, had us to their house, and we sat down, talked about this redesign, and said we're going to try to keep it real simple; two stories on your side, mask the third stories with these roofs. They were supportive of that approach, so it was very nice of them to engage with us at the time. Here's another rendering of that. And then, we were continued for some small items, the detailing of the pedestrian gate and the garage doors. These are images of those. This was the ensuing renderings, which was sort of the final one that shows the full project. Here's our materials board. It's been thoroughly reviewed with a lot of analysis, acoustic analysis because of being on Alma, as well. Now, in this latest iteration, as staff mentioned, we did have to add the BMR unit, which is a significant concession by our clients. But, that was something that was not negotiable. Then we went through another round here. We had to justify fire ladder access and floor area, realignment of street trees. There was one street tree that moved in the building permit process; we had to move it back in this process. These things were on the margins. And then, we actually got a different determination of daylight plane, which was more favorable. But, we didn't enlarge the building for that. And our plantings were revised to be more current and more drought-tolerant. It's hard to see the daylight plane here but there's a spot that we're not using because of the more favorable determination. Here's some of those native plants. In conclusion, it's been a pretty thorough process for us. We've been doing this for five years. I felt really good about the initial approval when we got it here. We worked with the neighbors, we worked with staff, we worked with the comments we got here. We took a pretty large design and made it hopefully into something sensitive. And everybody felt great because here's a portion of Alma that really hasn't seen any work for 50 years. We were hoping it was going to be this first building, that would sort of spur some redevelopment on this stretch. That is still the hope, that it can continue and get built and

be the, sort of first thing here that makes this block a little better. In fact, this whole stretch. Thank you for the time. I'm happy to answer any questions you might have.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I don't have any speaker cards. Is there any member of the public who would like to address this project? Then we'll close the public portion of this meeting. Does anybody have any questions for staff or the applicant? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: There are three stucco colors. In the render, I was just wondering if you could clarify a little bit on the elevations and how, in terms of...I guess this is my first time looking at the stucco, but in the render, it sort of looks like a really simple subtlety, and then, in the elevations, it says there are three different colors. Here, I can see one and two are similar, but three is really different. What is your design intent with using three different colors and where they go on your building?

Mr. Kummerer: Yeah, thank you. As you know, it's hard to render these things consistently. The intent is really to follow the materials board and for them to be subtle variations and not loud. The genesis of this was to reduce bulk by having different colors. That's the intent. We're really using, on this color board, the two middle upper colors to create variation, and then, that yellowish color on the left is just a little bit of an accent. If the question is which one did we choose, it's this here color board.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Thanks.

Vice Chair Baltay: Anything else? If not, I'd like either Robert or Alex to start us off and maybe...You two were on the Board when this was approved, so bring us up to speed. Were there any issues, concerns? How did it go about? Alex, maybe you should take the lead for us.

Board Member Lew: Yes. I think, as Chris had shown in his presentation, that the Board was not happy with the full three-story scheme, all four units, three stories, front to back. Also, I think the Board didn't like that the driveway was all open, is my recollection, to the street. The units didn't really have very much privacy. I think we've all been to the site. Alma is very noisy. I think the Board was just not seeing that that was the best option. They did the major redesign to the proposed scheme. And then, we did also continue the redesign to address some of the things, some of the windows, and stairs, and details, and landscape. My recollection is that there were, that the neighbors did complain about the three-story scheme, and then, we didn't hear from anybody on the revised scheme. I'm in support of the project. I think, looking at the project again, there are two things that I think could be addressed better. I think these are easily resolved. One is the rear elevation, I think could look better. And I think the elevation isn't drawn that well. It doesn't really show the setbacks, the setback of the third floor very well. I'm just thinking in terms of proportions and colors. I think it could be more attractive. The reason why I'm mentioning it is because it's only 10 feet from the rear property line, so the neighbors on Emerson are going to see it. And then, I think there's been a revision on the hedge on that back property line. I don't remember it being in the middle of the rear setback. I see that there is a utility easement. I'm thinking that that's not going to be viable. I think we have to figure out a way of having that unit have some sort of patio space and have privacy for the neighbors in the back. I don't know what the right solution is. I was thinking maybe **cleech [phonetic]** or something, where you have the green mass 10 to 20 feet up high, and then, it's open on the bottom for patio use. Maybe you need a second layer of landscape. Maybe there has to be something like vines on the fence, or something...Something. I think it doesn't really work as it is proposed now. Anyway, so, Chris, if you have any comments on that.

