



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: October 4, 2018
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay [arrived after roll call], Board Members Alexander Lew, Osma Thompson and Robert Gooyer.

Absent: None.

Chair Furth: Good morning. Welcome to the October 4, 2018, meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the city of Palo Alto. Would the staff please call the roll?

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: This is a time for anybody who wishes to speak to a matter not on today's agenda, but within the scope of what the ARB does, speak. I don't have any speaker cards. Is there anybody in the audience who wishes to speak at this point? Seeing none.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions or deletions. Staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. We would like to ask that the 429 University project be moved to first on the agenda. It is the third hearing for that project, so we do normally take those first. We have notified the applicants and interested parties as best we know of that time change. I do, however, have a card for 3705 El Camino. A resident would like to speak about that project and I don't know if they can stay if that is the second item.

Chair Furth: And what's the name on that?

Ms. Gerhardt: Noah?

Chair Furth: Noah, are you present?

Noah: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Could you wait through the first matter and speak at the second?

Noah: I need to go to work by about 9:00 (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Well, I would suggest that we open that hearing just for the purposes of receiving your comment. Then we will close it, and then we'll hear the rest of it later.

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3705 El Camino Real [18PLN-00136]

Chair Furth: So, with the consent of the Board...This is on 3705 El Camino. Is that right? I'm going to open that hearing for the limited purposes of hearing from Noah Fiedel. If you could pronounce your name properly and spell it for the record before you start, that would be helpful to our transcriber.

Noah Fiedel: [Spells name] Thanks very much for letting me speak and get off to work. I appreciate everyone's patience. I'm a local neighbor. I live on Wilton Ave. I'm in favor of this project. I think affordable housing is a great thing. I love having a diverse community. I have two requests for the ARB that I think are kind of mutual in terms of cost to the project. I'm not asking for any major concessions from the developer, but I think will help this project fit in better with the neighborhood, as well as future projects fit in better with the neighborhoods. The first one is regarding parking and parking studies. I've read, I believe it's Fehr & Peers studies in great detail, and I think they are really missing the critical aspect of people who park on the street. The first parking study, I'm not sure if everybody has read this in detail, attempts...

Chair Furth: Noah, I should have warned you that you have three minutes. Go ahead.

Mr. Fiedel: The first study didn't attempt to count cars on the street. The revised study interviewed seven residents of The Marc in downtown. Only seven residents in terms of attempting to count the cars on the street. If you go over one block from this development on Curtner Ave, the street is 100 percent parked every single evening. And by the methodology of this study, that street is perfectly parked with an abundance of parking. I would simply ask the DMV for the regular records, request (inaudible) for the street, for each of those vehicles parked on the street, where they are registered. It would be very easy for a study to be able to go down the street, collect a bunch of license plates, and see if those cars are registered to residents who live there. I simply ask that we're honest with ourselves about where these cars are registered. Right now, the current parking studies don't make any attempt to actually track parking demand on the street. I don't think that will change the Wilton Court project, but I think it's important for us to have a good energy between residents and developers, that we're honest with those numbers. The second one is regarding the traffic flow specifically at the 3700 Wilton Court project. The traffic study from Fehr & Peers asserted that there was roughly a net eight cars per day increase in traffic. But, what it didn't account for is that currently, 100 percent of the traffic to those two parcels enters and exits on El Camino Real. And this is moving 100 percent of that traffic flow onto Wilton Ave, which is a two-block residential street. If you took 60 residents, that's equivalent to probably 30 or 40 houses. This is going to be a 50-60 percent increase in traffic on Wilton Ave by moving all of that commercial traffic that's currently down on El Camino Real to Wilton. I don't think it would cost anything more to keep the traffic entering/exiting on El Camino Real. There is already a large curb cut there, so I think, especially as we do more and more development along El Camino Real with larger-scale, higher-density development, I think you're going to run into this over and over again. We're not going to be the only ones. I think if you can encourage high-density development to have traffic come in and out of those developments on the high-density street, that will keep the peace, and hopefully keep people in good relations and good neighbors with one another. I think those are main two comments. Please really just go for honest parking studies. I'm a scientist and engineer. If I read a study that did this in an accurate way, I'd be completely happy to take it at face value, and I do take those studies as honest, face value studies. But this study made no attempt until the most recent round to count, again, street parking, and it did that by interviewing seven people at The Marc, one of the most...

Chair Furth: Thank you. I think we have your point. I wanted to add -- and thank you very much. We really appreciate you coming. I wanted to add that Board Member Lew is on the committee that's working on the Ventura...What do you call it? Area plan? So, he will be listening to what you say with great interest...

Mr. Fiedel: Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: ...and thinking about it. Take care.

Mr. Fiedel: Appreciate it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay. I'm going to close this hearing on item 3705 and reopen it later in today's meeting. Instead, we will next go to item number...What is it? Four? Right. Which is a public hearing on 429 University Avenue.

City Official Reports - **NOT ADDRESSED**

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

Action Items

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@mgroup.us**

Chair Furth: I will not participate in this at the request of the applicant, who alleged through her attorney that I was biased with respect to this project. Board Member Baltay has also stepped down on this matter, so we will proceed with the remaining members, who fortunately provide a quorum.

[Chair Furth left the meeting.]

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, item number 4, which we will hear first, is 429 University Avenue. It's a public hearing for a quasi-judicial item. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a minor architectural review consistent with 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 the parcel. Zoning district is CD-C(G)(P), which is our Downtown Commercial District with Ground Floor and Pedestrian Shopping Overlay. Our project planner is Adam Petersen. Welcome, Adam.

Adam Petersen, Project Planner: Good morning, Chair Lew, members of the Architectural Review Board. I'm here today to present the condition compliance for 429 University Avenue. As Chair Lew noted, this project was approved by City Council on February 6, 2017. There is a condition that it come back to the ARB for evaluation of three items. The ARB heard this in August and September and continued it to this hearing, and specifically requested evaluation of four things. The first thing was the building color; the second thing was the landscaping. The Board wanted additional landscaping on the fourth floor. The third item was in regards to the west wall design, to integrate that better with the building. The last item was to provide accurate, higher-quality visual renderings. The applicant has come back in regard to the building color and they have lightened the gray, as well as the beige color. Those colors are on the materials board that has been submitted to the ARB. The top pull-out, if you notice on that materials board, is actually lighter than what's underneath. The colors that are underneath have been previously evaluated by the ARB and the top ones are, in fact, lighter. The other change that the applicant did make is that they made the colors consistent between the floors. The first two floors have the beige color, and then, the upper two floors, the third and the fourth floor, are gray in color. Previously, there were some alternating colors in between the floors, but all the floors are consistent now between the elevations. In regards to the landscaping that came back to the Board, the applicant has proposed 16 new planters on

the fourth story. These planters are located outside of a glass railing that is set back five feet from the edge of the building. The planters are anchored to the building. Those planters, the applicant gave us information on those planters this morning. There are photos that the Board has that shows those planters. The applicant has also included a new trellis at the rear of the building to better support the growing vine that faces the Lane 30 alley. And, they've also increased the size of the planters on the first floor, as well as the diameter of the planters on the third floor, just to enlarge them and make them bigger. Regarding the west wall design, the applicant has come back with an alternative proposal that includes some beige and gray banding on the stucco on the fourth floor. This mimics the color scheme that is found in the rest of the building. You can see here in the elevation. The applicant also included a note that they are retaining their original proposal of having the uplifting tree motif as well, as an option for the ARB to consider. But, again, they've come back with this proposal with gray and beige banding. Regarding the visual renderings, the applicant has come back with visual renderings. This is the rendering from University Avenue. You can see the west wall design that they have included with the beige and gray banding, which reflects the color scheme that's found in the building. Again, this is another rendering with trees and what it looks like with the trees along University Avenue. They've also included a rendering from the alley, from a birds-eye view from the Lane 30 alley, just to give a perspective of what the building would look like from that elevation. With that information, staff's recommendation is that the Board recommend approval with the conditions to the Director of Planning, Community and Environment. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Great, thank you. Now it's time for the applicant's presentation, and you'll have 10 minutes.

Laura Roberts, Coe Architects: Good morning, Board members. My name is Laura Roberts. I'm with Coe Architects. I'm here to present the 429 University Avenue project. Thank you for taking the time to review this project one more time. We really appreciate your work to provide recommendations to improve the design of the building. This is how we understand your recommendations. The first item that we have addressed is color. As Adam was expressing earlier, we have differentiated the first two floors that are the commercial and retail portion of this building with a beige color. And then, the third and fourth floor, which are recessed in the façade, with a gray color. In the materials board that we are presenting today, the colors are a little bit lighter. However, it is our preference to keep the original colors that we presented to you last time, as we understand that in an integrated concrete color - which is what we are specifying for this building - there is slag added in replacement of the cement. That would make the concrete pale with time and the tones will lighten with time. If we start with a very light color, we feel like it will lose its continuity with the other columns that are around University Avenue. The other item that we addressed was to increase the area devoted to landscape by increasing the amount of planters on the fourth floor. We have added 16 planters to the terrace, around the perimeter guard rail. We have also increased the size of the planters proposed on the first floor, third floor, and fourth floor, as well. We think these modifications, in terms of the landscape, will help to soften the edges of the building. As Adam showed earlier, we are also proposing a second option for the west wall. In this option, we are bringing the lines that are currently in the other three facades along this fourth façade, and we are using the same colors that we are using in the rest of the building. We're trying to create some depth (inaudible) instead of just being a blank wall. That's an alternative, as we'd still like to present as an option the tree motif. Finally, we have these two renders that are in front of you, showing a view from University Avenue, and another one from Lane 30. We are here with a team. Bill Brown, which is our contractor, is here to answer any questions regarding color or the mix of how that's created. We have Peter Coe and Elizabeth Wong to answer any other questions the Board might have. Please let us know. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Great, thank you. I do have one speaker card for the project, which is Michael Harbour. You will have three minutes, and then we will go back to the applicant. You will have a rebuttal period.

Michael Harbour: Please don't start the timer until I can get out of here. [Setting up presentation.] Thank you. As you know, the buildings that are...

Board Member Lew: Please lower the mic.

Mr. Harbour: Yeah. I'm Michael Harbour, and I'm one of the appellants for this project. As you know, five buildings are slated for destruction, and they are at the intersection of Kipling Street and University Avenue. Kipling Street is the most narrow street in downtown Palo Alto, and almost half that of Waverly and Bryant. This proposed mammoth four-story building really overshadows that. Of those buildings that are there, despite the applicant telling you falsely that they are not Birge Clark buildings, they are. These are listed in the PaloAltoHeritage.org website. You can go to that site. You should recall that the HRB unanimously - 5-0 - rejected this proposed project. Here are all the addresses that are Birge Clark buildings - 423, 425, 429, 433 and 437. The City Council motion requirements were a little bit gleaned over here by Adam. In addition to what they say is the western wall and design landscaping, which you need to review, they also said that you should review the building materials, colors, craftsmanship-related detailing associated with the project, and then, the motion from the City Council - and I have it in red - the purpose is to ensure - this is what the purpose of the motion was - to ensure the ARB reviews the exterior materials and colors and architectural details to improve design linkages. Please don't forget that when you are evaluating this building. That's the purpose of this. And there was also the strong recommendation that the ARB consider recessed pedestrian entries to improve the pedestrian experience of the building. That's in the motion. It has not continued to be told to you, but you can go to the motion and look at that. This project is subject to actual project matching Option 1, which is the schematic that you are looking at. I took some photos of 102 University Avenue, which shows the planters there. I want you to know that it's just impractical to think that a vine is going to go up multi stories. They've been having trouble with that vine at that site for years. Here's what's there right now, and that building has been there for years. You can see the bottom of the planter right there. It's ugly, it's corroded, it's always wet and moldy. Here's design construction materials for you. The existing building is poor. Look at all the cracking, the cement that's falling apart. It's not aging well. The design construction is poor. Those brackets that are there against the windows are inefficient, I think, and don't look well, and this is what they are proposing there. The submitted plan, which you are looking at, is not Option #1, and that is a requirement here. The applicant fired her original architect, Joe Bellomo, who has disavowed this plan publicly. And the design and landscaping is different than the original submission. Here, you see landscaping on her rendering, on the right-hand side on the fourth floor, and this is what was proposed to the ARB as Option 1 to be approved by the City. This is a mammoth four-story building. It's going from basically a 1.0 FAR to 3.0. It disregards the mandated design linkages that you are obligated to look at. The mass and size is incompatible with neighboring buildings, and it's not pedestrian friendly. The back side of that building is going to be a solid cement wall, which obscures the alleyway. There is a business there that uses that as its entry, so they have to look at this garage opening and solid wall, and the pedestrian unfriendliness is maintained. Our request is to reject this current design proposal. There has been no significant improvements since the City Council motion was passed over 20 months ago. We ask you to return to the City Council with your comments. The City Council will have the final approval on this. This is going back to the City Council. The director does not approve this project, so it's your specific recommendations which are necessary to go to the City Council. And please don't put your stamp of approval on this design. You guys are much better than this. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Mr. Harbour. Applicant, you do have a rebuttal period. Ten minutes.

Elizabeth Wong, Applicant: Good morning, members of the ARB. My name is Elizabeth Wong. I am the applicant. I have to say that this project has gone through many people and stages of the City. It started with Curtis Williams, when he was the director of planning. It went through Hilary [redacted], Amy French, Jonathan Lait, and an enormous amount of work by this staff of planning, as well as external consultants. Due Deck [phonetic], in particular, spent an enormous amount of time making sure that this building conformed with the guidelines of the codes of the City. I have with me Bill Brown. He is the founder of Bill Brown Construction, who does the very exquisite, personalized concrete that you see at 102 University. One-oh-two University has been published in this book, it's called *City by Design*, and it praises the design, the materials of the building, and I think Joseph Bellomo would have been terribly hurt, appalled, and would refute the comments that Michael Harbour made. I did not fire Joseph Bellomo. We are on very good terms. In fact, we are partners in this 102 University building. The appellant are

bringing up things that are totally irrelevant to this hearing. Bill Brown is here because I would like him to explain to you a little bit about the concrete, which is a feature of this 429 University project.

Bill Brown, Bill Brown Construction: Good morning. My name is Bill Brown and I am the owner of Bill Brown Construction Company. Our specialty is concrete work, particularly architectural work. I worked with Joe Bellomo on 102 University. My only rebuttal would be that any concrete building you look at, you can pick apart, you can find flaws, you can find things that are failing. My overall opinion of that, being in concrete for over 40 years, is that it's holding up pretty well. It's a simple design, and simplicity is basically what we are, you know, the building that we're doing at 429 incorporates a lot of the simplicity. Very clean lines. And we are expressing the concrete, which, to me, I'm someone who loves the look of freeway overpasses. But, it has a beauty to it. Just simple, pure concrete has a beauty to it. This is refined. We're using very refined form work and very clean joinery with our form work. We basically build cabinets and pour concrete into it. Regarding the window brackets. The windows on 429 University will not have those brackets. We have a completely different window system. If you want to take building to building, I think we should take relevant issues on the building. We are using two different colors of concrete, which breaks up some of the mass on the building as far as a visual mass. Also, to the point of the fading of the concrete, the sun will tend to burn out the colors over time. And you might get more burn-out on a southwest side in this area than you would on the northeast side. You're going to have a variability in the color, which I think is very attractive. Because concrete is a natural material, all the pigments are natural materials, it will be very attractive.

Board Member Lew: Thank you. Any other comments from the applicant side? Okay, we will bring it back to the Board. Let's start. Yes, Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Hi, there. Thank you for your updated package. I appreciate the renders that you provided. They were a lot more helpful for me just to understand how this project actually is in the setting. Because before, it was a little unclear how it was acting. I will say, I actually like the massing as it is right now, of the building. I think it's stepped back enough that I think, in that sense, the massing works. But, I think what's interesting that comes out in the render is that there is a disconnect in...I feel like the massing is good on its own. There's a disconnect when you see it in the context. The adjacent building's upper line is lower than the upper line of the second story of the building, so there is a clash of relationships when it comes to the adjacent structure. In terms of considering the context and the lines that are coming out of the context, I don't think that this massing actually works, even if, on its own, when you're not looking at the context, it looks fine. That's one issue I have with it. Now that I see the renders, I see that. Another thing is that there is so much detail in the adjacent structures. A simple, clean-line building maybe looks great in a highway, but in a neighborhood, that is extremely detailed. I'm just looking at this render here in Option A, and the lower one from University, that you have all this level of detail, and to just break it and have something that is reliant entirely on a single material without undulation, it's really just kind of a flat wall. It's a little bit of a stark contrast, and I think it does a bit of a disservice to the neighborhood character on its own. Neighborhood character is best improved when there is extra detail. There is a lot of pedestrian activity. You want human scale, hand scale levels of detail and this design does not have that. That's another issue I have with it, now that I can see it in context. And it's a little dangerous because I'm worried it would...If more structures take away things that have great amount of detail, replace it with stuff that has less detail, then I think that street suffers because of that. I do appreciate that the planters have been added. I did see in the plan view with the red mark-up. For some reason, the plan, you made it look like it was very lush, but then, when I see the render, it still seems a little lacking in terms of the color. But I still appreciate that more planting was added. I'll say that. Percentage is also a little hard to read in terms of...It's hard to see if the corner detail is actually clean, or no. It looks like, in terms of craftsmanship, there is...I don't know. There's a bit of, it looks like an error on the corner there. Let me see if I have any other comments.

Board Member Lew: Also, please comment on the west wall.

