



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES: December 6, 2018  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent: None.

Chair Furth: I'd like to call to order the December 6, 2018, meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. May we have the roll call, please?

[Roll Call]

**Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: The first item on our agenda is oral communications. This is the time for any member of the public to speak on a matter that is not on our itemized agenda but is within the scope of our concerns. We don't have any cards, I believe. We have no speaker cards. Is there anybody who wishes to speak on an item not on the agenda? Seeing no one, we'll go to the next item.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions and deletions?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No changes to today's agenda.

Chair Furth: In an earlier discussion, you indicated that we should remind people that the parking in the City Hall basement, in fact, in the Coral zone, is for three hours. We have a heavy agenda. We will try to move expeditiously, but if your item is going to be later in the agenda, you may want to talk to the City staff in the lobby about your parking options that will carry you through long enough.

**City Official Reports**

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

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. And actually, did we want to talk about the cell projects? We said we wouldn't hear those before 10 a.m.

Chair Furth: Oh, right. We will not begin hearing the cell projects before 10 o'clock this morning. It may be even later, but we promise not to hear them before then. If you are here for one of the cell applications and you'd like to do something else for the next hour and a half, you're free to do. If you'd like to stay and watch, that's fine, too. All right. We will not be holding a meeting on January 2nd. That meeting will be postponed a week.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, January 3rd, will be...

Chair Furth: Sorry, 3rd.

Ms. Gerhardt: ...postponed to January 10th, so it will be delayed a week. On January 17th, we will have our standard hearing. Also, related to the future agenda on the 20th, we have had a few items drop off, so we will just be hearing 2321 Wellesley, 3200 El Camino, and the Vinculums/Verizon Cluster 2. Those will be the three items that we will have on that agenda. We will also have elections for the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the ARB.

Chair Furth: Okay. And one other announcement related to other people's agendas, there will be... This Board recently reviewed and recommended approval of a new public safety building, and there will be a meeting at five o'clock today with the artist, Peter Wegner, about the public art element of that building. It's going to be in the Palo Alto Commons homeowner's association community room at 122 Sherman Avenue. I'm sure it will be of interest. All right.

### **Action Items**

Chair Furth: We are ready to proceed with item number 2, which is:

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3128 El Camino Real [17PLN-00462]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Architectural Review to Allow the Remodel of an Existing McDonalds Restaurant. Scope of Work Includes: Remodel of Exterior Facade, Landscaping, Signage, and Outdoor Seating. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15301a (Existing Facilities) Zoning District: CS (Commercial Service). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Adam Petersen at [apetersen@m-group.us](mailto:apetersen@m-group.us)**

Chair Furth: Concerns the McDonald's at 3128 El Camino Real. It is a request that we review a minor architectural change, the remodeling of the existing McDonald's restaurant includes remodeling of the exterior façade, landscape, signage and outdoor seating. It's exempt from provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. The property owner is Stanford University. The architect is Stantec Architecture, Inc. They are listed as landscape architects, as well. Has everybody visited the site?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: I did not have a chance to. I know that place pretty well.

Chair Furth: Pardon me?

Board Member Thompson: I pass by it all the time.

Chair Furth: Yes, okay. All of us have seen it, and everybody but Board Member Thompson has viewed it specifically for this application. Does anybody have any conversations to disclose in connection with this project? Seeing none, staff?

Adam Petersen, Project Planner: Good morning, Chair Furth, members of the Architectural Review Board. I'm Adam Petersen from the Planning and Community Environment Department. I'm here today to present the project at 3128 El Camino Real. This is minor architectural review related to the McDonald's there. This item was heard by the Architectural Review Board at the November 1, 2018, hearing. The Board had comments related to enhancing the landscaping on the site, providing additional shading, bringing the building to the build-to line at the back of the sidewalk, enhancing the pedestrian

environment along El Camino Real, giving details about the seating area and configuration, the railings and the trash can on site, and also, use of the corrugated metal siding around the building. As was noted, the project is located at 3128 El Camino Real. It's surrounded by a mixture of uses, commercial and office uses. You can see the project is circled here, squared in red. The landscaping plans that the applicant has proposed, again, as you can see, the previous landscape plan consisted primarily of a lawn area at the front of the building with a Japanese maple. This is the seating area, about four tables here. The applicant has made some changes to the landscape plan. They have retained the Japanese maple. They've removed the lawn area and they've replaced the lawn with succulents, flax and blue grama plants. They've also, in the initial plans, proposed planters along the edge of the sidewalk, and then, planters adjacent to this side dining area on the side of the building. The applicant did extend a covered walkway trellis to the back of the sidewalk. They brought this out. And then, the trellis is also over the two dining areas, one in front of the building, and then, one on the non-drive-through side of the building. The trellis does have a covering on the top. It's an aluminum covering with perforated metal panels to allow for some light filtration and some shading. The reason why it's semi-covered, or I refer it to as semi-permeable, is because if you cover it, it would count to floor area, and it would increase their parking requirement on the site. And the site is under-parked, given the City's parking standard for drive-through uses. This slide shows the covered trellis, again, extended to the back of the sidewalk. It's aluminum. We have landscaping on the edge of this. This brings it, allows people to enter the site. This slide shows the dining area and the bike parking. In the upper left, we have the railings that are used consistently throughout the site. These are used down the pedestrian walkway from El Camino Real. They are also used around the pedestrian seating area on the non-drive-through side of the building. There is bike parking. There is a six-foot-wide access area to park your bikes. There's space for six bike parking places. These are located about 11 feet and 20 feet from building entries. The applicant also provided trash containers. There are two types of trash containers proposed to this site. The first is an aluminum bin, and that's number 6 on the board, or on your screen. That's proposed in the dining areas, or in the outside dining areas. The concrete is proposed more along the drive-through areas of the site. As you can see, this is the original proposal that the Board evaluated, with the corrugated metal siding. The applicant did extend that siding all the way down the edge of the building. And then, the other thing the applicant did is that they extended that to all elevations of the building. After publication of the staff report and some conversations with the applicant, there were some changes to the plans that were provided to the Board as a desk item. What the applicant did is that they did add benches along El Camino Real. You're going to see that in the applicant's presentation. They also widened the covered walkway that you're seeing here, the trellis over the walkway. They also increased the amount of coverage in the ceiling screen, I would say, in the covered trellis walkway, and there were some changes to the landscape plans that the applicant is proposing. With that, I would be happy to answer questions, or turn it over to the applicant.

Chair Furth: Any questions of staff? Seeing none, may we hear from the applicant?

Jim Shively, Stantec Architecture: Good morning, Chair Furth and board members and staff. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: If you could introduce yourself, spell your name for our transcriber, and you will have 10 minutes.

Mr. Shively: Jim Shively, Stantec Architecture. [spells name] I've also got with me today Conrad Freeman, who is the owner/operator, and I've got Zorah Mariano, who is the project manager, and has a real good understanding of the hard numbers for the project. With that, I would like to start with, there were two issues that were brought to our attention shortly after noon yesterday. One was the benches and enhancing the pedestrian experience out front, and also, the landscaping was cited as an issue, the fact that they weren't incorporating the native landscaping. Both issues have been addressed, and as I go through the slides, I'll speak to those. If we look at this, okay, you're going to see on this landscape plan the two benches that are out front. We've centered those on the three flag poles. We also wanted to soften the surface there, so we've left decomposed granite around the benches there. We did continue the landscaping out on this adjacent side in front of the McDonald's placard, so the landscaping was

removed from this area, just knowing that we would have pedestrian traffic and children playing around the benches. The other thing we wanted to take advantage of... And I'm here to say that we are keeping those brick walls. All the walls that are there will remain. But there was a real seating opportunity in front, and our landscape architect was having some issues with the sliver of space that was left between the back of walking that wall. What we felt as a design team the best thing to do would be to add concrete. We don't like adding more concrete as a general rule, and I don't think you probably do either, but the reality of the situation is that that wall will be used for seating, and we encourage it. But, anything that I'm presenting here is open for discussion, and landscape in particular because I know there are concerns that we have. As far as the trellis goes, the two issues I heard yesterday were the height of them, the proportions of them, and the coverage of areas were concerns. The PowerPoint that you were shown earlier had the -- and bear with me, my vision here -- this is the primary outdoor dining area. What we had originally shown in your PowerPoint, it was bound by these two beam areas right here. What we've done now is added this element, and this element, which pretty much puts these side by side here. The existing wood trellis, which you've all seen, bottom clear height is 8-foot-6. What we are proposing for this front dining canopy area out here is 9 foot to bottom of structure, as well as 9 foot to bottom of structure over on the side one here. This, we're leaving at...No, it's actually been dropped. It's been dropped to 10 foot clear. That's what we... There's really a different purpose for this, this trellis. I took to heart last time I left here and discussed with the design team the fact that we were kind of divorced from the front here. It was important to make a connection from the building to the front and enhance our pedestrian experience on the project. What we've done is we used this linear, intentionally kept it narrow just for the...let me get my leader again here...intentionally narrow, just to define and mark that and accentuate the path that goes in there. Now, what we've got is a ramp condition here. We drop about two feet from back here, so inherently, it gets taller as it gets to the street. As I get to the perspectives, you'll see that it has been lowered, and it has been brought out to the front here. Also in the package that Adam handed out, there were two options as far as the grid goes. I call it the lid for the trellises. You're seeing right now, and it graphically is incorrect. It shows more of a translucent type material. There are two materials that I presented and handed out, that were in the handouts you got. One is a 55 percent open element. It's more of a traditional grid. You might find it in cadlocks, but it absolutely...I believe it's an inch and a half tall, and the orientation, we've intentionally run it parallel to the path of travel, will significantly block the sun. The other one is more of an architectural. Now, it's 75 percent open. It is used more in architectural settings. That, the detailing, you can just see the detailing in it that makes it more architectural. I spoke at great length with McNichols, they are a perforated metal manufacturer, and talked extensively about them. That product, the 75 percent perforated or open element, is being used on a lot of projects, exterior skins of buildings. Most recently, they installed the Denver Botanical Garden structure, is clad in the element. But we are open. I just wanted to provide the options and the percentages that were available there. This right here is the brick wall, and you can see where the planter has been taken out. It runs up the side here, and there is no planter there. We've got the two benches we've added. Here's the decomposed granite. You can see that the landscaping has been deleted. And then, we've got the wall on the other side over here that also will provide that wall. Right now, we're plus or minus 21 inches high, so it's a comfortable bench height. You can see on this, we did lower it, the corrugated metal, and this was plaster before. We've wrapped the corrugated metal around for the continuity on it. You can see right here that the trellis was dropped. We felt that it was important to maintain the height of that so it slips just over the awning on the building. That was our spring point for that trellis. This trellis beyond you can see is set at the lower elevation and matches the awning element. That's from the interior there, you can see it. And this one is not dropped. It will come down, and this edge of this canopy has been added to slide over. These, although it looks like they are separated by a greater distance, the distance is plus or minus 18 inches from edge to edge, so there will be continuity of shadows cast in this entire area. Here is the drive-through. You can see the enlarged canopy here. And another view of it. We did put the bike racks in, took that to heart. We have two lockers in back, and we have the six racks out front that are right here. We've got a total capacity of eight for the bicycles. We have this railing. Last time, we were retaining some of the pipe rail. We have modified that. All of it will be consistent on site. All railing will be this style right here. And I believe that's the highlight of the revisions. I have to leave you with this statement. We appreciate your comments, and we want to work with you. We're not digging in here at all. Thank you very much for your time.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I believe we have no public comment cards. Anybody wish to speak on this matter? Okay, if you could stay for just a minute. Oh, would you like to speak on the McDonald's matter? No? All right. Does staff [sic] have any questions of the applicant? Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. I have a quick question for you about the patio area outside the dining room. When I went out there the other day, it seems to me there's about a 12-inch grade difference between the landscaped area, what's underneath the majority of the new trellis, and the actual seating area. And when I'm looking at your perspectives, it seems to show that it's all the same level. Are you raising the patio outside, the landscaped area? I just don't understand what I'm missing.

Mr. Shively: I'm going to refer to the project manager on this.

Vice Chair Baltay: Please do. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, could you re-introduce yourself and spell your name for our transcriber?

Zorah Mariano, Stantec Architecture: My name is Zorah Mariano. [spells name]

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Mariano: The intent was to keep two different levels of patio areas. We do have a section, if you go back to the site plan, the (inaudible) site plan...? [locating slide] There are two paths of travel from the sidewalk, and they are right at that.... This immediate point is the access to here, and anyone that would want to come from this area would have to come back down to the ramp and over to this section here.

Vice Chair Baltay: Excuse me. Okay. I understand that. When I'm looking at this image presented to us, and several of these images here, I don't know if I'm missing something, but it sure looks to me like it's all intended to be one level. I want to just understand what your intent really is.

Ms. Mariano: It is not. It is intended to be two levels.

Vice Chair Baltay: In this image, there are two different seating planes?

Ms. Mariano: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: I do.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Going back to the trellis material, there is no sample here for the trellis, what that shading is, correct? And you said...

Chair Furth: The applicant is indicating that indeed there are no samples.

Board Member Thompson: I'm sorry, yes. Sorry. Could you go back and just explain the ones that you are thinking about, that are translucent, and then, a certain percentage perforated.

Mr. Shively: In the handout that Adam distributed, it should be after the renderings. There should be six renderings. Then there will be two sheets of a McNichols cut sheet, the specifications, as well as an isometric of those materials.

?: (inaudible)

Mr. Shively: Yes. There's two of those.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, they are both metal.

Mr. Shively: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: And what was the reason to go from wood to aluminum? Was it for the height?

Mr. Shively: More of a contemporary look.

Board Member Thompson: I see.

Mr. Shively: Right now, it's a heavy timber, and we wanted to go with a more contemporary line on the building. It seemed appropriate.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, I just have one more question. These two cut sheets kind of talk about the structure that it is, but is there a flat element that is going to go on top of that?

Mr. Shively: That...

Ms. Mariano: Those are actually the, the elements for the top of the structure. The main structure of the trellis will be steel posts with aluminum frame, and aluminum grating, or the architectural grating.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so these are the infill, even though...

Mr. Shively: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: ...they kind of look like...

Mr. Shively: They'll set on top. What you're seeing up there is there are intermediate members that in the photo run right-left, that are smaller steel tubes. We're thinking they're going to be probably 3 by 4 inches deep. The larger ones are going to be at the posts structurally. A structural engineer is obviously going to look at this. The design, though, was intended, you can see the c-channel on the trellis element itself, the outboard steel members. If you look at the white awning in the background, you'll see that that's a c-channel also. We were playing up the forms, but wanted to make it a different element, so painted it the gray that you'll find on other portions of the building.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, a few more questions. Sorry, I apologize I wasn't here for the last time this was reviewed, so, a couple more questions. The awnings, the white awnings and the metal trellis, those are all new and added to this part? Or was the white awning already...?

Mr. Shively: No, the white awning is new.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Okay.

Mr. Shively: The complete exterior is new, with the exception of some of the surfaces, which receive paint or the new materials. That would be on the elevations that were submitted.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thank you. Sorry, one last question. You said you added more concrete in your presentation. Could you explain exactly where that is?

Mr. Shively: The concrete we added was out front, and it was a maintenance issue. It wasn't a strong-arm, let's concrete this site. We wanted to soften it up. In Adam's PowerPoint, there would have been a landscaped strip here. It was about 12 inches deep, so the planting, unlike the planting back here, it doesn't get the heavy traffic, so we've maintained that thin planter there with the native grasses, which was our landscape architect's suggestion. This one, we've removed it. We felt it would have taken a beating and would have been a maintenance issue. But if the Board would like to see landscaping in there, we can do it. We could put the decomposed granite in there, pretty much like we've got over here at the benches, if we wanted a variation in materials. We are open for suggestions on that one. But that was the intent behind removing that and adding the concrete.

Board Member Thompson: All right, thank you. That is all my questions.

Chair Furth: Anybody else have questions? Just to clarify, then. The proposal is to put concrete between the brick wall and the sidewalk...

Mr. Shively: Yes.

Chair Furth: ...and still retain landscaping behind it.

Mr. Shively: Yes, absolutely.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions of staff or anybody else before we start deliberating? Does staff have any comments you wish to make? Seeing none, all right. Board Member Lew, why don't you start?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I can recommend approval of the project. And I did want to follow up on the corrugated metal. Last time, I think you mentioned another McDonald's project that was near a cannery district, and I did want to add that your project, this project, is actually across the street from Palo Alto's cannery, old cannery district, which has lots of corrugated metal. I think it actually will help fit in with the existing context of the neighborhood. I can support the project. I think the trellises look good. And I did want to point out, I think that there is an electrical vault along the sidewalk. It's in the planter now, so you may have issues with putting in the 12-foot effective sidewalk. I would encourage you to work with staff to see if, you know, there may be issues, and you may need to make it transition there, down to a narrow sidewalk, depending on the cost. Because this is a minor project, right?

Ms. Gerhardt: It is a minor project. Jodie Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager. It is a minor remodel project, but on the Midas Tires further down El Camino, we have a similar situation, and we required them to move any utilities or redo Christy boxes and things of that nature. I think we've been pretty strict on the 12 feet.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Thank you for that. Okay. And then, so, I can recommend approval. I'll see what my other board members think about the project. I would say, there are a couple comments for staff. On page 24 of the packet, which is on Findings, #2, I think you've got something there on plants, and the plants should go under #5. You've got some plant stuff under #5 already. I think it's just a cut-and-paste issue there. Yeah, page 24. In the first paragraph. And then, my second comment is that, I think I would like the concrete paving color and texture, (inaudible) finish, or whatever, to be submitted to staff.

Chair Furth: Board Member Gooyer.

Board Member Gooyer: Yes. I agree. I can approve the project the way it's presented. I think the trellises help a great deal. I'm also glad to see that apparently you dropped the trellises to the 9 and the 10 feet. At least in the renderings, they looked awfully tall, which I was going to recommend you lower those. The way it's shown like this, I can approve it as shown.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Hi there. Again, I apologize for not being here on the first hearing, so, sort of getting used to this a little bit more. In terms of the project, I feel like there are a few things that could maybe be improved on. Currently, when it comes to the trellis, a wayfinding, the way that it's laid out right now, if I'm looking at the render that we're all looking at right now, it looks like the front door is right at the end of that first run of the trellis, and it seems like that's not the case. You actually have to sort of take a right, and then take a left, and then take another left to get to the door. I wonder that, in terms of wayfinding, it might be better suited to the building to actually have that trellis run all the way from street to door, so that there is a very clear path of travel for people who are trying to get to the front door. I can sort of imagine people coming to the end of that first trellis and not really knowing where they need to go spatially, just because the architecture stops and changes material. I would recommend that that path of travel from start to entry...Because I feel like that could cause a lot of confusion, to get in and out. Also regarding the trellis, these cut sheets that you've provided are helpful, but the renders that are accompanying them look basically identical. I realize that that won't be the case, so, if this project were to come back, you know, either formally or as a subcommittee, I feel like this material that you're using for the trellis is not really well-defined. It's sort of hard to understand exactly what the feel will be underneath there. I did see an image really briefly of the first one, where there was a wood trellis. In terms of the feel, with everything, it almost felt like it had a better aesthetic than this metal trellis. I understand you're going for something contemporary. There are a lot of wood contemporary trellis styles, as well. You are using a, I guess, what is it called? E-wood, on the front of the building. It might have a nice relationship to continue that motif. Okay, that's on the trellis. The other wayfinding elements, like the location of the bike parking, also seems not intuitive. Unless I had already seen a bike parked over there, I wouldn't know that that's where I would need to put my bicycle. I do appreciate having the bike parking, something that's in public view, and I think that front plaza is a good place, but I wonder if there might be a more intuitive location, rather than something that's sort of tucked against the side. You know, we're not seeing signage. Maybe there's wayfinding, or something. It's kind of, a little hard to find the bike parking, so, something that might be more in clear view, something where everybody's eyes are on it, but also visible from the street. It might just be a simple rotation of what you're looking at. I think that could be improved on. In general, I mean, aesthetically, I don't know how critical to be. A McDonald's has so many different shapes and forms, sort of all over the states. I can really only judge this for what it is, and in the area that I know it to be. In general, the colors, in my opinion, seem too dark. A darker building accumulates more heat. It's sort of less efficient for the building. Again, I would recommend having something that's maybe, that considers different colors. I know dark is contemporary, and the accents are nice. I like the wood material that you have there. But for the gray that is otherwise extremely pervasive for the rest of the building, I think energy efficiency-wise, I don't know that it's the best solution. And even aesthetically, I don't know that it's the best solution. Those are all my comments for now.

Chair Furth: Board Member Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. Thank you for your presentation. I have two concerns at present that prevent me from recommending approval on this project. Big picture. The building really should be pedestrian-friendly and welcoming from El Camino, and I don't find that I can see either of those in this project. My concern has to do with the landscaping and the trellis design relating to the patio. In more detail, there is a grade change of about 2 1/2 feet, at least according to your grading drawings, between the street and the restaurant building entrance, which will affect how the trellis works. If it's 10 feet at one point, it will be over 12 feet at the other, which is, in my opinion, too tall at the street. It's not welcoming, it's forbidding. If it's 10 feet or 9 feet at the street, it will be too low at the entrance. What this strikes me as, is that you, it was designed more as a flat plain, and that wasn't really considered, and I think it has to be. It struck me very strongly, standing out there, that the grade change between the two dining areas -- the smaller one next to the building and the larger one in the landscape area in front of it -- are separate spaces, and they are by fact that you have about a 12-inch grade change there. When I look at your rendering, I'm sorry, but I don't see that. I see one flat area, which looks lovely, but it's not real. And it needs to be. I'm afraid I think the trellis needs to be thought about in enough detail



that it really functions as an outdoor area. And that's important because that's what makes the restaurant look attractive from the street, which is what we're after with our El Camino Real guidelines. Additionally, as Board Member Thompson was alluding to, I think the detailing of the trellis is not as attractive as it could be. I don't find it integrated with the building. It seems to come in higher than the other canopy on the edge of the building. It doesn't really connect you all the way to the entrance. It seems more like an afterthought, or like something the design board told you to do, rather than an integrated part of the building. Maybe that would be okay if it were on the side or it weren't so critical, but this is the face of your building. This is what you see as you walk by, as you drive by, as the community interacts with this McDonald's. This trellis, this landscaped area in the front, what we see, and it doesn't feel like it's been designed as tightly as it ought to be. I'm still confused also whether you have a perforated metal screening at the top, where you have the series of bar slats, which I think would be preferable because they provide better shade while still remaining open. But, to me, what's important is that the area underneath this trellis be comfortable to dine on and be attractive to look at, and I think certainly with perforated metal, it won't be comfortable underneath in the summer. It will be uncomfortable. And I think this industrial aesthetic doesn't quite cut it either. It just doesn't look right. On the landscaping, I also find that at least what's been presented to us seems to be too many succulents, too many dry grasses, and it's just not attractive. I think the idea of a decomposed granite bench area, at the foot of the bench on El Camino Real, also is, it just doesn't seem right somehow. That's what you put in a garden back in the woods more, and this should have maybe a different paving surface. I also think it's a shame to lose any kind of landscaping along the front of the bench, along the front of an existing brick wall. All these things are small, little things, or any one of them or two of them we can look past or try to get through a subcommittee, but in total, it feels to me, again, that the landscaping just isn't really put together as well. You have a really beautiful Japanese maple in the front, and I don't see any of these plants relating to that, or being part of the character of that tree or that plant. So, on those two counts, I found I just don't think this project is ready for being put forward. I think the trellis and outdoor dining areas need more work, and the landscaping needs more work. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation, thank you for your revisions. First, I'd like to say that I think that this proposal is better looking than your existing building and use of the site. The site is interesting because it's framed by tall trees on the back, and you have significant, you do have a significant tree on the site. I'm pleased that you're not proposing to maintain lawn, and myself, I would support eliminating that little theoretical landscaping strip between the sidewalk and the low wall. But, as part of that, I think you need significant landscaping that will show over the wall from the street. Because one of the things we're concerned about is how does this look as you drive by, as well as how does it look when you walk by. I'm pleased with the benches, that does address our concern that we're trying to make the street more friendly to pedestrians, more attractive to them. I do think that we need some seating which has, if not backs, arms, so that people who have difficulty standing up and sitting down can lever themselves up. But that's a minor matter. I'd like to hear more from my colleagues on the issue...And I think it's pretty clear, even if it wasn't communicated clearly, that we're not talking about perforated metal. The proposals that you're showing us are grates. Is that...? Applicant is nodding and indicating that's correct. I'd like to hear a little bit more from my colleagues on the, on the trellis. Looking at the drawings, they look pretty good to me, but I understand the drawings aren't necessarily accurate. And this is not a new building. This is a minor aesthetic remodel, so... But, we don't want something that could be better and isn't, and we don't want anything that doesn't meet our basic standards. If I could hear a little bit more on that fact from my colleagues, I'd appreciate it.