Mr. Kummerer: It was a condition of approval, so it wasn't on the initial approved set, but it was a condition of approval that we add screening back there. Philip helped us work through that item, and that's where these 10 trees came in, or 15. Fifteen. Because of the easement, we weren't going to plant them in an easement, so we kind of backed into it, if you will. I agree it's not the ideal solution because the original proposal has a patio out there. I'd be supportive of either figuring out a way to plant in the easement with something that's not a tree, that's more of a hedge, so that we accomplish the same things without killing the back yard.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And I would like, I guess, if we worked it out. There's the easement, but then, you have an underground electrical connection back there. There might be actually two different standards for how to plant around there. I think it may be kind of tricky. I think we have to resolve that because I think...There's only 10 feet, and if you have, like a, I think like a hedge now would take out five feet of that. And it's in the middle of the 10 feet. We have to figure out something else for that. Otherwise, I'm in support of the project. I think that the...For the reasons that we approved it before, in that it steps. It has a fairly strong roof, horizontal roof profile that blends in with the neighboring mid-century buildings. That's where I am on this one. I think I mentioned before - last time - that I wasn't crazy about some of these nine to 10-foot rooms, but that's not really the purview of the Board. But, it seems to me that there's some undesirable things inside the units. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. Well, from my recollection, it did take quite a few changes based on the initial proposal that came before us. But the thing is, even in this final version, when you're the first building on a block to go either two stories or three stories with nothing else around you, is that the thing really stands out. And, just because technically you're allowed to do it by code doesn't mean that it fits the character of the neighborhood. Basically, my objection to it is the same thing it was at that point, is that the unit in the back is just way too close to the back property line for a third story. The front one is probably okay, mainly because it is facing Alma and cars going 40 miles an hour. It's not that big a deal. I'm up in the air at this point whether...I believe I voted against it the first go-around also, but I'll leave it open at the moment.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's it? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I think, in general, it looks quite handsome from the street, I just discovered there's a stucco color number four here on the rear elevation, and we don't have that in front of us. There's also an obscure glass material back here, as well, that is...I don't know what that is. I think in terms of materiality and what you're doing on the elevations, I think I just need more information, for one. I'm okay with a bunch of different colors of stucco. I'm not entirely sold on how they're being played out right now, just given that there's a lot of it. And I do understand that you have worked in a series of reveals, but I'm not sure how successful it is with the colors that you're trying to use. If you guys do come back, I would really like to see how these colors actually do look, and more of an attempt to, sort of render these a little bit more authentically, to sort of understand how they do affect the street. I agree with my fellow Board members about the rear yard, that it is quite small. Yeah, I mean, I think it's, it's a handsome building, in general. There's a little bit of...What's the word? I'm still a little unclear exactly what I'm getting. I see a render, and I see some design intent, and then, when I'm really going through your elevations, it doesn't really add up, so that makes me a little nervous. That's where I am.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I'm feeling that this project has been reviewed, looked at, very recently, and I really am uncomfortable with the idea of grinding it out again. I think they've been through the process. We approved the building. I think the City needs to have this kind of building built, especially in this location, and we owe it to the applicant, to the town, to expedite, or at least help them get this thing out of here. To have to come back again...I don't want to discount, Osma, your comments about the colors are correct. I think that it could use a little more work. Alex, that back elevation is not the strongest part of the building, and that back yard, you have 10 feet full of hedges. Not a smart move. People are going to want some space there. I acknowledge the neighbors' comments about it being tall at the back property line, facing the single-family neighborhood, but we all know that Alma Street is going to redevelop with buildings like this. It's an RM-30 zone. I think the first time the Board went through this, they did an admirable job of balancing that out. It was a lot of work, it sounds like, to bring down a three-story building across the whole site. Clearly, the design has a lot of effort put into modulating it, attempting to placate the neighbors, to fit in better. I think it's been very well done that way. I can support the project as it is. I can also support if we want to put a few conditions of approval. Maybe they come back to a consent, if necessary. But, I'd like to see us move this along. This is new housing on Alma Street where it's desperately needed, and I think we should be aware of that and not go through a review process again. I don't know...We need three votes. Robert said he voted against it the first time, and Robert doesn't usually change his mind easily.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I mean, I agree completely. It's one of these things that, that is an area, I don't want to say in transition, but it's going to happen. It's just, land is too valuable to not have it happen. But, again, it is definitely, if anything is going to have to change on that, I think the back unit, you know, should be maybe slightly smaller. It doesn't need to be a 1,400 square foot unit back there. And, I think just three stories of stucco needs to be, you know, something changed on that. I mean, you know, it's the old adage, it's a four-sided building, and basically, three sides have been addressed and the back hasn't. And the person who lives in those two buildings on the adjacent street have to look at that three-story stucco mass for the next 30 years.

Vice Chair Baltay: I hear you. My understanding is that they've already finished construction documents on this and already had a permit issued once, so changing the size of that back unit is a major setback from the applicant's point of view, I would think. Does anybody else have other thoughts of how we might change it a little bit, or condition it and still let it get out of here? Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I would say, for me, if we just changed...If we changed the colors on the back façade, and figure out how to add, have patio space and landscape screening in the back, however we do that, subcommittee or consent, is fine with me. And then, to answer the question about the glazing, normally what we've done on other projects where we have a multifamily unit which is 10 feet away from a single-family house, usually we have, like, a double-hung window, and the upper part is clear glass and the bottom part is obscure glass, so that, just from site lines inside the unit, they can't look down into the neighbors' back yard. And so, that's...We've found on a number of projects in town, and we haven't done it this way, as shown in the drawings, where a bedroom has all obscure glass. We don't have to do it. I don't think that's in the code, right? I mean, this is something that we've just done on other projects, and I've seen them, and they seem to work, and it seems to placate the neighbors.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, thank you. That was going to be my question. We certainly can just obscure the bottom of the window. That is a standard treatment that we do that does protect the privacy, but still allows the light in. I did want to ask a question about the landscaping in the rear. Is the Board seeing that landscaping as a privacy screen, or are you seeing it more as a screen that helps reduce the massing?

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, do you want to address that?

Board Member Gooyer: Well, the problem I see is that you've got, you know, you've got a straight stucco two-story wall and the only thing that changes is that the bottom half is painted one color and the top half is another color. I just don't like that. We always seem to be hung up on the whole, the clear versus the frosted glass, everything else. It's like, I don't think there are that many peeping toms around that everybody seems to worry about, that everybody's going to sit up there and look down at the neighbors' yard. I'm more concerned that it's an ugly design from that side. I'm more concerned, if I was the owner of that building, I would hate to sit in my back yard and look at that thing. Not if somebody was sitting up there, looking down at me. I don't really care. And I think that's the difference I had. It's just a very unattractive rear of the building. I think some money needs to be spent either putting some wood back there like is on the other three sides, and maybe even a variation of some sort. You know, the windows seem to be nicer on the front than they are on the back. It's just, it's not close to the level of quality that, if I was the owner of the building in back of it, I won't...It's bad enough having a three-story building, and then, it might as well at least be an attractive-looking building I'm looking at. That's my main concern.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may suggest, if we're just talking about material changes on the rear, that's certainly something that could be handling at a subcommittee meeting. As far as privacy, I think most of these windows look to be high sill windows, so the privacy issue has already been handled in the placement of the windows.