Board Member Thompson: Yes. For the west wall design, I still like Option A a little bit more because it has more detail than Option B. At the same time, Option A still does not integrate with the rest of the

building, so a bit of a stalemate here. Option B better integrates with the building because it is simpler, but I think that's not the point. I think the point is to have more detail. So, I would still say Option A is my preferred option. At the same time, I still do not see that the applicant has actually integrated it with the rest of the building. In terms of the color, I do see that you chose lighter colors. I noted here that you still prefer the dark colors. I think I could be swayed either way for that. There is a very subtle difference in these colors anyway, so, even though it's minimally lighter, it doesn't feel like they are actually lighter at all. Okay. I think that's all I'll say for now.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I've been with this project since it first came to us, so I've seen all kinds of iterations of it. I guess we're down to a point now where I'm supposed to make a decision, whether it's Option A or Option B, right? That's pretty much my limit at...? I can't discuss what I think of the entire project itself. I mean, the problem I have is, for quite a few iterations, I think because the building is so massive, that if you're going to try and make it, to creatively bring the perceived mass down, I think there needs to be a total disconnect between the third and fourth floor and the first and second floor, so it becomes two different entities. Of that, I guess Option A is...Not that I'm a fan of either option because I just don't, I don't think we're helping the community with this design. But, be it as it may, if I have to select one or the other, I would select Option A because it does create that separation, where bringing the beige color up to the third and fourth floor I don't think helps it. It just creates additional massing.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Robert. Okay. Board Member Thompson, I think you mentioned massing, and I think massing is not on the table today. The previous ARB recommendation was a no, and it was appealed, and the Council heard it. They are limiting us to just the materials and colors and landscape. They actually made some changes to the massing directly. Like, they required the railings to be pushed back on the fourth floor. They required one room on the corner to be moved to reduce the perceived mass of the corner. So, they made some adjustments to that, but basically, I think that the massing in general is off the table. They considered it approvable at their level. I want to say thank you for the revised packet. I think it was very useful to do, a very useful exercise to do. I think I do still prefer Option A with the trees motif on the west wall. Even though it's a little bit different than the rest of the building, I think it's sort of an inspired idea there, and I think that can work. On landscape, I do like the larger planters, and the green screen on the back wall I think will help the vines to grow taller. I do appreciate the larger planters. On the colors, I think, Board Member Thompson, you mentioned they were slightly different. I actually think they are pretty different. I think it will be more noticeable out in the field. I think the stucco colors are more different than the concrete colors. And I've done integral color, and I do understand, it's a pretty dramatic fade in the sun in the first year, oftentimes. The painted stucco, I think won't fade quite so much. My main concern, though, was with a dark gray, like a dark gray can help reduce the perceived bulk of the building, and I've seen new buildings out there that have, like, dark charcoal up on the top floor to make them recess. My main fear was that it was going to be so different than the neighboring buildings that it was really going to stand out. That's where I am on this one. I think I could go either way with the concrete color. And then, my hunch is to split the difference on the stucco. It depends on the stucco texture because you get shadow from the stucco and it darkens the perceived color, so, I could go either way on that one. I can recommend approval of this project today. I think the Board's previous decision - which is a no - still stands, and then, we're only looking at these particular items. I will leave it to my fellow Board members to try to come up with a motion.

Board Member Thompson: When you said the earlier no stands, what does that mean, exactly? You said the previous no from the ARB.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, so, I mean, the Board made a recommendation of no and the Council decided to approve the project.

Board Member Thompson: Was it on this design?

Board Member Lew: It was a previous design by Joe Bellomo. Actually, if we go back even farther, the Board approved a Ken Hayes design. That was appealed, right? I mean, this has been going on for so long, I can't remember. The Board has approved one project. It was revised by a different architect, two or three architects. This is where we are today. And the Council was -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- I think the Council was divided, it was like a 5-4 decision, with Councilmember Filseth as the deciding vote, thinking that the project was, if under threat of a lawsuit, it would barely pass. Like, it could pass going through item by item in our context-based criteria.

Board Member Thompson: What do you think, Board Member Gooyer?

Board Member Gooyer: I mean, if I have to make a decision between Option A and Option B, I can do that. I voted against this project **go-around**. I **have a** hard time now saying, yes, you know, some very minor changes were made, but not enough for me to go from a negative vote to a positive vote. It's tough for me to now approve this project because of this. So, if I'm asked to make a selection between Option A and Option B, I can do that. Asking me to approve the project, I can't do that.

Board Member Lew: I would put it that the Council has already approved the project.

Board Member Gooyer: Pardon me?

Board Member Lew: I would say that the Council has approved the project, the overall mass of the project.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Board Member Lew: And they went through the criteria...

Board Member Gooyer: So, if the project...Or, I should say, if the proposal -- whatever you want to call it -- is worded so that we're not discussing anything other than Option A or Option B, I can make a vote. Other than that, I would just vote no.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, just to confirm what Chair Lew is saying. The City Council has approved the massing of the building, the main parts of the building. We are literally just talking about three items, being the west wall, being landscaping, and being color and materials. Those are the only things that are part of this application and part of this recommendation.

Board Member Thompson: Is there detailing as part of that?

Ms. Gerhardt: It's exterior building materials, colors and craftsmanship.

Board Member Gooyer: Then you get into a situation, craftsmanship or anything like that, it's an overall inclusive...That's not just an item that you can go A or B, as far as I'm concerned. Color, you can go A or B; craftsmanship, you can't go A or B. And that makes it tougher.

Board Member Thompson: Because, I mean, one of my main issues as it relates to that is this level of scale and level of detail that, if you're looking at the image that we look at right now, there is a whole lot of detail in the context. And then, that goes away with this building. Is that our jurisdiction to comment on? Because I take a big issue with that in terms of the design.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I can have you take a look at packet page 146, the bottom of that, Condition No. 3. Those are the three items that we're discussing today.

Board Member Lew: Board Member Thompson, I would say that in previous iterations of this project, we went through items such as the recessed entries, planters, the corner, if there's a cut-out in the corner; we talked about the filigree, we talked about the Birge Clark buildings; we've talked about, there's, like, a

15-foot spacing of the Birge Clark storefronts, and this is completely different; more like 20 feet. And we talked about all of these items. We've talked about awnings, and details, and places for signs. We hashed it all out and voted, the previous Board voted against the project. But, I think that that's all...My understanding is that's all off the table today. I could say that you could still, the Board could still make a...We should vote on this. The Board can still make a recommendation for something else. It may not happen. Right? Typically, in the zoning ordinance, we're allowed to make some sort of comment, so I think if you want to suggest something, I think that's fine. Sometimes it happens after the fact, and sometimes it doesn't. I would say just make your best recommendation, but we should maybe separate that out from the three items that are in the staff report.

Board Member Gooyer: The other way to look at it is, is that we voted no as a recommendation. It went to the Council. The Council overruled us, and voted that way. I mean, we could vote no now, and it's going to go to the Council again, and they could overrule us. Right?

Board Member Lew: Staff has said that this is actually...

Board Member Gooyer: I mean, that's their prerogative.

Board Member Lew: Staff has said that this is a minor project, the planning director decision. Anybody could appeal it, and then it would go to the Council. No? Jodie, could you just clarify, too, again -- I think we did this last time -- this is a staff director-level decision. And it's appealable, of course, to the Council.

Ms. Gerhardt: Exactly.

Board Member Gooyer: So, again, basically, just to beat a dead horse, the project has been approved, basically. This is just a minor detail. It's going to be built. It's just a matter of whether it gets built sort of as per scheme A or scheme B. There's really no decision today about whether it gets built or not.

Board Member Lew: Yes, that's my understanding.

Ms. Gerhardt: That is correct.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have the concrete contractor here, though, if you have questions about craftsmanship and things like that. Give me one second.

Ms. Wong: Mr. Brown has another commitment, so if you have any questions for him, could you ask them soon? Thank you.

Board Member Lew: I don't have any questions.

Board Member Thompson: I don't have any questions.

Board Member Lew: But thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Board Member Lew, we have a list of findings that we have to make, right? We have to believe that the project has a unified and coherent design that creates an internal sense of order, preserves, respects, integrates existing natural features to the site; historic character, including historic resources. So, we are evaluating these things that relate to that finding, correct?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, just those...Right. The three items.

Board Member Thompson: The three items.

Board Member Lew: Yes. And then, everything else you can disregard.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lew: With regard to the detail, if you don't think the detail is integrated with the rest of the building, then that's a legitimate criticism.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Okay, yeah. I mean, so, I would say, in terms of the detail, I do not think it meets Finding #2. In terms of the landscaping, I do think that more could be done, but I'm satisfied with what's there. Maybe we could just go item by item, and then, decide if we believe it meets the findings, or not. Is that the best way to do it?

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, would you clarify? When you say the details, are you talking about the west wall? Or are you just saying all of the concrete?

Board Member Thompson: I think...

Board Member Lew: The [crosstalk] details.

Board Member Thompson: I think it's the concrete façade, which I think we are allowed to comment on because I think that is part of the...

Board Member Lew: It's material.

Board Member Thompson: Where is that number? Exterior building materials, color, craftsmanship-related detailing. I don't see very much craftsmanship-related detailing. I mean, I do see construction details, which are helpful, but as it relates to the context, I don't see that it meets Finding #2. In that sense, I cannot approve that part of it.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And you're okay on the planters. And then, on the west wall, you were saying you would prefer Option A, but didn't think it was integrated?

Board Member Thompson: Yes. I did prefer Option A. I did not think it was well integrated into the rest of the building.

Board Member Lew: I don't have my zoning ordinance with me. We do try to discourage blank walls. I think in our guidelines, we do try to have all the walls designed with the same level of design, with the same level of design. I think that lacks...

Board Member Thompson: Same level of detail...

Board Member Lew: I don't have the exact wording in front of me...

Board Member Thompson: ...and scale.

Board Member Lew: ...but I've seen enough times where I think, I think you could...If we're at this level and there's a threat of a lawsuit, I think we should be very specific and have the staff read the actual language of it.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: And we do have the findings on page 63. And Finding #3 talks about the high quality design and things of that nature.

Board Member Lew: But it does mention in that, on page 63, it's talking about the street building façade, which is a little different than a side property line. Okay, so, I'm hearing that you are a no on two of the three, right? Items? And Robert, you're generally in agreement?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. I mean, at this point, like I said, it's going to get built, from what I understand, so now, it's a matter of, does it get built per Option A or Option B. And at this point, you know...

Board Member Lew: Right, but we have to...I'm trying to get you to a motion here. So, it's a no?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And I think...

Ms. Wong: May I make a comment?

Board Member Lew: Can you hold a little bit? We're trying to hash this out here.

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: I want you to be specific. Let's assume this is going to the Council, and maybe a lawsuit. I want you to be very specific and pick out exact findings where it's not, where it's not meeting findings. I think Board Member Thompson, you mentioned #2, right?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Finding #2 with regard to details.

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Board Member Thompson: One-forty-two.

Board Member Gooyer: One-forty-six?

Board Member Thompson: One-forty-two.

Board Member Gooyer: One-forty-two.

Mr. Petersen: Members of the Board, the findings that begin on page 140, 141, 142, those are the old findings for the project that were done as part of the City Council's approval. The findings that are being used to consider this project begin on page 60. Those are the findings that are applicable to the project before you today.

Board Member Thompson: Finding #2 is still, it's on page 61.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: I think even Finding #3 talks about construction techniques, incorporating textures, colors and other details that are compatible with the surrounding area. I think that's another one, too.

Board Member Lew: Okay. You're saying that they are not compatible.

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Would you try to put that in a motion?

Ms. Wong: May I make a comment? These are the findings that the City officially recorded, and these are the reasons why the project is consistent with Finding #2, and why it is consistent with Finding #3. I don't think that the subject today is to go back and dispute what the project's finding is at this moment. I think the items that are in front of you is for a minor level ARB review of colors, west wall, and materials. The materials were presented to Council, so these materials were approved with the project. It is a concrete building, and it was approved, so, it is not...You know, what we're bringing in today, we didn't have the design of the western wall, we didn't have all the landscaping, but the concrete was an integral part of the approval of the project.

Board Member Lew: Yes, thank you, Elizabeth. And I think from my point of view, the concrete is, you know, it's a very (inaudible) material. It can be really anything. If you look at the Leland Stanford Junior University art museum, that's one of the first concrete buildings in California, and it's a classical one. I don't think anybody would think of it as a concrete building. They just think of it as a beautiful little building. It really could be, in my mind, the concrete could be anything. I think that the Council...With regard to style, though, I think the Council has weighed in on the overall aesthetic of the building, so I think we've crossed that bridge already.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, if I may, the findings starting on page 140, those are the findings for the main building. Those have been approved. The findings that are starting on page 60, those findings are in draft form. Those are the findings that we would appreciate your comments on.

Board Member Lew: Board members, if there's something that you disagree with, then I would actually say, like, let's just go line by line and say what you disagree with on them. And I would suggest putting in alternate language. I would say go through Finding #2. All the staff's language is all, is all there.

Ms. Gerhardt: Do we maybe need a five-minute break to read through more of this in detail?

Board Member Lew: Okay. Why don't we take a five-minute time out? It is...Do we have the time now? It's 9:25. Okay. We will reconvene at 9:30.

[The Board took a short break.]

Board Member Lew: Okay, I think we are ready to reconvene. Okay, I would like the board members to focus directly on findings, which start on page 61, and try to be very specific about where you think the project does not meet the findings.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. In Finding #2, there is a sentence in the second paragraph that says, "*This finding can be made in the affirmative in that the project provides a variety of architecture with differing visual elements.*" I think I take issue with that line because I would say there is not very much of a variety of architecture or visual elements. I would say it's a singular style, and it has...It doesn't have the detail and complexity that I think this is asking for in terms of, as it relates to the neighborhood. And then, there's also a note on page 62, at the top. The first sentence says: "*Compatible with adjacent development when apparent scale and mass is consistent...*" And I think we're not allowed to talk about mass, but we can talk about scale, because I think that is related to the details. So, I would say that would be incorrect. It is not compatible when it comes to scale. And I'll disagree with mass, as well, but I guess we're not allowed to say that. And then, in Finding #3, the first sentence...Or actually, sorry, the second sentence, add stone and brick, which I don't think exist in the project. It's just concrete, glass.

Board Member Lew: I think it's mentioning neighboring buildings.

Board Member Thompson: Ah, okay.

Board Member Lew: Buildings surrounding the site.

Board Member Thompson: That's right. They have all these things.

Board Member Lew: Right. They are the...There's terra cotta, as well.

Board Member Thompson: Yes. Okay. Sorry, I misread that. But, the details, it says in the first sentence that the details are compatible with, and I would disagree on that. Anything that you guys discovered when you were reading the finding?

Board Member Lew: Yes, Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Yes, please.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Let's assume this is going to court. Please be very, very specific.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, all right, no, fine. I think it meets Finding #1, does not meet Finding #2, does not meet Finding #3, meets Finding #4, 5 and 6.

Board Member Lew: Thank you. I think that it meets, I think it meets the findings. I would say that the one that is the weakest is #3, where it says: *"The design is of high aesthetic quality, using high quality, integrated materials and appropriate construction techniques, and incorporating textures, colors, and other details that are compatible with and enhance the surrounding area."* And I think that's the weakest. Of all the elements on the project, that's the weakest. And I think that's one that the Board has been talking about for a long time, that it just doesn't fit in with the neighborhood.

Ms. Wong: May I make a comment, Chairman Lew?

Board Member Lew: I am thinking...Can you wait until we finish...? We're in the middle of deliberating, and it's...

Ms. Wong: Yes, [crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ...and you have...

Ms. Wong: ...but I think you are deliberating the wrong item. Detail, scale, compatibility, you know, as it relates to the neighborhood. Those are not items for this hearing, at all.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair...

Board Member Lew: With respect to...

Ms. Gerhardt: ...we need to close the hearing.

Board Member Lew: Yes, I'm going to close the public hearing. The Board is very clear. We're only deliberating the three items, but we have to address those with regard to the findings. And the findings are broad for the whole project, but we're only looking at it in a narrow scope, just for the three items. Okay, so, I think yours are clear on that, on the Board. I think if we put that into a motion, I think I would vote against the motion.

MOTION

Board Member Thompson: Okay. I would say that the project...I would agree with Board Member Gooyer, that the project does not meet Finding #2 and #3. Therefore, I move that we do not approve the project...?

Board Member Lew: We're making a recommendation to the planning director.

Board Member Gooyer: So, what is it exactly that you're moving not to approve?

Board Member Thompson: Because it does not meet Finding #2 and #3.

Board Member Lew: Which is what you had said, as well.

Board Member Gooyer: Right. Okay, I'll second that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, can we speak to the three items, how the three items do not meet the findings?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. I think we said it before, so, the west wall, while it is an improvement in the design, it does not integrate well into the building, so, as it relates to Finding #3, which asks for integrated materials, construction techniques, and textures, it does not meet that finding because it does not integrate with the rest of the building. The landscaping...yeah, okay. Sorry, was there...?

Board Member Lew: Well, and then, I think it's just...and the materials.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Just in general, the materials.

Board Member Thompson: That's right. The detailing and scale of the details, there is not that level of texture that I think is necessary for University Avenue as it relates to the surrounding context. I don't know if there's anything else to add.

Board Member Gooyer: You need a second for that?

Board Member Lew: I think you've seconded.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Is that clear enough to...

Board Member Thompson: Would you like more...?

Ms. Gerhardt: Landscaping.

Board Member Lew: I think we're saying the landscaping is okay.

Board Member Thompson: I think we believe the...Finding #5 is about landscaping, and I think the landscaping as it meets the criteria.

Board Member Lew: Okay. All in favor? Opposed? I'm a nay.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 2-1.

Board Member Lew: The Board is recommending not to approve the three items for the project, and we'll see what the Planning Director has to say about that. As the dissenting vote, I would say that, my take on it is that it is passable, and as I mentioned before, I think that the weakness in the project is that the

details, to me, in my mind, aren't really enhancing the neighborhood. If you look at the block, although the balconies, the tile roofs, the generally, the warm colors, are really character-defining of the block, and it's really very distinctive and very unique. And I think that the project is not up to that level. But, I do think that you have come a long way in the project, and I do think it meets, like, a minimum level of standards, so I think it is approvable today. That's where we are on this one. Are we ready to move on to the next item?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Thank you to everybody. We will take a five-minute break to get the other Board members back in the room. We will reconvene at 9:45.

[The Board took a short break. Chair Furth and Vice Chair Baltay joined the meeting following the break.]

Chair Furth: Good morning. We're back in session. Thanks to our colleagues for dealing with former item #4.