Board Member Thompson: I was just going to chime in here. I've already spoken about the trellis, and I know we want to hear about what Board Member Lew and Gooyer have to say. While Board Member Baltay was speaking, I kind of noticed that the awnings that you have definitely do compete with the trellis, and there might be a really nice opportunity to have a really clean, contemporary look, where you have this horizontal element that kind of floats above you, and that is your wayfinding that goes around the building. There's kind of a real nice opportunity, you don't have to have all these bits and pieces that kind of change plane and cut into each other. That maybe there is something that can respond to the grade change, but also act as this kind of horizontal element that people will use to get around and be

under and move through and around your building. As it's designed right now, it does not work like that. I think there is an opportunity to make that work really well for the building.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else? Alex or Robert?

Vice Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Chair Furth. Could I ask the applicant a question about the height of the trellis?

Chair Furth: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is it possible -- to the applicant -- to tell us, what is the headroom height of the trellis, both at the street and at the entrance to the building?

Mr. Shively: The bottom of the trellis at the building, the arterial one, the long linear one?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, the one showing on this image right now.

Mr. Shively: That is 10 foot to the bottom of it, and if we've got a 2-foot-6 grade, 12-6.

Vice Chair Baltay: This elevation showing the street view, that's 12-foot-6 high right there.

Mr. Shively: Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Shively: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: I put that to my colleagues, to be aware that this is twelve and a half feet tall out at the street.

Board Member Gooyer: Which I think is too tall.

Vice Chair Baltay: I do, too. And as I point it out, Robert, if you make it shorter at the street, you have a real problem at the entrance. It's not a simple, come-back-and-tweak-it kind of design.

Mr. Shively: Well, the first thing that jumps out at me would be -- and based on Board Member Thompson -- is that if we wanted to connect that outdoor dining awning to the main street awning, we could split that. Drop the one out front, and then, once you got to the landing and the ramp, then that trellis would transition higher at that point. We could step that, and as a way of wayfinding, the trellis would come into the structure -- there you see it. Once it gets past the bikes, it transitions to the left underneath the outdoor dining canopy, so it would be a contiguous trellis there at the same level.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: If you go with a set of floating trellises, then you can get away with doing that, having some variation on the various portions of it.

Vice Chair Baltay: Absolutely. I could see many ways it could be designed.

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Chair Furth: I'm going to suggest that I think these are matters that could be resolved in subcommittee. I don't think that the trellis redesign needs to come before the entire Board, nor do I think any landscape tweaking needs to come before the entire Board. Is that acceptable?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, I'd go along with that.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I think the trellis could probably come back. How do you and the other Board members feel about the color of the building being too dark?

Chair Furth: My concern is really the one you raised about energy efficiency. I don't have an aesthetic problem with it.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm okay with it the way it is, Osma.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, me, too.

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, there are two gray colors, and I think one of them is very dark. I would maybe suggest that the subcommittee could compare the colors to the dark gray on the Equinox across the street, which I think actually looks handsome. You might think it's too dark, but it's something to compare it to. Also, with gray colors and stucco, the texture of the stucco affects the color. Because the heavier the texture that you get, the darker the color looks. It actually is significant when I've done tests on buildings. I'm okay if the trellis comes back to the subcommittee. Board Member Thompson, you had mentioned the bike parking location. I've gone to the site several times, and people are already parking where they are proposing the bike racks. That's where people...I've seen lots of people go in, and they actually...I've gone there twice by bike and I park my bike exactly where they are proposing the racks, so I think that people have figured out where they need to go. And the heat gain is a huge issue. I've tested it out on my house. The darker colors really do make a difference, but I think on this one, yeah, I'm not sure that I...Yeah, I'm actually okay with the gray. It's a very good point, though, on the heat gain. (inaudible) make a motion?

Chair Furth: The notes I have are that we recommend approval with referral to subcommittee on the redesign of the trellis, to reduce the height at street level, and better design the two dining areas. Redesign the trellises?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I think it's important that the dining areas outside be integrated with the trellis design, so it's both the design of the dining areas and the trellis.

Board Member Thompson: And also the entry to the building.

Chair Furth: I think I said that.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, sorry, I missed that.

Chair Furth: If I didn't get...It doesn't matter what I said if it didn't get heard the way I intended. Okay. It would be redesign of trellis to better define and complement -- I can't think without writing -- the outdoor dining areas, lower the height at curb/sidewalk, and integrate with the main building. Review the stucco color in the context of the building, meaning structures across the way.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, and on that...

Chair Furth: And to minimize solar gain with the palette they're working on. Go ahead.

Board Member Thompson: I guess a question for the rest of the board is, if that color...Would the Board be open to that color changing if there was a better, more energy efficient color solution out there?

Chair Furth: I'm fine with that. I trust the Board [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: The most energy-efficient color would be white.

Board Member Thompson: Well, there's grades, right? It could be...

Board Member Lew: Right, but, I mean...

Board Member Thompson: ...off-white...

Board Member Lew: If you're going to the point of saying what is efficient, most efficient, then we would say pure titanium dioxide, right? And I don't think we want every building in Palo Alto to be white. It's beautiful in Greece. I don't know. I just find it, it's a difficult one. I think it's a valid point.

Board Member Thompson: At least I can be open to other colors.

Board Member Lew: If you actually look at the...I have two points. One is, for cool roofs, we don't get tax credits here for that. If you're in the central valley, you can get it, but you don't qualify here because it's not that hot. To me, that informs us that it's not a critical issue as if we were in, like, the central valley. And then, two, if you look at the solar heating, there's a huge jump when you go to grays and reds and whatever. You really do have to get a lighter beige to really get the big impact. I think we're going to run into some branding problems with their corporate stuff, which is fine. We can battle that if we need to.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: I don't know where we go. Should we take a straw poll?

Chair Furth: Well... Sure. How many would be in favor of asking that the stucco color be changed to white or a similarly heat-effective...?

Board Member Thompson: I don't know that it has to be white. I mean...

Chair Furth: Right. I think that's what Alex was just saying.

Board Member Thompson: I understand, but I don't fully agree. I mean, with all due respect, there are...

Chair Furth: That is what we always say before we disagree, right?

Board Member Thompson: There's jumps, right? Black is the worst, and then, gray is better, and then, there are gradients that are incrementally better. And just because we don't get a tax credit on our white roofs doesn't mean we don't deserve it. I don't know. There are other sides to this.

Chair Furth: All right, let's do something simpler. We can refer this to subcommittee to review the stucco color generally, and we'll let the subcommittee figure out what that means. Or, we can do it in a more limited way. What would you all like...? Alex, you proposed a straw vote.

Board Member Lew: I would just say another thing. The reason why we don't get tax incentives is because we are in a half heating and half cooling climate.

Chair Furth: Part of the year, it's useful.

Board Member Lew: We use half...Yeah. Half the time, like, November to April is heating months, May to October is cooling months. To me, it's kind of a wash. I'm not crunching energy numbers...

Chair Furth: Okay, so, I myself am not going to support a whiter change of color option. I think if we had addressed this at the beginning, I might feel differently, but we have not. What do the rest of you feel about this?

Board Member Gooyer: I'm actually okay with the darker color.

Chair Furth: Okay. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I would support something, if there's something, we're talking about an incremental change to a lighter gray, I would be willing to support that.

Chair Furth: (inaudible) out there, wondering where we're going. Yes, Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: I share Alex's statement.

Chair Furth: All right. Then the second item on our referral to subcommittee would be review of stucco color, both for suitability for the context and to see if there is a modification that would achieve the applicant's goals and increase energy efficiency on the building. Is that right? And I would ask that we also add review the bench design for suitability for universal access, and the paving color and texture, and the paving material under the bench, right? We're talking about? And, revisions to the landscaping behind the brick wall so that it is, it compensates for the loss of landscaping in front of it. Anything else? On the referral?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to express concern to my colleagues that this is a lot of stuff to put on a subcommittee. We've been finding subcommittee is, is having a hard time being effective on small things. This is a big thing. A lot of pieces going into this, and to me, collectively, there's too many things to make this really work on a subcommittee level.

Board Member Gooyer: I would agree. If it was just the elevation of the trellis, that's one thing, but now we're getting into color choices, which could affect the entire appearance of the building.

Board Member Lew: I think these are all very minor issues.

Chair Furth: I think they are small.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Okay, would somebody make a motion?

Board Member Lew: Well, I think you made a motion, and I will second it.

Chair Furth: Okay. I have my notes.

Board Member Thompson: Um...Okay.

Chair Furth: Yes. Before we vote does anybody wish to offer an amendment?

Board Member Thompson: I was just going to mention, in terms of whether the subcommittee would be effective in this matter or not, it's true, it's a lot. I do think a more formal review would be necessary, but I could be swayed to believing a subcommittee would be okay.

Chair Furth: Well, it looks like we're going to put it to an empirical test. We'll see. All those...

Board Member Lew: I think we know who we can put on the subcommittee.

Chair Furth: Absolutely. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? All right. That passes, 4-to-Baltay. No abstentions. And I will appoint a subcommittee to look into these matters.

**MOTION PASSES 4-1, with Board Member Baltay voting in opposition to the motion.**

Chair Furth: Thank you very much, to the applicant and to everybody else involved.

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3705 El Camino Real [18PLN-00136]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for the Demolition of two Existing Retail Buildings and Construction of a 100% Affordable Housing Project. The Project Consists of a Four Story Building Containing 59 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, and a Design Enhancement Exception to Allow for Garage and Ground Level Encroachments into a Required Rear and Street Side Yards. 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](mailto:Graham.Owen@CityofPaloAlto.org).**

Chair Furth: Now we will hear item 3, for which we have a large number of speaks. That's a public hearing on 3705 El Camino Real, which is a recommendation on the applicant's request for major architectural review to allow the demolition of two existing retail buildings and construction of 100 percent affordable housing project. The project consists of a four-story building containing 59 residential units, two levels of garage parking, and associated site improvements. The applicant is also requesting of other bodies -- not us -- a zone change to apply the Affordable Housing Combining District regulations to the site, and they are also requesting a design enhancement exception to allow for garage and ground-level encroachments into a required rear yard and street side yards. The project is exempt...wait a minute. The project is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act per Guideline 15194 pertaining to affordable housing. The project applicant is Palo Alto Housing Corporation. The architect is Pyatok, and the landscape architect is The Guzzardo Partnership. How many speaker cards do we have? We have about 10 speaker cards, so we may reduce the time for speaking to two minutes. But first, let's hear from staff. Staff? Oh, I'm sorry. This is a quasi-judicial matter. Has everybody visited the site?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: No.

Chair Furth: Everybody but Board Member Thompson has visited the site. Does anybody have any conversations, ex parte communications to report with others about this project?

Board Member Lew: No.

Board Member Thompson: No.

Chair Furth: No, nobody does. All right. Staff report, please.

Graham Owen, Project Planner: Thank you, Chair Furth. This is the second hearing that we've had with the Architectural Review Board on this particular item. As you mentioned, this is 3703 through 3709 El Camino Real, better known as Wilton Court. It is an application for architectural review for a four-story, 59-unit, 100 percent affordable housing project, located at the corner of El Camino Real and Wilton Avenue. As a bit of background, we've gone through the background before, but just to reiterate kind of

where we are and how we got there. This is kind of a, about a year, year and a half in the making, or so. The applicant submitted an application for prescreening with the City Council last year, and based on the results of that prescreening application, the City worked on an ordinance to create the Affordable Housing Combining District. That ordinance went through Planning Commission and City Council review earlier this year and was approved. Following that, the applicant did submit an application to rezone the property to do the Affordable Housing Combining District overlay, as well as the architectural review that you have before you today. The first hearing for this with the Architectural Review Board was in October, and this is the second hearing. Just to reiterate, the site is two parcels, 3703 and 3709 El Camino Real, located at the northeast corner of Wilton Avenue and El Camino. The existing site is zoned CN Neighborhood Commercial, and has a corresponding Neighborhood Commercial comprehensive land use designation, as well. The site is just under half of an acre and it's been used for retail and auto services in the past. There were a number of changes that were requested at the first hearing of the Architectural Review Board, and the staff report includes a list of the requested items that were to come back, as well as the applicant's response to those comments. First and foremost, one of them was to provide a formal site plan and landscape plan, and that's what you have before you today. This is showing the building in relation to the corner, as well as the street trees, the sidewalk, the pedestrian realm, as well as the rear courtyard, which is kind of in the L-shaped section of the building towards the end of the alleyway that's abutting the site. It also shows in the upper corner an area for a bioretention stormwater facility, and an oak tree that's existing on the site that would be retained. The basic orientation of the building has not changed. However, there have been a couple of important changes that have taken place since the first hearing. The first is that the number of units has been dropped from 65 down to 59. This is owing to a rear yard required setback for the second, third and fourth levels of the building. The number of parking spaces has remained essentially the same, gone from 42 to 41. One of the other, kind of larger ticket items that the Architectural Review Board had requested was to enhance the pedestrian experience as you're coming into the site by relocating the lobby, which was previously kind of at the center, center point of the building along the El Camino Real frontage, to the corner at El Camino and Wilton Avenue. There are a number of other changes that were requested to the cladding, to the architectural cladding, as well as looking at ways to make the building more imaginative. The architect will review the architectural changes with you momentarily, but I just wanted to give you a brief preview of what's to come. This is a couple of other additional items that have been included. I think a number of the, the neighbors that are adjacent to the site had some concerns about the building as it relates to shading, so the applicant has provided a shade study, which is included in the packet, in your project plans. We also have lighting plans with foot candle readings, which are preliminary, but those are included with the resubmittal. This is the building. As I said, it is essentially the same program with some modifications to the ground floor program. It's an L-shaped building. You have some differentiation between the materials on the ground level, which are board-formed concrete for the most part, and then, the upper levels of the building are terra cotta, as well as some stucco, stucco sections in different colors. These are the renderings from the rear elevation, or the east, as well as the alley elevation. There are a couple critical issues, key issues with the application that need to be taken under consideration. First and foremost, the site is located on El Camino Real, so the El Camino Real design guidelines and the South El Camino Real design guidelines apply in this case, and we have included in the draft record of (inaudible) action a number of the policies that are applicable and should be evaluated relative to the project. The other is the Affordable Housing Combining District development standards. As I mentioned, this is being tied in with a concurrent review of a rezoning to apply the overlay. Some of the underlying CN District regulations apply in this case, but the AH modifies the number of those standards. The second, one of the things that was also of importance to a number of the folks who live in the vicinity are the, the potential for parking spillover impacts, traffic impacts. The applicant has provided a Transportation Demand Management and Parking Analysis for the site. I have included a number of the measures that are included with the TDM plan in the actual staff report, to kind of give you an understanding of what they are hoping to do to reduce the number of peak hour trips that are associated with the project. They've also included analysis from GreenTRIP, which is a, they are basically a metrics entity that looks at a number of different variables and how they could be computed to approximate parking demand as opposed to trip demand. The GreenTRIP model suggested that 0.5 per unit would be sufficient for the project in terms of number of parking spaces. In this case, the parking that is provided is in excess of that standard. Lastly, design enhancement exceptions. There is a request to modify the setbacks for the

rear and the alley side, setbacks for the ground level, as well as for the below-grade garage level. Essentially, those are areas that are dedicated for garage and for vehicle and bicycle parking, and the request is to modify those, the strict application of those standards to allow for those features. Lastly, landscaping and street trees. We do have, the landscape architect is here and can speak to the landscaping intent. One thing that staff has been interested in seeing with the final iteration of the plans are some street trees along El Camino Real, something like a California plane, a London plane, or something that would be, kind of a broadleaf that would help to, certainly not hide the building, but to kind of shade it, and also provide for a better pedestrian experience. What's proposed now is some planters, so the intent with our comments there -- and the urban forester concurs -- is to get something that's in the ground, if possible, and if utility conflicts aren't present. Environmental review. The project does qualify for the Affordable Housing exemption under CEQA guideline, Section 15194. There are two sections to the guidelines that are applied. One of them is also 15192, which provides a number of criteria that need to be evaluated for this particular exemption. The project meets all of the standards for the Affordable Housing exemption, so we have considered it exempt from CEQA. With that, we are recommending approval of the project as presented, with a number of conditions of approval that are included in the project staff report, as well as the plans, and with the findings that we have in the staff report, as well. We are recommending that the Architectural Review Board find the project exempt from CEQA and recommend approval of the architectural review and design enhancement exception to the City Council. I'm happy to answer any questions, after that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I'd like to go straight to the applicant and the public, unless we have questions that really need to be asked now. We don't, so, if we could hear from the applicant, please. We do have one question. Is there a sample board, for material samples?

Adrienne Steichen, Pyatok Architects: Yeah. We also have some physical samples, as well as...

Chair Furth: Great. Want to give them to staff, so we can be looking at them? That would be great.

[Staff distributing/setting up material samples.]

Chair Furth: Thank you. You can go ahead.

Ms. Steichen: Sure.

Chair Furth: And if you could introduce yourself and spell your name for our transcriber. Probably your firm's name, too.

Ms. Steichen: Sure. I'm going to wait for the presentation to...

Chair Furth: Sure. Sorry.

Ms. Steichen: That's okay. My name is Adrienne Steichen [spells name]. With Pyatok Architects [spells name]. This is actually the third project we've come to the City of Palo Alto with, with Palo Alto Housing. Graham has described a lot of this, so I won't go into great detail on my first couple slides. Existing conditions, and the aerial. The existing single-story commercial properties that are on the two primary parcels. Again, this project is a 30-60 percent AMI, 100 percent affordable rental project. Up to 25 percent of the units are targeted to adults with developmental disabilities. Fifty-nine dwelling units, a majority of which are studio apartments. The height varies from 35 feet to 48, 49 feet, with a typical top height of 48 feet. Forty-one parking spaces remain, and we did increase the bicycle parking since you last saw this, from 70 to 86. And, the ground floor residential amenities remain. The site boundaries, we are commercial, Neighborhood Commercial along El Camino Real, abutting RM-30 behind us to the north. And then, of course, across El Camino is Neighborhood Commercial. Again, we're asking for the Affordable Housing Combining District overlay. Those two combine to setbacks as you see here, with a 50-foot height. The rear yard was determined to be actually an interior property line, with the front yard on Wilton. We're providing setbacks on both Wilton and El Camino to improve the effective sidewalk



width and add landscaping. That would be street trees and additional drought-tolerant landscaping, as well as street furniture in all of the street and side street frontages. In the massing, we decided to hold the street wall as you've seen prior, carve out a back yard in the interior of the property, step down to the neighborhood in accordance with the RM-30 abutting setbacks. Accentuate the corner by lifting it slightly, and define an entry on the corner based on some of your recommendations and comments. We also added significant solar shading. Previously, you had seen only top-floor solar shading. The south-facing facades are getting both vertical and horizontal sun shading. The west façade is getting vertical sun shading. That all combines together to the proposed design. Garage level remains largely unchanged since you last saw it. Ground floor, 17 parking spaces on the upper level of the garage. Bike parking took over a repurposed storage space next to the adjacent property line. We also moved the lobby to the corner to give it priority and emphasis. We moved the management office and laundry at your recommendation to accommodate that reorganization. We also cleaned up some interior circulation on the ground floor to improve pedestrian access in and out of the garage, but also to the upper floors. On the podium level, there is a similar organization of the units. We've pulled back from the interior property line to accommodate the rear yard setback. The courtyard space on the podium has large trees that are providing screening to the neighborhood. We've also added a vertical wall that provides some additional screening and trellis to really make a place on that podium for residents to have small gatherings, intimate gatherings. And then, have landscaped most of the podium to sort of limit the occupancy of that podium. Some demonstrative sections here of the trellis and the landscaping wall, the larger street trees and podium planters, as well as the landscaping buffer on the alley for access to the garage, and really screening the garage. Upper floor of the plan, very straightforward. Building materials. The materials that you have been looking at and the material board that was in your packet. We're proposing a terra cotta tile in some varied colors. We have a book that has some additional color options, and we're looking at more of the terra cotta, there's three terra cotta colors in there, adds the variation. The sunscreen with a perforated panel would be both the vertical and the horizontal sunscreens shown in the elevations. A thin parapet cap to give a top to the architecture. Two colors, mostly in a light body, to offset the terra cotta tile color, and then, a dark accent color that would be used on the residential portion on Wilton to step down the architecture. Capless storefront and board-formed concrete primarily for the ground floor. Provided for comparison, we're showing the current proposal and the previous proposal, which we had not color rendered. That's why you're seeing the difference there. But, accentuated the corner, really made more of a mass on the corner, but reduced the mass on Wilton, including the actual mass and the perceived mass. Instead of the terra cotta tile going all the way up and actually extending farther into Wilton, we've reduced the parapet height at the street level and really set that back with a stucco edge. That's reducing apparent height of the building along Wilton, as well as the setback step-down along Wilton toward the RM-30 zone. It's a little clearer once we get to the elevations, what I'm talking about. Again, on El Camino Real, really, we're leaving that corner piece available for public art. It could wrap the corner -- there's plenty of wall there -- to really make a real corner to that end of the building, and it will be exposed with the additional setback. The main building entry, there's bicycle parking for visitors at the main building entry, very visible to people coming and going, but also people inside the building, so it can be monitored and safely stored. A place to wait for car pickup or car service or a friend to come get you, or to just sit and be a part of the street life at the building entry. It really, we've also planned for building signage at that corner, and down lights so that it's a safe place to be at all times of the day. Here is an additional rendering that we had not shown you prior, of Wilton Avenue looking south towards El Camino Real, showing here with the tree that exists, and without. You can see the step-down of the mass, starting from the corner at El Camino, stepping down to, towards the alley, Lane 66. The units on the corner of Wilton Avenue and the alley are actually oriented towards Wilton alley, or towards the podium, so that they're keeping as much privacy for the adjacent neighbors as possible. Again, the elevation comparison for El Camino Real. We pulled together the windows for the units so that they are a little closer together. The space between now is an opportunity for an accent panel between the windows and the vertical mullions. It also allows for more recognizable, sort of residential pattern of the architecture. The frontage...We also then pulled the residential entry to the corner to give it a little bit more prominence. One of the things that was also mentioned last time was to actually raise the height of the ground floor, so we did do that by a foot and took it out of the upper floors, three inches or so out of the upper floors to accommodate it. Again, here is that elevation comparison on Wilton. That shows the perceived mass of the building stepping down. We also did a little bit of clean-up on the ground floor,

accessing around the existing transformer that's there, to clean up that architecture. Again, the landscaping along the alleyway to screen the elevation of the garage. We added a little trellis above the garage that will support additional landscaping climbing up and over, to really provide as much armature as we can for lush landscaping along that façade. Again, the interior property lines. And then, I want to actually give this over to the landscape architect to talk more in detail about the landscaping intervention. If I can.

Chair Furth: There's only 21 seconds left, but I think it would be important to hear from the landscaping architect, if the Board is willing to extend an additional two minutes to the applicant?

Board Member Lew: The other thing is, they will have a rebuttal period, as well.

Chair Furth: I realize they will, but I figure the public would probably like to hear what they have to say before the public presents its comments. I'm not going to cut the public time down from three minutes to two minutes, so, I think we should be equally generous to you.

Ms. Steichen: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Will two minutes do, or do you need three?

Gary Laymon, The Guzzardo Partnership: Good morning. My name is Gary Laymon, I'm with The Guzzardo Partnership [spells name].