Board Member Gooyer: Right, I agree. Like I said, I'm not too worried about the privacy aspect of it.

Board Member Lew: For staff, I think the...We have a stucco building 10 feet off of the rear property line. My take is to reduce the visual impact on the neighbors, so, one is typically, like, a wood façade, or a taupe-colored stucco. Something that just fades into the background and recedes. And then, I'd also like to have an evergreen hedge, ideally 15 feet high, 12 to 15 feet high. Just makes everything much more attractive. I guess the way I would say it is, like, I think I'm treating, I would treat this particular back yard as I would normally do on a single-family house's side yard. That's basically the kind of dimensions we're looking at, with only a 10-foot rear yard. Just trying to make it very low key and fade into the background.

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm just thinking, if we're using the shrubbery and landscaping to more breakup the massing, then it doesn't need to be a straight line of shrubs or trees. It can be more clumped together. And then, give some more sense of rear yard space.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, even the...I'm sorry, go ahead.

Board Member Lew: Well, okay, I think, yeah...Generally, I think the continuous line is good, and in this particular case, I'm willing to break it up. It seems like there's...Possibly in two. And then, I think what's very strange, I think, on this particular one, is that everything that we're looking at on the first two floors is plainer, but we have four different colors, plus wood railings. And I think that was just too much on this particular façade.

Vice Chair Baltay: Osma, did you have more to add?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. I think I kind of agree with Robert more, in that sense in terms of the back façade. I actually think adding some of that wood material to come around...It's true. I guess from a ground level perspective, if you have hedges that maybe block out a certain amount, it's really the top that you would see. I guess I'm not sure that something super subtle would make sense. I think something that is more in tune with whatever else is happening on the façade would be more appropriate. And I think I also agree with you, Peter, that it's true, this has been through a lot. I could see this going to subcommittee. I think the issues that we have brought up are reviewable in a subcommittee, so I could support that.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to have the architect come back to the microphone and respond to what we've been saying. Is this something that you think you can successfully modulate without being a big deal? Because you need to convince us. I think you're on the edge of getting sent back for another design review.

Mr. Kummerer: Right. Well, thank you. Thank you for the chance to comment. I'd like to step back for one second. In the initial discussions about privacy, it was noted that the neighbor at the rear, who was a very nice, older gentleman, has a forest in his back yard, so it's evergreen back there. So, these concerns at the time were not as much of a concern. And it's still that way. As far as plantings go - and I know plantings can be a **fig leaf [phonetic]** because trees come down, and what not, but that was part of the initial discussion. I wanted to bring that to bear. I'm not opposed to...

Vice Chair Baltay: Could I interrupt you for a second? I want to be clear. Is it true there's a heavily-landscaped property on the other side of this elevation, in the neighbor's...?

Mr. Kummerer: Correct. It's evergreen and quite dense.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do we have any photos or evidence of that?

[Looking for photos.]

Vice Chair Baltay: Robert or Alex, do you remember that from the previous review? Was that the case?

Mr. Kummerer: You can maybe see here. If you look behind that dotted line...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, but they're also removing several trees on the property.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, exactly. Trees can also be removed next year, sort of thing. I don't want to...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: After being...Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: Why don't you go on, Chris, and address our questions about the elevation, the [crosstalk] elevation.

Mr. Kummerer: This photo will show you the evidence of the tree behind, if that's suitable. I think the suggestions on the elevation are good ones, and from my point of view, just adding the wood veneer to that top right section of the elevation, to me, seems like a nice improvement. And then, maybe scrapping the yellow color on the lower would just simplify that. The glazing, the obscure glazing, was just something we worked out with the neighbor. Again, it was an elderly man who was behind there, and the neighbors were looking out for me. We proposed sort of half obscure, and they just said, "We don't want to have anything back there." Our clients felt it was odd to have a room that didn't have a window you could look out, but that was a concession we were willing to make. I agree, it's not great, but that's how we got there.

Board Member Gooyer: I don't have a problem, like I said, with the glazing. That could also easily be changed sometime in the future, if something changes. But, for instance, on A3.2B, the elevation that faces the driveway, if we're going to call it, the wood slats there on the second story stop right at the corner, and I don't like a change like that occurring on an outside corner anyway. I prefer, if you're going to change materials, I prefer to change...

Mr. Kummerer: It doesn't conclude. If you look on the top elevation on that sheet, it wraps the corner.

Board Member Gooyer: Oh, it's way back here?

Mr. Kummerer: It's a screen that wraps the corner for privacy. It's on two sides and stops where that window is, where the stucco is. Another item that was brought up was...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, still, my thought was that if that wood material goes all the way across, similar to what it is on the front of the building...Or, I should say, the Alma Street side. And as you said, get rid of the yellow, which I think is an arbitrary color that doesn't really need to be there. I think it would help enhance that back side quite a bit. It also splits up the elevation from the back. It is obviously, in a pure elevation like this, the third story looks a whole lot closer, obviously, than it is in reality. But still, I think that would help a great deal.

Mr. Kummerer: I think those are good suggestions. I also wanted to address the point about three-story stucco walls because...I just want to make sure there's not confusion about that.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I know it's two story...

Mr. Kummerer: They don't exist in the project unless you're in the middle of the project and looking up, and you're in the center between those two buildings and you look within the project.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. We're not trying to re-debate...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Kummerer: Yeah, yeah, [crosstalk] ...