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3705 El Camino Real [18PLN-00136]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for the Demolition of two Existing Retail Buildings and the Construction of a 100% Affordable Housing Project on the Site Located at 3703-3709 El Camino Real. The Project Consists of a Four Story Building Containing Sixty-Five Residential Units, Two Levels of Garage Parking, and Associated Site Improvements. The Applicant Also Requests a Zone Change to Apply the Affordable Housing Combining District Regulations to the Site. Zoning District: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15194 (Affordable Housing). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at Graham.Owen@CityofPaloAlto.org.**

Chair Furth: Our next item is a public hearing. It's quasi-judicial, 3705 El Camino Real, consideration of a major architectural review to allow for the demolition of two existing retail buildings and the construction of a 100% Affordable Housing Project on the site located at 3703-3709 El Camino Real, which we will now be referring to as 3705. The project consists of a four-story building containing 65 residential units, two levels of garage parking, and associated site improvements. The applicant also requests a zone change to apply the City's new Affordable Housing Combining District regulations to the site. I'm sure staff will tell us more. The present zoning district is neighborhood commercial. This project is exempt from environmental assessment from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, so what I just said to one of my colleagues about the environmental not being complete is wrong. It is complete because of this exemption. However, we are not being asked to make a recommendation today. Does anybody have any disclosures to make with respect to conversations about this project prior to this meeting? I do. I met with the chairman of the board of the applicant and another board member at the headquarters of the Palo Alto Housing Corporation within the last couple of weeks and saw the same plans that we have before us today. I did talk to them about our process, emphasizing the layer upon layer of guidelines that apply to projects on El Camino Real, and the fact that we apply a set of findings that are unique to the Architectural Review Board, many of which involve the functional operation of the site. And everything else we discussed, I believe, is in the public record, as indeed is that. Staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, good morning. Before we get started, my name is Jodie Gerhardt, I'm the manager of current planning. Just for the minutes, I wanted to state that Board Member Baltay has joined us. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Graham Owen, Project Planner: Graham Owen with the Planning staff. I've been working with the applicant on the project that is here before you today. This is...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, Graham, I can't quite hear you. You might move closer to the mic.

Mr. Owen: Oh, excuse me. I'll lean in closer. This is 3703 through 3709 El Camino Real. It is a 100 percent affordable housing project, meaning that all of the units that are going to be contained in this project -- which is a four-story building -- would be deed restricted for households that are under 80 percent of the area median income. Just as a bit of a background on this, the application that is before you today was previously reviewed by the City Council in a pre-screening application. This is a requirement for whenever you're going to be going forward with a major policy implication such as a zone change or a Comprehensive Plan land use designation. They reviewed the pre-screening application last year, and then, as a result of the pre-screening, the Council gave non-binding comments to prepare an Affordable Housing Combining District. Staff worked on that last year and the early part of this year, brought it to the Planning Commission for their consideration, and then, the City Council adopted the Affordable Housing Combining District ordinance this spring. What is it? It's a combining district, or it's an overlay zone -- as it's more commonly referred to -- that incentivizes affordable housing developments by providing more flexible development standards for projects that are proposing 100 percent affordable units that are located also within transit-served area. Also, it has to be applied on commercially-zoned sites, so, we're looking at downtown, the Cal Ave business district, as well as the El Camino Real corridor. This particular site is zoned for neighborhood commercial, currently. It also has a corresponding Comprehensive Plan land use designation of CN Neighborhood Commercial, as well. The site is about a half acre, 20,150 square feet. It is currently used as retail and services. You've got a coin shop, coin and stamps, a bridal shop, and a hair salon, as well as a grocery store. I was going to go through the floor plans, elevations, site planning, but the applicant has updated their plans since yesterday, and they have provided me with additional documentation that they are going to be providing in their own presentation. I'm going to leave this section of my presentation out so that they can pick up on things. With regards to the project, there are a number of key things that staff is looking at currently and will need to be wrapped up before we bring this project back to the Board for a recommendation for a decision. First and foremost is consistency with the various guidelines, as Chair Furth was mentioning, intended to regulate development on the El Camino Real corridor. You have the Comprehensive Plan, of course. You have the context-based design criteria, which are enabled in the zoning code. You also have the El Camino Real design guidelines from 1979, and the South El Camino design guidelines from 2002. These speak to a number of key components for redevelopment of the El Camino Real corridor, with specific guidance for residential-only projects in the South El Camino design guidelines. Generally speaking, they talk about everything from massing, and character, and transitions between, kind of a commercial frontage on El Camino Real corridor, towards the more residential neighborhoods in Ventura, and also on the other side, into Barron Park. Looking at things like street scape, lighting, the width of the sidewalks, but also looking at building articulation, looking at transitions in height, and also looking at things like setbacks. With regard to the setbacks, that's one of the key constraints right now with the project. In the plans, there are some setback issues that need to be addressed before the project can be deemed complete and ready for a decision. The applicant is continuing to work on those and refine the plans accordingly. Of particular interest to the neighborhood and Ventura has been the issues, perceived issues of parking and circulation as they relate to the project. The Affordable Housing Combining District regulations, in addition to allowing for increased heights, floor area ratio, and lot coverage -- these sorts of things that are intended to incentivize affordable housing -- we also reduced the requirement for parking down to .75 per unit. The neighborhood has, in general, expressed some concerns about that. With that, I'll leave it at that, but we are recommending that the application be continued to a date uncertain to allow the applicant to continue to refine the plans, to a point where they can deem the project complete, so that we have a point where we're ready to make a recommendation on this project.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there any questions of staff before we begin the public hearing process?

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Chair Furth: Okay. The first one that I know we have is...Can you put up the site plan and show us what the setbacks are under the existing zoning? I know we have two parcels that they propose to merge. A pretty sketchy one is all I need.

Mr. Owen: Right. It's not a unique situation, but you have a constraint, which is kind of leading to the setback issue that I referred to. Right now, the project site is two parcels, one that's at the corner, and then, one that's kind of an interior lot. The interior lot in particular would have a, kind of a standard front setback on El Camino Real. The corner lot technically has...

Chair Furth: Can you take us through the setback on the right hand side, southerly lot first? Under existing zoning. If it were a separate lot.

Mr. Owen: Yeah, so...

Chair Furth: What I'm getting at is what people could reasonably expect to see develop on these properties absent this proposal.

Mr. Owen: Sure. Yeah. I can also refer you to packet page 21, which has the zoning comparison table, kind of shows you.

Chair Furth: I think we've all read it, but it's helpful to see it.

Mr. Owen: Yeah, sure. Absolutely. In looking at the site now, when you combine the lots, the corner lot in particular, the frontage of the site is technically on Wilton Avenue because it's the narrower street frontage. El Camino Real being the longer block is a street side yard. It's somewhat of a unique situation when you combine the lots. For the interior parcel, if it were to be developed by itself, then that would be reserve. You wouldn't have a...

Chair Furth: Let's start there. I really want this on a very basic level. Take that parcel and tell me what the setbacks are on the two interior side lines, and then, the front and back.

Mr. Owen: The interior parcel, you'd have a zero-to-ten foot setback for the front.

Chair Furth: On El Camino Real.

Mr. Owen: El Camino Real. And then you'd have...With the intention of providing an eight-to-12 foot sidewalk.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Mr. Owen: For the corner lot...

Chair Furth: No, I'm still, in the side yard setbacks, on the interior lot?

Mr. Owen: Interior side lot lines for that interior lot would be zero lot line.

Chair Furth: Right, so, zero setbacks on the two sides. And what about the rear?

Mr. Owen: For the residential component. Your question was for the rear?

Chair Furth: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Owen: The rear would be 10 feet.

Chair Furth: Ten feet. Okay. Sidewalk is zero to whatever to get it sufficiently wide.

Mr. Owen: Eight to 12 foot sidewalk.

Chair Furth: Sidewalk, and zero setbacks on the interior...

Mr. Owen: Interior lot line.

Chair Furth: ...lot line, and 10 foot on the back. Okay.

Mr. Owen: You got it.

Chair Furth: And the other parcel without this one added to it?

Mr. Owen: The corner parcel is, fronts on Wilton Avenue because it's got the shorter frontage on Wilton Avenue. That would be zero-to-10, as well, and creating an eight-to-12 foot sidewalk on Wilton Avenue. On El Camino Real, you have a five-foot street side yard.

Chair Furth: From the CN District.

Mr. Owen: Setback. Yep. Exactly. The alley frontage -- and this is where the code kind of, in a way, is pretty unclear -- the zoning ordinance doesn't define what a street is. It does define what an alley is, but it doesn't define what a street is, so there is some uncertainty about whether we call it a street side yard or an interior side yard. The difference on the alleyway is, if you call it a street side yard, it's a five-foot setback. If you call it an interior lot line, then it's a 10-foot setback. If you combine the lots, the rear lot is technically the lot line that is adjacent to the retail just a little bit further down El Camino Real. If you combine the lots. Yeah. And with the combination of the lots, the frontage is on Wilton Avenue.

Chair Furth: At that point, you have the zero-to-10 to get a wider sidewalk requirement on Wilton?

Mr. Owen: Correct.

Chair Furth: You have a 10-foot setback on the part adjacent to the retail?

Mr. Owen: Correct. On the ground floor, the commercial component of a project for mixed use development is zero for the commercial component, and then, 10 for the residential portion of the project.

Chair Furth: Okay, and the alley has its complications, and El Camino Real would have...?

Mr. Owen: Five.

Chair Furth: Five.

Mr. Owen: Also with the requirement for an eight to 12-foot setback.

Chair Furth: That's an overlaying requirement from the El Camino Real...

Mr. Owen: Correct, yeah.

Chair Furth: ...guidelines.

Mr. Owen: Yep. In addition, you also have build-to requirements, so that's minimum amounts of the building frontage that need to be at each of those corresponding setbacks. In this case, it would be 33 percent on El Camino Real and 50 percent on Wilton Avenue due to the turn, and what's considered the front.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is everybody perfectly clear on this now?

Board Member Thompson: I have a question.

Chair Furth: Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. In terms of the bulk plane, in terms of the height, it was a little unclear in the packet. Could you just tell us what the height requirements are, where they are, on an elevation or in plan?

Mr. Owen: Sure. With the Affordable Housing Combining District regulations, one of the things that was modified is both height and transitional height. Overall height, when you add the overlay, the total height is 50 feet maximum. One of the things that was modified is also transitional height. Transitional height is a standard that is intended to regulate height when you're adjacent to residential districts. One thing to keep in mind is that components of the site that are within 50 feet of an RM 30 District, which is directly to the north, the limit is 35 feet, so, from the center line of the alleyway, basically. You go in 50 feet from the site and all of that zone, that buffer zone between the center line of the alleyway, and then, 50 feet into the site, the limit is 35 feet.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. And that also includes the little flange part of the site, the little L part that goes in? All that has to be 35 until 50 feet...?

Mr. Owen: You got it.

Board Member Thompson: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I'm following up on that. This is CN District. How is that different? Or is it the same?

Mr. Owen: Yeah, it is different. Under the existing zoning, so, if you don't have the Affordable Housing Combining District regulations, it's a different measurement point, and it's also a different buffer zone. It's measured, instead from the district boundary, it's measured from the property line, and instead of 50 feet, it's 150 feet into the subject property, which, with the application of that CN standard, makes the entire site subject to...virtually the entire site subject to a 35-foot [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: So, it's a 35 foot height limit under the existing...

Mr. Owen: For most of the project site.

Chair Furth: ...for all the small (inaudible).

Mr. Owen: Right.

Chair Furth: Okay. Any other questions before we hear from the applicant? Thank you. Is the applicant here? Good morning. If you could introduce yourself and spell your name.

Sheryl Klein, Board Chair, Palo Alto Housing: Good morning, board members. Sure.

Chair Furth: You have 10 minutes.

Ms. Klein: Yeah. I'm Sheryl Klein, I'm the board chair of Palo Alto Housing, and Adrienne from Pyatok Architects is going to be making the presentation. But, I thank you for your consideration this morning. We're excited about this project. In addition to providing affordable housing, 25 percent of the units in this building will be for adults with developmental disabilities. Here is Adrienne.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Adrienne, if you could spell your name, as well.

Adrienne Steichen, Pyatok Architects: Sure. [spells name] I'm a principal at Pyatok Architects. This is actually the third or fourth project that we have worked with Palo Alto Housing on here in Palo Alto. We completed Oak Court Apartments, and also the Treehouse Apartments with them, and then, have been

studying this project and another project site. You got a nice primer on the varying setbacks for this project. I want to walk you through the steps that we've gone through, briefly, on this project already. Here are the subject parcels and the existing commercial uses. The Euromart, Fashion Family Cuts, and Treasure Island Stamps & Coins, and Nouvelle Bridal. The existing conditions, you can see that the site land use, there is an existing driveway cut separating the two commercial uses, and a pedestrian crossing. As has been discussed, it's a 100 percent affordable project, up to 25 percent for adults with developmental disabilities. Certainly under 80 percent, but probably more likely in the 30 to 60 percent AMI. We've talked about the site area. Current proposal is 59 dwelling units, studios and one-bedrooms, the height varying from 35 feet to 49 feet to the top of the parapets. The structure of the roof more at 42, 43 feet. Forty-one car parking spaces; approximately 70 bike parking. And then, ground floor residential amenities for the residents. Just to locate the site in the context of various parks and transit. Site development, we've actually done a series of round tables with City staff and planning. First did a yield study at 67 units. Through study session, a second round went to 61 units and started shaping the building differently. At that point, the project still had retail in it and the Affordable Housing Combining District did not exist. We did a third round session with the round table, staff, planning staff, and varying departments, including parking, public works, utilities, and the project changed to 65 units. That design was also presented to the neighborhood in a community meeting, in which we got feedback around parking issues and density concerns. At that point, commercial was removed from the project with the anticipation of the Affordable Housing Combining District. Subsequent to that community meeting, we have continued to refine the building, including the application of Wilton as the front yard, and the interior lot line with the commercial property as the rear yard. That has reduced the project from 65 to 59 units. It remains four stories with the 41 parking spaces and meets the conditions of the FAR for both residential and non-residential uses. The ground level, there is basement parking accessed from the alley on the north side of the property. Ramps down to 24 parking stalls, a maintenance space, and then, elevator and stair access, both to street and to the lobby. It is a dead-end garage in the basement. Double-loaded aisles. On the ground floor, we are providing 17 parking stalls, including three accessible, one of them van, parking spaces. Again, with some turnaround space at the end, and also now meeting the parking aisle standards and parking stall standards under the Palo Alto Municipal Code. Lining El Camino Real as the public brought us [phonetic] frontage is management offices, the main entry for the building, a community space with community kitchen, storage and restroom for that facility, as well as a fitness space for the residents. Also here on the ground level is the bike storage access through the garage and additional storage for the project. Working with utilities, those are all coming off of Wilton, so that frontage has all of the utility services. Upstairs is an L-shaped plan with the courtyard on the north side of the project really fronting the mass of the building on the larger street frontage at El Camino Real. You see the 10-foot rear yard setback on the right of the plan. Units are 20 studios and one one-bedroom, and then, a podium courtyard. The podium courtyard would also be accessed from the alley side. There has been some conversations about the little nub at the north being a community garden, and that would then be accessed by the residents through the podium courtyard. Level 4 is where the 35-foot height setback comes into play, so we have stepped down the mass there to the north, and the remaining building is the 16 studios and one one-bedroom. One of the one-bedrooms would be an on-site manager. For the massing here, the front is a corner element that really marks the corner of Wilton Court, and then, a longer mass of the studio units sitting on top of the ground floor spaces. As you may have seen on the ground floor plans, those walls are canted and there will be some shadow play on the storefront at the ground floor. We are also studying varying storefront patterning and glazing options to provide some variety in terms of color of glazing, as well as sort of the patterning of the mullions to add some visual interest. They are set back so that there is also ample opportunity for landscaping. Here is the Wilton Avenue frontage, you can see the setback. We have drawn a line for the 35-foot height. One mistake that we have made is that we measured our 50 feet from the opposite side of the alleyway parcel and not from the centerline of the street. We think that that would push the setback line a couple of feet into the larger mass. If so, we will probably seek a waiver for that, meeting the intent of the setback from the neighboring property. The alley side elevation, ground floor parking with one garage entry, and then, you can see the step down on the mass. Colors, I would like to note, are representative of tones and not necessarily the colors that we've selected. We're still in the process of studying the colors and materials on the project. The orange is intended to be a large format tile or panel system, at least 1x2 in size, that adds some texture to that elevation. And then, the remaining materials would be

stucco. The windows are intended to also be recessed to add shadow interest to the façade. This is the interior property line elevation. With the rear yard setback, we have, probably different from what you have in your pre-packet, have been able to add windows to that façade with the setback, which is an improvement in that exterior façade. Again, the step down on the massing. We've also started to do some schematic perspective renderings to study, again, we haven't decided on colors, so we are missing the color in these renderings, but it is sort of the next step of our study. We also have identified an opportunity for public art on the exterior wall of the stair, and are interested in feedback and sort of ground-floor expression, massing, and the art opportunities on the project site. These are just, what you have in your packet is what I'm calling the previous proposal, in these comparisons. The perspective comparison on El Camino, looking to the southeast, and then, again, on El Camino, looking to the west, another perspective study that we know that the resident community has asked for, Ventura neighborhoods has asked for, is a view from Wilton looking south. That is one of the next studies that we would like to do. This is the elevational comparison between what you have in your packet and where we currently stand. Previous was El Camino. This is Wilton. And the alley, relatively unchanged. One of the major differences is that we don't need the roof deck that is in the proposal document that you have to meet our open space requirements. We have removed that in this next study. I think that's it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: You're done? Okay. Thank you. Do we have any speaker cards? Great. I have five of them. I have six. Got it.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, just as a reminder, we did have one speaker earlier this morning. Okay. Wonderful. That had some concerns about parking and traffic.

Chair Furth: Yes, we heard earlier from Noah Fiedel, who was concerned about methodology we use to do parking and transportation studies. The first speaker, Todd Lewis, to be followed by Nicole Ventre. And you will each have three minutes, and when you speak, if you could start by giving us your name and spelling it for our transcriber, we would appreciate it.

Todd Lewis: [Introduces self and spells name.] I own the two four-plex's across the street on Wilton, next to the Hong Kong restaurant. I have 17 residents there. Most of the units have two cars. We provide one parking space per unit at our building. We have six additional cars that need to park. They come home from work, they can't find a place to park because of the impact of the residents on Wilton, but more importantly, the Hong Kong restaurant, their employees and their patrons. It's a very successful restaurant. Wilton is a very narrow, narrow street. There's a lot of impact there, and we're going to put a 60 or 59-unit, four-story apartment building on the corner of Wilton and El Camino. Very impactful, very dense for that site. I need to say this for my own sake. I appreciate the effort to increase affordable housing in Palo Alto. I absolutely am for that. I have a disabled brother-in-law who lives in a group home. I'm for the disabled community having some more housing. It's now 15 units, or 14 units, so that's a change that's not in the packet. It says 30 units of developmentally disabled housing; it's now to 14, 25 percent of the total 59. I just want to make that point. Parking is a gigantic issue. Traffic is a gigantic issue. What nobody realizes is the level of emotion in the community at the community meeting, was a, you know, almost a riot. This is the neighbors on Wilton and the Ventura neighborhood, really disturbed and worried about their parking. And it's the opposite of downtown Palo Alto. It's not something where workers come in and park in the community, and then, they leave and the residents come back and park. This is people coming home from work and looking for a place to park on Wilton. Very, very difficult parking situation. So, it bothers me that this project is pushing the lower limits of parking. I think the last time I looked, it was 41 parking spaces for 65 units. Granted, some of those developmentally disabled people -- probably most of them -- will not be driving, but also, the studio units might have two people, because people get married, people have roommates, so this is more pressure on the parking. That's a very important issue. The CN zoning district, which is what El Camino Real has been a part of, had called for a 1.0 FAR until the affordable housing overlay. Now, it's two. That's twice as much density than was allowed before. The height limit has gone from 35 feet to 50 feet along El Camino. Now, the project is at 49 feet, stepping down to 35 feet on the setback. The setbacks are...I hope you all go out and visit that site. The alley is very narrow. One of the residents in the little apartment building right next to it is here,

and will speak, but it's a very, very, very tight little alley. So, that setback issue that you're going to be talking about is very important. It's very impactful to the massing...