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Laymon: Thanks for hearing us this morning. We're excited to be a part of this project. Had an opportunity to work in a very collaborative way with the development team to create a really wonderful space for this community that's coming to the site. We started with thinking about the pedestrian experience along the public streetscape, thinking along El Camino in particular. There were opportunities there to be able to enhance that to make it a more pedestrian-friendly environment, primarily by introducing street furniture, additional planting areas, both at grade as well as in elevated planters. Our initial thought when we saw the project was we should put some additional street trees, large-scale canopy street trees like you'd want to see along El Camino, and then, we went to the site and found that there were significant existing utilities in place that would preclude putting new trees in the ground. We looked at creating a new solution where we have elevated pots instead, which are compatible to utilities, and giving us some scale and canopy and separation, and making that a more pedestrian-friendly environment. We carried that idea around the corner on Wilton, as well, again, to help create a comfortable space to be able to work there. We were also cognizant that there's going to be parking both on El Camino and on Wilton, so that the landscape is going to have a tendency to get walked on. When we were encountered with that, we wanted to have green living material there, but wanted it to survive. We didn't want to put lawn in, which would be, kind of the go-to answer of yesterday. We have an actual ground cover material that is actually foot-tolerant, foot traffic-tolerant, and that's the carupa [phonetic] ground cover that's there. We've introduced some native plants in this area. I understand there's an interest to have more, and we're definitely up for doing that. We have salvia as one of our primary shrubs there. We have crepe myrtle trees in the pots. We think we can go to a western redbud, which would be California native, where we could actually include native plantings within those pots, as well, and probably substitute some of the planting along the foundation. Some of the grasses could become more native grasses, that sort of thing. We would be happy to work with staff in sort of fine-tuning that, to make sure we accomplish a greater percentage of native plants throughout the site. We had an interesting challenge in the upper-right-hand corner, with the large significant oak tree, which is basically growing in asphalt today, is very happy, for some reason that we can't understand. But we are improving it. We're taking the asphalt out, we're putting in, you know, soil. We've worked with the arborist to make sure that the stormwater treatment that we have in that area is outside of the canopy and it is compatible with preservation of that tree, and keeping that tree happy. It was important also for us to create a new good neighbor fence along the two property lines there, to be able to create a nice

transition to benefit both the neighbors and ourselves in keeping that area secure and clear. One of the other aspects that we were charged with was to really look at the alleyway itself, and to look at the paving material, which needs to be replaced and improved, and that's being done. We also wanted to make sure that that was a very secure feeling space, without introducing light that was going to be obtrusive to the neighbors, and to ourselves, for that matter. We worked very hard with our lighting consultants to develop a very crisp lighting plan that, as you can see on the photo-metrics, keeps the light from spilling beyond the property line.

Chair Furth: Thank you, and I'm sure we will have additional questions, but let's hear from the public now.

Mr. Laymon: Very good. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any essential questions to ask before the public hearing, or shall we proceed?

Board Member Thompson: Are we going to get a chance to ask questions of the applicant afterward, or...?

Chair Furth: Yep. Afterward.

Board Member Thompson: Afterward, okay.

Chair Furth: If it's the pleasure of the Board to do it now, we can. I just would like to proceed with the newest public speakers who have been waiting a long time. Not that they won't stay for our deliberations. The first speaker is Nicole Ventre, to be followed by Todd Lewis. Thank you.

Nicole Ventre: Hi, good morning. Thanks for having me this morning. Nicole Ventre [spells name]. I'm the manager of the property on the other side of the alleyway, to this proposal. First, I want...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, I just re-read our rules. I'm supposed to ask you for your address, too.

Ms. Ventre: Four-six-one Wilton Avenue.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Ventre: First, I want to say I absolutely support housing in Palo Alto, and I certainly agree that this site could afford to have a few improvements. But, as someone who lives immediately behind this building, I have grave concerns about, one, how large it is. This is a humongous four-story building with - if I can be so blunt -- a sardine can of people. And I still haven't heard how many is going to be the maximum occupancy of this building. I do know it has 59 units, so potentially up to 120 occupants, is what's in my mind. But, secondly, not only the mass of this building, it is absolutely encroaching on that very small alleyway. This is not a street. This is an alley. It is 19 1/2 feet from my bedroom window. That is including now bi-directional traffic, so, if you put two cars into this bi-directional traffic, it is now four feet from my apartment, my bedroom, as well as the bedroom of three of my other tenants. I have humungous concerns here. I feel like if this is an El Camino Real project, parking, entrance, and the building should remain on El Camino Real. I have plenty of documents I'm happy to hand out to you of a recent building that was once the Terrace Market for Stanford, is now the First Republic. They have a gigantic entrance to their parking garage on El Camino Real. This is a bi-directional entrance and exit. We already have a driveway carved out onto El Camino, so it's escaping me as to why we can't change this from alleyway entrance to El Camino entrance. This would remove a tremendous amount of grievance that I have with this project. If we're not having this 50 unit, 60 unit parking structure with access to parking, plus the 10 spots that I have on my own property. Seven, you know...Well, I know it's 40-some-odd, so let's say 50 cars up and down, four feet from my bedroom. Can we please just reconsider having this entrance from El Camino Real? It would absolutely reduce the encroachment that this building is having on my property. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Our next speaker is Todd Lewis, to be followed by Anita Lusebrink.

Todd Lewis: Hi, I'm Todd Lewis [spells name]. I own the two four-plexes across the street from the project.

Chair Furth: And your address, Mr. Lewis?

Mr. Lewis: Seven-zero Tulip Lane in Palo Alto.

Chair Furth: That's your residential address?

Mr. Lewis: Yeah.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: And my property is 482 to 488 Wilton. Right next to the Hong Kong restaurant. A huge impact on the corner of El Camino and a very small residential street, Wilton Avenue, highly impacted by traffic and parking. This project, we all support the project, we support the idea of low-income housing. No doubt about that. What we have a problem with is the height, the density, the number of people, the number of cars, the competing bicycles and pedestrians in our alleyways. I'm adjacent to the alley, too. And up and down the street, on all of the neighbors. It's double the size of anything built on El Camino because the emergency ordinance now allows a 2 to 1 FAR, as opposed to a 1 to 1 FAR. You now have a 49-foot building where, I think it was 30 or 40 feet max on El Camino before. It's very imposing. I would really like to see this, for many, many reasons, brought down in scale and number of residents, number of bicycles, and people with cars, from four stories to three stories, from 59 units to 40 units, and come into scale for our neighborhood, and impact the neighborhood a little less than it is. I've come off my previous remarks. Thanks a lot.

Chair Furth: Thanks. Anita Lusebrink, to be followed by, I think it's Jan Stokeley.

Anita Lusebrink: Hi, my name is Anita Lusebrink, and I'm voting in favor of this project. Our family home, I'm representing our family, is at 428 Ruthven in Palo Alto. It is a one-story home built in 1924 that borders an alley, four feet away. My mother has her bedroom right on that alley, for 40 years. On the other side, a new home was built and approved by the architectural board, I guess. It has two stories, a basement and a peaked roof that obviously holds an attic. On either side of this home, things have been built and approved, and this is the way things are heading, I'm afraid, because of modern life here in Palo Alto. Thank you for taking time for hearing stories of the people in the trenches that have family members with developmental disabilities that were raised in Palo Alto. I attended the meeting with the neighbors in Wilton Court and I found it very productive, and I also know that there are other outreach, you know, communications that are happening. Just two days ago, I took my niece to Housing Choices to get a below market rate housing wait list for...in Santa Clara County. The housing list that she is getting on typically have openings for her, will have openings for her in three to five years. She's on the autism spectrum and unable to work at a typical job, dependent on SSDI benefits from my sister, who died in 2004. My niece has been living with a roommate for two years in a studio apartment near Spartan Stadium in San Jose. The situation is becoming unacceptable due to occurrences of both financial and physical abuse. It is a well-known fact that people with disabilities are often taken advantage of due to their condition. This is why I hoped very strongly that my niece will be able to move into a location that she can be both independent and nearer to the support of her family network here on the Peninsula. My niece does not drive because of her condition and does not need her parking space, as is the case with many people with disabilities. But she does need to be near easily-accessible public transportation. People that, through some circumstance or another, have a disability that prevents them from competing economically should not be cut out from living near their family and community of origin. Let's level the playing field one tiny step at a time with new developments like the proposed Wilton Court project at 3705 El Camino Real. Thank you so much.

Chair Furth: Thank you, and before you leave, would you mind spelling your name? I'm sorry.

Ms. Lusebrink: I tried to write it very clearly on the card, but it is...My first name is Anita [spells name], the last name is Lusebrink [spells name]. And the name of the street, our family home is on Ruthven [spells name].

Chair Furth: Thank you, and we don't pronounce it "Ruthven" here. Our next speaker is Jan Stokeley, to be followed by Katie Talbot.

Jan Stokeley: Good morning, I'm Jan Stokeley [spells name]. I'm the executive director of Housing Choices. We're a non-profit organization, with our main office in San Jose. We work with cities and developers across the county to create inclusive and affordable housing for people with developmental disabilities, and we're here today to speak in support of the project. For more than four years, there's a group of families in Palo Alto who have been going to City Council, Planning Commission, many meetings, looking for opportunities with developers and the City to create more inclusive housing here in Palo Alto. Right now, there are more than 400 adults with developmental disabilities living in Palo Alto. Only 40 of them are living in their own apartment. Most of them are living at home with aging parents who would like to see them live in Palo Alto where they can be close to family and use public transit and shop in all the places they are already familiar with. We have supported residents with developmental disabilities to live in inclusive housing for more than 20 years. We've supported residents in studio apartments. Our residents who live in studio apartments tend to be very independent. They do not drive, but they use public transit. There's a focus on employment first, so many of the residents are working and using public transit to get to work. They do not have live-in caregivers, they do not have frequent visits from caregivers, so the parking reduction and the parking impact of this project is significantly benefitted by the inclusive nature of the population that will live there. We appreciate all the work that Palo Alto has done, of the many -- Palo Alto housing has done on this project -- of the developers that we reached out to, this was the only developer who really said, "We want to work with you, we want to overcome the barriers, and we want to make something happen." The project here today is a culmination of more than four years of advocacy by Palo Alto residents, and I appreciate everyone's comments, and I hope we can work together to create a wonderful design that will lead to a wonderful community that makes Palo Alto a more inclusive place. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The next speaker is Katie Talbot, to be followed by Linnea Wickstrom.

Katie Talbot: Good morning. My name is Katie Talbot [spells name]. And you want my address?

Chair Furth: We do.

Ms. Talbot: Okay, 600 Junipero Serra, Stanford. I am here to ask you to please support the Wilton Court development. It provides critically-needed housing for two underserved, less-visible communities in Palo Alto. The low-income and developmentally disabled communities need your support to continue to live in their home community, to contribute to the diversity and vibrancy of Palo Alto. I am impressed... I'm going to be very brief. I just want to have another statement of support for the plans that I've seen. I'm impressed with how far the architects have gone to make this, to respond to neighborhood comments, and make this building step down in the back so that it can blend in with the community. The front of the building looks very friendly and it looks like a really great place to be, and it looks like it will really contribute to El Camino's streetscape with the friendly seating in the front. The one comment that I have about the parking is that traditionally in low-income, and particularly in housing developments with developmentally disabled populations, the parking requirement is quite small. It would be a real shame if Wilton Court is, this Wilton Court development is required to have more parking spots than are needed, and that, if there is a lot of empty parking capacity under there. So, if you could consider that carefully. Thank you very much for your time.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Linnea Wickstrom, to be followed by Per Maresca.

Linnea Wickstrom: Good morning. My name is Linnea Wickstrom [spells name]. I live at 450 Monroe Drive in Palo Alto. I'm a 50-plus-year resident of Palo Alto and the parent of a young adult with a developmental disability, and I'm here to urge you to do everything you can to bring Wilton Court to fruition, with the AH zoning overlay and the design enhancement. Though my son may never be one who gains a residence in this proposed development, there are hundreds like him in Palo Alto. With the paucity of affordable housing in Palo Alto, the intellectually and developmentally disabled are much in need of exactly the kind of opportunity that Wilton Court presents. I hope that the number of units will be kept as is to accommodate the greatest number of renters of all types. Because parking is also an issue, I want to reiterate what Jan said. The developmentally disabled generally, almost none of them drive or own cars. They don't have licenses. My son currently lives in a studio apartment in Mountainview that is parked at .25, and that is entirely adequate. I'm there once in a while, quite often, sometimes at day, night -- It's fine. I also happen to live 200 yards off El Camino, 100 yards from a new development of the Hilton Residence Inn, with 157 or 200 rooms and 26 four-bedroom houses built behind that. It was a step down from the commercial district on El Camino to RM-15/RM-30, that now holds 26 four-bedroom units, parked at .5. And it's been fine. The step-down was fine, from the commercial to the three-story, four-bedroom units to RM-1. And it all worked out. There are probably five cars that additionally park on our street from that development. I want to emphasize that inclusive housing is a goal for our kids, and the design of Wilton Court is excellent for that. It's got a common room, bike storage -- All the things that people that don't use cars need. And, to join in with a community of, you might call them "abled" or "neurologically usual" people. They are very social, they want to hang out with people. Wilton Court will provide an inclusive community inside Palo Alto, where all their supports all, and inside an actual development where they can mingle with people. Thank you for your contribution to making Wilton Court happen.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The next speaker is Per Maresca, to be followed by John Ma.

Per Maresca: As my mother would say, good morning.

Chair Furth: Good morning.

Mr. Maresca: My name is Per Maresca [spells name]. I am currently 27 years old and was born and raised in Palo Alto. I'm here to speak for hundreds of others in Palo Alto who are intellectually or developmentally disabled and who need or will need housing we can afford. We want to be full members of our community. Wilton Court is the kind of housing that will meet our needs for affordable and inclusive housing. Housing in part of a diverse community of residents right in a town we know, and where all our support systems are. Wilton Court has features that everyone can use and that are really important to people like myself. There are bike storage lockers, laundry, and a patio and common use for get-togethers, like I have a community room at my complex where I hang out with my friends. And the location on El Camino is right next to the buses that we use all the time to get to shopping, entertainment, and our jobs. We will be good neighbors to the other residents and to the Ventura neighborhood, and we hope that they all want to be our neighbors. Please help Wilton Court become a reality. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Maresca. John Ma, to be followed by.... This one I'm really having trouble... Ramkee A. I'm sure you know who you are. Mr. Ma.

John Ma: Good morning. My name is John Ma [spells name]. My address is 1257-B Oakmead Parkway, Sunnyvale. I am the owner of the four units directly behind the proposed project, APN #13235024. Okay? I am actually quite pleased with the way the, what the architects have presented on the project. My primary concern is the alley behind the building. It is rather narrow, and I presented to the Board several pictures, of which Picture #1 is a commercial vehicle going down the alley, directly across from us. As you will see in the picture, this commercial vehicle will occupy more than 75 percent of the alley, which is the, like, for example, delivery vehicles or garbage trucks, which basically will impede any in-and-out of the residents of this project and my residence from accessing Wilton Avenue and exiting the property. There is basically 100 feet of, from the alley to El Camino, going down Wilton Avenue, which is

currently right now very congested, especially during commute times. You know, as you can see in pictures 2 and 3. And what this basically...The location of the garage is really severely add to that congestion, and as a result, it would just lead to a lot of frustration on residents of this project, and my residents. You have here basically a picture of what the alley currently looks like. As Nicole has pointed out, there is barely 18 feet between the fence and this, and the current fence, and there is a proposal to decrease the setback from 10 feet to 5 feet. Which basically is one of my other concerns, is the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians accessing the property. With the blockage of, you know, two-way vehicular traffic, there really is no room for cyclists. Okay? If you take a typical width of a vehicle, plus the, you know, plus the distance that you need for safe passage, there really is no room for bicycles. I mean, California law says they should provide cyclists three feet of leeway when you're going around, you know, as you pass a cyclist going down this alley. There is no three feet. I really am not in favor of reducing that setback. My proposal would be to take that, you know, part of that 10-foot setback and make it a sidewalk or a bike way for the cyclists that are...

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Ma.

Mr. Ma: Okay.

Chair Furth: If there's anything else you want to give the Board, give it to staff, but I think we do have your photographs. I am having trouble reading this -- Ramkee? Handwriting not as bad as mine, but...

Ramki Anandhakrishnan: My full name, Ramki Anandhakrishnan [spells name]. I live in John's property. I am one of the tenants.

Chair Furth: And your address? I'm sorry.

Mr. Anandhakrishnan: Four-fifty-five Wilton Avenue.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Anandhakrishnan: Yeah. My concern is the same, about the size of the project and the impact to the parking because I have a parking spot in that alleyway. That's the only access I have to park and come... And then, there's another resident who is trying to get in or out, one of us has to wait for the other person. So, right now, there are only four spots, and then, there's another four spots, trying to get through another, to another entrance, which actually goes into a courtyard. That's like eight cars right now, so you're going to double it, triple it, whatever. That's one big problem. And then, there's the time during the construction, during which all the heavy vehicles are going to be preventing me from leaving for work and getting back. And I work from home a lot, as well. And the size of this project, it's absolutely going to tower and cut out all the light, any air, any hope of that, completely off. I'm going to keep it short. I just want to second what John and Nicole have said. If you could move the regular access to El Camino away from the alleyway, and reduce the size, not make it such a big, imposing structure, that would be great. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Then it's time, the applicant, you have an additional 10 minutes to respond.

Ms. Steichen: Hi. Again, Adrienne Steichen with Pyatok Architects. Thank you for all of the feedback so far. We really appreciate all of the interest from the community about this project. One thing that I would like to point out is that we are moving trash access for our site onto Wilton Court, onto Wilton Avenue. That should reduce the trash service impact on the alley from this particular project. It would not change trash service to the other properties, but it would change trash service to this property, and that should have some reduction. I also want to point out, bike parking is accessed both from within the building, as well as directly from the street. Bicyclists who arrive at this site who live here are able to take their bikes directly into the bike parking on El Camino Real. There are actually two bike parking rooms that front onto El Camino Real. I also want to add, the current driveway access is on El Camino Real. By moving it

to the alley, we are going to add probably one to two spaces on El Camino Real as public parking, in the replacement of that sidewalk. It's a small add, but it's something, and it all starts to add up. I also would like to add, the location of the driveway entrance or the driveway access to the upper-level parking is very close to the intersection of the alley and Wilton Court. It should limit traffic on the alleyway. Not all 41 cars are going the entire length of the alleyway. It should also assist in limiting double parking on that side of the street because of the garage access. I'm open to additional comments or questions. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Any questions of the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: Are we done with the public...? Okay.

Chair Furth: They...Yes. I'll close the public hearing, though we may reopen it if needed during the course of this meeting. Osma, you had a question of the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I had some questions on the elevation.

Ms. Steichen: Sure.

Board Member Thompson: Are the windows punched at all? Do they recess into that tile? Or is it sort of flush with the tile, and then we have the shading?

Ms. Steichen: No, so, we did not pass around these example, sample window corners that we have here. There are two different windows here. What we included in the proposal is actually the black frame, which is a self-panning window, so it has some shadow depth to it that will create more of a punched look and a more of a recessed and additional architectural interest to the façade.

Board Member Thompson: And what's the other one?

Ms. Steichen: The other one is actually a vinyl window that...Let me flip it around for you. [moving display around] It's a vinyl window option, which has less of a profile to it, less of a recess to it, but has similar aesthetic quality. Vinyl windows are slightly better performing than aluminum. We will have to run our energy models to really make sure, but they tend to be slightly better performing. You can get similar sizes in them, and the exterior finish material can be made to look like it's aluminum. I actually tricked my construction administration director last week on a site. He thought that vinyl windows on a project that I have in construction were actually aluminum windows. The color match to the aluminum frame was...And he was standing right next to it. There has been quite a leap in that technology, and improvement in, sort of the color range and choices that you get to the aesthetics of vinyl window. We're presenting just as a financial option for the project, but our primary interest is in the self-panning recessed frame.

Board Member Thompson: And then, in the elevation on the south side, I notice there was a little different coloration in the windows, so, is there spandrel glass in between those, sort of in the main...? Not this elevation, but the other one.

Ms. Steichen: This one?

Board Member Thompson: Yes. Is there spandrel in those...?

Ms. Steichen: There are two primary window sizes. There's the large window, and a smaller window that's, like, three feet wide. And then there is... And the smaller window, we're proposing to have a, not exactly spandrel glass, but some opacity to it, to provide some additional variation. And then, there is a trim piece between the two windows at the structural support to provide an additional accent. It probably would match the window frame color.



Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, we kind of have, like, a rhythm of two, two open, and then the trim, and then one open.

Ms. Steichen: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: But there's no spandrel in there.

Ms. Steichen: No.

Board Member Thompson: I thought I read that wrong.

Ms. Steichen: We do have an example of it in our little materials page in the packet that you should have received. And it's also on this material board.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, great. Just a couple more questions. The board-formed concrete, in some images it's running horizontally, in other images it's running vertically.

Ms. Steichen: We're intending to run it vertically.

Board Member Thompson: Vertically, okay. And then, in terms of the terra cotta façade, it didn't...You said three colors.

Ms. Steichen: Up to three colors, yes.

Board Member Thompson: Up to three colors? And is it going to be something that's, sort of really prescriptive, like the patterning of these colors? Or is it...?

Ms. Steichen: I think we will do a design for the patterning of the colors. I think we will want to control that and not fully randomize it because the pieces are larger than, say, a brick that you might want to randomize. I think this, we will want to have a little bit more control over.

Board Member Thompson: And that is the size?

Ms. Steichen: That's the size.

Board Member Thompson: True scale. Okay.

Ms. Steichen: That's the size, and that's the intended, sort of heft in weight of the material. And then, the book that we were passing around, there's a -- I should have tagged them -- there's three colors that are sort of a variation of that, that I think work quite nicely with each other. Yeah. The second two that you're pointing, and... Yeah. And then, the one below it, there. Yes. Sorry, I should have tagged them. I apologize.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thank you. Those were my questions.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to follow up on the terra cotta cladding, if you could.

Ms. Steichen: Sure.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm only passingly familiar with this, but it seems to me that the detailing of the mitered corners where the windows are all come into play. Can you elucidate me a little bit further, how cleanly that can be done?

Ms. Steichen: Yeah. We're quite familiar with detailing a little metal jamb piece that will receive the open end of the terra cotta tile. They can be detailed so that the terra cotta tile looks as if it's mitered together, but there is actually a little metal piece that's pulling them together at an outside corner. And then, against the window jamb, a J-mold piece would be sufficient.

Vice Chair Baltay: I see. You need additional metal trim...

Ms. Steichen: Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...at all edges of these things.

Ms. Steichen: We do.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the architect? I have a question of the landscape architect. Looking at sheet L-3-1, and particularly on the section of the sidewalk, you seem to be showing a plant that would be about 10 to 12 feet tall in the planter.

Mr. Laymon: That's right.

Chair Furth: And you're thinking of...?

Mr. Laymon: What's shown on the plans are crepe myrtle trees. It's sort of a standard form of a tree, and we were thinking, if we wanted to increase our native component there, we could use a western redbud that would have a similar sort of scale to it.

Chair Furth: And these are both deciduous, in this climate?

Mr. Laymon: They are both deciduous, yes.

Chair Furth: This is just a little bit above the first story, the ground floor. Is that right?

Mr. Laymon: That's right.

Chair Furth: My concern is that when we have a building of significantly more stories, it's nice to have...it's good to have higher landscaping. Of course, our first request is street trees. But, is it correct that staff has advised you that that's not possible on this block, this frontage?

Mr. Laymon: It's what we...

Chair Furth: That was kind of a complicated way of saying that. Did staff say you can't do that?

Mr. Laymon: No. That was not a staff comment. We observed that when we were on site, walking the site with our engineers, and found that the existing utilities, both the utility boxes and the...Actually, it had been USA'd already to indicate where the underground lines were. In fact, the existing trees there wouldn't comply with where the utilities are. We're obviously leaving those in place, but we're looking for ways to be able to increase the tree canopy and create that separation on El Camino, make that a pedestrian-friendly environment. Having the planters of the size we're showing, we're expecting to get the trees up there, you know, as we're showing here, and give us some shade, particularly on that ground level.

Chair Furth: But that's essentially the height you can, the maximum height you can hit reasonably using a planter strategy like this?

Mr. Laymon: Yeah, the trees could probably...I'm being a bit conservative in terms of what I can deliver.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Laymon: The trees themselves, you know, if they are happy, can get to be bigger. They can be taller. But I don't want to overstate.

Chair Furth: Right. Not a lot of these particular crepe trees in my life. Okay. Any other... Oh, and I had one question for the architect. I understood what you were saying about, by removing an entrance on El Camino, there will be additional curbside parking. I understood what you said about relocating the trash collection and bicycle traffic out of the alley. I missed what you were saying about reducing double parking.

Ms. Steichen: We've observed, and we have heard, concerns about double parking in the alley, and that...

Chair Furth: Oh, in the alley itself.

Ms. Steichen: In the alley itself, constricting flow there. I do think that having that active garage entrance will assist in reducing the double parking, particularly near the intersection. That was the comment.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Ms. Steichen: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Does staff have anything they wish to add?

Mr. Owen: Just a bit of clarification on, kind of the City's take on the tree situation, and the street trees. Our urban forestry division, looking at the latest iteration of the plans, they are removing some trees that are existing on the site, that a lot of them are in pretty rough shape, given that they're growing, essentially in asphalt. The urban forester looked at the plans and included a condition of approval, which is in your packet, to install street trees that are better in the ground. What we're hearing from the landscape architect is that that might not be feasible given the layout of the utilities. I think what we would want to do is likely have some sort of caveat where, if we do an investigation into the sidewalks, to look and see what's actually under there, if anything can be moved, and if it can't, we might need to have some sort of backup in terms of allowing for a planter or some sort of, something that's not as permanently in the ground. If it's not possible to... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: How are the planters watered or irrigated?