Vice Chair Baltay: ...so I think we're done with questions for you. Thank you.

Mr. Kummerer: Cool. All right. Thanks.

Vice Chair Baltay: The question to the Board is, do we put this to a subcommittee? Or do we want to see it back again?

Board Member Gooyer: I'm fine with a subcommittee. This is not that drastic that it needs to come back for total review on our part.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, maybe you can make a motion for us, then?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: Okay. Let me get the findings out here. I'll make a motion that we recommend approval of the project, subject to the findings and existing conditions of approval in Attachment C, with the addition that it returns to the subcommittee for review of the rear...? What do we want to say?

Vice Chair Baltay: Rear elevations.

Board Member Lew: Revision of the rear elevation. And, two, is consider an alternative planting plan for the rear property line that allows for the dual screening and patio use.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do we have a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Let's take a vote on it, then. All those in favor? Opposed? Okay, the motion carries 4-0.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to call a five-minute adjournment, and then, Alex will be taking over for Chair after that. Thank you.

[The Board took a short break. Vice Chair Baltay did not return to the meeting because he recused himself from discussion of Item No. 4.]

Board Member Lew: We are ready to reconvene.

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 429 University Avenue [18PLN-00240]: Recommendation on the Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Architectural Review Consistent With Condition of Approval #3, for a Previously Approved MixedUse Building (14PLN-00222), Requiring Architectural Review Board Approval for the Proposed West Elevation Wall Design, Landscape Details, and Exterior Building Materials, Colors, and Craftsmanship. Environmental Assessment: Use of Mitigated Negative Declaration Prepared for 14PLN-00222. Zoning District: CD-C(G)(P) (Downtown Commercial with Ground Floor and Pedestrian Shopping Overlay). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Adam Petersen at apetersen@m-group.us**

Board Member Lew: Item number 4, 429 University Avenue, recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a minor architectural review consistent with the Condition of Approval #3, for a previously-

approved mixed-use building, requiring Architectural Review Board approval for the proposed west elevation wall design, landscape details, and exterior building materials, colors and craftsmanship. Environmental assessment is the use of mitigated negative declaration prepared for parcel 14PLN-00222. The zoning district is CD-C(G)(P), which is our Downtown Commercial. Project Planner is Adam Petersen. Welcome, Adam.

Adam Petersen, Project Planner: Good morning, Chair Lew, members of the Architectural Review Board. I'm Adam Petersen from the Planning and Community Environment Department. I'm here today to present a condition compliance item for 429 University Avenue. As you stated, this item was approved by City Council on February 6th of 2017. There was a condition of approval that was part of that, that this item return to the Architectural Review Board for evaluation of three specific things. This is an evaluation of the design of the west wall, or the interior property line wall, along the third and fourth elevations. It's also an evaluation of the landscape plans and details, and then, also, an evaluation of the exterior building materials and colors that are proposed in craftsmanship for the project. As you are aware, the project is located at 429 and 425 University. This is on the corner of University Avenue and Kipling Street, as you can see here. The first item that I wanted to get into is the proposal for the design of the west wall. What the applicant has proposed is to basically have, sort of a cement plaster over the west wall with aluminum reveals. These aluminum reveals are about three inches wide along horizontal portions, and then an inch and a half wide along the vertical and the angled portions, as you can see here in this slide along the third and fourth elevations. On the first two floors where the building is obscured by the adjacent buildings, the applicant proposed a CMU wall. Where it's exposed, the applicant proposes using a CMU wall with a text coat, a pink covering over the CMU. In terms of the landscaping that's proposed, there is less than 500 square feet of landscaping proposed for this entire project, for the entire building. The landscaping is proposed in individual pots. It's watered with a drip irrigation system. On the first floor, this is located in the upper right image on the screen. The first floor has five rectangular-style planters that sort of border the open space area. These planters are roughly three feet long by one foot tall by about a foot wide. Two are four feet long with the same height and length dimensions. These planters would be planted with a gray rush-type plant. The second floor would have one planter. This is a round planter. It would be planted with a western azalea. The third floor would have three round planters planted with a sedge firm. And then, the fourth floor would have similar rectangular planters, and these planters would be along the exterior of the elevator with a vine that grows up the elevator. The planting that's proposed is native, indigenous, and drought-tolerant. Going back to the green wall on the first floor, that's planted with a California morning glory vine. That would go up, and you can see that in the lower left, a sample. It's not exactly what's proposed, but that's a sample of what would be located on the ground floor along the alley elevation. Regarding the building materials, the applicant notes that these are the same materials that the ARB evaluated in the Option 1 plans that were approved by City Council. This is a concrete...Excuse me. It's a 70 percent replacement of cement with slag material on the first three floors. The fourth floor would have cement plaster over the metal framed walls. The color scheme would consist more of a sandstone color on the first three floors for the slag material. And then, the fourth floor would be more of a silver smoke color that the ARB can see on the material board. This silver smoke color would obviously be over, would be on the cement plaster over the metal stud walls. Like I mentioned, there's a CMU wall on the interior property line. Where it's covered by the building, there wouldn't be any treatment, but where it's exposed, there would be treatment with text coat paint. There is a skylight system, though, that's proposed on the fourth floor. This is not necessarily visible, but it's between the elevator, and then, the office building to provide some form of covering. With that information [ringing]...I'm sorry. I'd like to back up. We did receive a comment letter - I guess I'll keep going - We did receive a comment letter from the appellant in regards to the materials and the color scheme that's being used for the project. That comment letter was forward to the Board, and the appellant is here today, as well. With that information, staff's recommendation is that the Board recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Great. The applicant, if you could come up, and you have 10 minutes.