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Fiedel [sic], you've hit your three minutes.

Mr. Lewis: Yeah, my name is Mr. Lewis.

Chair Furth: Sorry.

Mr. Lewis: Yeah.

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon. I'm usually one behind.

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Lewis: For future speakers, if someone is in the middle of a sentence, just wait for the period. Please.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I forgot to confirm that everybody has been to visit the site at least once.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Thompson: I have not been in the last two weeks, but I know the area pretty well.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, we do visit the site. We're not using the buzzer today, so when the light starts flashing red, that's when the three minutes actually ends. Nicole Ventre. I'm sorry I'm mispronouncing Miss Ventre. To be followed by Jeff Levinsky.

Nicole Ventre: Thank you. Hi, good morning. [Introduces self and spells name.] I am one of the tenants of the adjacent property on Wilton, on the other side. I would love to, if I can pull up the slide that showed my very, very, very tiny apartment building on the back side of the alleyway, between these two buildings. I'm also the manager of that property, from 453 to 467 Wilton Avenue. My biggest concern -- as Todd has already alluded to -- is the distance of that alleyway, is somewhat about 20 feet from my building. My apartment itself, my bedroom, my bathroom, as well as the bedroom and bathroom of three of the tenants on that one building, are about four feet of that 20 feet. We have a push-back on our property. We are very close to the edge of that alleyway, maybe four feet. And you're already in the 20-foot alleyway, not at all accommodating for two-way traffic. My parking spot is actually on the alleyway and is so tight that I have to hug the right side of the alley to make a left into my parking spot, which is on the alleyway, that now, I will have to navigate two-way traffic within 20 feet of my bedroom, and this massive building. That is absolutely unacceptable. Not to mention, this alleyway is used for trash and deliveries. Our mailman parks on here because there is no other parking on Wilton Avenue for him to deliver his mail. When my recycle, my compost and my trash men come, they have to pull in, block all of my parking, my spot as well as three of my tenants, as well as the entrance to the other four parking spots located more centrally inside of our building. He blocks every single person from getting in or out. And he needs to back out of that alleyway because there is no room to turn around. Not to mention, when I pull out of my parking spot, I have to do this to get out because the spot is so tight, so I can actually turn down the alley. And we're going to have two-way traffic with, the most recent I'm heard is 41 spaces, of people getting in and out of the alleyway. My other issue is this is not enough. I know you guys have heard plenty about parking. This is a humongous issue, that we do not have enough parking for every tenant. Not to mention in their proposal, half of that parking was for staff, and for, I believe I saw for the storefronts down below. Which I'm not sure that's even relevant any more. The other issue is sunlight. My building is two stories tall, and this is absolutely going to cast a humongous afternoon sun

shadow on my entire property. No sunlight for us, which is unfair. The only other comment I'll make -- I know I'm running out of time -- is, of course, the dangerous intersection. It is very congested, very narrow, as you've heard before. I'm concerned about the noise. There's a noise even on this property for people to hang out and come together. It overlooks my building, overlooks my bedroom window. Lastly, I have also great concerns about the smoking, and where pet relief areas will be.

Chair Furth: Mr. Levinsky, to be followed by Robert Moss.

Jeff Levinsky: Good morning, Board members. [Introduces self and spells name.] I've lived on this block for 15 years or so, and I agree with the previous speakers about the parking problems. We heard today that it would be, up to 25 percent of the units would be for people with developmental disabilities, but the parking has been designed as if all that 25 percent was going to be met. I think it's important that it not be "up to," but it be 25 percent, if that's how the parking reductions are going to be dealt with. There's another problem with parking reduction. Our City gives away parking exemptions right and left, all over town. What that does is reduces the number of parking spaces that are accessible because the number of parking spaces that are accessible is based on a table that so many, if you have so many regular spaces, some of those have to be accessible. For this building, if it were using the regular City code, it would be required to have four accessible spaces. Instead, it's only being asked to have two. My question is, where do the people who need accessible parking spaces go? If they have to park way down the street, that's not accessible at all. If this building is really trying to serve its residents, some of whom may be there for the rest of their lives because this is going to be a good deal if you get in, then I think it needs to rethink completely how it deals with the needs of actual residents in terms of accessible parking. I'd like to bring up another issue, and that is, that I think matters to lots of people in this town: What are we doing to El Camino? When you look at all the different projects there are and are going up on El Camino -- you're going to hear another one later this morning -- it's becoming a canyon. It's becoming a row-after-a-row of large, and I must say unimaginative buildings. You know, you look at the renderings and you go, "Do I really want to see a street full of that?" This is an opportunity, I think, for the ARB to look, you know, take a broader vision of what's going on and try to find ideas that will help create a more livable and viewable city. Anyone who has driven through San Antonio, on San Antonio and seen what's happened near San Antonio Center knows how bad things can look with that growth. There was a question about the parapet. The parapet in earlier drawings was eight feet high, and I'm wondering if that could be reduced or slanted or something, so as to make the building look less massive in that regard. One other thing, the architect mentioned Oak Court. If you contrast the look of Oak Court with this building -- and it's night and day -- and it would be really nice if we could pick up some of the styling and human scale of that kind of design when we do these buildings. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Bob Moss, to be followed by Gary Mahany.

Robert Moss: Thank you, Chairman Further, commissioners. Speaking as one of the people who created the CN zone and the El Camino design guidelines, I'd like to emphasize that this project grossly violates both of those. First of all, the CN zone requires that buildings be no more than 30 or 35 feet tall and that they be consistent with nearby residential properties. This is not. Second, it requires that the ground floor only be used for retail, not for storage of bikes or for a management office. Furthermore, as you mentioned in an earlier discussion this morning, it's essential that buildings' mass and scale be consistent with nearby properties. This violates that principle. There are no buildings of this mass or height on either side of El Camino within half a mile of this site, so this project would be a really bad approval. Furthermore, because of the lack of parking -- as you've already heard from the previous speakers -- it's going to create a real overflow problem, and it's going to create traffic problems as people drive around the neighborhood, trying to find where they can hold their car. At the very least, the building should be reduced by at least one floor, which will reduce some of the traffic and parking impacts. It should be scaled down in a mass that you look at from the front. And, it should have more landscaping along El Camino. Right now, the landscaping is trivial, and there have been basic principles for years that when new buildings are built along El Camino, the landscaping be upgraded. This fails that project requirement. Also, it would be good if the building, the structure, the façade of the building, not be uniform and a single color and a single line. You have some kind of change in the color in the structure as you go along,

so it doesn't have a big, massive effect. It has more of a structural effect, which has some changes along it. I think this project needs to go back for an awful lot more work, and I certainly hope you won't approve it as it's being proposed today because it has a lot of problems, and it has a lot of inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan, CN zoning, and the El Camino design guidelines. It's not ready for work.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Moss. Gary Mahany.

Gary Mahany: Hello. [Introduces self and spells name.] I live over on Madero Avenue, right by this facility. People have been hit crossing El Camino there at Wilton because there is a little bit of a traffic islands right in that area. The traffic is a complex mix of people making right and left turns out of Barron Park and off of Wilton. If we're putting 50 more units there, it's going to have to have some kind of pedestrian right-of-way issues crossing El Camino. We would like to see a setback on Wilton Avenue that's equivalent to residential area, so as not to crowd that intersection that's already crowded there. People park right along El Camino Real, all along there, so if you're trying to make a right or a left turn onto El Camino -- which personally I don't do, but many other people do -- you can't see. You have to ease out, ease out, keep pushing out until you can see down El Camino, around somebody's SUV that's parked right on the corner. There needs to be some traffic control and mitigation with the traffic in that area. I would like to echo what this man just said. There's a bunch of developments happening and the City of Palo Alto seems to like to look at one thing at a time and not the overall consequence of adding a lot more people along that area. Oh, and by the way, the purported fine transit is a fiction. There isn't adequate, good transit up and down El Camino Real with the buses, certainly no transit east and west. Thank you, for now.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Mahany. Does anybody else wish to speak? The applicant is entitled to respond. That's another 10 minutes.

Ms. Klein: I'd like to speak to why we are proposing 59 units in this building. In order for us to get our funding from tax credits and other sources, we need to maximize our building on the property. That's why we are trying to put as many units in as possible. It takes a long time to get these projects through the whole planning entitlement cycle, and that adds to our cost for the projects. When we find a site, we try and really maximize what's there. That's what we've tried to do on this project. We don't have a lot of flexibility in our funding sources to cut down the number of units. The project isn't feasible if we just have 20 units on the site. We can't make our funding work. We're trying to balance all these different constituents. It's like putting pieces of a puzzle together. Go ahead and...yeah.

Ms. Steichen: I wanted to address the parking and transportation concerns. We have heard from residents and are listening. We have been waiting for this meeting before we have a subsequent follow-up meeting with CalTran, to speak to them about their right-of-way access. There is that existing driveway, and it's been asked of us if we would consider having our parking enter on El Camino. I think that's a subject that CalTran is going to have a lot of thoughts and feelings about, so we need to have that subsequent meeting with them. I think that we could also request our transportation study to analyze parking entry and exit on El Camino. We're willing to do that as part of understanding better the constraints of the project. I would also like to note, however, that the parking review by City staff has recommended that we use the alley as our parking entrance, so while we are willing to investigate that entrance on El Camino, we also are listening to City staff recommendations at the same time. As far as setbacks, we are currently meeting the 50 percent build-to line on Wilton as our front and are using the front yard setback to improve the sidewalk width along our frontage on Wilton. We are likewise doing the same on El Camino and meeting the build-to minimums, as well as providing the eight to 12 foot sidewalk on El Camino, as well. The new plan also addresses the rear yard setback on the interior property line, and substantially meets the 35-foot setback, but I think that's also something we could discuss. I'm happy to take questions, further.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions of the applicant? Apparently, people have a bunch of questions. I don't know if you prefer to stand or sit while they raise them.

Vice Chair Baltay: With the Chair's permission, I have questions of some of the speakers, actually. Is that okay?

Chair Furth: I have no objection.

Vice Chair Baltay: If I could ask Ms. Ventee [sic]...

Chair Furth: Ventre.

Vice Chair Baltay: Ventre, I'm sorry. I have two questions for you. Thank you for coming out to speak. When I was out, it wasn't clear to me, you say you live in the building on the other side of the alley to this. Which rooms in your building are facing the alley, facing this new project? Are they bathrooms, or...? What type of spaces are inside?

Ms. Ventre: Bedrooms and bathrooms. And one living room for the bottom, a living room and a bedroom for the top. All of our bathrooms. And on the very front corner of the building, if the alleyway is here, this is my bedroom. This is the bedroom of another tenant. So, literally, headlights will be just turning into our...

Vice Chair Baltay: Those two bedrooms both face across the alley to the new building.

Ms. Ventre: No, they face Wilton, but whenever anybody turns in, we are so close to the edge that every headlight goes directly into our bedroom.

Vice Chair Baltay: The bedroom has windows on two sides, then?

Ms. Ventre: Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is that the case on all of the bedrooms there?

Ms. Ventre: One way or the other, yes. Not to mention, we also have a secure...We have a lot of petty crimes and things that happen on that property because the alleyway actually does dead end. We have installed security cameras, we've installed light-activated, activated lights by motion, light up our house like a jetway. Luckily, I only have 10 tenants, so we have 10 cars, but that's 10. And my tenants are working every day. They don't spend all nights of the day going in and out.

Chair Furth: I just had a follow-up. I'm trying to...I should take pictures because my visual...

Ms. Ventre: I encourage you to go out to the site and see... [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Oh, I've been to the site. Many times. I'm just trying to remember. On the first building as we enter the alley, that's the building, that's your building, right? To my left as I drive into the alley.

Ms. Ventre: Right.

Chair Furth: And on the ground floor, are there any windows, or are the up on the higher levels?

Ms. Ventre: No. We all have windows.

Chair Furth: There's windows all along.

Ms. Ventre: Yeah. We have a small piece that might go about...

Chair Furth: That's what I couldn't see.

Ms. Ventre: ...about here.

Chair Furth: Right.

Ms. Ventre: But when you're standing in the apartment, you can still see...I can see over the fence. I can see the Hong Kong Restaurant from my bathroom. I can see the mountains, I can see the trees.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: The other question I had relates to parking, and with the indulgence of the Chair, can you give me a guess, how many bedrooms do you have, and how many parking places do you have in your building? I'm just trying to get a sense of the actual use. How many parking stalls does your building...?

Ms. Ventre: I have eight, but I...

Vice Chair Baltay: Eight parking spaces.

Ms. Ventre: ...I have eight, eight units, eight spots, 10 tenants. We have an open courtyard area that's properly located in our building...

Vice Chair Baltay: I need to go quick or I'm going to lose my opportunity to ask your questions. Eight spaces, eight units, 10 tenants?

Ms. Ventre: Right. And those extra two cars have to park in non-designated parking spots on our property because there is no more parking on the street.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. If I could ask Mr. Lewis, as well. Did I get your name right, please?

Board Member Thompson: Here's a Google map image of the property.

Chair Furth: We're circulating a photograph of your building...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: Four-eight-six (inaudible)?

Mr. Lewis: Yeah, that's me. Yeah. Two four-plexes side by side.

Vice Chair Baltay: Mr. Lewis, if I could. Thank you for coming out. Appreciate your feedback. I'm trying to understand the parking situation again. You said your building has 17 units...

Mr. Lewis: Nope. Seventeen residents.

Vice Chair Baltay: Seventeen residents.

Mr. Lewis: Yeah. Eight units.

Vice Chair Baltay: Eight units. And how many bedrooms are there in each unit?

Mr. Lewis: One bedroom in each unit, just like Nicole's.

Vice Chair Baltay: One bedroom in each unit.

Mr. Lewis: Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: And again, how many units?

Mr. Lewis: Eight.

Vice Chair Baltay: Eight units. And how many parking places do you provide for those residents?

Mr. Lewis: Eight.

Vice Chair Baltay: Eight, so it's eight and eight. And that's not adequate as it is, you're saying?

Mr. Lewis: No. We have 14 automobiles. Six of the units have two married couples that both work.

Vice Chair Baltay: Those are one-bedroom apartments whose tenants have two cars.

Mr. Lewis: Yeah, and then, two of the units have young children, single young children.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much for that.

Mr. Lewis: I want to make one comment as long as I'm here. I just didn't get a chance to say that I would really love to see this come down one story, one full story, in every way. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: All right, any other questions of the applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I do, again. Or, am I taking up too much time?

Chair Furth: Feel free. It's an important project.

Vice Chair Baltay: For the applicant, please. You had shown several studies of this project. Is it possible to see that first inch, the one where you...? I saw something about parking lifts or something in that. I wanted to go back and just ask about that. The very first project study you showed.

Ms. Steichen: With the courtyard?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. On my left here.

Ms. Steichen: Yeah. Yeah. This was, we have always shown the parking entrance on the alleyway, but this was assuming not a ramp down to a lower level, but just doing parking stackers. They are a significant up front cost and they do contribute to the initial ask that developers go for, from the state tax credit allocation committee, etc., etc. So, we have moved away from stackers on most of our affordable projects.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can you elaborate on that? Because that's something that many developers in Palo Alto take advantage of. Is that a feasibility for your project?

Ms. Steichen: I think that's actually something that Palo Alto would have to comment on in terms of the construction fees, the cost feasibility. I know that they are doing another construction cost analysis on the latest plan and we would have to ask them if they are...

Vice Chair Baltay: Can you address that question?

Ms. Klein: I won't have an answer for that question. I know it's very expensive. I don't have an answer for that question.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, you need to be close to the mic...

Ms. Klein: Oh, sorry.

Chair Furth: ...so the transcriptionist can pick you up.

Ms. Klein: I don't have an answer. I know it's very expensive. I don't think we can afford to do it, but I don't have a definitive answer.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thanks. Go ahead, Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. I had a question, I think this is probably for Palo Alto Housing. I just had a question about the program. I saw studios and one-beds. I'm just wondering why not two beds. There's not really an opportunity to have families with just a one-bed, so I was just curious about that choice, and if that's something that is up for discussion.

Ms. Klein: When we initially thought about this project, I'm sure that it was studied, what financially we could afford to build there. This is the most, sort of the best use of our resources, is to have studios and to have a few one-bedrooms.

Board Member Thompson: And the efficiency or...I don't want to say "efficiency," but, of course, the unit number would go down if you did two bedrooms.

Ms. Klein: Right.

Board Member Thompson: Is that how you are counting efficiency, by units? Or is it just square footage of livable space? Because the square footage would stay the same, potentially.

Ms. Klein: Right. I'm counting by units.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Ms. Steichen: I can add to that. The Affordable Housing Combining District counts parking per bedroom, so, two studios and a two-bedroom, if they are of equivalent square footage -- two studios equals one two-bedroom -- the parking count would not change. If that tracks.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: Anything else, Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Those are all my questions of the applicant.

Chair Furth: Robert? Any questions?

Board Member Gooyer: Nope.

Chair Furth: Alex? Let me check my notes here. Oh, one set of plans shows one accessible parking space, but did you say three accessible parking spaces including a van space when you made your presentation today?

Ms. Steichen: Yes. They are all contained on the Level 1 plan. You can see them, they are near the community space that fronts El Camino. Two accessible and one van accessible.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And the community space, could you tell me more about the anticipated use of that space?

Ms. Steichen: Well, I think Palo Alto should answer that, but we've actually, in many of our community projects, our non-profit, affordable projects, this is a place where the resident can gather for community meetings, for their resident meetings. It's a place where programming takes place. There are opportunities, like at Tree House, there are craft events, and so forth.