Mr. Owen: That would be a good question for the landscape architect.

Chair Furth: The applicant.

Mr. Laymon: The existing trees are not watered, and we would be adding water to them. The new trees would have irrigation brought up through the planter pots, so we would come through the sidewalk and pop up to make sure they are irrigated.

Chair Furth: Okay, and those are on the City's property?

Mr. Laymon: Yes.

Chair Furth: And who maintains them?

Mr. Laymon: Mostly the buses. No, they are taken care of by the property owner, typically. We would be taking care of the irrigation system, making sure that's viable.

Chair Furth: Okay, thank you. Anything else? Anything else before we start discussing this among ourselves?

Board Member Thompson: Is that a stucco sample, paint sample, over there?

Chair Furth: That's Board Member Osma, pointing at something.

Board Member Thompson: No? Okay. Do we have a paint sample of what the stucco would be?

Ms. Steichen: We do not. We only have the rendered and the color samples on the board.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thanks.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Who would like to begin? Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. Okay. I think the presentation today is greatly improved over what we saw the last time, but the problem I still have with this project is that it's still, is a very tall, flat, you know, elevation, that there's really no undulation, no nothing on the two sides. And, in fact, the two sides that are the most attractive are the two that face El Camino and not the side that faces the residents and the community behind it. That is a stucco elevation, which has even less fenestration on it. Just seems like a very large building, just too large for the location. I was hoping to say, like I said, a little bit more detailing to the, to make it a little bit more visually appealing than it is now. The entrance has been shifted to the corner, but still, when you drive by, it's still tough to see. It's a single door in a glass wall that, to me, isn't really an entry point. It's still sort of, the door is somewhere near the corner, but it really doesn't enhance that location. Considering, also, because you mention that a lot of the people are going to be coming in through the front door rather than the traditional, everybody pulls into the parking lot and never sees the front door. With the occupants in this, they will, so I would like to see that enhanced. It's not really doing anything for that. I do like the possibility of having some artwork on the side there, which I know is not part of this purview, but I like the possibility of that. Like I said, the materials are greatly enhanced, and I think do a lot for the building, but I'm just still not...It just still looks like a very large, four-story shoebox to me.

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. This is the first project that the Board has reviewed with the new proposed Affordable Housing overlay, so I'm struggling with it a little bit. I would say on the massing, I would normally, if it was like market-rate housing, I would normally try to step down more towards the existing apartments on Wilton Avenue. If you're doing market rate, like, townhouses, you can do more with the units because, like, the third floor could be in an attic or something, and you could bring the scale down to match the neighborhood. I think that this project, it seems like you're meeting the zoning requirement, and they are studios, so you don't really have that much flexibility with the unit design because they're so small. There are very few options with that. Normally, I would try to get, if it was, like, a townhouse, it would have an entrance there on the corner of Wilton Court and Wilton Avenue, to really try to tie it into the neighborhood. But it seems like that's not possible on this particular project. I think also, in looking over the dimensions, I would ideally like more space in the, in that alley area. Like, the planting, planting area. I did look at your plans. You don't have a lot of, you don't have a lot of fat in the floor plan now, so I'm not sure that that's actually feasible. On the building design, I do like all of the changes that you've made to the windows and the sun shades and the materials. I think that that looks good. On the public art component, I know we have our whole process for that. I would ask, maybe consider having artwork at the street level and not up high on the wall, to make it more pedestrian-oriented. It will depend on the public art process, as well as the artist. But I would cite one project that I just saw recently. There's the, it's called Bayside Park. It's a senior housing project in

Emeryville, along 40th Street. They have a sculpture, and it's, like, a three-piece sculpture, and one is in each structural bay along the sidewalk. As you're walking down the street, you see this thing evolve. In that particular one, they have a deeper arcade. They have a... You don't have quite as much space in here, so it may not, something like that may not work in this particular case. But I think that the location that you're showing tentatively now looks good. I'm not sure how many people are going to see it if you're driving by, or if you're walking by. It may not be as noticeable as it is, as we're looking at it in the drawings. On the street trees, I think that was probably the first thing that I, sort of popped out at me on the drawings, that I really would prefer to have the London planes at 25 feet on center, as our guidelines call out. Even if there's a way to get one in, one more, and then, the rest are crepe myrtles, or something. Or your alternate species. I would really encourage you to try to figure out if there's a way to get even one more London plane. On the sun study, thank you for doing the sun study. I just wanted to point out one little, minor thing, is that I think that the north arrow is incorrect. I think the sun shades, the sun...The model itself I think was calculated correctly, but the north arrow is off, so it did make me question everything. But I think it was all done accurately. On the windows, I think our guidelines call out for recessed windows or trimmed windows. And then, we haven't always, I think, enforced that for affordable housing projects. My recollection is that the Mayfield housing that Stanford built on El Camino had some sort of projecting fin to make it look like trim, but it was really part of the window. I think you're proposing sort of opposite, something recessed, and I think that's fine. I think my only other suggestion is maybe on the terra cotta, that the corner element has some slight difference in color or texture. I'm open to... I'm flexible on that. But generally, I could recommend approval of the project. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. Thank you for your nice presentation. I find myself generally in favor of recommending approval of this project. I have two smallish, functional questions on the inside, which I'll just put out there. I don't think they're really part of our purview, but I think the parking ramp is exceptionally steep. It seems to me that if you just increased the size of the underground area to go under the entire building, you would have more room for the ramp, and more comfort making the parking function better inside. It seems actually very obvious to me that that would make sense. I can see there's probably an economic reason not to do that, but I would leave that determination to our transportation division. If they feel the ramp works, it works, but 22 percent is really steep, especially around a curve. I just throw that out there. Secondly, your bicycle parking, the way you have it in the front right corner of the building, at least as I see it you have to come... Say I come in from the street and park my bicycle. Then, I walk into the garage and upper ramp, down the length of the garage, and if I want to go get my mail or go back into the lobby, I have to go back down a ramp again. It seems to me that you could probably just organize it a little bit better internally so that it's more friendly. The only reason I bring it up, really, is that it's important that we make citizens using bicycles feel as first-rate citizens and not have to be off in a corner where the parking is difficult at the end of a corridor, or something. If you could change that, that's fine. My critique would really be that I think the corner is still not quite strong enough. The treatment is improved, and having the entrance to the building underneath it is good. But the pattern of the windows, the exact same material, the treatment of the detailing, is all identical to the other terra cotta pieces. To me, it doesn't quite have a strong enough corner feeling. As well, the top of the parapet there is only a foot, maybe, above the rest of the building. It seems to me, if you get a little more difference, make the corner taller or the rest of the building just a little bit lower, that would serve to strengthen a little bit more that corner element. Somehow change the way the windows are done, or the shading, perhaps. Aside from that, I think you've got a handsome-looking building here, and I can support approval. Let me comment to my colleagues that this is a big building. It is a FAR 2.0 box, and the only other way to reduce the mass is to push it further into the back. I just don't see a whole lot architectural ways to cut it back. And this is what the council wants us to be building in this town, this kind of density, so this is the shape of it. I just put that out there to the public, to hear. This is what FAR 2.0 housing looks like. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Hi. Thank you so much for your presentation. I agree that it's much improved from what we saw last time. I really appreciate the use of your light-colored stucco. I appreciate that you are using a terra cotta that is a good thermal mass. I appreciate that you will spend some time to make sure that that pattern of the different colors reads the way that you're trying to show this in the renderings. I saw some pictures in this little pamphlet here of just singular colors all the way in a running, kind of grid bond, and it's way more impressive than what you're showing here. I like that you're using the different colors to soften it. I think it will help with the big massiveness of this building, which is really what you have to deal with. In that sense, I appreciate all those changes. I think my first... When I first saw this, I had a similar reaction to Board Member Gooyer, that it still is quite boxy in terms of its massing. I understand the struggle because in order to make this less boxy, you might need to lift a corner, or something, or do things that could potentially take up more space, and you're under a lot of pressure to keep this thing looking small. But, at the end of the day, Board Member Baltay is right. This is what it is, and what you have is, I think, what you should try to make as beautiful as you can. I agree that that corner element... I don't know that I would support changing the color necessarily, but it seems like there is something more that could be done there in terms of adding an extra layer of textural element, or detail, or something that could make that special. It almost seems like it's, it's just kind of one step away from being what it really wants to be. I also appreciate that you added shading elements into the building. There's something that makes me a little nervous, in that somebody could just VE it out, and it could be just be like... You know, we're here with the budget, what can we take out? Well, those shading things could just be popped off. And that would be really terrible. Part of me was asking about the punches because that recess would give you some inherent shading. It would definitely add a bit more depth and dimension to your façade that might otherwise be quite flat. I don't necessarily oppose this element. Actually, the more that I'm playing with it, the more I like it. But I do worry that it's something that could just be taken off, so, I don't know if there's a way to integrate the shading a bit more into the design, into something that is less-easily knocked off. Because I think it's important, and I think it speaks well to the other, sort of sustainable elements that you've added to the building. The north elevation, is there a way that we could change the slide to the north side? [change slide] Yeah. Your previous proposal had much more interest than this current one, and it's really just because you're adding swaths of color. I would encourage you to bring that back in a little way. Not necessarily the darker gray. I like the lighter color that you have, but something just to add more color, or something. You don't need to dress it up all too much, right? Because kind of, there's this, you know, multifamily housing thing where, you put the money where most people will see it in terms of the façade. And it's true, on the north side, not many people will see it, so you don't want to spend as much there, but you can use things like paint and other things to make that more interesting. I would definitely... I think that's actually a really important part. This north side, as it stands, to me, is kind of unacceptable. A few tweaks, I think it could be a little bit better. In general, I'm very supportive of the project. These elements that I've spoken about, I don't know if those are things that could come back to subcommittee. There are very important things, and some of these other things that we've spoken about, I would like to see an update, in general. But, in general, it's going in a really good direction. Okay, yeah, that's all for me. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Staff, what's the residential density on this project, as it's revised?

Mr. Owen: I believe it's 127 to the acre.

Chair Furth: Does that sound right to the applicant? You can check that out.

Ms. Steichen: Roughly 59 over .46 acres.

Chair Furth: Okay, thanks. And the property across the alley, which is zoned RM-30, is it?

Mr. Owen: Correct.

Chair Furth: And what density is it developed to, currently?

Mr. Owen: I'm not entirely positive on the unit count, so I would have to double-check that.

Chair Furth: Seven, or four? I've heard both. Is it seven units? Eight units.

[someone responding off-microphone, inaudible]

Chair Furth: And the total acreage? Do we know?

[someone responding off-microphone, inaudible]

Chair Furth: So, that's a fourth of a commercial acre. Just about developed to the max already. Is that right? Thank you. Well, thank you to everybody who came and spoke to us. It's all helpful. Thank you to the applicants. I really appreciated the analytic presentation by the architect. It helped me make sense of what you're doing in a way that these presentations sometimes don't. I would say that generally, I think that the changes are an improvement. It's interesting that it's true that when you relocate the windows, you do get a more residential feel, and this is a residential building. Just to the members of the public, this board does not review individual single-family homes, so we don't review very large personal structures being built in neighborhood, but we do review multiple family housing in commercial buildings. Let me look at my notes. It seems that the neighborhood concerns take several shapes. One of them is shading. One of them is increased traffic on the alley. One of them is that this is simply a very large building and a very big change. One of the requests is that we instead ask for a project which has an entrance on El Camino Real. It is a large project. That is both our general plan, a comprehensive plan, and our zoning and our City Council have been moving in this direction. The general plan is for higher buildings along El Camino Real. Making them not damage buildings behind them is a tricky proposition. Usually, when we are looking at large, tall buildings next to residential, which is essentially half a block from El Camino Real, we're looking at hotels. And from our point of view, I think it's a very, it's much better to be looking at housing. I think it contributes more to our community. I think it contributes more to a neighborhood. I don't think that this is a location... And it also, our plan also basically says, let's try to make El Camino a more attractive place to walk; let's change from our pattern of asphalt parking lots with a building in it, to something which pulls buildings up to the front. You're right that some of these buildings have access from El Camino Real. I don't think that works in this particular site. This site has a lot of constraints on it because it does have both an alley frontage and an El Camino frontage, because we define the front of it as being on Wilton Court, which is not, sort of intuitively what you think about buildings on El Camino. I think that it doesn't have too many units. I regret that we lost the ones that we had to lose. I think they are well-designed. I think that they have good ancillary functions. I think that the applicant has worked hard to provide a better experience along El Camino and along its own section of Wilton. I had a question for staff. It's hard to get access onto these small streets, both from El Camino Real and to El Camino Real. There's a whole series of these small streets that debouch onto El Camino. When I was trying to look at the buildings, setting again today, and was trying to make a right-hand turn off El Camino, I couldn't because there was a car parked right on the corner, and there was a large personal vehicle waiting to make a right-hand turn. So, I blocked traffic in the curbside lane of El Camino. What is the thought about that corner parking?

Mr. Owen: I think that there's a couple of different factors at play. You have, as Adrienne was mentioning, the trash that's going to be off of the Wilton Avenue frontage, so, that location for additional street side parking might not be the best location, given that there's limited, as you were saying, radius, basically, to turn. One thing that we could look at before the City Council meeting and provide a recommendation on is looking at having a loading, some sort of loading zone or other sort of restricted...

Chair Furth: Well, I'm actually thinking of having some "No Parking" space, so that one can make that turn.

Mr. Owen: Right, exactly.

Chair Furth: Having a larger vehicle, that wouldn't help.

Mr. Owen: Right. Doing some sort of red curb or "Loading Zone Only," some sort of access and parking management in that area, we could certainly take a look at. I would want to get the recommendation from the traffic engineer before we make a specific recommendation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thinking about parking, I think the problem with this project isn't that it doesn't have enough parking. I'm confident that it has plenty of parking for its users, and that means the people who live there, their guests, the people who provide services to the building. The problem is that we have an existing parking deficit in the neighborhood and this building can't solve that problem. I think we have a duty not to make it worse, and I think you'll have a better sidewalk, I think you'll have a better interface with El Camino. I think you'll find it's a bit quieter. That's my experience with a large building between me and a more heavily-trafficked street. I think there will be better landscaping, I think there will be better maintenance, I think there will be better lighting. Sorry -- lighting. Hope there's no better lighting. And I think it will be good to have more people in the neighborhood. I think it's good to have more people walking and biking. It tends to make drivers a little more aware of what's going on. Staff, what's our take -- or colleagues -- what's your take on what the shadow studies show? And I'm glad to know that what was puzzling me was that north arrow. I kept trying to make it make sense. What does it show? Does it show excessive shading?

Vice Chair Baltay: It shows that in the winter, the apartment building across the alley will be in shade. All the time.

Chair Furth: Okay. That is regrettable. I will say that this is... Because there is an alley there instead of just a side-yard setback, you end up with more open space between the buildings than you would if this went straight to the edge of the property, right? If there were no... These were simply adjacent lots. So, the alley is actually a bigger setback, combined with the building setback, than most buildings, than most residences in that area can expect. It's not a plus, it doesn't make things better in the winter, but it's within the realm of the acceptable. I think that the removal of the upper-story open space gives better privacy and quiet to the neighbors. I think that the preservation of that oak tree area is a benefit to everybody in that area, and perhaps particularly to the users of the alley. And I think that the podium level -- I hate that phrase -- slightly elevated outdoor space is going to be very attractive, both for the people who live there, and for the people who are nearby. And if they become friends, then it's going to be a pleasant place to assemble. I am delighted to see this project. All of us know that we're all in favor of affordable housing, and we find particular proposals difficult. And the question is always: What about the real proposal in front of us? Does this meet our standards? And I believe it does. I very much would like... I think it's going to be very important to have the best possible landscaping on the alley, it's going to be very important to have the best possible landscaping on the street. I am particularly concerned that we may not have street trees, so, I would like to refer landscaping to a subcommittee. Other than that, I'm ready to vote yes. I am interested in my colleagues' comments.

Board Member Lew: And also, for staff, do you want us to comment on the DEE?

Chair Furth: Good point, Alex. This is a classic situation for design enhancement exception. The orientation of this lot, strange, in this case, strange definition of front, all makes this an appropriate case for a DEE. This is not about some architectural frivolity.

Mr. Owen: We would like recommendations on both the major architectural review and the DEE.

Chair Furth: Does anybody want to make a motion?

Vice Chair Baltay: I can support the DEE comfortably. I share Osma's concern, and I think Robert also, about the back of the building just not having the same quality of appearance. I would like... I think the corner of the building could use a little more work on it. I don't know if that's something we can do in subcommittee. I'd certainly like to push this forward.



Board Member Gooyer: I think a lot of that is going to depend if the corner just means changing the pattern of the brick or something like that, or actually doing a redesign. If we're talking about just changing the texture, then it can go to subcommittee. But, if you're actually talking about changing the design of the corner or doing something on the other side of the building, I think it might need to come back.

Vice Chair Baltay: If you had an increase of one foot difference in elevation between the corner piece and the rest of the parapet, that's, I think, a subcommittee-level thing.

Board Member Gooyer: Absolutely. That's true.

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't quite know what the architect will do. That's sort of why it's hard to guess.

Chair Furth: Would the architect care to comment?

Ms. Steichen: We would support going another foot taller on that corner. We tried to keep the height as low as possible, hearing comments of concern about the height of the building. I do agree that a slight more separation between the primary roof height and the corner would help emphasize that corner architecturally. We also, between October 1st and today, studied turning that corner, trying to change its orientation to the street, change the parapet edge -- None of it looked good, so we did not bring it to your, to this for review.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to be very clear that I'm not saying you must change the elevation. I would like to see the architect think hard about what to do. That's just an idea.

Ms. Steichen: Understood. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I had a quick question.

Ms. Steichen: Sure.

Board Member Thompson: Are these renders, like, these elevations we're looking at, do those include the PV's, or is it...?

Ms. Steichen: They do.

Board Member Thompson: You don't see the PV's at all?

Ms. Steichen: The parapet height is set so that we don't need an additional OSHA guardrail, so that we are meeting a 42-inch height edge at the parapet edge of the building. And because of that, it prevents the projection of, we think will prevent the projection of the solar panels from being seen. I think we will, we will continue to do that, but the perspective that you saw, and these renderings all have model objects for solar panels in them. We'll just have to continue to study that. I think if we do see them, they won't be very much more over the height of that.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Steichen: Thanks.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, I can support the design enhancement exception. And I think Mr. Ma, I think I just wanted to clarify, to make sure that he understands that your setback is on the...how do I say this? Is on the side yard, what we would think is the side yard, between the properties on El Camino. It's not along the alley. Right? The narrow frontage on Wilton is considered the front of the building. And I think, I would say, in support of the DEE, is that the original intent of rear setbacks was to provide light and air into units. If you go back a long time, developers would build on 100 percent of the lot, and there

wouldn't be windows, and bedrooms, and things like that. The intent of the setback was to provide light and air, so, I think all the units here have adequate light and air. And then, neighboring building is commercial and doesn't have windows on the side property line. I think that that's all okay. And with regard to subcommittee coming back to the Board, I'm willing to do subcommittee. If the subcommittee thinks it's too much, or thinks there's too big of a change, you can always bump it back up to the Board. If you feel like it's really just not, you don't feel comfortable making that decision, it can come back to the Board. We've done that in the past, on occasion. That's where I'm at on this one.

Chair Furth: That's two of us in favor of recommending approval with referral to subcommittee. What else? What are the other views?

Board Member Thompson: Can we list out all the items we would review on subcommittee?

Chair Furth: The ones I have so far are: A redesign, a modest redesign of the corner element between Wilton and El Camino Real, to make that a more visible and distinctive part of the building; modifications, probably in terms of color and/or texture and landscaping on the alley.

Vice Chair Baltay: On the building (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Building façade facing the alley. I think the matter of the curb striping is a referral to staff, right? That's...? That's something we'd like you to address because I think it's a concern in the neighborhood, and certainly that was my experience, trying to get there. Anything else?

Vice Chair Baltay: The street trees.

Chair Furth: Oh, yes. And landscaping generally, street trees in particular, with the goal of having significant street trees, if at all possible, along the sidewalk, on El Camino Real. And if not, other significant landscaping.

Vice Chair Baltay: Why don't you make that into a motion?

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: I move that we recommend approval of this project, and including the design enhancement exception, in this case, to the City Council...? Is that where this goes? To the City Council...?

Mr. Owen: Correct.

Chair Furth: ...of the City of Palo Alto. On the condition that the matter also be referred to a Architectural Review Board subcommittee to address the issues just discussed.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Furth: Just itemize. That's a motion and second. Is there any other discussion before we vote? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye. All those opposed?

## **MOTION PASSES 5-0.**

Chair Furth: That's a unanimous recommendation. Best of luck. I trust you will continue to work with your neighbors and do everything possible to make it all work well for everyone. Thank you.

Ms. Steichen: Thank you.

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

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: If all of you could take your seats, we will proceed to item number 4, which is 4115 El Camino Real. That is still not the Verizon applications. We regret that we have a heavy agenda and that many of you are waiting long periods of time, but we, as you can tell, we have important things, and twitchy applicants, and we will proceed as expeditiously and fairly as we can.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 4115 El Camino Real (17PLN-00280): Recommendation on a Major Architectural Review for a Proposed Three-Story, 16,725 Square Foot Mixed-Use Development Comprised of Ground Floor Retail, Second Floor Office and Residential, Third Floor Residential (Seven Residential Units in Total) and Below-Grade Parking. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration was Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is Being Circulated for Public Comment Between November 30, 2018 and January 2, 2018. Zoning District: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.**

Chair Furth: Item number 4, 4115 El Camino Real. Recommendation on a major architectural review for a proposed three-story, 16,725 square foot mixed-use development, comprised of ground-floor retail, second floor office and residential, third floor residential, seven residential units in total, below-grade parking. There is a mitigated negative declaration that is still open for public comment until January 2, 2018 [sic]. First of all, has everybody inspected the site?

Vice Chair Baltay: I have.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson?

Board Member Thompson: No. Not in a while.

Chair Furth: We're going to publicly shame her so that next time she's [crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: I'm ready.

Chair Furth: She did, however, grow up here, and is intimately familiar with almost every business involved in these applications. She's patronized them all.

Board Member Thompson: I know it very well.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Are there any conversations to be disclosed on this project? Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: I had a telephone conversation with Randy Popp on Tuesday, mostly discussing the previous day's council meeting. But he did mention that this project would be coming before the Board, but we did not discuss it.

Chair Furth: Okay. Board Member Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: I have talked with Randy Popp in the past about this project. Several months ago, I believe, now.

Chair Furth: And what did you discuss?

Vice Chair Baltay: He just presented to me that he was getting involved in it, actually. It was more when he was coming on board, helping the architects. We didn't discuss anything in particular about the design.