Peter Coe, Peter Coe Architects, Inc.: Good morning, all the ARB members. My name is Peter Coe of Coe Architects, Inc. We're located in downtown Palo Alto. We got the project last year. We've been working

on this project, for the contracting document for the building department, the last, almost a year now. At this stage, we already got the building, fire, all the department approval, and then, trying to obtain our demolition permit for continuation of construction with the project. Today, we're here just for those three items. One of the items - Adam addressed it - I just want to say that we, there was a blank wall against the (inaudible) building. Only upper two level was visible from the street. You probably can see it from University Avenue a little bit. Also (inaudible) on the alley space. Our concept was really simple because the upper two levels on the third and fourth floor, we have a different color. Actually, I want to correct what Adam just said. The first and second level was the, the color was a more beige color, and then, upper third level and fourth level was the smoky gray color we proposed. And we do have the concrete block infill between the structural columns along the west wall. The concrete block infill was recommended by the structural engineer because the movement of the entire structure. That has to have...Concrete block was like an infill. It's a lot better than a solid concrete wall along the west side. And the original design, the whole project we've been working on for the last year has been follow exactly the conceptual project, what's approved Option 1, was approved by City Council. So, every detail, everything, we try to follow the elevations, everything. Only the upper part of the third and fourth floor. It was proposed stucco finish over there, and our concept was really simple and just using the metal aluminum reveals to form, like, a tree-like, what's going to be aluminum color, natural aluminum color, so it will be a contrast to the smokey-gray color to form that tree-like pattern on the top. I think that the colors really match everything proposed. I just want to let you know I'm here to answer questions. Thank you very much.

Board Member Lew: Great, thank you. Okay. I have one speaker card, from **Michael Harbor. [phonetic]** If you could come up, and you have three minutes.

Mr. Harbor: Hi, good morning, Board. It's been 18 months since I've been back here. I'm disappointed that it's taken this long for the applicant to propose drawings after the last City Council meeting. But, as you know, there are three main reasons for this, what is supposed to be a quasi-judicial hearing. We have the proposed west elevation design, the landscape details, and then, exterior building materials, colors and craftsmanship. The west wall design in mine and other appellants' opinion is out of character and context with the rest of the building. It is not consistent nor compatible, which was originally proposed to this ARB Board or the City Council by architect Joe Bellomo. The site beside Chevron's appears somewhat like a tribal pattern and clearly stick out as an add-on by an unrelated architect, and I think this is the sixth architect that the applicant has now used for this project. When looking eastward down University Avenue, you have to think about the context, and again, how I initially was able to work with this appeal is that there was municipal code violations - 1818.110. We have to think about the Varsity Theater architecture, the Birge Clark, former Apple Building, and the Hotel President as all buildings that you're looking at as looking eastward towards University Avenue. This is not something that is just put together, slapped on, just to address a design issue. The second major issue that we have here has to do with that of the materials, colors and craftsmanship. It is impossible to evaluate the expected craftsmanship of the building or landscape because the applicant has not provided any background information, experience or completed past projects of either the new building architect, contract, project manager or landscape architect. Joe Bellomo, who I have spoken to about this project, has completely disavowed himself from this design, and in a phone conversation, he said the current design is not his, and he is no longer affiliated with the building. And he was adamant about that. Therefore, the applicant is obligated to resubmit -- I believe -- the entire plan to the ARB, counsel and the community, in its entirety for evaluation. And if the plans aren't satisfactory, then the ARB must immediately notify the Council of such. The applicant has previously praised her choice of architect, meaning Mr. Bellomo. She brought him here, she referenced all of his accolades, his Birge Clark designs, and stood here and, you know, applauded him for all his past work. And she said that the new building would be iconic, and that it would be an anchor with the existing project at 102 Alma, which is the parking garage and offices there. That it would anchor the two things. Mr. Bellomo is no longer affiliated with this project, and since he disavows this building, I think this needs to be taken into consideration. The other thing about the Bellomo projects, the craftsmanship and construction of the materials is unique. I think we need to ask the architect what his experience is in building these, who is going to do

the contract management, you know, what experience do they have in building these Bellomo projects? I don't imagine any. And it seems to me that we've had a bait and switch here...

Board Member Lew: I think you need to try to wrap up. I think you've used your three...

Mr. Harbor: I have three minutes, and I'm not there yet. But, it looks to me like there is a tactic of cost-cutting, which is going to result in unknown quality and craftsmanship with this building, and it's just too important an historic parcel to be left to chance without any additional scrutiny and confirmation of quality. And we must remember that five buildings are going to be torn down, including a Birge Clark building, for this major development. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Great, thank you, Mr. Harbor. We do allow the applicant to make comments based on the public comment period, if you have anything you want to address. I don't know if we have a time limit for this particular one. Maybe it's 10 minutes? It's 10 minutes. Okay.

Mr. Wong: Good morning. My name is Jaime Wong.

Board Member Lew: Mr. Wong, could you spell it for our transcriber, please.

Mr. Wong: [spells name] And my family is the one behind this project. First of all, I want to say that Mr. Harbor is very careful in his choice of words, saying Bellomo disavowed himself of this building. But really, we have his permission to use his design, and this is his design. And the reason why we switched architects is because when Bellomo was completing this design, he had one person working for him who was studying for her architecture license. We didn't think he had the staffing or the wherewithal to produce all the drawings that were necessary to get the building permit. That's why we went to Peter Coe, an internationally-recognized architect who has completed many buildings of this magnitude, or greater, and of this quality, or greater. Bellomo's experience is mostly local Bay Area, if not entirely. I think that the appellant - and he wants to call himself "appellant," but that appeal has left the station. City Council has already approved this project, so he is using a lot of information to try and derail what is going to be a beautiful addition to the city. If he tried to do something constructive for the city instead of standing in the way of these things, he might find that the project of this magnitude is hard enough in itself without having to have obstacles put in our way. The level of scrutiny expected for the building is much higher than expected of any other construction. It is right in the middle of downtown. There are no Birge Clark design buildings being torn down. Another piece of misinformation. It's going to be still iconic, same construction design, same construction techniques. In fact, the frontrunner for the concrete work is the same one that did the iconic building at the end of University Avenue. I just don't understand the level of animas [phonetic] that he has against this project. I am beginning to lose patience on that. Bellomo has not repudiated this building. He has just said, "I am no longer involved in it." I think that's clear, or that should be made clear. That's all I have to say.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Mr. Wong. Okay, I will close the...