Chair Furth: This is a communal space for people resident in the building.

Ms. Steichen: Correct. But I would believe that if there was a need for the neighborhood to rent it or borrow it for an afternoon, that would be something that folks [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Thank you. Let the record show that Palo Alto Housing Corporation is nodding. To refer to them as "Palo Alto" is very confusing here. We've got so many Palo Alto actors.

Ms. Steichen: Sorry. Palo Alto Housing.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I do have one question. You mentioned that, I think you said there could be up to 25 percent special needs?

Ms. Steichen: Mm-hmm.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Ms. Steichen: For the developmentally disabled population.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you.

Ms. Klein: Can I just add one more thing about that?

Chair Furth: Yes.

Ms. Klein: Those are very high-functioning special needs adults and they generally have jobs, and they use public transport to get to and from those jobs. They just don't drive themselves. And they don't need very many services or people coming onto the site to check on them. They are pretty self-sufficient.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions before we start deliberating? Alex, if you could start us.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. The drawings were fairly clear and easy to read. I think that for the next meeting on this project, I think that there is some critical stuff that we need, which is the contextual site plan and street elevations to see how the building fits into the neighborhood. At the moment, there's no way, there's nothing in the drawings to see how this fits in. I mean, I did go to the site and looked and sort of (inaudible) things, and I have a fairly good sense for that. But really, it does need to be...You do have to show that in the drawings as part of our view, and it's required in part of our findings, so we really do need that information. On the building design, I'm generally okay with the organization of it. It seems to be well resolved. Issues that I have concerns with is...let's see. You got the...Is it the fourth floor roof deck? Does that need to have its own exit staircase? I've seen it both ways. Yeah, you don't have to answer it today.

Ms. Steichen: [off microphone, inaudible]

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I was just commenting (inaudible). And I think it's desirable to have...Generally, I think it's desirable to have open space. When I was at the site, I was concerned about loss of privacy to the neighbors, and also, that your roof terraces on the shady side of the building, which seems less desirable in a way. But, given all the noise of traffic on El Camino, it does seem to have advantages of putting it on the quieter side of the building. Also, on the alley, I was concerned about the back-up space for the neighbors. We do have projects in town that only have, like, 25-foot-wide driveways, and we do get complaints about those. Also, you've got utility poles and lights by the alley there, so, if those are being removed, I do think we need some sort of replacement for that. On El Camino with regards to the street scape and design guidelines, my take on it was to maybe try to emphasize the corner more than what you're doing. I think what you've shown so far is a start, but I would encourage you to try to make more differentiation at the corner. I would also encourage you to try to make the entrance even more, to highlight the entrance even more than it is. It's not that different than the rest of the storefront facades. To my eye, the first floor is too low. Make that too short. I make that comment to a lot of projects, and I understand everybody is trying to work within the height limit, but I'm just saying, just design-wise, we would ideally like...I would like that to be taller. I realize that that probably won't happen on this particular project. If you go to...I've shared with the Board photos of mixed-use projects in Berkeley that are working. They're at, like, 55 feet high with tall, 20-foot-high ground floors. And they get the height limit by including affordable housing in the project. But, having the tall floor is really much more desirable. In this particular case, the neighboring buildings on El Camino have fairly low storefront heights, so I actually think you will be able to meet the contextual findings on this one, on this particular site. I did see the oak tree in the back of the property. I was interested in how you can incorporate that back area into the project to try to make something desirable there. On the outdoor space, I do see that the overlay zone doesn't really require any. I do want to try to encourage you to do as much as possible with regards to providing privacy to the neighbors. I think that's really important. Other people on the council have mentioned that's very desirable. You're trying to foster social activity, healthy lifestyles. We've got some new projects in the works here where they've got, like succulent gardens and edible vegetable gardens up on the first-floor roof. I think that's actually all very desirable, and I do want to encourage you to try to do that as much as feasible. Also, in the next packet, I think we do need to see the lighting, especially if you do have the roof gardens. And then, we did have Mr. Fiedel asking about parking. The Board hasn't seen any parking studies in this initial study, so I'm not going to comment on that yet. I think we do understand that the Ventura neighborhood has lots of parking concerns, and I do bike through there almost every day, and I do understand that there are parking issues there. I do understand there's a retail preservation, potentially retail preservation issue, so we'll see where that goes. Also, I think it would be useful for Ms. Ventre's comments, maybe do a sun study. We have done that before on other projects. It's fairly easy to do in a 3D model, just showing us, maybe like the best-case, maybe summer solstice, and the worst case, winter solstice, and then, the spring and fall. Just get an idea of how the shadows will work on the particular project. That's where I am. I'm generally in support of the project. One last comment on the El Camino things, guidelines, is that I think it was Mr. Levinsky mentioned the unimaginative buildings on El Camino and in the vicinity. We on the Board have been hashing it out, too. We've been talking about that, too. I think that is an issue. I do like the Tree House project, where really the art piece was front and center on the main building. We do have our public art requirement as part of the project. That may help. Or, just having architectural filigree, extra details. I used to work on affordable housing projects. I know that usually a lot of those things get cut from the budget because things are so tight. But, whatever you can, I do want to encourage you to try to make it a really unique and distinctive project.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I have to agree with a lot of the stuff that my fellow board member indicated. I was happy to hear that on one of the elevations -- for instance, the east elevation -- I was really worried about not having a window. Then, I guess it turns out that your latest version does have windows. That makes me feel a lot better. There is a certain...When you try and make a project pencil out, especially a project like this, you have to put a lot of units in there, which does make it a tight fit. The problem with that is, as we mentioned -- we've struggled with this -- it does become another big shoebox with a flat roof, which it is getting to be every building that gets built on El Camino is turning out

to be a flat-roof shoebox. And I think one of the speakers used the term "unimaginative buildings," and that is a real challenge. I do like, you got a little bit creative with, if nothing else, you know, the window placement. I like that. There's not a whole lot you can do, but at least you gave it a little something. And I think a lot of this is going to make the difference of what the materials are, that sort of thing. I do agree, again, with my board member, that I think the bottom floor should be higher. You've got a 10-foot floor-to-floor, and a lot of that depends on, obviously, what framing you're using. I'm guessing you're using a wood frame. That makes it a little bit more difficult, but, you know, I'd like to see, maybe the upper floors a little tighter. Maybe 9 1/2. That gives you some flexibility of being able to make that ground floor a little higher. I also agree that the, the South El Camino design guidelines make much more, or indicate that they want much more of a statement for the entry. And if you drive by this building, you'd have a hard time realizing where the front door is. And because you do mention that a lot of the people will be using the bus or are pedestrians, I think that probably wouldn't hurt. If it's one of these things where nobody is ever going to use the front door, then I can see it. But here, theoretically, you're also indicating that they will, so I think it's definitely necessary that that needs to be enhanced. Let's see...I do have a bit of a concern. That's why I asked about the special needs. You know, with three accessible parking spaces, I think that's a bit tight. Now, I understand, especially when you start talking about van-accessible parking spaces, that sucks a whole lot of square footage. At this point, I don't know. It's a tough situation. Again...And I agree that the lift system is expensive. I doubt, because you're probably on a fairly tight budget, but it might be one of these things that, if it becomes a more, you know, workable solution, you may need...I'm not saying everything needs to have those, but maybe, you know, pick up a couple of them to give you a few more accessible parking spaces, I think would be helpful. Other than that, I think the layout works well for what you have to work with. The stepping down, I understand, you know, the units in the back, whenever something like this gets built nearby, it's tough to handle. The other way to look at it, it becomes a heck of a barrier for noise from El Camino. That's sort of the positive aspect of this. I think that's it for the moment.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Hi, there. Thank you so much for your presentation. I'll try not to repeat. I'll just try to summarize the impressions I have on this project. I'm going to jump straight around the, um, straight to the "unimaginative" comment Mr. Levinsky had. I mean, I work in multifamily housing, as well, and I understand yield studies, I understand efficiency, and it is sort of a funny crux when you're battling these two things. And at the end of the day, you really want something amazing, right? You don't want something that's just like everything else. And I think this project had a danger, I think, to fall into that, but I think there's some new comments going around. Something that could help is the southern façade, I see you have shading on just the top set of windows. Why not do more shading? Shading is a great way of adding interest to the façade, adding relief, adding depth and interest. Sometimes a really awful project can be made all the better by really good shading. I would just encourage you to use that as a tool more. In terms of the tile and stone stucco, you know, relationship that you're exploring, it would be nice to sort of see what else is out there that has a bit more texture, a bit more relief, a material that's not just a material that you're relying on as a blanket, but something that you can use as part of the architecture to create more detail on this structure. And part of that is just developing a really strong design concept. That could just sell what you're trying to do. Your concept, I didn't really hear any conversation about concept. I know that's not really the point about this, but, at the same time, it will help us love your project more if you give us something that you're holding onto in terms of concept, whether it's light filtering, or audio visual things. Looking at the floor plan, I had a similar impression that, yes, the courtyard is on the shady side, so it's going to be a cold courtyard. No one's really going to want to be there. It would be really great if the courtyard was on the south side, but then you have this height issue. I would encourage you, while you're still playing with massing, that...See what you can do to make that courtyard a little bit better in terms of usability. And even on the ground floor, there's program along El Camino that would be nice to look at, like the kitchen and the fitness center. Having the management office on the corner is maybe not the best use of the corner. Maybe some of that exciting program could be moved to the corner. I would encourage a little bit more shuffling in terms of what the important parts are on the street, and then, use the program that you have right now to address those important parts. East elevation, I see you improved your east elevation. I also had a similar note about the no windows on

that. And, I guess, going back to the massing in terms of the roof line, it would be nice to see something that's sort of...it could maximize. I don't know how realistic mezzanines are on the top floor, but there is, you know, El Camino has a base, middle and top thing that is with the guidelines, and making your top story a little bit more elongated. If you could use a mezzanine, or something. I don't know. I feel like that's also a planning thing that you might need to work out. That might give you a chance to enhance your efficiency. Get more square footage, potentially, but also just make that top part different from everything else, just to kind of give the cadence that is part of the design guidelines. That's all I have for now.

Chair Furth: I don't know about you, but I'm down to three items so far. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you to my fellow Board members because they covered many of the points I was about to list. I think they are saying things that I agree with strongly, so I'll just go very quickly through those things. First, I'd like to address a central idea I had about your parking and your building massing, which -- I don't know if it's been explored, but it seems to me you could -- which would be to force all of the parking underground on one level, using stackers or something like that, so that you could get a grade-level courtyard as your outdoor space. I think your project is deficient in outdoor space for your residents, and I think it's all the more important to have viable outdoor space for people living here, especially when you have so many units so tightly together. And there's no easy public park within walking distance, or other space. And when you have an outdoor space on a second level, especially the way it's relating to the units you have and the complications of landscaping and stuff, it really isn't as good. You have an opportunity, if you had a U-shaped or L-shaped building fronting off the alley, maybe a metal grill with a nice gate to come in. People could walk into a pleasant courtyard, which would be used a lot. That would really enhance your project. And you could push your parking underground with the use of stackers and still fit it all. That was just an idea that sort of came across my head, thinking about your project, and I think it's worth considering. Although I understand it's a big change at this point. On the building massing and such, the corner feature is very important. Having a cap on the building is very important. Those things have been addressed. I think not having the management office at the corner of the building is a great idea. It's just symbolically, if nothing else. It doesn't say what's important about the building. I do encourage you to look at the building Osma referenced. It's called the Huxley. It's a new apartment building on El Camino in Redwood City. I don't know how, but they've put their fitness room and their community center down on the ground level. I don't think this is a below-market-rate unit, but at night, it's brightly lit, and when it's being used, it has this feature of animating the street. Not just the building, but the whole community. You get a sense of life going on. You get eyes on the street. You get people outside looking in; people inside looking out. That's really what the El Camino guidelines are after. That's what we are all here for. It's a really great opportunity to do that. A lot of that is in the details, making it a little bit taller. The beveled wall you have at the front is a good idea. Detail it out more. Think about it more. Think hard about which uses are really in these visible spots. The corner is really important, how you treat that. Having a management office with only windows facing one side is a real lost opportunity. I think you can take that a lot farther. Something else that I didn't hear mentioned was that your current plans have apartments facing your open space on the second level, and they are all at the same grade. This is the only window in this apartment, and it's right next to the common open space, which is close to the doorway, the passageway going out. It's inevitably going to lead to people inside just leaving the shades drawn all the time. That's a very meager existence, to be on the dark side of the building with your shades drawn because you have no privacy. People outside always feeling like they're making too much noise and there's additional conflict. It's an age-old architectural issue on multifamily housing, but you have the onus to do it better than I think you've done it here. If you do persist on having that open space on the second level, it should be done a little more carefully to preserve that. I think you could also do better linkages from within the building to get to that space, just to celebrate it more. It's a back yard, it's got a stair off the alley, and make it so people really could come and go through that entrance if they so choose. You have also, the trash area is coming in off of Wilton, and again, if you could get that off the alley somehow, back, or by the parking. Again, you help to animate the street. It's a small detail where you locate these things, but perhaps think about that. On the massing and articulation of the building, I agree with what my colleagues have said. Maybe what I'll say is a statement I jotted down here -- That the building is really a large urban mass. It's quite

suitable to the future as we see El Camino Real developing into. That's what our design guidelines are asking us, what other people are doing, but we really need to acknowledge, it's not compatible right now. As one of the speakers said, there's nothing this size within half a mile. It's a very large building. I believe it puts the burden on you as the developers to do it better, to do it more sensitively. That means having perhaps more detail, or more refinement, or sophistication. Or, as Osma said, some understanding and sense of play. Right now, it's a fairly large shoebox. The most I can see is two colors of plaster or two colors of material. How about a roof cornice? How about some special treatment of the entrance? How about a little bit of detail, or some awning at the windows? All these things are in the architect's toolbox, to make this building not an unimaginative part of El Camino Real. I think you just need to work on that a little bit more. Because we are essentially approving this as something for the future of El Camino, but we're not there yet, so you really need to be cognizant of that. The last comment, to follow upon that, is I understand it's affordable housing, but the burden is even higher, then, to make it so that it doesn't feel like that, to the town and everybody else. Right now, driving by, it's not the Huxley in Redwood City, which is a real fancy-looking building. But, we don't want to make that statement. We want the opposite to be true. We want all housing to be nice, to be good, to make people feel happy to be going home. Not like they are second-class citizens. This design, right now, just feels a little bit too much like it's sort of on the budget side. I know it is, but you have to take that challenge doubly hard. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, everybody. I can't read my own handwriting, is why I take notes on a computer. Thank you to the applicant for the presentation, the neighbors for coming to speak to us. I have never, of course, been an architect, worked in design of affordable housing or multifamily housing, but I've spent years working on the financing of those things, from the point of view of public agencies, trying to encourage them, and I know how complicated and perverse our funding of this kind of housing is in this country at this time, and for the last 40 years. My thoughts. It certainly is a complicated set of setbacks, height limits...What do we call the horizontal, what do we call the diagonal?

Board Member Thompson: Bulk plane...?

Chair Furth: Daylight planes. Concerns about shading. We certainly need solar and shading studies so that we can really understand what this building would do to adjacent structures. Sometimes it might seem to people that we're making somewhat random comments, but we're going towards a set of standards that we are required to apply. One of them is that the design of this building will enhance the living conditions on site, and in adjacent residential areas. Things should be better when we're done than when we started. The upside of this site is that you're working from a pretty low base, in the sense that these are not well landscaped sites. They don't buffer the noise or the impact, psychological impact of a state highway. The downside is that they do, given their present low-intensity uses, probably not cause a lot of parking problems themselves. That seems to be generated by our general parking shortage in Palo Alto. I live in Downtown North, where, because of the presence of restaurants, we're not dealing with a neighborhood where everybody goes home at 5:00 or 10:00, either. We have steady parking demand from early in the morning until late at night. And I will say that the residential parking program has made it possible, most of the time, to park within a block of my house, which is where my guests need to go. I look forward to seeing more information from the City and the applicant on how the present system works or doesn't work, what kind of deficit position we may already be in on this street. I think as we look at the redevelopment of these buildings fronting on El Camino, the City...We look at design site by site, as people have pointed out, which has its limitations. But, the City definitely has a set of guidelines, which anticipates bigger, higher buildings along El Camino, closer to the El Camino frontage. In a sense, they're trying to make El Camino itself have boundaries and edges. One of the things that we lose when we do that is incidental views of the hillside. One of the things we gain is a sense of presence as we go down El Camino, which I've been going down since 1964, when it really didn't have much of a presence. But we see Curtner, we see Linder [phonetic], we see these streets, and they have...We need to think hard about how these new turns into those streets work. We need to think about -- and hear from staff -- on how does the El Camino frontage work there? Could it be better? We've heard that visibility is impaired because of the Palo Alto habit of parking as close to the corner as possible. Is that still appropriate here? How would the pedestrian and bicycle access work as we go around those heavily-impacted corners? Where would somebody wait for a ride-hailing system? One of the things that the El