Chair Furth: Okay. It sounds like the public is well informed about what we're relying on in making this decision. May we hear from staff?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, thank you, good morning. I'm Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner. I have a presentation for you. The applicant is also here with their presentation, and the materials board is also available for you to look at. Behind you, I believe. There's already been a good overview and introduction of the project there, but moving on to some background. The project was before this Board back in June, at that time identified some issues. One was, parking was insufficient. The project at the time did request a parking modification. That the materials of the building should be reorganized to be more pedestrian-friendly and have a more residential feeling to it, and that the signage should not be located on the second floor/upper floors of the building, and also, to make the building more pedestrian-oriented. Since that time, the applicant has revised their project and elevations, and they will go into a little bit more detail about it, but you can just notice, first off, that definitely the signs have moved from the upper levels and focused more on the pedestrian side. Some of the other materials are more pedestrian-oriented and provide that more residential feeling to it. Here is the real elevation. The project does include frontage on two streets, El Camino Real as well as El Camino Way in the back, so the rear is an important elevation for the building. Also, going four-sided architecture. The right side of the building was also changed. Some of the wood massing was revised to feel more organized, and landscape was added to the garage screen to soften that edge. And then, this is the left elevation, as well. Some of the context in area, a lot of low, kind of low-intensity type of development. Some change-over into more modern types of buildings coming on line, but definitely in the direct vicinity. You've got some commercial, some residential. For the site plan, one thing to consider here, that from the early project description of the project, there was interest from the developer and applicant to include the breezeway that would have some public access from the residents. That residential portion or community that's in the back that has access from El Camino Way to get to El Camino Real. The project does include retail, so it's important to have that feature in there. There is a desire from the applicant to have that. It is a desire for the City to make sure that access is provided in the future for the project. We did include a condition of approval for you to consider, and it was to require an easement. However, the applicant did object to having an easement, and in further conversations with the applicant recently, this is for discussion, but we are considering a modification to that condition, something to the effect that would preclude any types of gates or structures that could be put in place to hinder public access in that breezeway for the life of the project. We want to put that kind of open-ended at this point, have a discussion about that. But if an easement is off the table, then something, so then, it would be a condition of approval if a future owner of the property were to put gates, and that could be a complaint by the community, the City could enforce something. The basement has been modified to accommodate puzzle lift system, and the puzzle lift system would be for residential and office parking. Also in the basement, you have the bike lockers. The project does include some affordable housing -- one unit, actually -- and that's a requirement. There's a little bit of in-lieu fee that would be paid at the building permit stage. The project is eligible for concessions or incentives, and part of that is by-right parking reduction for the residential. It streamlines that a bit. Otherwise, the residential component would require 15 spaces, but under the affordable housing, streamline reduction for parking there, 11 spaces are required for residential. The office and retail would still be to the full maximum. The total parking would be 47 spaces for the site. They are providing all of those on the site, so no parking reduction is requested. And then, some additional square footage for the BMR unit is allowed pursuant to the municipal code. That's, again, another incentive to allow more housing production in the city. The project is consistent with a number of the architectural review findings. The Comprehensive Plan goals and policies are included in attachments for you, as well as the South El Camino design guidelines, the context design criteria, and performance standards. The site does include some amenities for the residents, as well as for the public. There is a little outdoor area for seats if an eatery goes into the retail space. As mentioned previously, an environmental document is being circulated at this point. There were some topics that would have potential for physical environmental impacts, and mitigation measures were provided. Those were

deemed to be feasible to be implemented by the applicant. This is for biological resources, cultural and tribal resources, geology and soils, and noise. These were just real basic ones that come up for most projects anyway. The recommendation is that the Board recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and provide comment on the environmental document that's currently in circulation, as well as mention the condition regarding the breezeway. Just need to hear any feedback on that. That concludes 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? May we hear from the applicant, please? Name, spelling and address, please.

Randy Popp, Architect: Hello. You got it. My name is Randy Popp. I'm an architect here in Palo Alto. I'm supporting this project as a consultant in the entitlement stage.

Chair Furth: And your address?

Mr. Popp: And my address is 210 High Street. [spells name]

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: All right, thank you. Let me just restate our agenda, and I appreciate the really excellent staff report on this project. Our goal here is to review the changes made since our last review, and to clarify, as Sheldon mentioned, the conditions of approval that were drafted. Our goal here today -- and I'll state this clearly -- is to move the project forward, if we're able to. I want to start by looking at the front elevation along El Camino. We've made some significant progress, I think, when you compare the last version you saw and the version we have before us today. I'll use this format a number of times in the presentation so you can be familiar with it. Generally, we refined the placement of materials, using them as really subtle organizing elements in the façade to break up the massing and to add interest. We removed the flying beams. I think a lot of this is easier to see in the rendering itself because a portion of the building is oblique in the 2-D elevation. So, I'll focus on this, but if you'd like me to switch back and forth at any time, I'm happy to. You can see that the column base material has changed to settle the building into the site. We have alignment of the windows with the retail below. We have office balcony railings now that are revised. A third-level horizontal plane that strikes to...Let me see if I can get my cursor to work.

Chair Furth: (inaudible) for the material board. You can have a gap while we look for it.

Mr. Popp: Yeah, so, there's a ....

Chair Furth: Do we have it where we can see it?

Mr. Popp: It's up there.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...put it over there, looking at us, then?

Mr. Popp: Mr. Gooyer has it there, yeah. The residential balcony glass railing has been raised to create a bit more definition for the massing in itself. The retail storefront rhythm matches that of the office above as it wraps the corners, and we've got a subtle refinement of the metal canopies at the breezeway and at the third level residential area. Moving on to a slightly different view of the front of the building where you can see the right side. I'll note that we made some changes to the garage ramp screening so that aligns with the elements that are above. We've adjusted the placement and the scale of the windows on this side of the building so that they are, again, more aligned and centered and consistent with the scale of the other windows around the building. The wood material has been extended across the recess for consistency. We have landscape materials that have been added along the screens at the edge of the

garage to soften that. The projection of the balcony at the third level has been reduced to enhance the terracing design, and material placement has been adjusted at the office for consistency overall. Here at the rear elevation of the building -- again, tricky to get all of this in one shot, so we'll look a little bit at the 2-D elevations here, and then I'll flip to a larger view of the, the perspective. Along the breezeway, we've added planters. It's easier to see that on the plan, so I'll get to that in a moment. At the second level, the railing has been replaced with a planter, with materials that will spill over the wall. Planter depth has been sized to sustain a large tree or a small shrub. The shrubbery that we've selected will grow to 15 to 20 feet in height once mature. The vertical trellis element has been aligned with the window sills as a datum. We have wood materials that are extending on the right side to overlap the balcony and the garage. The balconies have been shifted to remove the cantilever that was there previously. It was a little distracting, and I think this is a cleaner expression of the massing. The balcony separation walls have been shifted to coordinate with the updated material placement and the plan, and the residential windows have been adjusted and organized for consistency. Again, you'll notice that the breezeway is a dominant feature here in these elevations that you can see, but it's a little difficult in this perspective. But, hold that image for me, and we'll get to that. I'll also just note that the landscaping in these renderings is meant to sort of express about a one-year maturity, but at 10 to 15 years, it will be much more significant. As we get to the left side of the building, again, paying attention all the way around, this is the most simple side. Much of this visible from the other views, and we've talked about many of those elements already, but you can see more clearly here how the vertical trellis element aligns with the window sill datum. And I'll only point out that we adjusted the wood screen color on this side to blend in with the wall color a bit more. In regard to the plan, the through breezeway for pedestrian access is a significant feature of the diagram for us. As promised, we want to talk about that with you, and as Sheldon mentioned, there's a desire for us to maintain an openness to that for the neighborhood, and for users to access that. But, we need to maintain control of that overall. The public open space feature on El Camino Way and the common open space feature on El Camino Real bracket that at either end, welcoming people in and through. The resident parking access from El Camino Way is pretty clear to see, with the eight spaces, four in the garage and four at grade. Public parking access to the underground garage from El Camino Real can be seen at the lower left of the diagram. The retail at grade is the predominant space on this plan. Bike storage and shower have been maintained, and the trash room -- which is essentially at the center -- is still under discussion with the City of Palo Alto's trash team. We're talking about whether we'll pull the cans to the front or the rear, but they have agreed that having the maintenance team who manages the building for us do that would be acceptable. Very minor changes in the garage for us, primarily at the El Camino Real edge of the building, where we have altered the profile of the garage in order to avoid conflicts with El Camino and Caltrans as we are shoring and building this garage. As you note, there is 47 total spaces provided, which is conforming. Nineteen of those are in a puzzle lift that are for the use of the office and the residents, and the remainder is for office and retail use. Moving upstairs, I'm sure you've already made yourselves familiar with these plans, but just noting quickly at the second floor, we have office area along El Camino Real and four residential units that wrap around, and at the third floor, the final three residential units are in place. Just briefly touching on the landscape materials. I'll say, it's a very simple palette of planting material, durable, drought-tolerant, easy to maintain, and rapid to mature. We have varying contrast in both color and texture. The landscape furnishings on the site are high-quality materials and provide very nice amenities, we believe. As we go to the upper level for the office, and then, the resident decks, you'll see that we're suggesting wood decking at those areas on raised standards. The railings will be raised in the right areas to provide privacy and control site lines into those balconies, and in other areas, very open and glassy to allow for the building to showcase the activity that's happening up above. Sheldon did a great job catching a parapet height that we drew a bit too high, so I'll just note here on the building sections that the 40 foot, 9 inch parapet height that we've shown will be revised to be 40 feet tall. With that, I want to just touch on the draft conditions of approval. Condition #6 was related to the stucco surfaces, and I'll confirm that we will be a 20/30 or smoother finish to the stucco.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry. Could we have the page number, please, staff?

Mr. Popp: And I don't have that, I apologize.

Chair Furth: That's why I'm asking staff.

Ms. Gerhardt: That would be packet page 131.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Go ahead.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. That is Condition #6. And then, for Condition #7, you know...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, I...You can have another 30 seconds, but Condition #6 is about stucco finish. What did you want to say?

Mr. Popp: I wanted...So, Condition #6 reads: "*The owner or designee, prior to issuance of building permit, shall demonstrate on the construction plans and elevations and in details that the project's stucco surfaces shall be a 20/30 or smoother finish.*" That's a designation of a stucco finish. I'm here to say we're going to commit to that. That's no problem for us.

Chair Furth: That's acceptable.

Mr. Popp: That's acceptable. Number 7, however, is not acceptable to us. I'll just say that the project ownership needs to maintain control of that space for safety and security reasons. Staff has provided no nexus between the project and the requirement for the easement, and there is no legal obligation for us to be compelled to provide it. We request that be deleted. We want to maintain an open and through access for people to move between Meadow and El Camino, through our site. You know, for years, people have been riding their bikes or walking through the Pizza Chicago parking lot in just that way, and we're formalizing that. We're open to the idea of a condition that would say no gates in that accessway. I think the likelihood is that because it's an egress path anyway, we couldn't do that. But we do need the ability to put those little plaques at either end of it that said, "Right to pass by permission of owner." So that we can control vagrants, we can control trash, we can control maintenance -- All of those things. It's akin to saying to your neighbors that, you know, "I'm going to give you all rights to my front yard, and you can come here whenever you want." Right? We just wouldn't do that. And there's really no reason for us to do that, so we ask that this condition be struck. And if you have a suggestion for something else, be happy to discuss that with you, but this particular one is not something that we can agree to.

Chair Furth: To summarize, you believe that's in excess of the City's legal rights to ask for that? Or demand it?

Mr. Popp: I believe it is.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. That's it. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of the applicant? Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: The awnings, the sun-shading elements, what are those, materially?

Mr. Popp: Materially, they are a steel frame with a wood slat in the field of the awning. Exactly. Just like that. It does show up in a number of the renderings. It's probably a little small on this screen, but we can look at that larger, if you'd like to.

Board Member Thompson: It looks white. Like, the fill of the...

Mr. Popp: The light's coming through it.

Board Member Thompson: Hmm?

Mr. Popp: The intent is that it filters the light, the light comes through it, but the material itself is the wood material that we have on the building.

Board Member Thompson: It's the same cedar?

Mr. Popp: Yeah, exactly.

Board Member Thompson: And that's for all awnings, on the top and on the pedestrian level?

Mr. Popp: Correct. That's correct.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. And while we're on this, the privacy screen, there's...It looks like there's two, but maybe they are the same. I just wanted to confirm the vertical screen. Are they the same?

Mr. Popp: Same wood material, yes.

Board Member Thompson: And what is the material?

Mr. Popp: Cedar, correct? Yeah, the same cedar wood.

Board Member Thompson: I'm sorry, I'm talking about the white vertical perforated screen.

Male?: [off microphone, inaudible].

Mr. Popp: All right, it's a flawed...

Chair Furth: Could you use the microphone to...

Mr. Popp: Yeah, I'm sorry, I'm going to repeat what Jeff, who is the architect is saying. It's a flaw in the renderings, it sounds like, and the intent is that we will have the same cedar wood material in those positions.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, and that's on the side, that's kind of wrapping around that left elevation?

Mr. Popp: In all those [crosstalk] right there. Yeah. That's correct.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, that wouldn't be white, it would be wood.

Mr. Popp: Sounds like that's the, that's the intent. I apologize for the flaw in the rendering. Here, this is Jeff Potts from SDG.

Jeff Potts, SDG Architects: Yeah, the intent for the vertical and the horizontal screening is that it would be the same material, but a lighter stain, so not so dark over those areas. It would be a lighter stain, but the same material, instead of applying the dark stain to it.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, the lighter stain... When you were saying that that left elevation changed, that was just changing the stain on that?

Mr. Popp: I apologize. It was a communication error between myself and Jeff. The rendering shows on the left hand side there, those panels that I thought were going to be matching the wall color, it sounds like it would just be a lighter stain of the wood.

Board Member Thompson: And we don't have a sample of what that is.



Mr. Popp: We do not. We can provide that, if you like. We can do that to staff, or a subcommittee, or something, if you'd like us to do that.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Popp: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Could one of you spell your architect's name?

Mr. Popp: [spells Jeff Potts' name].

Chair Furth: Thank you. I meant to announce the architects and the landscape designers earlier and forgot. Oh, and we have an anonymous LLC as the applicant. Is there a name for the owners?

Mircea Voskerician: My name is Mircea Voskerician [spells name]. I represent 4115 ECR LLC.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Part of the reason we ask is because we're required to not participate in matters involving people that we have shared financial interests with, and when we have an anonymous LLC, we can't know whether we're doing that or not. Thank you. We have raised this with staff before.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, if I could confirm one more thing about the materials.

Chair Furth: Sure, go ahead.

Board Member Thompson: This vertical screen is also the lighter-stained wood, also happens at the garage level when you're entering on the street? From El Camino?

Chair Furth: Could you tell us which page you're looking at, sheet you're looking at?

Board Member Thompson: Sorry. I'm looking at Sheet A017.

Mr. Popp: Right. It's in that rendering that's on the upper right-hand side. There, you can see it.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Okay. And the...Okay, so, it's happening in, sort of three places -- the garage, the left side, and then on the top.

Mr. Popp: Yes, three places. Exactly.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. And the green walls, that framing, is that...? What material is that framing?

Mr. Popp: It's just green screen. It's a landscape material that you purchase, and it's a framework that...

Board Member Thompson: Okay, it's just the...

Mr. Popp: ...plants grow in. The intent is it just disappears.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Popp: It's a three-dimensional mesh of welded wire. Very common. It's used all the time. And it stands off of the building so it doesn't damage the building surface, but is... It's just meant to be a framework that the plants grow within.

Board Member Thompson: Gotcha. Okay. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Anybody else have questions? Board Member Baltay, Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, a question for staff, please. It concerns the pedestrian passageway through the property and whether or not, I guess, we have an easement of some kind. I want to know what options we have, or what is typically done. There's many passageways such as that one, this one, throughout town. Do they all have an access easement? Is there some other legal security we can get that allows the public to pass and still respects the owner's concerns about private property? Do we have any choices?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we need to explore this a little bit more with the attorneys, and we don't have as much experience with past projects. But there was a concern because the applicant had offered this as a public way, so, the offer was made, and we wanted to then condition the project to make sure that that was going to happen. But, at the same time, I don't know that that's, you know, that we have a guideline or a code requirement that mandates this. We can speak to the attorneys, though, and see if there is a, some midpoint that both parties could agree to and still allow the public to walk through this accessway. It is leading to a commercial space, you know, so between parking and commercial space, so it does have to remain open. There's just the legality of, you know, truly being able to walk through there.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm just curious about this. The... I mean, I can see his point, that they really, you know, if for some reason, sometime in the future, they want to put a gate in there, or whatever, I can understand that. Now, I was looking at the site plan, and there's 2 foot 3 1/2 inches from the face of the building to the property line. What if they shift that a foot eight inches to leave a 44-inch or 48-inch area there that, let's say 99 percent of the time, everybody uses the public access, so the public access may need to shrink a little bit, or whatever. And then, if somebody after hours, or if the owner decides later to lock that during, you know... I don't know, from midnight to 6:00, or something, someone could still pass through in that area on the side. I mean, it's not a big, wide area, but if you want to cross from... You know, it's one of these things that, if we're looking at just an ability to do that... First of all, I agree with the applicant, I think. I don't see any code requirement that would be mandate having an access there. But, if there is something, then at least doing the, shifting that, like I said, a foot and a half, or whatever, would allow a passageway between the two streets.

Board Member Thompson: Do you mean on the east side, or the west side? Of the building?

Board Member Gooyer: I'm talking, on Sheet A009...

Chair Furth: The Honey Baked Ham sign.

Board Member Gooyer: If you look at the top of the site, it shows 2 foot 3 1/2 inches from the face of the building to the property line. If that gets shifted slightly, enough to leave a 44 inch walkway or a 48 inch walkway between that... Or, I don't know. You could have it compacted... You know, some sort of a finish that is walkable, but... And that would be something that somebody could walk through.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Would you like me to address that?

Ms. Gerhardt: I do want to say that...

Chair Furth: No.

Mr. Popp: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, the applicant has said that they would be willing to accept a condition that no gates be put on that breezeway. You know, I think...

Chair Furth: Well, before (inaudible) that, I've got a number of questions, so maybe we'll get all the questions out, and then, we can start looking towards answers. This is a mixed residential and commercial building. What's the ownership structure going to be? Are these condominiums? Are they apartments? Are there two condominium associations? What's it going to be?

Mr. Voskerician: It will be condominiums for sale.

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Voskerician: Condominiums for sale.

Chair Furth: The residential space and the commercial space?

Mr. Voskerician: No. Commercial space will be retail for rent or for sale. We don't know that yet, right now.

Chair Furth: There will be an entity that owns the retail portion of the building. You're going to sell the individual residential units?

Mr. Voskerician: We will sell the, we will sell the residential units, and it's possible that the retail and office would be maintained as a rental, or sold. We have not made a decision at this time yet.

Chair Furth: Well, what I'm trying to get at is, who is going to be responsible for maintaining the common spaces, the garage, the building, this walkway, the parking lot. How is it going to be governed?

Mr. Voskerician: Probably through an HOA association that's going to have to deal with all the trash, make sure the trash is taken on, on the street, and maintenance, and everything else, is going to be part of an HOA.

Chair Furth: But what about...? A lot of this building isn't going to be... I mean, you usually can't make a housing HOA responsible for the maintenance of the non-housing portions of a building.

Mr. Voskerician: Yeah, so, in my experience...

Chair Furth: See how the department of real estate is going to figure this one out.

Mr. Popp: Yeah. Let me try...

Chair Furth: ... [crosstalk] on us.

Mr. Popp: To clarify this a little bit, and I'll look to staff to confirm this. But, in my experience working on mixed-use buildings like this in Palo Alto, when we get farther down the road here, we'll get a series of conditions that come from public works, building depart -- All these other groups, that very clearly specify things like how the management of the building, the maintenance of the building, all of those aspects, will be handled. There will be an HOA that manages the relationship between the homeowners and the building, and then, there will definitely be an ownership component that interacts with that HOA. And in the multifamily projects that I've worked on, those interfaces are where you do things like manage the trash, manage the landscaping, clean the garage -- All of those things happen as part of those legal agreements between the ownership components of the project.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Not quite sure I understand what you're proposing. And, of course, I'm asking these questions because it has to do with the continuing availability and maintenance of that walkway and the garage. We made need some further discussion on this. I had one other question of the applicants, which is one I've raised before. I am living in a residential unit, I come home late at night. Where do I park, and how is it secure?

Mr. Voskerician: Yes. Obviously, because we have retail and office, so, we have to put a condition that during the day, the gate, the rolling gate that's going to the ramp, it's going to have to be open. And then, for...

Male?: (inaudible)

Mr. Voskerician: Yeah, for the below-grade garage, it's going to have to be open until a certain time, and then, it's going to be key card access for the residents that are going to park underground. That's for the underground.

Chair Furth: Do you have hours of operation in mind?

Mr. Voskerician: Well, the retail and the office, I mean, obviously...

Chair Furth: Office obviously can use key cards.

Mr. Voskerician: Yeah, they use key cards, too, but, I mean, depending on what retail is going to go in there, we assume they're going to be there until, maybe six o'clock at night. But this was just an assumption for the time being.

Chair Furth: So, there is a gate, and there is a key card system.

Mr. Voskerician: We want to put a gate and a ...

Chair Furth: Do the plans show that?

Mr. Sing: There's no gate presently.

Mr. Voskerician: I don't think it shows at this time.

Chair Furth: Yeah, I think it's not on the plans.

Mr. Voskerician: Yeah.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That's helpful. Does anybody else have any questions of the owner's representative? Okay.

Mr. Popp: I want to just clarify that. We had an email communication with Planning staff yesterday, or the day before, where they asked a specific question about the rolling gate, and whether that would be present, and whether it would be timed, etc. Perhaps it came from the conversation with you. And we...

Chair Furth: We actually raised this at a previous hearing.

Mr. Popp: Yeah, so, we made a commitment to staff in this email response to them that we would provide to them, we were intending to provide a rolling security gate that would be at the entrance, and that it would be on a timer control, so that it would shut when we are outside of operating hours, typical operating hours.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That's helpful.

Mr. Popp: All right, thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: And just to clarify, that's a condition that we would be adding.

Chair Furth: Good to know. I wasn't going to be able to make one of the required findings if you didn't. Discussion. Who would like to start?

Board Member Lew: Do we have public speakers?

Chair Furth: (inaudible), but I shall, of course, ask for them. Would anybody care to speak on this project, on this matter? No takers. All right, I'll bring it back to the Board. I'm sorry, Peter, did you have further questions?

Vice Chair Baltay: [off microphone] No, but I want to go into the easement (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Well, why don't we start deliberating? Peter, you can go first.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to further address the easement or the pedestrian passageway. We've seen this project several time and I've always been very excited by the ability for pedestrians to walk through from El Camino Way to El Camino. To me, that's been an integral part of my finding the design suitable and appropriate. And to be more specific, we make Finding #2 e., where the design has to enhance the living condition on the site and in adjacent residential areas. To me, that walkway through there is an integral and essential part of being able to make that finding. All along, you've been saying this is pedestrian, and I'm concerned now when I hear a stronger desire to assert your property rights, which means you can basically shut that pedestrian passageway off. When I hear that there's not a real clear understanding of how this passageway and the garden next to it is going to be maintained, I'm having doubts if this really will be the passageway, the beautiful picture that's been painted before us. That's bothering me. I wish we had a stronger sense of what can be done to preserve that without trying to step on your property rights. Nobody wants to take the land from you, but if there's not a way for people to comfortably be able to walk through there, then it changes my take on the whole project. I'd just like to leave that for now, so my fellow colleagues can hear that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Okay. I guess, Osma, you haven't started a deliberation. Your turn.

Mr. Popp: Excuse me. I thought we were going to have a 10-minute period...

Chair Furth: Well, there's no public hearing to respond to.

Mr. Popp: We don't do that? Okay. I did want to address the issue of this easement...

Chair Furth: Go ahead.

Mr. Popp: ...if you don't mind. I'll just take two minutes and do that. Maybe even less.

Chair Furth: Have three.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. I will try not to even use it. Commissioner Baltay, I want to just point out that we found out about this condition when the staff report was published. We had not heard about that previously. It was not a part of the project context until it was written in this draft agenda that came out for this hearing. We would have spoken earlier about the desire to provide open and clear access for the public to be able to move through this space freely in perpetuity. It's our intent to be able to do that. But the idea that we are obligated by a public easement to do that is something that's untenable to us. We need to be able to maintain control of our site. We need to be able to maintain the ability to manage who comes and goes through the middle of our site. And I don't see a way... I've spoken to counsel about this, capable counsel about this, and there is no nexus for the City to require an easement in this manner. And as a result of the discussion I had with Sheldon, we agreed that we would be happy to consider a condition that says something to the effect of no gates or, you know, open access. We've established furnishings and open space at either end of this breezeway to encourage people to come through. But we just can't agree to a condition that says that there is a requirement for an easement on

this. It's too difficult for us to manage the legality of that. It was a surprise to us, and we're just responding to it at this point because it just came up. But it's absolutely our intent to maintain this. We think it is an integral, and actually, one of the driving design elements of this project. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Hi. Based on...It's actually really nice to see this. In general, I would say it's a huge improvement from what we saw last time. I really appreciate your use of cedar in the many locations. I would like to see that sample eventually, of how that sort of interacts with your stucco and your other color. In general, it's funny. Even before knowing all of this about the breezeway, I did make a note that the breezeway itself does not architecturally seem very welcoming. I think there could be more done to that entrance, should you want people to come through there. That seems to be a, sort of interesting matter. Board Member Gooyer's suggestion of moving that sort of outer limit of your project a few feet south might be a way to solve that, but I see that there is landscaping there. So, if that were the case, there would sort of have to be, maybe a potentially different way to address that. So, yes. The other issue that I think still remains is what I think was labeled as the left elevation. I think it's actually a west elevation. That is pretty plain and blank, and you have a stair, so... On the page, it's just the top of the page.

Chair Furth: What sheet are you looking at?