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question of staff.

Board Member Lew: Sure. Let me close the public portion of the meeting and open it up for questions of the Board.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. Just to clarify for myself, it has been a while on this project. The last time it was before us, it was going to go the City Council. We did not approve the submittal, and it went to City Council. But, I don't remember seeing this design. This Option 1 is different than what we rejected?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, you are correct. When we went to Council, there were actually three options that were presented to them, and Council chose to approve what we consider Option #1. Those drawings are up on our website.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I downloaded it. That's how I got it. Basically, then, we haven't seen any of these three that the City Council picked. Or, I should say, none of those three options went through us.

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't know that you've seen this full option in its current form, but it was approved by Council and Council did have three items that they asked for the ARB to review at this time.

Board Member Gooyer: I just want to clarify. I'm not trying to be facetious, but basically, we're being asked to look at a portion of a design that we've never seen to begin with.

Mr. Petersen: In regards to your question, the three options that went before Council, the ARB did review those options. This Option 1 was the study session option, and then, the applicant came back subsequently with an Option 2, and then an Option 3 before the ARB. Those three were brought before the Council and the Council elected to go with Option 1, which was reviewed, the preliminary design reviewed by the ARB in September, I believe, of 2016, if my date is correct. I'd have to go back and check that exact date.

Board Member Gooyer: You're telling me we've seen these before? Because that doesn't look familiar to me. Okay.

Board Member Lew: Any other questions? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I think I understood that we haven't seen this, and that this came out of a City Council meeting, and that there were different options that were presented earlier, at an earlier time?

Mr. Petersen: Correct. There's been many iterations of this plan. As noted, there were three options. The Board reviewed other options. The Option 1 plan, again, was reviewed by City Council, and the changes that were made, there were some conditions or some changes that were made, namely removing a corner office, having a portion of the third floor roof, fourth floor sort of floor, extend over the office buildings. So, there were some changes that were made to the plan at the Council hearing.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And then, I just want to clarify for my Board members that this is a separate, they've given us a separate project number on this particular one. It's a minor project, so we only have two reviews of this. Normally we would have three reviews for a major project. And we are limited by the Council scope, which is the three items. And the Board has not seen this particular design because the Council made changes to the project. We have not seen, say, the corner cut-out. We have not seen that. And the Council hasn't seen it either, right? Is my understanding. Okay. Anybody want to start? Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. First of all, a couple of things here. On the title of the thing on the application, it says [reading] *Requiring Architectural Review Board approval of the proposed west elevation wall design, landscape details, and exterior building materials, color and craftsmanship.* Start with the bottom. The exterior building materials, I could see, based on the color board. The colors, I could see on the color board. But craftsmanship, seeing as though I don't even know what this design looked like before this point, I have no idea what the craftsmanship is. It has nothing to do, you know, I haven't seen a set working drawings. And I'm not saying that usually that's the case, but it's very tough for somebody to say, "I need you to judge the quality of the craftsmanship," when there's really nothing to relate it to. I mean, I need to physically see something or see a set of construction documents where I can say, yes, the detailing is adequate, or not adequate, or whatever. So, that one is sort of difficult to answer. As far as the review of the west elevation, from what I've seen on this, first of all, having not been able to put my input on the overall design of the building, but from what I do see here, putting stripes on two blank walls doesn't really enhance the quality of those walls, nor do those chevrons -- or whatever you want to call them -- relate to any other portion of the building. I mean, I can see why it's a separate project because it really doesn't relate to the rest of the building at all. I don't see any chevrons

or any three-inch-wide banding in the plaster in any other portion of the façade, so, to me, it makes no sense. I have a hard time approving this, mainly because I don't think it fits at all with the rest of the project. As far as the planters, I guess it makes sense, having a climbing vine on the back side, but again, with planting, it's kind of tough to say what that's going to look like. The problem with any kind of a living wall is it could look great, and it could look horrible. I mean, it's tough to see. Usually you're not asked to do a design approval for a climbing vine, so, again, I have a hard time doing that one also. I'm just stuck on this project.

Board Member Lew: For the Board, the reason why the landscape came back is because there wasn't a landscape architect on board originally. I think the intent was just to make sure that we got something to come back.

Board Member Gooyer: I understand why it was done.

Board Member Lew: I just want to make sure. Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Hi. I sort of struggle in a similar way, not knowing what the rest of the building is doing. At the moment, the way that it's been presented to us, it seems like this whole building is this beige and white color, and I'm struggling with why this wall is not those colors. It's a gray color. And maybe it would make sense if I knew more about the rest of the building. Even just the change in color is confusing. I also would agree that in terms of the level of detail that you are presenting here, I don't know that it's really working with the rest of the partee of the building. The building currently has, the façade, it's a little hard to say with this render how much of the façade you're keeping. Assuming you are keeping it, there are sort of expanses, and then there's these little moments of really high detail. I think maybe a similar partee -- it doesn't need to be exactly that -- would help break down the scale of that wall. The wall is still reading very massive because your moves are very massive. Your diagonals are crossing the entire mass of that wall, so I don't know...I'm sorry, I say I don't know. I do know. Your design is not breaking down that scale in a way that is beneficial, or I think, in with the intent of what I think when they talk about exterior building materials, colors and craftsmanship. It sounds like they're going for something that is more in tune with the context, and I don't think that this is doing that for you. At the moment, it's a struggle because I wish I knew more about the project so that I could kind of understand why some of these moves are being made. At the moment, it seems very out of the blue, and it also seems inappropriate for the location. So, until I have more information, I don't think I can put my support with this design.