Camino design guidelines require is pedestrian-friendly access. Where are the benches available for the general public walking down this street? Or, available for your own residents and their friends? We need to see that. We need at least minimal pedestrian amenities, though I would say that your building, with its more interesting façade and its landscaping, is an improvement over what's there right now. I live in a group of two-story and one-story residences adjacent to a four-story building. It provides us with buffering against a higher traffic thing, but part of the reason it works, even though the driveway is on the side street, is because it's landscaped within an inch of its life. It has a landscaped garden over that podium that's visible to the public as they walk along that sidewalk. It has wisteria hanging down over the entrance. It has probably six to eight-foot hedges on one side. It's a completely different experience than going into a dark, cavernous, unattractive drive. There is a lot that can be done; there's a lot that needs to be done. I'm concerned about the tight access, so we need to know more about how it would work, both for this building and the existing driveway. How trash collection would work. I get caught in my garage on occasion by the garbage trucks going by, so I need to add -- and there's three of them -- need to add extra time to get out on garbage days, or move before they get there. How is that going to work? I do think that there are serious problems with the El Camino Real entry, also, but I wait to see what further studies show. In terms of the design of the building, I like the sort of complicated fenestration, the placement of windows on the upper floors. I don't understand -- looking at the elevations we had previously -- how the ground-floor windows strengthen and relate to that. It looks a bit random to me, or unintegrated. I'm also concerned with floor-to-ceiling glass adjacent to a busily-traveled sidewalk, at the ground level, if it's not a retail space. That doesn't seem to me to be optimal in terms of having uses that you want to look at. I don't want to look at wastebaskets and people's feet as I walk by the sidewalk, and I probably don't want to have them exposed. I know this started out with some retail, but it doesn't have it any more, so I would like some more thought on where those windows actually should go. I don't think every guideline -- and they are, in fact, guidelines -- meets every zoning requirement. We're going to have choices to make. But, we shouldn't abandon them with respect to pedestrian amenities or ground-floor transparency. Those are both achievable. It looks like we have an existing neighborhood parking deficit. It's not the responsibility of this project to solve existing problems, but it is not to make it worse. I think that the way we signify, the way we show that a project is residential in this area is with lavish and significant landscaping, not just juncus. Not to say that you're using juncus, but it needs to be big, it needs to have flowering things; it needs to not be industrial. That's the way we signify that a use is residential and not office. Not that some offices don't have pretty fancy landscaping. The issue of lights shining into the adjacent residential is important and should be manageable. I agree that the parking calculations need to depend on, not the possible number of accessible parking spaces. This is a project where parking ratios are set by state law, not by us, so I'm sure they will set specifically that way. One of the issues here is that El Camino is, in fact, changing everywhere and becoming higher. I don't think that a series of rectangular buildings has to be a problem. I mean, there are spectacular neighborhoods around the world that have a basic design shape, and they repeat it, and they are great. And they are great because of the quality and detailing of the building. And I would say in the case of a temperate climate like ours, the landscaping makes it a pleasure to be there. There's a great old article called *Our National Heritage* or that *Rat-Infested Slum*, and it's about Georgian terraces, which are very repetitive, and were treated by planners looking to modernize that rat-infested slum, and were saved by the irate neighborhood. And that was probably a good thing. But, my point is, it's okay with me if you have a box because that's efficient, but it's not okay if it's not beautiful on some level. I don't think I disagree with anything my colleagues have said, except perhaps I'm okay with boxes as long as they are beautiful. Or, as we say in our standards, something about excellent architecture and high aesthetic quality. I think outdoor spaces are important. I think they need to be designed with an eye to the acoustic and visual privacy of the neighbors, the existing neighbors who live there. Sometimes that involves landscaping that sets the users back further from the edge. There was a comment about smoking. I think that local regulations may preclude that anyway, but we should know for sure. Certainly, that's not anything. We do need a sun and shade study. And I think that's it for me. I don't think our comments have created conflicting instructions. I did review the minutes from the City Council's prescreening of this project. Whether this is a suitable site for affordable housing with these modified zoning standards is not our call. That's the call of the City Council. Our responsibility is to look at this project in light of the specific standards that we apply, and that's what we will be doing. I agree that if more of the parking were underground or compact because of the use of stackers, it would be better. In

the testimony in front of the City Council, there was a concern about the continuing operational cost of stackers. There was a quantified number there. I don't know if it's possible, but it's unquestionable that if more of this were underground, it would be a building that fit in better and was more accommodating to and enhancing of the neighborhood. I'll look forward to additional information from the staff, particularly on parking and transportation, and from the applicant on the operation of the building and its impact on adjacent properties, and how that works in a way that works. Anything else before we close?

Board Member Lew: I have one quick follow-up on the parking stackers. You might want to look at Stanford's Mayfield affordable housing project on El Camino. I think that's a bridge...Is that bridge? They have parking lifts at grade. And I think they were triple-decker stackers. They might have some sense for cost. I think I've heard third hand that the tenants don't like them, so I would think that you would be interested in that, as well. If there is an issue there.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. And, I should say that I am very pleased to have this project in front of us. We get a lot of projects that are for either office space or unaffordable housing, and this is a good change of pace. Mindful to our obligation to those who live there already, and those who will be coming. We will do our best. Thank you. We will take a five-minute break before our next...

Vice Chair Baltay: We need to make a motion.

Chair Furth: Oh, we need to make a motion to continue this to a date uncertain. Is there such a motion?

Board Member Thompson: I was just going to add one more thing, really quick. For opportunities to add interest to the façade, in addition to shading devices. I'd also written here -- I didn't mention these -- that punched reliefs is an option, and then, also, balconies give the project a residential feel. Doesn't have to be very deep. Could even be Juliette balconies that don't even add square footage, but they still kind of create different interest, and sort of gives the building a more residential feel. Sorry, I forgot that earlier.

Chair Furth: Those are the balconies from which you cry Romeo, Romeo, wherefore...

Board Member Thompson: And Juliette balconies don't have any depth...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Some people call them French balconies.

Board Member Thompson: ...and they have a guard rail.

Chair Furth: Got it.

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: Good idea, Osma. I move that we continue this project to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Lew: Second.

Chair Furth: Okay, motion by Baltay, second by Lew, to continue this project to a date uncertain. All those in favor say aye? Opposed? None. Hearing none, the motion passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSES 5-0.

Chair Furth: We will take a five-minute break now. Thank you.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: Thank you. We'll reconvene the Architectural Review Board. We are on item #3.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3200 El Camino Real [18PLN-00045] Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition for the Existing 16,603 Square Foot Motel and Construction of a new Four-Story Approximately 53,599 Square Foot Hotel. The Applicant Also Requests a Zone Change to Remove the Existing 50 Foot Special Setback Along Hansen Way. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Furth: We are on item #3, 3200 El Camino Real. This is a proposal for a new hotel. This is its first formal review. I should say that while it's a formal review, the application is not yet complete because the environmental work has not been completed under the California Environmental Quality Act. This is consideration of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of an existing 16,600 square foot motel and construction of a new four-story, approximately 53,600 square foot hotel. The applicant has also requested of the City a zone change to remove the existing 50-foot special setback along Hansen Way. Does anybody have any conversations to report? Okay, no *ex parte* conversations. Has everybody viewed the site?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Again, I haven't been there in the last two weeks, but I know the area pretty well.

Chair Furth: Anybody else?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday.

Chair Furth: And, Bob, you've seen the site? I have seen the site. All right, staff?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, thank you. Thank you for the introduction of the project. The project does include the demolition of an existing motel that was constructed in 1947. That was prior to the establishment of that 50-foot special setback. This project is at the intersection of El Camino Real and Hansen Way, and that is one of the entries into the Stanford Research Park. This project does include the architectural review, as well as the zoning amendment. The project will receive recommendation from this Board, as well as recommendation from the Planning Commission, and then, those will be forwarded onto the City Council for their final decision. Some site characteristics about the project. It is within the CS Service Commercial zoning district. That will remain. It's a flat topography for the site, surrounded by commercial, as well as research park across from Hansen Way. Mainly, it's low-intensity type of development. Along El Camino, there is some transition to some newer buildings, as you were discussing earlier today. The images there on the screen are both along Hansen Drive, as well as along El Camino Real, to provide some context of development in the area. There were some prior meetings for this project. It did go through a preliminary board meeting back in 2015, as well as two pre-screenings with the City Council, addressing the issue with the special setback. And then, we had a preliminary ARB last year regarding this project. So, there have been some changes along the way from those meetings. Some of the issues identified by the board at the last preliminary was relationship with the Fish Market property, having the third and fourth story modulate along that property side, as well as enhancing the plaza area, providing some more screening for that type of amenity. There's also a comment about the continuity of the sidewalk. The sidewalk along El Camino Real is at 12 feet, and then, it tapers down to six feet along Hansen Way. This is a site plan of the project. It shows the footprint. The building does cantilever over a little bit on the plaza side, as well as the back-rear end of the property. Presently, the

site includes a driveway from El Camino Real. With the new project, that will be eliminated and the access for this site will be along Hansen. That will include a loading zone, as well as any drop-offs. The project is also proposing valet, so that will be a part of the project, where someone would stop. Also, trash would be taken from that entry, as well. In this image you can also see that the "pork chop" that exists now at the Hansen intersection will be eliminated, so some of that property is going back to the project site, which allows for more enhancement of that plaza area. These are some perspectives that were included in the packet. The applicant does have a robust presentation that will show, I think, a little more detail of these, but just helps the public view the project. This is from across the way at the intersection of Hansen and El Camino Real, showing that plaza area. You can see that it would include some low walls and screening to help with some of the noise associated with El Camino Real. Again, these are some other birds-eye views, as well as images from El Camino Real from the other side, taking into consideration the Fish Market. You can see that the second floor, you have a terrace with some landscaping along El Camino Real, and that wraps around Hansen Way, as well as the upper floors along El Camino Real do go inward, so it provides some relief from El Camino Real. This is from Hansen Way, and it shows the bike lane, would also be enhanced with some protection. These are just a straight elevation view, showing some of the colors and materials that are proposed. Material boards, as mentioned have been updated. And then, more elevations there. Some topics of interest that we wanted to at least get some feedback on would be elimination of a special setback; the elimination of the "pork chop" and the intersection; consistency with the context-based criteria and architectural review findings; compatibility with the El Camino Real design guidelines. The project does include a parking reduction request. Part of the project would be to include valet, which is indicated by the applicant that they could include, at a minimum, 16 additional parking spaces. With the valet, you could park within the drive aisles, so that does help alleviate some of the parking deficiencies. And for a hotel, that kind of makes sense, with the operations, one use where a valet really makes a lot of sense. We're still evaluating that with our Transportation Demand Management Plan, and we will bring that back the next time we're here with the Board, along with the environmental document. One of the next steps it to complete that environmental review. We're really close to doing that and having that published, returned to this Board for the recommendation. We will have public hearings with the Planning and Transportation Commission, as well as with the City Council for their final decision. The recommendation today is to consider the information presented, and provide comment and continue the item to a date uncertain. With that, I complete my presentation. Be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of staff before we hear from the applicant? Thank you. If we could hear from the applicant, please. You have 10 minutes. Good morning.

Yatin Patel, Applicant: Good morning, Chair Furth, Vice Chair Baltay and Board members. My name is Yatin Patel. Our family owns and operates this...

Chair Furth: Mr. Patel, could you, like everybody else, spell your name for the transcriber.

Mr. Patel: Yeah. First name is Yatin, last name is Patel [spells name.]

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Patel: Sure. As I was saying, our family owns and operates this hotel. We've been in business for decades. It's been a long, long journey to get to where we are here today. As a family, we are incredibly proud of the progress we've made. I'll cede the microphone to our architect team, with Jim Heilbronner.

James Heilbronner, Architect: Hi. Good morning. Name, James Heilbronner [spells name]. I think you guys have a pretty good package in front of you. We gave you a package of what's on the screen, also. What I wanted to do is, one of the handouts I gave was a list of materials, so we are clear on the kit of parts that we're using, types of metals, glass and painted stucco. It's a fairly simple list, but sometimes we all get caught up in what those are. The second thing I wanted to address -- so I use up my 10 minutes wisely -- is our responses to your comments at the last meeting, from June of 2017. One of the biggest concerns, I think, across the board was the northeastern corner near the Fish Market, with

respect to its, I'll just say mass height and proximity to property line. For clarity, the building on the north side is 10 feet south of the property line, which is further than it is today. Today, it's probably three to three and a half. It varies a little bit. Because of building code regs and...There's no setback requirement, but to have windows in the hotel, we need to be 10 feet away, minimum. That area is landscaped. Half of it is landscaped five feet, and then, there is a crushed granite exit way and accessway for fire department, for firemen to go back and forth east/west, if you will. On that corner, I think the second slide...Is this just a forward thing? If you look at the corner of the building, we've chopped back the main balcony, so we have more stepping in the north/south direction, and we've always had it in the east/west direction. Really dominated on the Hansen side. We have four step-backs of the building to work on the mass, to carve it out -- as has been discussed here today -- the shoebox, with different roof planes and elements going on, to soften the building's facial façade. And, of course, we have landscaping on the second floor to also scale the building differently than just a traditional box. The second item we picked up on, I think there was a lot of discussion about the pork chop. To make a long story short, the pork chop is gone. It's consistent with the City's transportation plan to not have them. So, we will be increasing the site, if you will, into CalTran's property. The curve is going to be a smaller radius and will pick that up in the sidewalk, and it effectively increases the plaza area. The second-level deck, there was conversation about perhaps public accessing that. We preferred not to do that for security reasons. The second deck is for hotel guests, access to maintain the plants, and there are some rooms with balconies up there. It's really a hotel private area, but humans will still be up there, and there's adequate exiting for that without a second stair to the ground. The sidewalk dimension on El Camino is clearly 12 feet. The El Camino design standards talk about setting the building against the setback. We're a little further back, another six feet or so, with landscaping, so we have a 12-foot sidewalk, landscaping, building on El Camino, which is a relatively short amount of frontage for us. It's a skinny site. I talked about the proximity of the building on the north property line. I think we just weren't clear about that in the first round. And item 7 was the same thing. I think we've really softened up that northeast corner, where you really primarily see it driving south on El Camino, with green wall, step building, glass, and particularly the high roof that breaks up and gives a lot of shadow to the building. Item 9 -- or item 8, I should say, and 10 -- is about the café that we've proposed. The café is really a functional element of the hotel, which is pretty common today, to have a small coffee/juice amenity bar that, in this case, will be open to the public through the plaza. We're talking about a small blade sign on El Camino to say you're here at the café. There's tables, chairs, umbrellas, screened off from both streets with planter walls and glass rail to try to reduce the noise. But, the café is public, so there is no restriction other than operating hours. We don't know what those are yet, but most likely it will be closed by somewhere, nine o'clock-ish, eight o'clock. We're not restricting public access. And the entrance was a discussion. The entrance to the café is off of the plaza, which is probably 15 feet off of the El Camino sidewalk. The plaza itself has grown a bit because of the change in the pork chop, but it's a contained area with alternating stones that are on the color board that we brought. Tables, chairs, more potted plants that we don't show, but pots that can be moved around. The top of service we have on the plaza are, it's a posted-up plaza deck so we can route irrigation lines underneath it, so we can move pots around without trenching and digging things back up. A flexible, really, plaza deck, that's hard deck, drains fast, drains well, and is flexible in how we move things around on top it based on what's going on in the hotel. Another comment was on our driveway, which we have moved down on the furthest part of Hansen that we can get. We've tightened that up a bit. Staff felt the same way. Where vehicles are coming in, making a right off of Hansen. The distance of the driveways there are quite good from the corner, from a traffic interference point of view, and we've re-delineated the street for the bike path, new delineator signage, green stripes, etc., that are required by the City for the bike path -- that does continue down Hansen. Parking issues. Well, to make a long story short, there is no parking on the site that you'll see. It's all underground. There are two levels. There are 82 parking stalls on the site, and with valet parking, we can easily get to, really easily get to 100 cars here. We want to manage the parking. It's appropriate for a hotel in this area to drop your car or self-park. It depends on the guest and how long they are staying, etc. Currently and historically, the parking count here, or the parking demand, has been about 70 percent for the 42 rooms that are here. The study, based on all kinds of traffic data nationally, points to the same statistic, so, we think having 82 cars plus the ability to grow it in the aisles is appropriate, where there won't be any backup or parking on the street. The other comment was on interior spaces. I think the location of the café, the location of the fitness center, the size of the conference room, which actually is kind of small, but for this type of

facility, at a 100 rooms, it's more than adequate. It's really more impromptu meetings, not a planned conference center or convention center. It's not really designed for that. The fitness center we deliberately put on El Camino to have some activity there, trying to meet with the design guidelines of, in this case, seeing people going nowhere on a bike. I think I covered the primary comments from last time. We've done some shifting since you saw it last, some design refinements. Colors, proportions; that continues to gel as we're going into technical documents, so there's always shifts of joints and stucco edges, etc. We've done some of that. I don't think it's hard to reconcile that unless you compare drawing to drawing. The corner element of the building is probably the last element, which is basically a stucco structure with posted-out metal screening to give it a lot of shadow and a different look, if that will turn the sun as it moves around the building. We haven't finalized the pattern. It's really a custom metal pattern. By now, we're talking about bubbles, different size holes that will let the light through. You'll kind of see more shadow than you will stucco color behind it. That was the intention of the corner, giving you...

Chair Furth: Thank you. The previous speaker said it would be nice if I stopped people at the end of a sentence. My experience is, the sentences don't end sometimes. But, we will ask you. Thank you very much for your presentation, and I'm sure if we have questions, we can get some more details. I don't have any speaker cards. Is there anybody...? Or do I have a speaker card?

Mr. Sing. You have one. You have one speaker card.

Chair Furth: I do have a speaker card. Great. Mr. Levinsky? You'll have three minutes.

Mr. Levinsky: Good morning. It's still morning, Board members. [spells name]. You received a letter from Becky Saunders, who is moderator of the Ventura area neighborhood, and I share her concerns about parking. And to just kind of understand the parking calculations, it looks like there are various deductions that have been occurring here. We heard the café will be public, and so, I think there is a concern that it's getting discounted or something in the calculations, so it's not being fully parked as it would be a public café. Also, I joke I'm the only person in Palo Alto who has ever read a TDM. There is a company that you go to, and you put in your name and address, and they do a few things, and out comes a 40-page TDM. In there, there's lots of boilerplate about how you're going to appoint somebody to reduce your traffic, and talk to your employees, and things like that. But we've never heard that any of these work. We've never seen any studies that show that they accomplish things. So, when hotels start talking about reducing parking through TDM's and things like that, does that really translate into removing the parking requirements, or...reducing the parking, or, will the employees be parking across El Camino, as happens with Stanford, as happens with other businesses, and so, intruding on the neighborhood. I would ask that really good parking studies be done that look at the effectiveness of...the reasonableness of any reductions that are given. One other thing is about, thank you for your thoughts about the looks of buildings, and all that. When you drive south on El Camino, you're going to see this big wall, and I think if you go back to the rendering that was shown, the part that's pointing towards the hills seem pretty unadorned. It's going to look like a big, white wall with some windows in it. I'm hoping that we can...There's nothing else around of that scale that's going to interfere, so either some robust trees or some good thinking might help solve problems like that. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Levinsky. Anybody else? Seeing none, I'll bring it back here. Okay, I have some questions for staff, but we'll start with questions for the applicant. Mr. Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. For the architect, please. I'm trying to understand. On the third and fourth floor of the building, you seem to have, what I would have thought are balconies, but they seem to be setbacks from the building outside of the guestrooms on both of the facades facing El Camino Real and Hansen Way. What is the function of those spaces?

Mr. Heilbronner: The upper, upper floors are basically step-back, but the space in front of them are roofs, not balconies. That's a particular discussion with our client on sale-ability or usability of balconies. We

have a limited amount, so we thought it would be best that the larger spaces on the second floor, but not the third and fourth floor. It's really a programmatic.