Board Member Thompson: A009... Well, that's the plan, actually. The elevation is on, the elevation is on A14.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. It's that big, blank, wood wall. I think I remember last time expressing some concern about that wall just being a bit too massive and with too little visual interest, at least for those coming up El Camino. And given that it's a stair, I think there's a lot of opportunity to add daylight there. I see that you have glazing on the... I guess I'll say the plan left side, but you also have a big shading element there. I actually doubt that that stairwell in itself will be very well daylighted. And there's a nice opportunity to add daylight there, and also make something more interesting happen on your façade. In general, I would say, though, it's a tricky site because you sort of have a funny trapezoid shape that you have to sort of address. I think this improvement is definitely a much better step in the right direction. I think there's a little bit more refinement when it comes to treating some of these big, massive surfaces, like the left side. But, in general, I would say that it's definitely coming along. That's all I'll say right now.

Chair Furth: Board Member Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, so, my concerns about the pedestrian passageway aside, I think this is a really nice building. I think it's been well-designed and -- let's see -- it's got a very nicely-organized façade, I find. The removal of the flying buttresses is very positive. I really like the floor plan, the basic arrangement and organization of it. It has to do with the pedestrian passageway, but even more than that, the way you've separated the residential from the commercial, the way the retail works, the parking -- I think that's very good. I think the materials are attractive and handsome and high-quality, durable, and they should prove to be a positive addition to the El Camino street frontage. Lastly, I very much like the small garden area on the side as you walk past it. Again, it seems like a nicely-designed garden, it's a nice idea, it's a good location. I think the tenants, the owners, are going to really enjoy using that. My sole concern is somehow finding a way to preserve that passageway. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Great. Thank you for the revisions. I can support the project today. I have a couple suggestions. One is to... For the Board, I think we should add a condition that there is parking signage to the underground garage. We have that College Terrace Centre that was mentioned earlier today, and there have been so many complaints that people don't know how to get down to the garage. To me, it seems obvious, but it's not. I think we should try to address that. Two, I would suggest more documentation on the materials in our packets. There really isn't a lot of detail in them. And then, in that, I do want to, if you would include the ground floor retail glazing. We do have projects like the College Terrace Centre that I mentioned, where they have, like, really dark glass. And they did it, like, they picked the glass based on the upper floors, and they just continued it down to the ground floor, which was a big mistake. Really huge, huge, huge mistake. I just want to make sure that you guys pay attention to the glass spec at the ground level. Third, on the lighting plan, you've got some poles lights on El Camino Way, and there's no height specified. The manufacturer gives a wide range of heights, so, I would like to see that come back there. And thank you for that, because I think it will help that intersection. And, on the findings, I think I would add that under Finding #2, for staff, I think I would add that they are retaining that elm tree at... Is it the Chinese Elm? On El Camino Way. They are preserving an existing feature. With regarding this easement, yeah, I think that we're making a mountain out of a molehill here. It's not like it's connecting two different streets. It's just connecting it to the retail space on El Camino. I don't know. We have other projects on El Camino Way that have these breezeways. We could look and see what they have on there. They've been kept open. I think, generally, I don't support a public easement here. I will say that we have products in the downtown area that have sort of indoor/outdoor spaces, and there have been problems. Like, after businesses close, the homeless move in, and make a lot of noise, and disturb the neighbors. And I think that they have to be able to have the flexibility to adapt to whatever situations arise. And it's going right through the building. They've got a building all the way around, on all four sides. It seems crazy to have a public easement through there. It seems like we're making another problem. I'm think of the design (inaudible) University Avenue, where there was... That was all private property, and then, the public... The alley was added later, so, somehow the owner agreed to have public access through there. But, there was no alley there to begin with. And then, we were struggling with what to do with it. Yeah, I just don't know where we're going. I don't really see... Even if it gets closed off, what are you really losing? I don't really get it. I'm in support of the project. I think that there are things that need to be followed up on, though.

Chair Furth: Could you specify what those are, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Well, I think I did, right? Signage down to the garage. More detail on the materials, including the ground floor glazing. The lighting plan needs to specify the pole heights, the fixtures, because that affects the photometrics. And then, Finding #2 on page 124, I think we would add...

Chair Furth: We are retaining the Chinese Elm.

Board Member Lew: Yes, they are retaining a tree as an existing feature.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm quite happy with the changes that were made from the last presentation, and I can approve the project as it stands right now. And I have to agree with Alex. I don't see that... I think that item #7, the access, it just seems excessive, right through the middle of the building. Like I said, if we want to do something where it could go on the side if we need to, I can do something like that. But just running an easement right through the middle of the property, what if in, you know, 10 years, they want to redesign the thing? All of a sudden, they are stuck because there is an easement there, and they have to go through all kinds of hoops to get that changed. I agree with some of the various items that Alex indicated to be added to the conditions of approval, but I think 7 ought to be eliminated. I can accept it the way it is.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you for the drawings, which I thought were very helpful. I like the way that this building plays with the different orientations, alignments of the

streets, so you have these spaces moving in and out. I think that will be enjoyable to experience, whether you're driving by or walking. Staff, if I forget, we need to add a condition that there will be a key card gate that will be closed outside of normal retail hours. And I actually think you should be more specific in that. I mean, if retail starts to go to 10:00 or 11:00 at night, I don't think that's okay for residential security. I don't know what hour is acceptable to the owner, but I think we need to specify it.

Ms. Gerhardt: Ten to six would be our, or 6:00 to 10:00 would be our standard hours. The gate would be closed, you know, late-night hours usually start at 10:00. I don't know if that...

Chair Furth: You've still got me lost. You need to put in AM and PM.

Ms. Gerhardt: Sorry. Ten P.M. After 10:00 p.m., if a business stays open, that's considered late hours and would need additional permitting.

Chair Furth: The parking garage would be secured at least between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., and longer if that's possible. I'm sure you're going to get pressure from your residents. That's a condition I would request and need to have before we made further findings. This site is a mess right now when viewed from the bay side. It's not designed to be viewed from the bay side. It's oriented exclusively to El Camino. The one thing that it does offer is you can walk from one side to the other. And it's important, I think, in making our findings that this proposal continues that. There are very few documents in law that are more flexible than access rights. It's not true to say that you can't have an access commitment to the public and the City that doesn't permit you to close things outside normal business hours. That doesn't permit it to terminate should the building be redesigned. That... I mean, I live next to a publicly-accessible, privately-owned public space, essentially, which is gated. It's got cameras. It's not open to the public on weekends, which is a big mistake. I regret that. And, it's not open after sunset or before dawn. I believe it's possible for the City and the applicant to fashion an agreement that is not a dedicated easement, that permits this building to operate in a way that facilitates that access when it makes sense. A lot of it has to do with design, but I think without some commitment, it's going to close tomorrow. You can shake your head at me, but residents typically, unless they are very well operated, don't normalize a public passageway until time has passed and they know it's well, and safely operated, well-lit and secure when it should be. So, I don't think we're ready for prime time on that one. I also think this shouldn't be approved until we have a condition fashioned that makes it clear that the entity that owns the bulk of the building outside of the condominium spaces is responsible for the maintenance of these other areas. I hesitate to... It's possible that you can get seven condominium owners who will take responsibility for the common open space and what not, of the rest of the building, but I've never seen it. And if we don't have that, then I feel we're going to lose the amenities that are so important for the success of this project. Guidance from staff would be appreciated.

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question. Oh, sorry.

Chair Furth: I was just going to say, it's because we're supposed to find that the building is well designed to operate effectively, blah, blah, blah. And this is a split ownership building. Sometimes you design those buildings so that they can ignore each other. You know, this is this part, this is that part. They don't really have to talk. Except when they re-roof every 30 years. But this isn't like that. This is an integrated project.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm actually, about this whole access thing, does that mean, then, every property that gets developed on the island then is going to have to have some sort of easement through the middle of it?

Chair Furth: No, and I didn't specify an easement, and they offered as an amenity this kind of passageway. I think that if we don't have any kind of commitment to keep it open, which, to my mind...

Board Member Gooyer: What do you mean by a commitment, then?



Chair Furth: It could be a CC&R covenant with the City. We often do that. Because you're going to have to have CC&Rs. We have a lot of those, for example, over on the infill project, on the old Palo Alto Medical Foundation site. A lot of commitments on those spaces.

Board Member Gooyer: That would be done, like, let's say, for example, through the HOA, or whatever.

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Chair Furth: Whatever the management...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: I could accept something like that.

Chair Furth: I'm not saying they should have something that shows up on their title report the way CC&Rs do. I also think that realistically, that they're probably going to want the ability to close it off during some hours. It just doesn't quite seem to be thought through. I'm trying to figure a situation in which people will want, the owners will want to be able to leave it open because it facilitates their own commercial developments and residential ease of passage. And, the neighborhood understands that it's available for a passing-through use and nothing else during reasonably-limited periods of the day.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I thought you were going...

Chair Furth: I'm just struggling.

Board Member Gooyer: ...back to the while idea of the easement, which I'm against.

Chair Furth: I understand.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may. I did want to point out or clarify that we do have some policies related to this in the comp plan. Policy L2.2 talks about enhancing connections between commercial and mixed-use centers and the surrounding residential by promoting walkable and bikeable connections. We also have context-based design guideline that talks about pedestrian and bicycle environment, designing new products that promote, you know, walkability, and connections. We definitely have some guidelines related to this. It definitely was a commitment made by the applicants, and I think in our latest conversations, the applicant is talking about potentially an access agreement. I don't know if that would be, sort of the happy medium. But I think we...

Chair Furth: You know that we work with Stanford all the time, and they never grant anybody anything. Which is why we have a lot of public access easements. There are lots of documents that could probably let everybody live happily.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, I do think that, at least from a staff perspective, we feel like we could get to that happy medium.

Chair Furth: Good. Does the applicant agree? Does what we say make sense to you?

Mr. Voskerician: Yes.

Chair Furth: We've said so many things. Let's see, is there anybody we haven't heard from? I've got Alex's list, but is there anybody else we haven't heard from? Everybody got their issues on the table?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I think I'm, just to reiterate one point that Alex made, and maybe one that I made earlier. There is a bit of clarification needed on the materials used and the material palette. And it's a little... I think there's some, like, kind of trump doy [phonetic] happening with the renders. I'm not sure if some materials are proud of other materials, or when the material changes, it happens in a plainer way. I think there's also a little... I don't know. I have more questions about what materials go where, but I don't want to...

Chair Furth: Okay, so, we have three options. We can continue this matter for a further hearing by us. We can recommend approval without a subcommittee, just with referral to staff. Or, we can recommend approval with referral to a subcommittee. Without binding yourselves on the final motion, what are your thoughts on this. Us, subcommittee or staff?

Board Member Thompson: I'd like to see some stuff again, so, whether that's in...

Chair Furth: You either want it to be on subcommittee or come back to us. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm okay with it. To me, the issue is getting an access agreement.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Gooyer: But that could be done sort of, you know, by staff, and...

Chair Furth: It should be done by staff.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: ...the owner [crosstalk]...

Chair Furth: It's not our area of competence.

Board Member Gooyer: ...long as we put in there that some agreement...

Chair Furth: You have to add a condition.

Board Member Gooyer: ...needs to be made.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, I'm satisfied that, the way Wynne described it is fine. I don't think asking for a full-fledged easement across the property that gets put on title is appropriate.

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Vice Chair Baltay: But, I would like to see something that also just grants the public... Puts in writing the applicant's intention....

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: And do it through, like, the HOA, or something.

Vice Chair Baltay: Any sort of thing like that would be perfectly... [crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: Right. Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: I just want to see something.

Board Member Gooyer: If that's the case, I'd be willing to approve it with coming back to staff level, or something.

Chair Furth: Okay. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I am... Yes. I think that the... It seems to me that the outstanding issue, then, is, like what Osma pointed out, the blank west façade. And that if there are changes... Like, I think you were asking, if it's possible to do windows, and I think it's a, there may be fire rating issues, and two-hour enclosure issues.

Chair Furth: The applicant's architect/representative is nodding.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, so...

Mr. Popp: Yeah, if I could just... I know this is out of procedure, but we're 2 feet, 3 inches from a property line. It's...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: At five feet, you're not... At less than five feet, you are not permitted to have any openings...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: ... so we're trying to decorate the wall.

Board Member Lew: It seems to me that that would be a big, if there were a change, that would be a big aesthetic thing that maybe the Board would need to see. My take on it is the wall isn't that long, and there is the Honey Baked Ham building in front of it.

Board Member Gooyer: And it's only a three-story instead of a four-story.

Board Member Lew: Yes, three stories, not four stories. And there's wood... Yeah. But I would guess that that would be one concern. I think generally I'm okay with subcommittee for these remaining items.

Chair Furth: Okay. And I would support a subcommittee, so that's three of us. On this signage for the parking garage, I don't... Do we need a space counter sign? I mean, I'm sure it's tricky when you've got mixed use parking, but it seems to me those are the only ones that actually work. You know, I shop at a supermarket which has rooftop parking, and I can tell as I come down Hawthorne Avenue that there's zero, or 13, or 42 spaces, and that modifies my behavior. But just saying "parking garage" doesn't really tell me if I'm going to get lost in the bowels of a substructure. Applicant have any thoughts on this?

Mr. Popp: We can definitely do what you're describing. I think the trick here is that the space counter is really just for the retail use, and there's mixed parking down there. It's going to be hard to gauge how many available spaces there are. Also, just aesthetically, having sat in your position, I'm not really in favor of having neon signs blinking how many spaces are available out on El Camino Real.

Chair Furth: I'm sure you can design a tasteful one that doesn't blink.

Mr. Popp: They look like what they look like.

Chair Furth: I love them. Sort of the way I feel about solar panels. In certain circumstances. Not as designed by the City. Okay, so, I think we're moving towards a motion to recommend approval, with a new condition of approval requiring the installation of a key-controlled gate, card-controlled gate on the parking, that would be secured outside of normal business hours, which we will leave to staff to define before this goes for final approval. At the moment, we understand that they will be closed between 10:00

p.m. and 6:00 a.m., or longer if the applicant wishes. That we would add a condition that there would be signage indicating availability of parking for retail or commercial uses somehow, possibly with a counter sign. But the design of that signage, in addition to... How do you want to describe it? Review of materials? For the review of materials? Is that what you're talking about, that you want? I mean, clarification...

Board Member Lew: Especially if you're specifying the materials, right? I mean, it just says wood and stucco, which really could mean anything.

Chair Furth: Okay, specification of, and materials to be reviewed by a subcommittee of the ARB after further details are provided by applicant? Right? You're going to have the right to say yes or no?

Ms. Gerhardt: And that would include, like, material samples, and then, also, clear delineation of where materials start and stop.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...with sufficient specificity so that you can review it for approval or denial, recommending of approval of denial. Sorry, my computer just decided to go to sleep. Modifying finding... Oh, specification, lighting plan needs to specify pole heights. Do you want the subcommittee to further review the lighting plan based on that information?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, or staff.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Okay. We'll just dump it all to committee at the moment. And, we need to modify, recommending modifying... Where are we? Condition #7? Six? What page? Seven. And we'll stop calling that public access easement and simply call it public access. And the owner shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that reasonable access will be available for pedestrian and bicycle use of the access way during normal business hours. And that the entity responsible for maintenance and operation of that will be capable of undertaking that task. Everybody...? They are nodding over in the applicant's bench. You know, we could have an interesting discussion about whether there's a null and dull and nexus here, because right now, there is access across the property. But we certainly don't have an interest in claiming a City property right in here as access that's available to the public. And it needs to be something more than good intentions. Buildings get transferred. The owner and operator of this building needs to be able to tell the people who think, "Oh, let's just close it off," that we can't. That we've made a commitment, and it's a binding commitment. Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Could we add more element to maybe...

Chair Furth: Subcommittee?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, to the subcommittee review? For that left elevation, even if it has to be without any fenestration?

Chair Furth: We need to specify...

Board Member Thompson: Oh, the west elevation. The one that has the fire barrier.

Chair Furth: What's its face? The Honey Baked Ham elevation?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, that one.

Chair Furth: The one closer to downtown. The one as you proceed towards San Francisco on El Camino Real.

Board Member Thompson: That one that, you know, is not allowed to have openings, but there could be more to be done aesthetically to make that less of a massive wall.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, a review of the materials and detailing on the stairwell façade.

Board Member Thompson: Right.

Chair Furth: To see if they can have somewhat more interest, interest without, in light of the restrictions on openings. Okay. Everybody okay with that? It's a series of referrals to a yet-to-be-named subcommittee. Players to be named later. Great. That's a motion by me. Is there a second?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. Further discussion?

Vice Chair Baltay: I would like to add that I did read the initial study of the EIR and I found it okay.

Chair Furth: For the (inaudible). The mitigated negative declaration, right? Great. So, what that basically said was that this could have had adverse effects on the environment, but you were able to design around them and work around them. The applicant is looking at the clock; I'm sure so is everybody concerned with other projects. Did we vote?

Board Member Thompson: Not yet.

Chair Furth: All those in favor? All those opposed. Five to nothing. It is approved.

**MOTION TO APPROVED PASSED 5-0.**

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. We will have a three minute break, for everybody to get in space for the next item, which is Verizon.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: Can I see a show of hands from members of the public who are here to speak on this matter? Three? I have both a question... Well, I have a question. We realize that you had to wait a long time to speak. So has the applicant, but they are mostly here on paid work. We have two items before us, two separate clusters. One is called 2, one is called 3; 3 is downtown north; 2 is not. Are you here on 2 or three?

Male?: Two.

Chair Furth: Two?

[inaudible response from the audience]

Chair Furth: Right. You're both... Okay, fine. Because if you were not, I was going to suggest that we merge public testimony of the two. But since everybody who wants to speak is here on the first one, we will just proceed. Thank you. Staff? Oh, go ahead, introduce the item.

**5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 2, University South Multiple Addresses [17PLN-00433 File Uses 250 Hamilton Avenue Address]: Request by Sure Site (on behalf of Crown Castle to Lease to Verizon) for Seven Small**

**Cell Node Tier 3 Wireless Communication Facility Permits in the Public Right of Way, Including Six Streetlight Nodes and One New Streetlight Node. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning of Node Locations is Public Facilities, Adjacent to These Zones: Public Facilities (275 Forest); Commercial Downtown CD-C (P): 345 Forest; Residential Transition (SOFA) RT-35: 248 Homer, 190 Channing; DHS (SOFA) - 385 Homer, 905 Waverley (formerly 400 Channing), 845 Ramona. For further background information, please refer to the City's website under the project file number 17PLN-00433). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Rebecca Atkinson at [Rebecca.atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Rebecca.atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org).**

Amy French, Chief Planning Officer: Okay. I'm Amy French, Chief Planning Officer, here to present the project called Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 2. It's some small-cell nodes for wireless communication facilities in the University South neighborhood. The address is noted on the ad that we've published in the newspaper, The Post, as well as what we sent out to the neighborhood with notice cards. They are wireless communication facilities in the right-of-way, in different zones, including the Commercial Downtown zone; the DHS, which is a SOFA zone; the RT-35, also a SOFA zone; and... I think that was it as far as the zones. This is the first hearing on Cluster 2 proposed by Crown Castle on behalf of Verizon. Rebecca Atkinson -- to my left -- is the project planner. I am here to deliver the report. Albert Yang, to my left as well, our City Attorney staff, here to represent. We have the applicants here. They do have, I just wanted to mention, a Dr. Bushberg, I think is his name. He is to teach a class at UC Davis at 2:00 p.m. today, so there was a request for earlier presentation by this gentleman. I will make my presentation, and then, possibly, they can reverse the order of their presentation to have him speak first. Okay. I'll begin. This is Cluster 2 in University South. There are six streetlight poles that are involved here, existing streetlight poles to be replaced by new streetlight poles, and there is one streetlight pole proposed that does not exist currently. The poles would receive canister antennas on the top, and their proposal is to install ground-mounted fake mailboxes containing radio units. They are large radio units. That is their proposal. They have, today, some alternate images, alternatives to where to put those radios, and they will show in their presentation that we saw last night at 7:00 p.m. I wanted to also note that at places, we have two reports, one for each of these clusters. Cluster 2 is what you are looking at now. We have the CTC technology and energy report at places. This is a consultant that the City hired to help us understand what the design alternatives are and the RF radio frequency emission technical matters. We have that. Also at places we have some comments from members of the public that the ARB should have received at places. On the screen, showing images of each of these nodes. You can count them. Did I say six? There are seven nodes proposed, six of them, again, existing locations for streetlights, with proposal to replace the streetlights, and one new streetlight in a place that does not exist. There's only one streetlight here that is not on a corner, and that's the one that's proposed where none exists. The other six are located near intersections. Staff recommends denial of three of those nodes, and the reasons are on the screen. I would note that the applicant would request feedback on alternatives that they are proposing today, in the presentation we saw last night, and our email. They will go through those for each of those nodes that staff recommends denial on. They are also showing alternatives for all the nodes as far as faux mailbox pedestal or side-mounted equipment. Staff is recommending approval on four of those nodes on the screen, and with alternatives that can be explored today, and conditioned. Again, the applicant is going to present some alternate images. Here are some images showing the mailbox problem. This is not a mailbox; it's an enclosure, and it's subject to vandalism, and there are issues with repair of these, and not happening in a timely manner. Here in the middle is the image of the size of the radio, the remote radio unit that is proposed. This is... Several of these radios going into an enclosure makes for a large enclosure. On the right is an image of other types of utility boxes in Palo Alto in the right-of-way, so that's showing an alternative not proposed by the applicant. We have some images here that are from this technology report, CTC report, regarding underground, being the size of vault would have to be for undergrounding, and some other considerations. We have construction challenges. You have this on the screen now that talk about, you know, how far you can put one of these enclosures from the antenna. There is a 90-foot requirement, there's a 70-foot requirement here. If anyone has questions, we can go back to this if the vaulting question comes up. Here is an image of a vault, showing the size that our consultant determined would

be required. This is not proposed by the applicant. Vaulting. On the right, there is an image of the AT&T proposals using these microcells that are much smaller than the radios proposed with this application. Here are, again, from our CTC report, consultant report, showing some examples of mounting on top of the pole, the conjunction of the antenna, and the radio or radios. And then, on the right, the images of a side-mounted sets of radios.

Chair Furth: Amy?

Ms. French: Again, these are the smaller, microcell radios.

Chair Furth: Sure. I know you got a lot of information from them at the last minute, and from our consultant. I just wanted to clarify. When do you need to leave by? Ten minutes ago?

Dr. Gerald Bushberg: Yeah.

Ms. French: Do you want a break?

Chair Furth: Well, if you would like to, with the permission of the Board, if you would like to take some of your applicant's time to make whatever brief presentation you can before you leave. I'd hate to have your trip be in vain.

Ms. French: Okay.

Chair Furth: We'll go back to staff report...

Ms. French: Sure.

Chair Furth: ...after that, and we'll just...

Ms. French: Do you have a presentation to upload?

Dr. Bushberg: No, I can speak from my notes here.

Chair Furth: Okay, and this will count against the applicant's time.

Dr. Bushberg: Thank you for your consideration.

Chair Furth: If you could spell your name for the record.

Dr. Bushberg: It's Gerald Bushberg [spells name].

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Dr. Gerald Bushberg: I am a consultant retained by Crown Castle to do the analysis that's before you, and was reviewed by outside counsel, or outside experts. There's only just a few points that I'd like to make. My general background is I'm a clinical professor of radiology and radiation oncology at UC Davis. I'm also the chairman of the board and senior scientist at the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements in Washington. We study both ionized and radiational x-rays, as well as radiofrequency energy. The comments that I have today apply to both Clusters 2 and 3. I just want to make a few points. First of all, I know a lot of people think that this wireless technology is something new that we don't know much about, but actually, when you really think about it, it's really the coming together of three pretty old technologies. It's a combination of radio, computer and a telephone. We have over 100 years' experience with RF broadcast and have been studying biological effects of RF energy for over 60 years now. As shown in the reports, the maximum exposures at ground level are less than one percent of what is allowed by the FCC for continuous public exposure. And the thing that is

important to understand about that is that the exposure standards are not set right at the threshold of potential harm and safety. In fact, they are set 50 times below a level that is thought to be potentially harmful. That really represents a safety factor of over 5,000 times, and that is the maximum exposures that are anticipated. Finally -- and this is sort of a counterintuitive point, but -- for those people who are concerned about RF exposure, the vast majority of RF exposure today comes from uses over your cell phone. Because it's not so much that it's high-powered, but because it's close to your body. Both your exposure and the exposure to people next to you are the highest RF exposures that people typically experience. The other thing that people don't know about their phones usually is that the phones have, all phones have something called adaptive power control, which means that when they are really close to a cell site and have good coverage, like, all the bars, they're only operating at about one percent or one-tenth of a percent of their maximum. When they are far away and you only have one bar, the phone reaches out to its maximum. The difference between your exposure when you have good coverage and you have bad coverage can be 1,000 to 1. For those people who are really concerned about RF exposure and live in a community that has wireless service, the very best thing you could do to reduce the ambient levels of RF exposure would be to have really good coverage in the area that's being served, because then, the phones would be operating at extremely low power. And they do this not because of a safety issue. They do it to preserve battery life, and also to keep signals within the site that the cell sites want to see. For those that have a concern, it seems counterintuitive, but having really good coverage in an area is one way -- probably the most effective way -- to reduce the greatest public exposure. I will conclude my comments with that, and would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Chair Furth: Does anybody have questions of the speaker? When thinking about radiation exposures of any kind, is it cumulative exposures we're concerned with? Or peak? Or both?