Board Member Lew: Any comments on landscape?

Board Member Thompson: I don't, truthfully. I see where it's happening on the ground floor. It's a little hard to understand how that's going to affect the rest of the structure, so I will refrain from discussing the landscape. I appreciate that there are planters there, and that's really great, but it's hard to say how it's going to enhance the building the way that it is currently represented.

Board Member Lew: Okay, great, thank you. On this particular one, I guess I struggled with it, not seeing the full set of plans for this, just to see how the building has changed since the Council looked at it. I was actually more supportive of the pattern on the south façade. I think I agree, it's different than the context. It's not what I was thinking of in the past reviews of the building, but I think I can accept it. I think I agree with my colleagues about scale. I think there is something there, but I think I would have to see it in with the context in there, to actually see how much of it you would see from the street. On the planters, I think my general recommendation for planters is to use whatever plant looks good for a long period of time, and in many cases, that's not native plants. A couple issues with native plants. One is a lot of them have a dormant period in the summer, where they don't like any summer water. And then, the other issue is that...One, they don't look good, and two, if it's in a planter and it's getting watered every day, that they can actually develop disease and die prematurely. They're not necessarily adapted to that particular, to living in planters. That being said, I don't have any particular issues with the plants that are being proposed. With regard to the colors, I think the thing that is confusing me on the colors is

that, my recollection is that Joe Bellomo had proposed, on the third floor, I thought he had proposed, was it 3form? Like a plastic? It's a polycarbonate plastic panel up there. And he had used it on one of the houses in Downtown North. And then, I've lost track of what happened on the materials in any subsequent hearings. I'm not actually sure what's happening up on the third and fourth floors. I was wondering if you could explain that, please, Mr. Coe.

Mr. Coe: I have a model, a 3-D model here, if you want to look. That's a lot of wall facing, on the third floor, has concrete, was proposed. And then, the back wall is just stucco facing the west side. But the third floor, because it's residential, the openings on the bedrooms are just for the window and one large sliding door. The rest part of it would be concrete wall. That's the third floor, yeah. The third level, yeah. There's a lot of...

Board Member Lew: Third floor concrete, okay.

Mr. Coe: Yeah. So, because of the first and second floor, first and second floor is the retail, and the second floor will be office. We consider it as a commercial use. Upper level third floor and fourth floor is office, is way set back. But the third floor has a lot of walls just the same color as the west wall, with that grayish color. That was the same color, so it will carry the color all around.

Board Member Lew: And on the third floor, concrete?

Mr. Coe: Yes.

Board Member Lew: Is that precast or is that cast in place?

Mr. Coe: It's a cast-in-place concrete.

Board Member Lew: And it's this color.

Mr. Coe: Exactly, yeah. All the walls on the rear -- you see in the model, on the west side -- will be stucco finish. And then, there will be the same color wrap-around.

Board Member Lew: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Coe: Again, the wall facing University and also Cleveland the alley, they will all be the same color, and then, the same texture, we're trying to match to the concrete wall back there.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Thank you very much. That helps.

Mr. Coe: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Would the Board like a minute to study the model?

Board Member Lew: No, I think I understand...I think I've got it. I think I can recommend the third item, which is for the exterior building materials. I'm fine with that. I'm also fine with the landscape design detail from planting. And then, at least for me, the first item, which was the decorative wall treatment, I think other Board members are opposed to it, so I'm not opposed to revisiting that item.

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question. On some of these openings here, where you've got the dots on there. Are those, sort of exposed concrete that have the construction divots in it?

Mr. Coe: That's the tie for the concrete because they're pour-in-place concrete.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I understand that, but, I mean, you've got the little dots on here, which is fairly traditional for when you pull off the shoring, that you've got the little divots in there. Is that what these are going to have?

Ms. Wong: They are tie knots, and the building will look, the concrete will be very similar...

Board Member Gooyer: This will be exposed concrete.

Ms. Wong: ...to the building at 102 University Avenue.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Elizabeth, could you please just identify yourself for your transcript, please?

Ms. Wong: Sure. My name is Elizabeth Wong. I don't know what to call myself - the manager for the owners of the building. It's not just me. It's several people. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. I think that, you know, the west wall is a personal preference. If you have 10 people, 10 people will come up with a different design. We are just in the process, at the very late stage of getting this process, the building permits, so we have a year to make some changes to this. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Great. Thank you, Ms. Wong. Okay, so, let's bring it back to the Board. What do you want to do with the west wall? Or the south wall?

Board Member Thompson: I was going to talk about the planter on the side that I'm looking at right now. Yeah.

Board Member Lew: There's one similar on University Avenue.

Board Member Thompson: Is that right?

Board Member Lew: Um-hmm.

Board Member Thompson: Is it a similar scale in terms of how much concrete to planter to concrete?

Board Member Lew: This one might be a little taller but it's high.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. In the model it seems quite massive. It seems like a little overbearing, and if the planter were not there, that would be absolutely quite terrifying, just to have this big concrete wall on that side. I'm not sure about that particular part. Going back to the west wall, I think also the model, it's really helpful. I'm actually really glad you guys brought that. I think it still doesn't answer my question, though, about how it relates to the rest of the building. It's true that there is a subjective part, but there is also something that is appropriate. There's nothing else in this building that does that in any way, even in the partee. Some of the walls look like maybe they tilt out, the concrete walls tilt out, but I can't see how that pattern relates in any way to the building. I'm not ready to approve this project as it is right now.