Vice Chair Baltay: Same question on the second floor, further deep on Hansen Way. There's a large open, what I would have called a balcony, again, over the entry courtyard. What is the function of that space, again?

Mr. Heilbronner: The porte-cochere is strictly what it's intended. It's a weather-covering device for cars coming into the site, but high enough for fire trucks to traverse underneath it. Basically, it's a reflective white roof on the roof of the porte-cochere.

Vice Chair Baltay: And in this case, all these guest rooms are looking at this reflective white roof. Is that right?

Mr. Heilbronner: That's correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And is this a partially-landscaped reflective white roof?

Mr. Heilbronner: No.

Chair Furth: No. The landscaping is all on the level below. It shows it as being on top of the porte-cochere.

Mr. Heilbronner: Landscaping is on the second...

Chair Furth: That's not the porte-cochere. Sorry. That's the other. That's the cover of the plaza I'm looking at.

Mr. Heilbronner: Right. Landscaping is on the second level.

Chair Furth: And the graveled roofs or the white roofs are on the top of the second level, top of the third level. Is that right?

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct. Third and four...right.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Heilbronner: Hmm-hmm. And, of course, the roof at large on the top.

Chair Furth: Right. And could you explain to me how you arrived at the dimensions and color of the cantilevered element that faces El Camino?

Mr. Heilbronner: The eyebrows -- as I call them -- were basically, when you're designing things and sketching things, you're looking at proportions and how things feel. The wing shape of it, the sloped undersigned and how far it cantilevers, I have to say that it is a feeling, and a pencil, using your aesthetic values, if there's any left.

Chair Furth: After we're finished? Is that the implication?

Mr. Heilbronner: No, I'm just...Just left as a career. The color is, those are also, you go through a number of color renditions, particularly with your client who has more emotional feelings about color as the owner of the building than everyone else, so, it's a back-and-forth design thing.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions of the architect? I'm seeing a lot of no's here. I had a question for staff. At this site now, because of the low profile of the existing accommodations, I see a lot of trees behind it, right? Big trees. Remind me how the rear of the site works, who property those trees are on, what that alley-ish space back there is.

Mr. Sing: I believe you're referring to the redwood trees on sheet DR-2.1. It does show those trees. Those are on the adjacent property, and those are to remain and be protected.

Chair Furth: What is the adjacent property? Is that access to...? That's private, with access to buildings? I mean, it's roadway, right? Or an alley? But not public? It's a driveway?

Mr. Sing: I believe, yeah, that's not a public way.

Chair Furth: A parking lot/driveway. Okay. Those would stay. Well, since we're on sheet DR-2.1, and to prove that I read the fine print, it says: *All sidewalks, curb and gutter in public right-of-way shall be violated to the property frontage.* What is "violating" the curb?

Mr. Sing: I think those notes have to do with construction, but maybe the applicant... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Well, we won't spend a lot of time on it, but if you could check. I used to be a lawyer for a building department. I do not recall us asking them to violate sidewalks, but if you could check that, I... It may not be what we wanted. Okay.

Board Member Thompson: I actually have a quick question for the applicant. If you could just briefly walk us through the material. You have two kinds of cement plaster...?

Mr. Heilbronner: Two kinds of, two different paint colors on cement plaster, correct.

Board Member Thompson: That's the white on the band.

Mr. Heilbronner: The middle band.

Board Member Thompson: The middle band.

Mr. Heilbronner: That's correct.

Board Member Thompson: That's just one story.

Mr. Heilbronner: Mm-hmm.

Board Member Thompson: And the white is two stories...

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: ...give or take. There's a parapet, so, a bit more.

Mr. Heilbronner: Mm-hmm.

Board Member Thompson: And then, there are three metal panels. One is the gray that is the band underneath.

Mr. Heilbronner: The gray is the lower, first-floor level, which are metal panels that clip on the building.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Heilbronner: And then, there is the screen mesh that is metal #2. Or, I'm sorry, whatever metal that is.

[crosstalk]

Mr. Heilbronner: And then there's the windows storefront, the aluminum, anodized gray/silver color that we're listing as one of the metals.

Board Member Thompson: What about the graphite mica? Metal...

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes. The last one is the larger eyebrow. That's still a metal panel, but the darkest of the colors. Sort of a charcoal.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. And then, how do the three type of glazing go together?

Mr. Heilbronner: Well, you have typical dual glazing, relatively clear glass that you see through into the guest rooms and the storefront. Then there's some opaque panels, spandrel panels, where we're using glass, but you can't see through it because there's structure behind it.

Board Member Thompson: Where does that happen?

Mr. Heilbronner: You'll see that in the darker, like, in some of the darker...The lower bands down here at the base of the building. The lowest...my mouse isn't working here. The lowest level of the bottom windows, so that band, where you would have tables against the windows, we don't like to have through glass, so there's basically drywall finished on the inside, and spandrel glass that appears like glass, but you can't see through. It's all around town. The other glass is just basically clear single-pane glass on top of the screen walls at the plaza. As a sound barrier.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Sound barrier, so their height is like...

Mr. Heilbronner: The screen wall is about 36 inches and the glass goes up to about give, so it's another two feet, five-and-a-half feet. To block sound.

Board Member Thompson: Sound barrier goes just to five-and-a-half feet.

Mr. Heilbronner: Pardon?

Board Member Thompson: The top of the sound barrier is just five-and-a-half feet?

Mr. Heilbronner: Mm-hmm. About my height, right here. Somewhere right here. A little shorter than me. Sorry.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Heilbronner: Am I allowed to bring up a...? Can I help with one item?

Chair Furth: You may...

Mr. Heilbronner: If I just, real quick?

Chair Furth: I will give you that privilege.

Mr. Heilbronner: It's really relevant more than a parking study. We have built-in parking studies now. We did the Hilton Garden Inn here. Half the parking underground that we built is never used. Ever, ever used. The hotel has been open now for close to two years. That whole level of parking is not used. A

project that we did in Redwood City, the courtyard on Highway 101, same thing. Now, they are above-level parking, but half used. And we just finished one recently in Burbank; same thing. Downtown, whole block, half the parking is being used. Half. And I'm talking when it's fully occupied.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Heilbronner: It's good data.

Chair Furth: It is interesting data, and at some future date, if this persists, doubtless, neighborhoods who have parking problems will be coming to use those resources when the City changes its approach. I'm going to take the liberty of going first because I have some design questions, and my colleagues are better qualified than I am, and I'm interested in their comments. First of all, thank you so much for continuing to work on this project, and my thanks also to the City for, I think, making this a much more useful site, both for the property owners and the neighborhood. It's going to be a much better corner for pedestrians, bicyclists, for car drivers. That's all good. I have a couple of concerns. I think they are all easily addressable, but they need to be addressed. I don't see adequate seating for people walking down El Camino, as opposed to customers of your café or hotel. This is supposed to have pedestrian amenities that don't require buying a cup of coffee, so I expect to see more of that, perhaps on Hansen frontage, too, although I'm less...It would be good, but I'm less concerned about that. El Camino is a more traveled way and we want to encourage that with this great intensification of use on this site. With respect to the café, I'm concerned still about the access. It looks a little awkward and tight, walking into that narrow doorway right in the dark-ish corner. One possible approach...The goal is to make sure that the general public knows it's there and begins to use it as they are wandering buy, or want a break from their office, or something. One possible approach is signage, so that as you walk back and forth, you see it, you think, and you go, "Oh, around the corner, there is a café." But I think that's important. It was clearly important to the City Council when they were looking at this. I find the fourth floor window alignments confusing. The windows are much bigger and they don't quite seem to make sense in relationship to the lower floors. And finally, the eyebrow element. These are very bushy eyebrows. I find them, at least in the drawings that you've given us, too big and too dark. We hear over, and over, and over again, a couple of things. One is that people on this Board -- and in our guidelines -- want a top to a building, and people who live in this area, or live in the town, want buildings to minimize their imposingness. There's got to be a better way of putting that. We have a really big cantilever on the Epiphany Hotel downtown, which predates the current iteration of the, current use of the building. And it's unfortunate from every angle, in my opinion, including the upper floors of city hall. When I look at these drawings, you have a lot of terrace in back, you have space for some really good landscaping, you have this open plaza, and then, you plop down this big, heavy, dark element at the top, and that seems to undermine -- to me -- to undermine a lot of the good you've been doing. I would want that modified. I look forward to hearing what my colleagues have to say. That's interesting data about the parking. I had an operational question. If I come over to meet somebody at the hotel -- this is directed to the applicant -- can I leave my car with valet parking?

Mr. Patel: Yes.

Chair Furth: Okay, and if I come over to have a cup a coffee and meet a friend, I could do that, too.

Mr. Patel: Yeah.

Chair Furth: Thank you. All right. Personally, I'm very fond of valet parking, especially the kind that doesn't charge. Who would like to go next? Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you very much for your additional presentations you gave us this morning. It's really quite helpful to have the multitude of eye-level perspectives of the building. We've not invested as much time into this as you have and it's really helpful, even if they're sketchy and not full renderings. I would encourage you to keep providing those for us. Many of my questions are answered just looking at those renderings. The project before us this morning, if you were listening, suffered from a lack of detail

and inspiration on the architectural, we think. And I think your project, by contrast, is doing too much. I'm not sure if that's coming from the architect or the client. For example, take the façade along El Camino Real. From the bottom, you'll have a heavy metal, wavy pattern. Then, you've got to step back a series of portal frames with a plaster base. Then, a row of windows, then a detailed, deeply-recessed element with heavy pillars. And then, the tall, the roof (inaudible). Five or six different architectural vocabularies. And I could go around the building and find that almost everywhere. I mean, that's not including the detailed concrete/glass element you are proposing. It's just too much. It's not refined. It's not really sophisticated. It just feels like too much. I think if you could just restrain your hand a little bit and try to limit it a little bit, think more about how these things merge together. I don't necessarily share Wynne's sense that a large roof overhang is inappropriate, but it needs to somehow be working with the rest of the building. You've got four or five different ins-and-outs and ups-and-downs and coming-out. It's not doing it, for me, at least. I'm very concerned that all of these terraces and stuff are not activated. There's not people. There's not landscaping. And we're trying to make El Camino Real a busy, urban corridor, where we are also trying to have tall, three- and four-story buildings along that corridor. What makes that succeed historically around the world is to have life, activity, in those spots, those balconies, those windows. When you take a guest bedroom and set it back five feet with a hard reflective roof, there's never, ever going to be anybody there, any sign of life there. You've taken it away from the community, forever. When you're building on the second floor, you have a wonderful guest terrace that would really be attractive, and guests will really like that. I go up a level and it's not there. I don't have anything. And especially on the El Camino Real frontage, with this very dramatic roof overhang, and these pillars...I was just thinking to myself, man, I would love to stay in that room. Except I wouldn't because I can't go out there, I can't really experience it. I can't step out and look up El Camino, and look down. On the other side, I can't step out, and from there, you have a view of the hills. It's really quite nice on the Hansen Way side, with the southern exposure. It could be lovely to have a... Come back from a business meeting and sit outside for a second. And you've got the perfect opportunity to do it, and yet, you're not doing it. That's what activates the building from the outside. It enhances life on the inside. When I come down to the corner plaza, I find the same problem at a different problem. Yes, you have a café there, but the café is so successfully tucked away and hidden. The door is just a single piece off to the side. I really would have to know it's there to feel comfortable going there. I want to see the café curve with the roof element above it. I want to see it somehow have evidence that there's tables and places to make it comfortable for everybody, not just from the inside the hotel going out, but from outside, looking at it. These are details that can be adjusted. But, what I'm troubled by is the consistent lack of your embracing that idea. That corner, that plaza, that café, is also a public space. Yes, it's private; you own the land. But, it's something that we're looking for. You're getting a 50-foot setback adjustment. We're looking for you to help the community have some presence on that corner, some place where it feels comfortable to sit, to meet a friend for coffee. And I just don't see that in the design. And even if that's not going to be your operating intention, I think you should design the space such that that is possible, and that means making a coffee shop that addresses the courtyard, and designing the courtyard so it's comfortable that way. As I look through your drawings, the other set of questions I have -- and I just have notes all over the place -- is about details. I take your larger corner element -- the three-story piece with, again, the concrete and glass element -- and where you have these windows deeply recessed, how is that detailed? Is that material wrapped into the thickness of the wall? Or is it sort of like, I can see on your renderings here where it's just a two-dimensional surface and there's some sort of a metal soffit, or something. When you do that deeply-recessed window, it's all about the details. It's all about how that surface is treated. On your second floor, you have this curving parapet wall, metal panels, but there's got to be a cap of some kind on top of that. Your detail shows just a minimal sheet metal piece, and I think it visually needs more. I think you should show some detailing and give some more thought to how that's going to work. I won't go through all the details around the building, but I found that there was a bunch of places where I just wanted to see a little more thought into integrating these components. On the one hand, I'd like to see you reduce the number of pieces; on the other hand, detail them a little bit more carefully, perhaps. I'll pass on making any comments on the materials now. I just saw the board for the first time this morning. I'm eager to hear what everyone else has to say. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Hi, there. Thank you for your presentation on the project. I have to agree with a lot of what my board members have said already. I'll kind of go in the order that I wrote my notes down. One thing I noticed is that on your southerly elevations, which are sort of the southeast and southwest, I don't see a lot of shading, so, in terms of efficiency, there's...I talked about shading on the previous project as well, but I have to emphasize why I feel like it's very important to talk about it. Because in terms of building efficiency, that side is going to get a lot of sunlight, and it will add to your heat gain. At the same time, you do have a very, sort of plain-ish façade on that side. And I understand it's not the front and center part, but at the same time, that still is a street frontage, and people are going to walk by there, and I think that side deserves some visual interest in terms of dimension, scale, relief, so that it doesn't feel like a wall, that it could have something that comes out, whether the windows recessed, or there's something that sticks out that shades. And that could maybe tie better to some of these other architectural elements that you're already putting in here, like this big shading element at the top. Which I agree, at the moment, feels a little alien. The relationship that it has with the rest of the building is a little unclear because it happens once, and that really awesome sloping form doesn't happen anywhere else. I think there's an opportunity here, where you can sort of think about, what is the design relationship and the design concept that you're trying to push here? Because I think what's happening, it's getting lost a little bit. And what I mean when I say "design concept" is, what I really care about is a relationship that is derived from the massing and the materials and how it relates to us as humans, not just visually, but even operationally. This really fun, metal mesh, like, I really like that material. I think it adds a lot of detail with, you know, sort of an efficient way to do it. It happens here, and then, I think in this render, it's missing at the top, but I see it in the other renders, so I'm assuming there is more of it on top, per your material board. It does happen in these places, but I feel like it's such an important part that the other places that it happens, like behind the green wall, it kind of gets lost. It would be really nice to have this really hide-and-seek relationship with this really awesome material, and this otherwise plain material, but really make that what your building is about. Right now, it's kind of one element that you're putting here. It's nice, but it doesn't tie in as well as it could with the rest of the building. In terms of the perforation pattern, the (inaudible), I do like a lot of the other patterns that you've shown here, as well, that add a bit more angles and a bit more dimensionality, so I would encourage you to explore something other than the bubbles. I've seen the bubbles around a little bit, but, again, it's sort of your choice. And it also will depend on how you choose to better integrate it with the rest of the building. At the same time, in terms of the palate of the building, I see white, light gray, dark gray. These colors are kind of on the cold side, which I know is pretty popular now. I think can make the project feel a little stark, so I would encourage considering adding color in some way, to sort of add a little bit more life to the project, and greenery is one way to do it, if you decide to do that more. If you decide not to do that, then maybe adding color might be an option to do it. Or, maybe something that kind of brings a little bit more warmth to the building. I agree with Board Member Baltay, that on the Hansen side, there are these views, and a lot of opportunities. It's also sunny on that side. It would be great to have a balcony or patio, something that actually embraces that condition that you have, where you have great views, you have great sunlight. It's a nice opportunity on there. I do appreciate the other landscaping elements that you've put in here. The green walls are a nice touch, and the other landscaping on the patio is nice to see. I do agree the coffee shop does feel hidden. It was a little hard to find, actually, on here. I'm getting a little confused. This is my first time looking at the project, also, so I apologize for that. But, yeah, it would be nice to have that area seem a little bit more welcoming to the public. I'll leave it at that for now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I'm largely supportive of your project. You've made all the big design moves. I think you've done well. I think my comment here...Here are my comments. One is we do have Rebecca Sanders' comment about the parking requirement. I think that's at the discretion of the director and not the Board. I think I want to say, in general, a lot of the hotels have, if you go in the middle of the day, the parking lots are empty, almost empty. That's my observation to you on visiting the site. That's actually when the staff are there, like housekeeping staff, and also, if there happen to be customers of the café, I would think they would be there in the middle of the day, at this given site. I think it can all work. I think there's also some...She had a comment about a restaurant use. I

did want to make a comment that on El Camino, we have several different zonings. We do have, like, neighborhood commercial, and service commercial, and we also have some downtown zoning for the California Avenue area. I think the different zones are intended to address neighborhood needs, as well as broader community service needs. I think this was zoned CF and not CN, and I think that was done on purpose, so I don't think that we really have neighborhood commercial driving this particular zoning requirement. On the massing of the project, I'm generally largely supportive of the project. I think the ground floor base and the stepped-back massing of the upper floors is working really well, I think. On the colors, I think I shared the concern with the colors that my other board members have mentioned. I think with regard to the design elements, Peter, you're saying there are too many. In a way, I disagree, because I think on large buildings, actually more is better. I think architects tend to try to make everything too uniform on buildings this scale, but I completely agree with you about the merging of the different elements. I think that's what I was struggling with when I was looking at the plans yesterday. I think some refinement could be made, and my view is that keeping all your design elements, but just looking at how they all intersect with each other, and maybe trimming back the (inaudible) on El Camino slightly. I think there's just some little tweaking that could go on to make this, to make it work better than it is. Thank you for the landscaping. I think you added some trees along the side property line. They're not showing that well in the renderings, but there are, like, I think on the, on the Fish Market side, I think there are evergreen podocarpus, and then you've got some green screen with ivy closer to the street. I was wondering if you would show the green screen, maybe continuous. I think instead of just individual panels, maybe considering possibly making it more continuous. Also, with ivy, you don't necessarily need green screen. It depends on the vine. I'm not sure exactly which species of ivy you have. Some of them can stick directly to the stucco, although they will cause some damage. Other vines, you do need the green screen. Like, twining vines, you do need the green screen. It seems like you don't have space to add trees up near the front. And then, with regard to...Oh, also on landscaping, we do have a native plant finding, and I think you're meeting the minimum requirements for that. I think you're showing a lot of...You are showing a lot of pittosporum and Chinese fringe flower shrubs. I think I would argue that maybe there are native options for that. I think it's a little tricky because there is sun and shade, they are in sun and shade, and that makes it a little bit harder to find a native plant. Also, I think if you're trying to keep things low, I think that also makes it harder because a lot of native shrubs can be, like, 10 feet high, which I think is too big for this particular location. And then, lastly, I think, on the materials, I think you are showing the perforated...it's not perforated. The custom metal panel up on the mechanical screen. I think that can work. I do want to caution you, though. We did do that on one project, at the Pavilion. We approved a perforated metal screen, and you can see right through it and see all the equipment. On that particular building, it's an old building, with very narrow floor plate, so the mechanical screen is close to the edge of the building. You have a much wider building, so the screen may not be that visible from the streets. But I do want to caution you about that. But I do like the metal, that particular custom metal panel at the corner. I think that that's working well. I do support the previous comments about making the café more visible from the street. I think I also do support Osma's comments about sun shading. I know it's come up before on other projects, like the Hilton Garden Inn, where the owner really didn't want to do any sun screening and wanted to rely on high-performance glazing. So, I do understand that's an issue with some building owners. That's where I'm at. I'm generally in favor of all the big design views on this particular project. I'm happy to see some revisions come back to the Board.