Dr. Bushberg: Well, with x-rays, the answer is yes. With radio waves, the answer is no. Let me give you an example. With x-rays...

Chair Furth: I'll take your answer. That's fine.

Dr. Bushberg: Oh. Okay. It's no. The RF exposure is non-ionizing radiation, like visible light. For example, visible light does not accumulate in the body, so there's not an intensity that builds up and damages the optic nerve. The same thing is true with RF energy. You're exposed, the energy is dissipated.

Chair Furth: So when my dermatologist is telling me to limit my sun exposure, cumulatively, she's wrong?

Dr. Bushberg: No. They're talking then about ultraviolet radiation, which is right at the threshold of ionizing and non-ionizing. The RF radio waves are about a million times less energetic. In fact, they're less energetic than light waves.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Dr. Bushberg: Okay.

Chair Furth: Any other questions?

Dr. Bushberg: Thank you for indulging me. Appreciate it.

Chair Furth: Yes. Hope you make it to class.

Dr. Bushberg: I will. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Safely. (inaudible) for the disruption, but you did advise us of this necessity, so we will get back to the staff report.



Ms. French: Yes. And that was very nice. I'll move along here. The images that I had just finished describing on the screen are examples or concepts for placement of the radios between the top of the pole and the antenna that's proposed above the pole. That's on the left side. On the right side is a side-mounted set of radios. These radios here in this concept are really the micro or pico-size radios, which are much smaller than the radios that the applicant is proposing. Here are just some images of other poles that are nearby some of the proposed nodes. Again, the applicant's presentation will describe in detail how they came up on the node locations that they are proposing, but I'll just briefly blow through these images we took in the field, showing what else is out there. These are all relatively short poles, providing light, street lighting. I'm just going to... These are available if the ARB wishes to go back and look at some of these alternate possibilities. Again, the applicant would have some comments on these, I'm sure. Just showing, especially for the ones that the staff is recommending denial on. This is a situation where we have a historic building, Category 2 on our local historic inventory, and the options are several: To relocate to a different site entirely for a node; the image on the right shows a nearby streetlight. The applicant will show you today their proposal to put the mailbox in a different location but retain the location next to what's known as Staller Court today. This is the other recommended-for-denial location. The City does not want to have a new streetlight placed where there is none today. There is some analysis that would go with that. Those are the nearby poles on the right. The CTC report, not to bore you with details, but it is, we had quite a scope for them to look at. They had site visits, they did review of the capacity and on-site coverage -- All of these things related to the technical aspects of the project. And, they did propose these images of alternate design. Their findings related to the scientific, the RF's, are on the screen, and signal strength, etc. They believe that the proposal will provide the service that they are looking at providing to their customers. Again, here are just a couple images. Showing on the left, these are the radios that cause the large mailbox size to be proposed, two of these. They are longer, 27 inches tall, or long, and 12.5 inches wide, and a depth of seven inches. As opposed to the pico or microcell units on the right, which are 7.8 inches wide and 3.9 inches deep. More of a square shape. Again, here's our recommended motion. Conditional approval of four nodes, denial of three nodes, and comments on the potential alternative design locations that the applicant is showing. We have the generic standards that are in the staff report on these packet pages -- 200, and findings, 202. We have not crafted findings for approval of this project, nor conditions of approval at this time. We have... The next steps on the screen would be director's decision within 14 days of the ARB recommendation, and then, appealable to the City Council. That's the standard. Here on the screen, I'm going to remove this so the applicant can upload their presentation. And we have staff here for answers to questions, if we want, before their presentation. Or, hear next from the applicant.

Chair Furth: I think we'll go ahead with hearing from the applicant first, and again, we have a transcriber, so if you would spell your name, give us your address. If you have a corporate affiliation and that needs spelling, do that, too. Applicant is entitled to 10 minutes at the beginning of the public hearing, and 10 minutes after you hear from the public, which you will. You have six minutes and 37 seconds left.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Okay.

Ms. Swanson: If I may, Chairman Furth, is it possible to take Dr. Bushberg's time off of my Cluster 3 10 minutes, considering that is a shorter presentation?

Chair Furth: We'll split it.

Ms. Swanson: Thank you. I appreciate that. If I may, I ...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Swanson: ...timer on here. What shall I put my time for?

Chair Furth: Eight.

Ms. Swanson: Eight minutes. Thank you so much.

Chair Furth: Coordinate with her. She gets eight.

Ms. Swanson: Hopefully you can see that; it's a little dark. First, I want to thank you again for having us here. This is our second appearance. We had a preliminary back in September of 2017. Hard to believe it's been that long, but it has. I want to start by introducing the change...

Chair Furth: You need to remind us what your name is.

Rochelle Swanson: I'm sorry. Rochelle Swanson. I work for SureSite Consulting. I'm doing government relations on behalf of Crown Castle International, who is the applicant in this matter. I know Verizon has been brought up a few times. However, they are a tenant. This is a Crown Castle project, Crown Castle being the nation's largest owner of fiber infrastructure and working through wireless deployment. I want to first, like I said, introduce the team. I'm sorry, you want my address. I live in Davis, California, another lovely college community. Do you need my street address, or is that adequate?

Chair Furth: (inaudible, off microphone)

Ms. Swanson: All right, 2780 Brentwood Place, Davis, California. Behind me I have Dick Stoddard, who is our construction manager; Morgan Hunt, who is our manager of RF engineering; Todd Threw, who is the CEO of Costal Communications, lead designer of their A&E, and helps us with compliance on all design issues, local, state and federal; Michael Shawnafell [phonetic], our legal counsel, as well as Sharon James, the director of government relations, and Reejay Redivarie [phonetic], who is the project manager. I share the titles and the depth because I believe that if you have questions that have to do with those subject matters, rather than to referring to an analysis of generalists like myself and staff, that they are really the go-to people to ask. Just a little bit of background. Crown Castle is a competitive local exchange carrier, also...Oh, this is not working. Hold on. It's not clicking through. [Technical difficulties with digital presentation.] All right. Going back to, explaining that Crown Castle is acelic [phonetic,] and what that means is that they qualify as public utility and have special status to the public right-of-way and poles and equipment, but also being regulated as a utility as opposed to a carrier. This project here is an expansion of a previous project of 19 sites, from 2015. This build-out here is an expansion, as mentioned before, and it really is about bolstering infrastructure. While everybody is very much excited and talking about smart cities and 5G, this is also for 4G infrastructure, which is important to have the ubiquitous coverage within communities and between communities. The real core of this is the need for coverage and capacity. Years back, it was really about coverages and holes in coverage, but now it's really about capacity because of the ubiquitous use of wireless devices. Not just phones, of course, but there's also tablets, laptops, and at some point, cars and other issues. As you can see here -- and I won't belabor going through -- the numbers, and they continue to grow, is the amount of people who are using data, it's rapid increase. What's interesting is that, going back to the need for infrastructure, we're 36th in the world for actually having the deployment, though we're probably some of the highest in demand there. Right here it says that 48 percent have wireless service only. Actually, that number has already climbed to nearly 53 percent just in the time since putting this together. I will note as I go through here, I'm going to try to address some of the other questions from CTC. We received that this morning, because I know that was just also received by staff last night, so, where possible, try to connect it, which is also why... And I apologize for the late submittal for our own report. We have been waiting on photo sims to address the staff report that came out on Friday night, so, to try to give you the most information that we have. The specific request that we have here is to take a look at all the nodes. As staff put out, as far as the different ways that we can house the equipment, as put into potential conditions of approval for those four nodes, and also, being able to use them as solutions for the remaining three. Specifically looking at Node 26 and the different options on the mailbox, which was discussed. The preference for the location for Node 28m1, if you'll recall, we came here with Node 28 in front of 370 Channing back in September 2017, and it was recommended then that while it is stated that it would be preferable to avoid corners, but to go ahead and go and look at the corner, especially what was explained there by our engineer, Ernesto, theorized that we have an ability to actually have greater coverage when we locate on

corners rather than mid-block. Because there's a line of sight for two different streets, and that allows for more efficient use of each site, potentially less sites, depending on the location. Node 25 of the request, while it's for denial, to allow us to move forward with a conditional approval, to continue to work with staff to address their concerns, considering the fact that that's the only viable node that we have there. And then, of course, any additional feedback from all of you, as well as, you know, looking forward to the landscaping proposed by the urban forester. No opposition to working there with staff and doing what is applicable and feasible in each one of those locations. Just quickly here for the history because I want to be able to recap those two minutes that were lost, is that we first walked the start sites in 2016, in November, and then, of course, was here in September 2017. I raise this, the whole history here, to kind of denote the way that Crown Castle does business when it comes to locating locations. It is not a desktop exercise, so, a node that gets proposed isn't throwing something on the wall. Whenever there is a sidewalk, there is a full team of people -- usually folks want to stop us on the street and know what we're doing -- anywhere from five, seven, sometimes 12 people. Everybody from every discipline, half of which are here, take into account, what does the code say, what is General Order 95, which is the regulations from the Utility Commission, as well as orientation of equipment, climbing space, proximity to balconies, to homes, to second stories; what's the proximity to the street; what's the least-intrusive piece? And that all goes into an account physically in the field before we even approach staff with doing the pre-application meeting. Which, of course, I did have a couple of pre-application meetings. We've had a number of community meetings, any time that we've made a change based on feedback. When we were here before and it was considered that we should look at an alternative to Node 26 because of the concerns with Staller Court, we held a public meeting. When we moved 28 to 400 Channing to replace an existing sign, we had another community meeting. We've actually erred on the side of caution, and when we come, we bring all the information in case there were members of public who wanted to discuss any of the other nodes, and have had only a handful of people who have shown up. And I'll discuss more on Cluster 3 some of the specific changes that we made. The main concerns that have come up have been RF noise and siting. I take that that I'm getting very close to the end. As was mentioned, the different options that we have are a side mount in relation to what staff had recommended. There is a pedestal mount. I want to point out the pedestal chosen here is from Cupertino, where all the carriers came together to agree on a design that would work for their equipment. While a pole-mounted/top-mounted was mentioned, that is not a solution for all carriers. That takes a very small footprint and a very specific kind of antenna. And then, beyond that -- and I'll read this for your specific questions about the nodes for denial -- is that our RF engineer will be able to go through... And I put these in the slide, not for my coverage, but for his ability to look and show the due diligence that was done, and why we have been, they are unable to have a feasible alternative on both Node 25, 26, and that 28 really is either the pole at 400, or at 370 Channing. With that, just, again, request that we can move forward with the conditions of approval, and we're here to answer any and every question that you have. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We have speaker cards. Somewhere. The first speaker is Nicolas Flegel, to be followed by Don Jackson.

Nick Flegel, Partner, Jorgensen, Siegel, McClure & Flegel: Good afternoon. Nick Flegel [spells name]. I'm a partner at the firm Jorgensen, Siegel, McClure & Flegel in Menlo Park. Our office address is 1100 Alma Street, Suite 210.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Flegel: I'm here speaking on behalf of my clients, Mike Midolo and Neil O'Sullivan. They are the owners of 362 Channing, which the original proposal was for a node to be put at 370 Channing. They came here during that original proposal and opposed it back in September 2017. They came here because they said, hey, it's an undergrounding district; number two, that there's absolutely no tree coverage for where that pole was, and there's no possibility for tree coverage because there are utility boxes right underneath where that pole is. And number three, the pole is, and where this node will go, are directly visible from their upstairs window. I brought some pictures, and this is the first picture.

Chair Furth: We have those, thank you.

Mr. Flegel: This board suggested to the applicant, "You should look at alternatives." And they did look at alternatives, and we really appreciate that. And keep in mind, 362 Channing is mid-block, okay? They proposed this new pole, it's 28m1, and we really appreciate that proposal. We support that proposal. We think it meets a lot of the sitting criteria in terms of it being, having coverage there. There is a pole there. It would be replacing a pole. It's replacing a pole. I saw staff's report. I think that there are some issues that are not insurmountable, that applicant and staff can work together and make this pole at 400 Channing work. That's our request. Number two, alternatives we have, maybe this Board could give direction to look at other proposals, and another proposal might be, we think is a really good one, moving it basically one block west... I'm sorry, one lot west, to where there's the Mini Sharp [sic] Park. That's a location where there is not a light. There's a crosswalk there, there's tree coverage there. We think that that would be a benefit for the City, for safety reasons.

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon - A mini shark park?

Mr. Flegel: Mini...

Male?: [off microphone, inaudible]

Chair Furth: Oh, Scott Park.

Mr. Flegel: Sorry, sorry. I apologize. And then... That's picture number two in my presentation. And then, number three, the last couple pages are four other alternative sites that we think that it would be nice if the Board could ask the applicant to look at. Our fourth request would be, the Board can just deny this node, Node 28. I don't think we really have any evidence that it's 100 percent needed for this coverage plan to work. We certainly just don't want it in front of our client's property. And if there is going to be a proposal for that, we don't want it... Our clients don't want it there. That's it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I have one question for you. Could you...? Your clients don't want it there because...?

Mr. Flegel: Well, the main reason, there's zero coverage, tree coverage.

Chair Furth: Visibility. You're talking about the appearance.

Mr. Flegel: The pole is right there. You can see it right from outside their upstairs room. There's just no way to make it look nice, in our mind.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That testimony pertained to site, which is now 28M1, right? No? Formerly...? Which...?

Board Member Lew: It was the original 28. And then, they approved an alternate, which is 28m1.

Chair Furth: Staff, which of the ones you presented to us today are we talking about?

Ms. French: Twenty-eight-m-1 is the 400 Channing, also known as 905 Waverley. That's the alternate node for the node at 370 that was originally proposed.

Rebecca Atkinson, Project Planner: And was removed from the plan set.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, what page is that?

[inaudible response]

Chair Furth: Let's just talk about today. Actually, we can talk about recent history. The applicants came in 2017, or 2014? I forget. A while ago.

Ms. French: Twenty-seventeen.

Chair Furth: Twenty-seventeen. And they asked that a proposed pole be moved from in front of their house. The applicant submitted an application, which is now our number 28m1? Which removed it from in front of the objectors' house. However, the City has objections to that proposed relocation, and the... Mr. Flegel, on behalf of his clients, is saying, "Don't put it back in front of our house." Is that correct? Is that a summary of what just happened?

Ms. French: Yes.

[crosstalk]

Ms. French: ...accurate.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I would just say that it's very helpful when people are talking to do as you did and address both the address, the street address, and the node number, because otherwise, we get quite easily confused. Thank you. We have another speaker, as soon as I find the cards I just buried. And that would be Don Jackson, to be followed by Michael Midolo. Yes?

Don Jackson: Hello. I'm Don Jackson [spells name].

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Jackson: I reside at 845 Waverley Street.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Jackson: Yesterday, I sent an email to the Board, describing my interest in this project, which, to summarize, is to explore the feasibility of leveraging any associated street trenching, boring conduit, that are required to link these various cell nodes by a fiberoptic link, in order for me to use the same trenching to establish a fiberoptic link connecting between my house and either Packs [phonetic], which is at 529 Bryant, or an existing city fiber vault at the corner of Waverley and Channing, which is approximately 125 feet from my property. Obviously, if this were to happen, I would have to bear the cost of any additional work that would benefit only me. If this project goes forward, the City will be allowing the applicant to install communications equipment on City street lights, install and maintain associated cell site electronics at ground level on City property, and inside enclosures that look similar to postal relay boxes, and to link the cell sites by fiberoptic cables that will be installed underneath city streets. The space area underneath our city streets is a limited and finite resource and should be used as efficiently and cooperatively as possible. Additionally, trenching a city street is highly disruptive, leaving patches of replaced asphalt, and, as I recently discovered, it is incredibly expensive. And we should seek to minimize any such projects. My request is that if this project moves forward, that the applicant be encouraged to make a good faith effort to explore the possibility of leveraging any associated street trenching.

Chair Furth: Could I ask a question?

Mr. Jackson: Sure thing.

Chair Furth: Familiar issue over the last 20 years, how to get this higher-speed connectivity. You're asking that they...? What are you envisioning, just briefly? Who would own...? Additional fiber? Or would other people have access to it.

Mr. Jackson: As you know, there are numerous ideas and discussions about...

Chair Furth: Twenty years, at least I remember.

Mr. Jackson: ...city... No, I'm talking about city, I'm talking about me getting fiber from Point A to Point B.

Chair Furth: Right, and you're proposing to own that line?

Mr. Jackson: Yeah, I would use that line.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Mr. Midolo.

Mr. Midolo: Good afternoon, members of the Architectural Review Board. It's nice to see you again. I saw you last in September of 2017. At that time, I came before you to stress concerns that I and Neil O'Sullivan have for our home at 362 Channing. We have lived in Palo Alto for 25 years. We own our home. I'm here this afternoon in support of -- and I'm going to be very specific -- 28m1, which is the alternative site. This is not the one in front of our home. This is the one at 400, located at 400 Channing. The proposed location is a result of over a year of discussions with the City and Crown Castle, and I urge you to support it. There is currently just a street pole there. It is not a light pole, it's just a regular old street pole, right there. It's to indicate parking and such. At the same time, I also urge you to deny the placement of any node at this time, or in the future, on the light pole outside of our home. I believe you have in your exhibits very clear documentation of how visible that pole is from inside our home. And there will never be the ability to shade or shield in any way that pole because of the other utilities immediately surrounding it. It is also one of the exceptions that... I know Amy mentioned earlier that they are all on corners. This is the one exception. This is the one that's in the block, right in the middle of the block. We have been through a labor of love, remodeling our home. We retained the architect in 2013. It's taken three years to remodel it. You guys have seen the photos, you know that it's quite a big commitment. And we appreciate that Crown Castle is trying not to exacerbate the unattractive light pole outside of our house. Over a year ago, in September 2017, we came to the preliminary ARB board to oppose location on the pole outside our house. The architect showed you pictures of the home. The close proximity to the pole, to our windows, and the lack of tree screening. We identified how the pole at 370 does not meet the City's location and criteria for small nodes because the pole is in an undergrounding district. There is no tree screening. The node would be highly visible, again, through the windows. At the meeting, you encouraged, as a body, you encouraged Crown Castle to pursue alternative locations for the node. We anticipated that your indications would be followed. However, several months ago, we received notice from Crown Castle that, again, they were proposing to put Node 28 on the pole outside our house. So, we went to that community meeting and expressed our disappointment, and then, worked with them on alternatives again, pointing them towards the location at either 400, or multiple other sites. We provided at least six sites for them to consider. Our attorneys have followed up numerous times with the City staff and Crown Castle and still don't understand why any of these sites that were suggested aren't reasonable. We appreciate that Crown Castle is working with us in supporting an alternative location. If there is more information the staff needs to be comfortable with a new light pole at 400 Channing, we encourage you to direct the applicant to provide that information, and direct staff to work with them to make it work. One alternative that I think would be perfect would be to remove the pole at 370 Channing, the one that is right in front of my house. Remove it, move it just down the street to 346, at 346 Channing, at Scott Street. What I am suggesting here is the pole in front of our house at 370 be moved to 346. Why? Because after the Summerhill development, there was the new Heritage Park. There's a walkway, so, what people do, including myself and my 69-year-old dementia-affected aunt, do is we constantly cross that, at least three times a day, and there is no light there. None at all. That's the natural connector between Scott Park and Heritage Park, and everybody uses that, including pedestrians, elderly and young. No light there whatsoever. Yet, in front of our house, where we don't need a pole, there is a pole. Either 400 would be a great location for that node, or else, quite simply, if that pole, there could be a pole at 346 Channing, or if not, there is also one inside the park, or if not... "Inside the park," I'm referring to inside Scott Mini Park. Or if not, the other alternative is denial of it. You've got four different options, five different options there, for 28. Sorry?

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for coming to speak to us. Sorry we kept you waiting so long, and your time has elapsed.

Mr. Midolo: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any questions for Mr. Midolo? Other than M-I-D-O-L-O? Is that the spelling of your name?

Mr. Midolo: M-I-D-O-L-O. Yeah. Again, it's...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Midolo: ...since there's no light mid-block, it would be great to have a light mid-block.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Midolo: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay, and then, we had a final speaker card from David Baumgarten [spells Baumgarten]. And he could not stay, so, he says: "Consistent with staff recommendation, no cell unit at 400 Channing/905 Waverley." We have a full range of public comments on that one. Anybody else wish to speak as a member of the public on this matter?

Board Member Thompson: Wait, his note was not in favor of...?

Chair Furth: He supports the staff recommendation.

Board Member Thompson: To deny it? Okay.

Chair Furth: To not approve that one. Applicant, you are entitled to another 10 minutes to respond to public comment.

Ms. Swanson: At this time, I'd like to have Morgan Hunt address specifically those nodes, especially Nodes 28 and 28m1, as well as 26 and 25 respectively. And then, if time remains, I'll talk about the design between the pedestal and the side mount.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Morgan Hunt: Hello. My name is Morgan Hunt, and I am the RF manager for Crown Castle. You want my address?

Chair Furth: No, I don't.

Mr. Hunt: Okay. All right. Great. And, you should...

Chair Furth: Oh, I'm sorry, I do need your address. I though you said, did I know your address.

Mr. Hunt: No, do you need it. Okay, is that your presentation up there? My address is 695 River Oaks Parkway in San Jose.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Hunt: All right.

Ms. Swanson: You might ask them which node that is because it's hard to read. It's just the first one.

Mr. Hunt: Yeah, I don't know what that is. That looks like 25, right?

[Adjusting presentation]

Mr. Hunt: Okay, so, in this presentation, there are three locations presented with the alternatives analysis. This one is 25, right? This is adjacent to 200 Forest Avenue. The objective is to provide continuous coverage on Forest Avenue and Ramona Street. Look closer, the node location is to, the intersection is bare coverage. Once you start moving further away from the intersection, the coverage objective will start degrading. That's what causes some of these alternates to not be acceptable. This shows the 200 Forest Avenue, that meets the coverage objective. We looked at 688 Ramona Street, which we could not use it due to the close location to the balcony. And then, at 275 Forest, it's too far from the Forest Avenue/Ramona intersection, with no line of sight, so, it is not covering our objective. And then, we looked at two more locations that were further down the block, 720 Ramona and 223. Both those locations don't meet the coverage objective. That's 25. I'm on a time limit, right? Okay, so, I'm going to go to 28, try to...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Hunt: Okay, thanks. Yes. What's up there now is 28. This is proposed 28m1 at 400 Channing, and the objective is to provide continuous coverage on Channing Avenue in both directions, and partial coverage on Waverley. The objective is to be closer to the Waverley intersection. We looked at a number of alternatives. The original location, which is acceptable for the coverage, 370 Channing. And as presented by the speakers, by the public speakers, what evolved is we chose the 400 as an alternate to the acceptable alternative, and being submitted, and is to replace an existing parking sign pole. And we also looked at, on the intersection, which has traffic signal poles, which are not allowed. We cannot go on city traffic light poles. And then, 425 Channing is farther from the intersection and has less line of sight. That impacts both Channing and Waverley Street. We looked at 346 Channing Avenue. That is closer, I believe that park that was mentioned, and there is no pole there, and it is a little bit further from the intersection, and closer to an existing site, SF Palo Alto 030. So, for a couple of reasons, this location is not acceptable. There's no existing infrastructure to replace, you know, an existing pole, and it is not quite meeting the coverage objective on Waverley. Nine-twenty-eight Waverley Street was also looked at. It is even... Let's see where that location is. Sorry, get my bearing. Oh, yes. That is down south, in a southern direction on Waverley from the intersection that is... We are losing the coverage on Channing, which is the objective. That is the same as the case for 842 Waverley. We can look at 26 real quickly, before I run out of time. Somehow... Okay. Is that 28...? I think that's 26. This is across from 675 Gilman, and it's objective to provide coverage on Forest Avenue and Gilman Street. Again, we want to be closest to the intersection to provided the best coverage. And clear line of sight provides the best coverage. There are existing nodes on Hamilton Avenue and Bryant Street that need to be considered in the placement of this node. We look at alternatives, and one of them is 332 Forest Avenue, is a viable location, but there.... in alternate to 26, but there is no existing pole there. It would be a new pole placement. Three-oh-three Forest, as you see, moves down. Stop?