Ms. Roberts: Hello. My name is Laura Roberts, I'm with Coe Architects. I would like to answer your question on how we approached the design for that back wall.

Ms. Gerhardt: I would just like to confirm that we have closed the public hearing, so, Chair, if we do want to answer, could we please relay that?

Board Member Lew: Yes. I'm interested in the design idea.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Ms. Roberts: We feel that this design not just relates to the project, it relates to the entire city of Palo Alto. We think this is an abstract representation of what a tree is, and we're trying to mimic this in a mural, and that's the only opportunity in this project where we have a big blank wall to do a mural. All around the town, you can see a lot of these features, so, we felt that this chevron -- as you're calling it -- for us, are more like branches of a tree. It was an abstract representation of that. Materials, Peter already described a little bit of what the intention is for the coloring. I just wanted to say something related to how we approach that.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: May I respond? Thank you for that. If that is the case, I would say that I think that is a really great concept, to think about trees and abstracting them on your wall. I don't know that that's the best way to go about it. In that concept itself, there are many ways to do that, and something that is more detailed and finer grain. And even...what's the word? A little bit more layering, I think, would give it that complexity that I think trees have. I think the design intent is good; I don't think you've accomplished it in this particular instance.

Board Member Lew: I'm reading a book about how humans relate to nature. One of the theories is that with trees, is that it's fractal geometry, and that we can actually see...We perceive that. We know about the complexity and the layering of the different branches, so, like with trees, you have very tiny little twigs. They are in the same geometry as the larger branches. I think Leonard DaVinci had a theory that, like, the area in the main trunk is equal to the layers, if you took a cross section of the tree up at higher levels. It would all add up. That was his theory. It's not completely true, but there is something to it. Okay. Would either of you make a recommendation, or make a motion for this? Because I think you guys are not on board with the west wall, at least, and you have some questions on the planters.

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

Board Member Lew: And would you try to elaborate on your thinking on the west wall? Just to give them guidance.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: I think you've done it, but...

Board Member Thompson: I think revision to design on the west wall, something that does have a bit more detail, more layering, something that is more true with your design intent, would, I think, make a difference. And then, also, to provide more documentation of how this looks on the street, how it relates to the context, how it relates to the rest of the building. I think that would help you guys convince us that this is appropriate. I would say the same thing with regard to the planters, especially the planter on Lane 30, and that garden wall. Just a bit more understanding of the choices of those plants and how those will behave over time and through the seasons, given that that is a big swath of wall, that if the plants were to fail, would be very large.

Board Member Gooyer: One suggestion based on that. If we also have to determine craftsmanship, we should see some either construction details, or something to see what the craftsmanship is, rather than just a couple of lines on a piece of paper.

Ms. Gerhardt: Do we want...

Board Member Lew: I think the process would be, if you're going to follow Robert's Rules of Order, maybe second, then propose an amendment.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, I'll second it, and then, that's my amendment.

Board Member Thompson: I accept that.

Board Member Lew: We have a motion to continue to a date uncertain by Board Member Thompson, second by Gooyer. All in favor? Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSES 3-0.

Ms. Wong: May I make a comment?

Board Member Lew: Yes, you are allowed, I think you're allowed a closing comment, maybe? I don't know.

Ms. Wong: Elizabeth Wong, again. This is a very late stage, you know, and we don't have the time, so I will probably ask the City to approve the project with a deferment on these three issues. I would very much like to have it, to come in as a subcommittee because these issues are things that take a lot of time, you know, instead of just a presentation. And then, we could have two or three members of the Board working with us, because we are flexible in accommodating some of these things. It is not the typical three or four ARB meetings that we are going through. As I said, I think that this project is almost ready for building permits, and as such, I would request that the City defer these three issues, and these three issues, I would very much like to work with the ARB because, you know, people have different ideas of what they would like, and we're trying to please the ARB. The other point I want to make is that the west wall will eventually be built up, the building next door will build up, and it will cover it. Any sort of layering would be probably not feasible. The other thing is that this building is built, is designed to every inch, so there are things that, you know, we like to (inaudible), but we would like to have a subcommittee to work together on this. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Ms. Wong. Jodie, did you have a comment?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I just wanted to confirm, you know, the ideas that we're speaking about today that we just made a motion on, they are somewhat important details to the building, but they are details. We will work with the applicant to see how we can somehow help them with the timing of the project. If there are parts of a building permit that we can release, or something of that nature, we will see what we can do there. But, I think the Board has made a motion to continue this to a date uncertain, and we will follow that.

Board Member Lew: And from my point of view, if we do...The Board made this motion. If the Planning Director prefers to have it go to subcommittee, I'm not opposed to that. We have two Board members who are going to be recused on this project anyway, so it's just the difference between two people and three people on the Board, reviewing anything that comes back. It seems to me it's fairly straightforward.

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Well, because she wrote a letter to the newspaper regarding this item previously, and she was not even, I think, on the Board at the time.

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't think we have any true legally-required recusals, but we do have some people who made some comments, worked on the project, things of that nature, so, out of the abundance of caution, they have recused themselves.

Board Member Lew: Okay, thank you. We will see what the Planning Director recommends on this particular project. Thank you, guys. Good luck with your project. Okay, so, I think that concludes our meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Board Member Lew: We're not going to review minutes today because we didn't receive them.

Subcommittee Items

Board Member Lew: And we don't have anything on the subcommittee items. Thank you.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements - not addressed.

Adjournment