Chair Furth: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I think I sort of fall a little bit in between my fellow Board members' opinion. I can sort of see, I guess, what you were going for. Let's face it. This is a 40-mile-an-hour street and you want to catch some attention, and this is the type of building that will do that. I think the problem is, is that...I understand the whole concept of the -- and I think you carry it to almost the extreme here, the whole base, middle and top idea -- but some of the things, I think you have to understand that this community is very particular or very attuned to the size and mass of a building like this. You've heard from a previous discussion this morning that, you know, putting an eyebrow that big and making it that dark just stands out incredibly. I'm not saying it's a bad design the way it is, but the way it's done in this particular location, it goes back to the whole concept of the building fitting into its

environment. I think this is just...There's too much. This is what I agree with Peter on, is that it seems like you've done, you know, you've spent all the money, so to speak, on the corner, so there's eight different varieties of textures, like you said. The whole idea of using the perforated screen for screening the equipment on the roof. I think that's totally a waste of money because I know that screening isn't cheap, and I agree that that's not something you want to focus on. I'd just as soon make that disappear. If you're going to put an eyebrow on the Hansen side, it needs to be bigger than that, or something. It's like, if you're going to do something, then do it to the proper proportion. It seems like the one on El Camino is too big and the other one is too small, if you're going to do it that way. It also is a situation where about one-third of the elevation on Hansen, and then the elevation on El Camino, are way over the top, and the rest of it is a relatively bland, rectangular box, which makes the previous one we had actually look exciting. If you're going to do that, a building like this is a four-sided building, and I think it needs to be addressed as such. Like I said, there's so much going on at the corner that I think that needs to be toned down, and I think the rest of it needs to be enhanced. I agree completely that you've got all kinds of opportunity for balconies and terraces and you're not using them. The roof of that porta-cochere would be a perfect example of that. All you're doing is for those rooms there, looking at a big, white, reflective spot, I agree. Which is probably the most cost-effective thing to do, but I don't think it really enhances the whole idea of making this a communal area. As far as the café or the cafeteria, I agree that that's probably going to be an asset. I mean, I guess probably the main reason...Because, I mean, at least the literature I was reading, that we were given, is that part of it is based on the parking requirement, not so much on the reality of what's going to happen. I think it needs to be brought out into the corner. If we're going to try and make El Camino at all more of a walkable area, it has to be enhanced rather than, you know, stuffed somewhere in the corner. I would say that's probably it for the moment. I pretty much agree with most of the other things that the other people have said.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have a question for staff. Are there zoning or code implications for using those upper-level roof/balcony spaces? Can they be landscaped? Can they be open as amenities to the hotel rooms without causing problems under our code? Is it the applicant's choice, basically?

Mr. Sing: Yeah, there's not a zoning issue with that. I mean, there's building codes that they have to address.

Chair Furth: Could the applicant give us any insights into your thinking about this?

Mr. Heilbronner: I'm sorry, what's the question on the balconies?

Chair Furth: Using the upper floor balcony-like spaces, in fact, as accessible areas and/or planting areas, landscaping areas?

Mr. Heilbronner: They would have to be pots of some kind but not built-in landscape planters. The upper part of this building is a wood frame, is wood-frame construction, so the floor-to-floor height is just at, I'll say minimal for a hotel. And because of the floor framing system, we don't have the thickness to create the waterproofing system that we'd like to have, that we can't have on the second floor because the second floor is concrete. It's a podium deck. So, one of the ingredients to not have balconies is the complexity of waterproofing those decks, which are effectively on spaces below. We don't have the luxury of height to do that. We have a 50-foot height limit, which is not bendable.

Chair Furth: We're familiar with the height limit, yeah.

Mr. Heilbronner: Right. That's one of the ingredients that went into those upper spaces, would not be...That doesn't preclude having pots of landscaping there, which...

Chair Furth: With light soil mix and careful watering.

Mr. Heilbronner: Right. And the roof color is being generated by sustainable, by criteria of the state building code, so, it's a green building. It's not about our choice to have a lighter...

Chair Furth: Reflective.

Mr. Heilbronner: ...reflective roof. We can tone it down to more of a beige-y color, but it can't be traditionally the darker roof color. That's just something we're all dealing with in architecture with respect to, when you look out...And you're stepping the building back, trying to carve the building, and you have a roof, and then you have windows, and you're going to see it. There are these Catch-22's in design.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Yes, Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I was going to say, I think the issue is not the roof is white, necessarily. I think we all agree that it's sustainably responsible to make that white. I think more of it is that there is this open space that is front of a room that is an opportunity, both for the person who is in the room, and for people on the street to look up and see activity, or to see green. I think that's really what we're getting at. It's not really about changing the color of the roof. Unless you guys disagree.

Mr. Heilbronner: Yeah, well, I mean, as the views are to the north, that you talk about, which adjoining us completely is a black parking lot. So, there are heat gain issues and views that aren't that pleasant everywhere you go. It's a dilemma with placing a building... [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Okay, could we hear from the owner on their thinking on this? Your thinking.

Mr. Patel: On balconies, or...?

Chair Furth: On the use of those spaces and those...

Mr. Patel: A couple things. I think, on El Camino, in our experience, operating, when guests come, they don't want to be on El Camino. They don't want...They just automatically associate El Camino traffic noise with being the noisiest part of the hotel. Very often we will get requests, "Hey, just set me back, apart from there." As far as the idea of people wanting to use balcony space in these areas, I mean, to the...I guess to the west, there's just large redwood trees. On El Camino, I'm not sure that anybody wants to use...I mean, we're providing it on the second floor. I'm not sure how many people are going to demand [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: What about the Hansen frontage?

Mr. Patel: On Hansen? I think on the second floor, we've got balconies. I mean, some of this is just, I think, a cost issue on the third and fourth floors. I mean, we can't...I don't think we can provide balcony space for each guest room. And then, I don't know about ADA issues on...? No. Okay. Some of it has to do with cost on the third and fourth floors. I think...

Chair Furth: Appreciate it.

Mr. Patel: One other comment. I know we're very focused on, like, activating the space. I mean, there's got to be some sort of privacy for hotel guests. I know the second floor initially...I don't know if it was Council or ARB, suggested activating the second floor for public use, or even just hotel guest use. It was a common space. When people come back from work, they just want some sort of common space. I think we've created the plaza space, and then, on the interior, sort of a common meet-up space, as well, to kind of keep all of the common activity on the first floor, so as to not disturb guests on the other floors.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the owner?

Board Member Lew: Just one last comment, though, on the balcony issues. On wood-framed buildings, if you tried to do a roof deck, you can do it the cheap way, like coatings.

Chair Furth: Those are the ones that fall down.

Board Member Lew: Well, yeah, the (inaudible) coatings. So, it's kind of high-maintenance. It does require maintenance every year and some owners don't want to do it. And then, if you do it the more expensive way with, like, pedestal pavers, you're adding a lot of weight. I forget offhand. It might be like 15 pounds per square foot, or something. It's a lot, and it's relatively thick. You're adding...

Mr. Heilbronner: An inch and a half.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, but you're trying to make it, if you're trying to make it level, right? There's a paver, and then the pedestal.

Mr. Heilbronner: There's different ways to...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, there are different ways.

Mr. Heilbronner: It's not the weight. It's the composition of the cookie to allow it to get the right materials. Let it drain properly. Not putting a deck right on top of plywood, or trying to have a walkable and waterproof surface all in one. It's a constructability issue for sure on the upper floors. It's not weight, or a code, or accessibility. It's composition.

Chair Furth: Okay. Peter, do you have an additional comment?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I just want to be clear because you've come back before us -- I looked at the record -- since 2015. I'm sure you want to get your building approved. You have heard from the Board consistently about the café, about activating El Camino. You've heard from City Council. They've said the same sort of things to you. I'm not hearing you come back to us, saying, "Yeah, we're going to look at." You're telling me it can't be done. I build buildings for a living. You can put balconies on wood-framed buildings. There are many ways to do it. You can put plants there that aren't just a pot. We're looking for a back-and-forth here, not just being told something technical. If you could just try to work with us, your building really will be approvable. Alex is right. This is a handsome building, and it's got a lot of potential, and it will be a great addition to the town.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Peter. Thank you to the applicants. I had a couple comments on the landscape plan that I forgot. One is, it's very helpful if the plant list is something bigger than agate type. I can just barely read it as it stands, but if you need to put it on a separate sheet, please do. And, I think a number of those plants don't, particularly the bushes and trees, don't particularly meet our standards. I mean, I know we've got extra constraints on street trees, but these are not either local or good habitat plants. Our research indicates that Berkeley sedge is native, by the way. But, in any event, I'd like some larger plants that meet the goals of our findings, if that's feasible. And I echo Osma's comments on the colors. I think one of the characteristics of the southern part of El Camino and of the town has been that it's leafier, quieter, definitely funkier, and one of the things is its rather soft colors, it's rather warmer colors. A very cold, flat gray/white palate -- and we just got these material boards today -- I don't think is particularly desirable. Okay, anybody else want closing words before we completely confuse the applicant? I hope you've gotten some clear understanding of our thinking.

Board Member Gooyer: I just want to add one thing. I want to agree with my two fellow board members here. I'm not a real fan of somebody coming up and saying, "No, we can't do that," if three out of the five of us here think that it's something at least worth investigating. It may be a little bit more difficult, but, I mean, I'm sure we've all...I've designed it, I'm sure a couple of my members here have done the same thing, so it's not a matter of it can't be done. Now, maybe it's more difficult. Whatever the case is, I

don't really care. But, as Peter was saying, your goal is to get past us, to a certain extent, or get our approval of it. And we have an understanding for what this community is looking for, so I think you need to work with us. I don't think we're being totally unreasonable, demanding some sort of amazing comments. No, I don't need the response...

Mr. Heilbronner: I wasn't arguing. I was just pointing out...

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Chair Furth: Excuse me.

Mr. Heilbronner: ...how we derived...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: This doesn't need to be a discussion. I'm just making a point.

Chair Furth: Time out, everybody. Thank you for your comments. Let me just go down quickly the list here, try to see where we have consensus, so you can understand what we're thinking about. Two of us commented that we'd like a different color palate. Three other conflicting or agreeing views on that? From the other three of you? Looks like a matter of indifference.

Vice Chair Baltay: I support those comments.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, that's a consensus, a majority, slight majority. I think there was a consensus on having a café that welcomed the general public along El Camino. People are nodding their heads on that one. Anybody disagree with me about the need for seating along some of these frontages, that's available to the public?

Vice Chair Baltay: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: No. Well. I dare you. People don't know what we say every time, although I know you do a lot of thinking about what we think about. I will tell you that part of the reason for wanting people out on those balconies and what-not is that it does enliven it. I also want landscape that is significant in size, and visible. Achieved in some way. I think of juncus as a very small plant. I think that's probably as much direction as we can give. Staff, do you have anything else?

Ms. Gerhardt: There was some conversation about the eyebrows and the amount of textures.

Chair Furth: There was. I think there was generally a consensus...the big moves, as Alex said, are well done, but that the other elements are not sufficiently integrated at the moment, and at least some of us think that there's too much eyebrow on El Camino, and maybe not a well-designed eyebrow on Hansen.

Board Member Gooyer: The biggest concern with the eyebrow is not even so much the size of it. It's the color. It's that it's ultra-dark, which makes it stand out even more for a four-story building that is pushing the max.

Chair Furth: A little too eye-catching.

Board Member Thompson: Just to add onto that. I think it's also part of the conversation about integrating an architectural concept throughout the building, instead of just having it in one place. And I also kind of... I know two of us talked about shading...

Chair Furth: Oh, right.

Board Member Thompson: ...on the southern side.

Chair Furth: And I would support you in that. So, support for that approach.

Board Member Thompson: That could kind of be part of that conversation, about integrating...

Chair Furth: Well, it's probably...

[Slight distortion in recording.]

Chair Furth: ...not adding more enlightenment, but I think those are all helpful comments, and thank you all for them. Do we need a motion to continue to a date uncertain? Sheldon, is anything coming up in the environmental review that we should be thinking about between now and our next meeting? I know you haven't finished the documentation, but...

Mr. Sing: I mean, we're still evaluating that.

Chair Furth: ...what are the issues that have arisen? You've probably identified the issues by now.

Mr. Sing: I mean, there's no traffic issues, the building is not eligible for historic listing.

Chair Furth: It's under a plume? Or over a plume? A toxic plume?

Mr. Sing: That is the case, but there is mitigation that we're looking at.

Chair Furth: It can be handled. At the moment, you're expecting a negative declaration, so that everything that might cause a problem won't once the building is properly designed. All right.

MOTION

Chair Furth: Motion, please, to continue to a date uncertain.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we continue this project to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Is there a second.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Baltay, second by Gooyer, to continue to a date uncertain. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say no. Hearing none, this project is continued to a date uncertain.

MOTION PASSES 5-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your continued work on this project. We look forward to seeing you again. That concludes our hearings for today. We have a subcommittee meeting, and we have two sets of minutes.

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Minutes of August 2, 2018.

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 16, 2018.

Chair Furth: Somebody want to make a motion on the minutes for August 2nd?

Board Member Thompson: I'll abstain from voting on the minutes.

Chair Furth: You were not here?

Board Member Thompson: And I haven't read them.

Chair Furth: We can continue it for one more day.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes from August 2nd.

Board Member Lew: I have some comments on them.

Chair Furth: All right. Is there a second, first of all?

Board Member Gooyer: He had comments, you said.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, I have comments on August 2nd. On page 17, the reference to the night school at Stanford University. And it's not "night school" like daytime and night time. It's actually k-n-i-t... It's a person's...

Chair Furth: It's the Knight Foundation.

Board Member Lew: It's the Knight business school. Like Knight Ridder...

Chair Furth: K-n-i...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, k-n-i...

Chair Furth: K-n-i-g-h-t.

Board Member Lew: ...g-h-t. On August 16th minutes, on page 11, I made a reference to pleached trees, which is p-l-e-a-c-h-e-d. It's what they do in Paris, they prune the trees.

Chair Furth: They whack the heck out of the elm trees. P-l-e-a-c-h-e-d. Sorry.

Board Member Lew: Yes, pleached.

Chair Furth: It's "peached" with an l.

Board Member Lew: On page 18, there's a reference to Michael Harbour. I think that was misspelled as H-a-r-b-o-u-r.

Chair Furth: What's the proper spelling?

Board Member Lew: There's a "u," right?

Chair Furth: Oh, sorry.

Board Member Lew: That's all. I can make a...

Chair Furth: Second?

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we approve the minutes as amended.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Furth: Motion by Lew, second by Baltay, to approve the minutes as corrected, for August 2nd, 2018.

Furth, Baltay, Lew, Gooyer: Aye.

Chair Furth: Nay? Abstentions?

Board Member Thompson: Abstain.

Chair Furth: All right, so, 4-0-1. Motion passes.

MOTION TO APPROVE AUGUST 2ND MINUTES PASSES 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSTAINING FROM THE VOTE.

Chair Furth: I would entertain a motion to approve the meeting minutes for August 16, 2018. Unless there are any amendments or corrections to suggest.

Board Member Lew: Actually, one of the corrections I made was for August 16th.

Chair Furth: We'll take that as read. Why don't you make the motion?

Board Member Lew: Okay, I'll move that we approve the minutes for August 16th, 2018.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Baltay second. That's motion by Lew, second by Baltay, to approve the minutes with the previously-mentioned correction, for August 16, 2018. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Abstaining?

Board Member Thompson: Abstain.

Chair Furth: All right, so, 4-0-1, that motion passes.

MOTION TO APPROVE AUGUST 16 MINUTES PASSES 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSTAINING FROM THE VOTE.

Subcommittee Items

7. **3945 El Camino Real [16PLN-00374]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to 1) Designated Guest Parking Spaces, 2) Details for Several Material Choices, 3) Location and Design of at Least two Benches, and 4) Alternative Colors/Stains for the Siding. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance with Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning Districts: CS/RM-30. For More Information Contact the Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt at jodie.gerhardt@cityofpaloalto.org Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Furth: Let's see, we're going to have a subcommittee item, which is item 3945. Remind who the subcommittee members are.

Ms. Gerhardt: We have Board member Thompson and Board member Baltay.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We will let you go ahead with that.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: Are there any board member questions, comments or announcements?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I've been putting together an updated list of awards that recent ARB projects have gotten. We are up to 12 awards now, just in the last couple of years. I will pass that on to all of you, as well as the Council and staff.

Chair Furth: Thank you. It will be helpful, and a pleasure to see. Anything else?

Board Member Thompson: I may be absent November 1st.

Chair Furth: And I'm going to have to leave fairly promptly from the next meeting. I have a plane to catch, but not until one o'clock, do I have to leave. I'm puzzled, staff. Do we not adjourn...? We must adjourn the meeting now because we're going to run out of quorum. We will adjourn this meeting, and the subcommittee will meet with staff immediately following this meeting. Thank you all for your attendance and courtesy.

Adjournment