Chair Furth: Why don't you finish your sentence.

Mr. Hunt: Okay, so, 303 Forest moves down to the middle of the block and is preventing, preventing the coverage objective not to be met.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Staff? Any responses?

Albert Yang, Deputy City Attorney: Sure. Deputy City Attorney Albert Yang. I think the information about the applicant's coverage objectives is informative for the planning director, and he ultimately preps the City Council. But, from the ARB, we are primarily looking for your judgment on the aesthetics of the various options that are presented.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody have questions of staff? Or anybody else?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. In terms of the aesthetic options presented to us, it sounds like there's only one option for the actual, what's happening on top of the light pole. And then, seeing a photoshop



of the mailboxes with the side attachment is just in that diagram, we don't have any other documentation of what that looks like? And any other option? Okay.

Chair Furth: Go ahead.

Ms. Atkinson: Question of staff. On the staff report, there is a web link that points to some visual simulations that Crown produced for other cities, with their decorative pole and side mount. I believe the applicant has some preliminary visual simulations from other cities that have a side mount and a pedestal for associative support equipment. The faux mailbox was a design solution in the past that was large enough to accommodate two carriers' equipment, and right now, the second carrier is not in the existing faux mailbox. My third comment was that the faux mailbox solution potentially identified in the past is oversized relative to the equipment proposed on these individual nodes.

Board Member Thompson: I'm sorry, so, is there an image of the other types of mounting in our packet? Because I think I just saw the mailbox, but maybe I missed it. In our drawings.

Ms. Atkinson: Sure. Yes, you can find that on page 13 of the staff report, and it's packet page 179. Those are existing side-mounted deployments in downtown Palo Alto, and the web link leads to other visual simulations, and the web link is on packet page 177. And then, the applicant presentation, there are a few visual simulations of side-mounted. Staff hasn't had the time to fully analyze, but nonetheless, they are there. The same with pedestal. I think with the side-mounted pole placement and pedestal, transportation and public works and planning would need to very carefully look at horizontal and vertical clearance implementation relative to curb lines, corners and sidewalks. The horizontal and vertical clearance are also important considerations.

Ms. French: Board Member Thompson, would you like to have one of those images displayed on the screen for discussion? From the applicant's presentation?

Board Member Thompson: I would prefer that. Probably ask permission of the Board to show that.

Chair Furth: Yeah, let's take a look at them. Meanwhile, I have another question of counsel while you're finding that. Our recommendation, the recommendation to us is to deny a number of these nodes. Are you comfortable with that recommendation?

Mr. Yang: Yes, and as noted, staff would like the ARB's comments on potential alternatives to the nodes that are recommended for denial.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have a minor question for staff. In looking at these not-mailboxes, are they reviewed to make sure that they don't eliminate a parking space? Because you can't open your curbside door anymore?

Ms. Atkinson: That's one of the items that makes it important to have the 1.5 minimum clearance from curb lengths. You know, for any equipment.

Chair Furth: You believe that there is enough space to open car doors and get out with these installations.

Ms. Atkinson: Only if they are placed at a minimum of 1.5 from a curb line.

Chair Furth: But that's what you are proposing, no?

Ms. Atkinson: No. Right now, the...We're not proposing anything...?

Chair Furth: They are, right?

Ms. Atkinson: Right, so, what I'm saying is, the applicant design, in order to meet clearance requirements, would have to be a minimum of 1.5.

Ms. French: We are not recommending the faux mailboxes.

Chair Furth: Counsel? You had a comment?

Mr. Yang. I think, just to clarify, what staff is saying is that there may be some issues with what you've described.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Swanson: All right, thank you. If I may address that just briefly, is that, especially on the sites that are on the...

Chair Furth: Yeah, let's try to get the hearing. We're at the deliberation section, and...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Swanson: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: ...raise your hand and I'll...

Ms. Swanson: I'm sorry, when you looked at me, I thought you were ready for me to talk about the...

Chair Furth: I'm staring into space. Sorry. We were looking for an image, right? Correct.

Board Member Thompson: I think we just need to see the image.

Chair Furth: From my point of view, it's invisible.

Ms. Atkinson: It does tend to blend with the pole and with the color....

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: (inaudible).

Board Member Thompson: I don't know that that image is satisfactory enough to describe exactly what's happening right there.

Ms. Swanson: Let me see if I can get you a better...

Chair Furth: Six feet up?

Ms. Swanson: Yeah, let me go to 31, It might be a little bit clearer there for the side mount. Let me know... That's a little bit easier to see.

Chair Furth: Why don't you just give us the rough dimensions of that. Is it cylindrical?

Ms. Swanson: No. This shows, this would be square, and it would be 28 by 24 by 20.5. It's basically 8.7 cubic feet, and it would be on the side. Typically, we try to orient...

Chair Furth: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Ms. Swanson: I'm sorry. That would be 28 inches high and 24 inches wide, with a depth of 20.5 inches.

Chair Furth: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Ms. Swanson: You're very welcome. I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: Trying to visualize. Having a little trouble.

Ms. Swanson: Yeah, feel free... And I apologize, with the copies, we have a black and white, I would have made more color copies for you guys. Normally these come up a little bit brighter on here. And that would be mounted on the side and oriented in the safest manner. When these sims were made, we kind of were trying, at the last minute, directly address the staff report. Because we've been talking off and on the last year and a half or so what are some options.

Chair Furth: I'm going to cut you off just because...

Ms. Swanson: That's okay.

Chair Furth: ...it's such a complicated conversation. And I'll let you...

Ms. Swanson: And I also have, like, the construction guys, who may...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: I just want to mention, I was handed this exhibit that I'll pass out, but the first page has the side-mounted, and the second page has the pedestal. It's a lot easier to look at.

Mr. Yang: This is just a printout of what the applicant is trying to show on the screen.

Chair Furth: And take us through what staff is recommending in terms of installation. I know we have a recommendation that, when you've recommended approval, it should be in an underground vault if technically and logistically feasible. To date, everybody has assured us that it never is, so, what are we thinking at this moment? What is staff recommending?

Mr. Yang: Staff is seeking the ARB's recommendation among the alternative designs. That is not the mailbox.

Chair Furth: [inaudible and off-microphone]. That would be the large object attached to the pole, or undergrounding? Are those the options?

Mr. Yang: The box that is attached on the side of the pole, or the pedestal design that's on the next page. And then, staff's consultant on the last couple pages of the CTC report presents an alternative technology which may or may not (inaudible) doesn't work, but we would appreciate the ARB's feedback.

Chair Furth: That's the CTC report.

Mr. Yang: That's correct.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, colleagues, these are very frustrating and complicated hearings because we are very constrained as to what we can do. There is a wealth of material, but sometimes not that much information. And we're also looking at multiple sites. And we have shot clocks, and we have federal legislation which is designed to minimize our discretion, and yet, we need to do what we can. I would suggest that we take perhaps the simpler ones first, and I'm going to... I'm going to suggest that we do it site by site because it's hard to generalize. You're disagreeing with me completely. But... Okay. We have a staff recommendation, which we can accept, or we can reject. They are different on each side. I would like to start, as a pilot project, with the one that is -- I keep losing my index there -- the one that is in front of what used to be Laning Chateau and is now something-or-other court. Staller Court. Which

apparently is the older name. And that is illustrated in the CTC report on pages 14 and 15. And the staff recommendation on that one, Amy, is...?

Ms. French: Denial.

Chair Furth: Because?

Ms. French: It obstructs views of the historic resource.

Chair Furth: I would like to say, from my point of view, I agree with staff on this one. This is a historic structure, it's catty-corner from a historic structure. We have spent a fortune in public money on restoration of this site, and it's frequently and heavily viewed. And to plop this little structure in front of it seems to me to conflict with everything we have done in terms of trying to keep that corner simple and open, because this is a building that orients towards the corner. I have two questions. One is, do my colleagues agree with me, and secondly, does our counsel think that's a valid basis for recommending that this be located somewhere else?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I'd like to talk, Wynne, to this, but to me, the issue is really not just site-by-site, yes or no, but rather the separation of the antennas from the rest of the ground-mounted equipment. I think in almost every case, the antennas are by far the less-noticeable, obtrusive, objectionable item on this. What I would like to focus our conversation on is the ground-mounted equipment, and whether we should be allowing that. In this particular case, I would say that the antenna is okay, but the ground-mounted equipment is absolutely not okay.

Chair Furth: Let's here from everybody on the narrow issue of, do the antennas generally not offend the sensibilities? Do we think that they are part of a reasonable urban infrastructure that is no more objectionable than the light poles themselves?

Board Member Gooyer: Let me ask a question, then. You'd be happier with a big box hanging on the pole than...

Chair Furth: No, I'm not saying that.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: Okay...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: The question is, right now, I'm just asking you about antenna, at the suggestion of Vice Chair Baltay. I'm trying to keep my blood sugar up here, too.

Board Member Gooyer: I was talking to Peter when I asked that, but it... This antenna, as you said, isn't that bad, but what I usually have a problem with is this massive box hanging on the side of the pole.

Chair Furth: Okay, we'll put that as our next item.

Board Member Gooyer: I would rather it even have a full mailbox than a big box hanging on the pole, because the reality of it is the average person is going to notice the box hanging on the side of the pole much more readily than a faux mailbox.

Chair Furth: Okay, I'm going to try to keep us confined to the issue of the antenna for a moment. Alex. Talking about these sites.

Board Member Lew: I'm okay with the antenna.

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I think in general, I'm okay with the antenna. Just isolated as its own element.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Distinct from equipment.

Chair Furth: Peter? You started out with saying you're generally okay with the antenna.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. I think in every case today the antennas are acceptable. I can make the necessary architectural review findings to allow the antennas to be placed on top of the light poles, as they are presented in the proposal in front of us.

Chair Furth: So, they can have an antenna. The question is, can they communicate with anything or anybody? Yeah. Do you have anything to say specifically on that point?

Ms. Swanson: I do, I do, and thank you for giving me the opportunity. In this particular one, especially when we looked at the alternatives, even the neighbors didn't want to necessarily be moved closer. If you look at this particular slide that's on your monitor...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...you're talking about Site 26?

Ms. Swanson: Site 26, right there, is that we can have the antennas alone on the node on the corner, and we propose to move the faux mailbox across the street, adjacent to two existing newsstands. It just requires a little bit longer of a trench, but that would protect the integrity of the viewpoints of installing, and still allow us to have our equipment that, in that particular environment, just blends with the existing street frontage.

Chair Furth: Your response to this criticism is to suggest locating it across Gilman?

Ms. Swanson: Correct.

Chair Furth: Across Gilman. Thank you.

Ms. Swanson: Correct. Thank you.

Chair Furth: That's helpful. Okay. I think we have one piece of... You have one piece of feedback from the ARB. We're okay with antenna design. I think the next piece is that we are not okay with the associated equipment. I'm going to ask people to briefly state their position, if they have one. As I understand it, Robert, your belief is that whatever its intrinsic merit, something on the ground looking like a mailbox or some other box is preferable to a...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: I'm better with that than something hanging from the pole, yeah.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, so, I think I would prefer, in the situation of, for the faux mailbox across the street, the side-mounted equipment, I think does work on telephone poles. The telephone poles are larger. When they are streetlights, then there's more of a difference between the equipment and any

shroud in the light pole. I think that's my preference. My recollection is we went, in the past, went with the faux mailbox because on downtown corners, there were people on the second floors, and there were no trees screening them. And then...yeah. And there may be issues with the mailboxes and delivery trucks, say, like on Florence Street, but I think that would be less true on corners.

Chair Furth: Which often have red curbs.

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Furth: Except next to our new housing project. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Can I quickly ask staff what the reason is, why we're being asked to consider anything but the mailbox as an option?

Chair Furth: Why is staff opposed to the mailbox option?

Ms. Atkinson: The size of the mailbox being oversized, for one, relative to our development standards and findings. Secondly, the maintenance issue. When they are hit, we even reported the faux mailbox damage, and it has yet to be repaired. Third, Transportation and Planning have been looking at the bicycle and pedestrian transportation plan, and on narrow sidewalks especially in the downtown, this is one more aspect of street furniture in the public realm that doesn't serve the public. And... In the way of pedestrian flow. And then, also, clearance regarding, excuse me, horizontal and vertical clearance, and ADA clearance.

Chair Furth: To amplify on Osma's question, are you supporting smaller sidewalk-mounted facilities? Instead of faux mailboxes?

Ms. Atkinson: That's something that hasn't been presented by the applicant. We've requested design options and alternatives. I would be happy to forward that to Transportation and Public Works for review.

Chair Furth: As it stands now, they proposed mailboxes, you proposed not mailboxes. We're not looking at a series of alternatives. It's, our mailbox is acceptable. All right?

Ms. French: Yeah, we do not like the mailboxes. If there had been a proposal, say, for a bench that would serve the pedestrians in an amenity sort of way, we could have evaluated that, but we didn't receive any such alternative. The other alternatives that have been presented today are the side mounted on the pole. We also would say mounting it on top of the pole, which, you know, the problem is the size of the radios. If you have smaller radios, it's a smaller footprint. And we have these large radios, so it's tough.

Chair Furth: I have a question for the applicant, just briefly. It used to be that what we got was all these applications for antennas on buildings. Is it now the case that they must be installed on these smaller poles in our neighborhoods? Or is that that's what you have the right to do, and that's what you're pursuing?

Ms. Swanson: It's a mix. They're called macro sites that are on buildings, and that services a larger area. And Mike may want to weigh in on this a little. And then, within the right-of-way, they can be smaller installations that are lower powered, that helps with capacity, and capacity's issue is you may have four bars, but you try to download something or make a call, and it fails. That's why we're able to do it, and it has a smaller footprint. One other option that wasn't mentioned is that there are pedestals also that go on the bottom of these if the side mount is not something that...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, that go on the bottom of what?

Ms. Swanson: Of the light pole. So, along with a side mount, we also have the pedestal option that we can do. And Amy is correct that for the top mount that's suggested in CTC, those work with the much smaller antennas and smaller radios. That doesn't necessarily accommodate everybody. The pedestal that we're proposing here, all four carriers came together over a number of months, working with the city of Cupertino, and agreed that this particular design is the one design they could all agree on. So, in that situation, it could be a ubiquitous design that there is no choice; you have to make it work in that one. That's why we scrambled to get this one in, once we saw that a pedestal or a side mount was an opportunity for us to be able to have a condition of approval.

Chair Furth: Great, and could you show us a picture of the pedestal to remind us what it looks like?

Ms. Swanson: Yes. I believe there is one right there. On the pedestal. A couple different viewpoints so you could see it from more than one site.

Chair Furth: Do we have a picture where it's big enough to see?

Ms. Swanson: Yeah, that's, I'm trying to get you one there, where you're able to see that. Is that one showing up on your screens better?

Chair Furth: No.

Ms. Swanson: Okay. If I may approach, I can show you the one in my particular printout. That might be a little easier. Unfortunately, these are... Yes. And it's one of the reasons why it was late, is that I had pushed back to be able to get larger sims for you to be able to see. But I do have it here in color if you would like to see it up close.

Chair Furth: Does it go around all four sides? I'm looking at...

Ms. Swanson: It does.

Chair Furth: ... view 1, page 16, as it goes around all four sides of the post.

Ms. Swanson: Correct. It actually sits...

Chair Furth: It's like a large base.

Ms. Swanson: Right. The light standard, the octo-flute [phonetic] matching, what staff has requested, it would just mount there. We would keep the luminaire at the existing height.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Swanson: And then have that... You're welcome.

Chair Furth: Appreciate that. Well, we'll keep slogging our way through it, but one of the problems we have here is that we don't have good illustrations of options, we don't have the materials that would let us make the findings we need to make. We need better graphics. This is frustrating. I will say that I believe that Alex is correct when he says that the side, pole-mounted, in the air facilities are out of scale with these rather delicate street lights. They are not... It's a very different situation there. They are not full of wire connections, they don't have transformers on them. These are simple... Somebody gave a lot of thought to the design of these things, and they were designed to be simple. I do not think that... Personally, I don't think a problem is created by putting an antenna on top of it, but clearly, there are members of the public who feel strongly and differently and have come here to tell us that. Anybody have a thought that they want to express?

Vice Chair Baltay: I wanted to see if I could get staff to pull up a photograph taken yesterday of Node 29. That's the one across from St. Thomas Aquinas Church. Amy? You have this in your server. Could you put that on the screen for everybody? What I'd like to point out is this. I think that Alex is absolutely correct, that the pole-mounted boxes on the side of the light poles is clearly way out of scale. My opinion, full mailboxes are often, almost all the time, inappropriate, out of scale, in the way of the sidewalk, causing traffic hazards, perhaps. I don't think they are a real solution most of the time. Obviously, when you move it across the street and put it next to a bunch of other items, it kind of fits. But, in general, it doesn't. And I have to say that we just haven't been shown alternatives that really work, that fit into the infrastructure that we have without being clumsy and heavy-handed. I think the same goes for the stuff mounted on the telephone poles. We'll come to that. But certainly, the light poles cannot withstand it being mounted on. The base that you show, as best I can tell on the three-quarter-of-a-inch square photo, is really clumsy looking. And what I'm pulling up then, if they can find the photo I took yesterday of the one across from the church. You guys conveniently cropped out, there's a very large underground vault for electric utilities right next to it. To me, that's an answer that works. You put the thing under the ground, in a vault. The photo shows you very clearly how, it's there, you don't notice it, you don't think about it. And what I'd like to really press my colleagues on is this: If we establish a firm standard of what this equipment has to be, or how it has to be put away, then we've done everybody a favor because we're not constantly going back and forth and arguing about these things.

Board Member Gooyer: I think...

Vice Chair Baltay: Come out and say the equipment has to be completely concealed within something existing, like the delicate base of the light pole. Or, put underground in a vault. Or, put next to a bunch of existing equipment. But all of the solutions you're showing us are not that. That's where we're struggling so hard, because we get such a sense of pushback, it can't be done, it's not technically possible, they're not going to give us anything but a tiny, postage stamp photo at 11 o'clock this morning. We're not getting a sense of cooperation to find answers. And what we really want is to find a standard that these things need to be concealed.

Board Member Gooyer: I think the reality of it is, it's strictly a matter of money. Putting a box in is a heck of a lot more expensive than putting a faux mailbox or hanging something from a pole. It's as simple as that.

Vice Chair Baltay: I take the photo I took yesterday of the, across the street from St. Thomas Aquinas Church, and I take your proposal here, and I look at the architectural findings we're required to apply, and I'm sorry, but what you're doing is required to enhance the living condition on the site. And if you ask me which one of these enhances the living condition, it is decided not the faux mailbox. I cannot make that finding based on the faux mailbox. On the second one, comparing it to the other vault that is right there, right now, I can easily make that finding. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: I just wanted to mention that I also have, was brought this laptop, which has an image of the pedestal option. I would have to agree with a lot of what Board Member Baltay said. If there's an existing vault, there's no reason why we shouldn't be using it. And if there's existing infrastructure that allows for equipment like this, there's also no reason that we shouldn't be using it. In general, the pole-mounted, the pedestal options, are both extremely under-baked and not aesthetically acceptable in any way, shape or form. They are just detrimental, in fact, to the public experience on the street. There might be ways to make the pedestal option better. There might be ways to increase the functionality of the aesthetics of that. There could be ways to make that great. As it has been presented, it is unacceptable, in my opinion. The mailbox, as well, has a bunch of problems associated with it that are extremely understandable, and I can see why we're being encouraged to look at other options. So, I would support staff's analysis on why the mailbox option also does not work. There's also all this extra signage on these poles that will add to the visual clutter, in general, and some of these renders show them, which is good. But I think also an approach for how to reduce the visual clutter. I know these signs



are probably mandatory, but there could be ways to shape them. Maybe they're not just, like, flags on a pole. Maybe they're thinner and a bit better integrated with the pole. I think there's a lot of design work, honestly, that needs to get done, I think, before -- I'll just speak for myself -- before I can even think about approving this.

Ms. Swanson: May I ask a question?

Chair Furth: Just a minute, please. Okay, that's not a very favorable recommendation from us so far. Alex, did you have something you wanted to add? I have a question for staff and for counsel. I think there's a majority up here that believes we cannot make the normal architectural review findings with respect to these properties, these proposals. I will say that the pictures are, they're really illustrative of what the problem is. This is an area where we've undergrounded utilities, at great expense, to get this open, clear sidewalk and this open clear vista. So, what you see is trees, an open sidewalk that is easy for people with strollers, people proceeding slowly with canes, to maneuver. I think that across the street from -- I still think there's Laning Chateau -- is an example of a place where that's better, but generally, our streets and our corners are getting more and more crowded, and every piece of equipment makes it worse. Every piece of above-ground equipment makes it worse and less functional. We spend all our time here, trying to encourage more people to use the sidewalks, and then we plop all these objects in. And they are not, they're not what they should be. So, I have to agree with my colleague that they should be underground. Albert, counsel, what can you tell us about our ability...? This is what we believe. Is this what we can find?

Mr. Yang: If that's the ARB's recommendation, that's what staff and the Planning Director will take into account. I guess I would ask for the ARB's thoughts on the micro cell configuration that's in the last two pages of the CTC report.

Chair Furth: We are now picking up the CTC report, which is this document, for Cluster #2, and we're looking at the last two pages. Looking at 44 and 45? Is that right? What am I looking at?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Furth: I'm looking at this, right?

Ms. French: Yes. Page 44-45. Using the small...

Chair Furth: This is referenced by... Amy, I'm sorry, I'm just reduced to first names at this point. In her presentation, this is somewhat smaller equipment. It is 21 inches by 22 inches. Is that right?

Ms. French: The small pico cells are seven inches square, and then, about four inches deep.

Chair Furth: Which page are you on?

Ms. French: Sorry, that's each radio, and that's not on this page. This shows, you know, a...

[crosstalk]

Ms. French: Shroud, thank you. That's what I was looking for.

Board Member Gooyer: the problem with this, tough, is it shows 35 inches, and the drawing relates it to be about 12.

Board Member Thompson: It's totally not to scale.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean, this thing is so out of scale, it's not even close.

Board Member Thompson: I don't think we can evaluate those.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean, this is not... I mean, luckily, you have the numbers there. If it wasn't, I would assume both of those were about a foot high. Based on the proportion of the light next to it. Rather than, you know, five feet.

Chair Furth: It's two feet, I think.

Board Member Thompson: Oh, the numbers say it is, but the actual drawing scale is...

Chair Furth: Right, is wrong.

Board Member Thompson: ...really deceptive.

Chair Furth: I think to give you good commentary, we would need an accurate drawing, and perhaps a photo simulation. I think that we can at least...

Board Member Gooyer: There you go. That's a better...

Ms. French: If I may, on the screen now...

Board Member Gooyer: ...reality.

Ms. French: ... is an example of the Erickson 2203 micro or pico sell. That has been used in AT&T's proposal, which they stacked them vertical. Stacking vertical of smaller radios, it's easier to conceal.

Board Member Thompson: Does this not have a mailbox option? This is everything in one?

Ms. French: This is everything in one, correct.

Mr. Yang: To clarify, this is not something that the applicant has...

Chair Furth: Proposed.

Mr. Yang: ...proposed at all, and it would require more sites overall. But we are interested in the ARB's thoughts.

Chair Furth: What's the ratio of more to present? Twice as many? Three times as many?

Mr. Yang: I believe our consultant has said about twice as many.

Chair Furth: Twice as many.

Board Member Thompson: And does it also come with this underground diagram to the right? Or the left?

Mr. Yang: No, that's a separate...

Board Member Thompson: It's separate?

Mr. Yang: ...diagram.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: If we're trying to get consensus, we have no enthusiasm for large structures on the curb. We have... I guess none of us would object to underground facilities if they were feasible. Is that right?

Vice Chair Baltay: Can I try making a motion here?

Chair Furth: Okay. And before we do that... Well, the other issue, let's address that issue later, but the other issue we haven't addressed is the location of the antenna in the vicinity of Scott Park. Let's do that later. Okay. Go ahead and make a motion.

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: What I'm thinking is that we can make a motion to approve this with a condition regarding the location of the equipment. Let me take a stab at this and see what you folks think. I recommend that we recommend approval of all of these nodes, conditional to all equipment and associated wiring, except the antenna, being located either underground, or concealed within, or camouflaged directly adjacent to existing infrastructure.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, what?

Vice Chair Baltay: Let me try that...

Chair Furth: Camouflaged adjacent to existing infrastructure?

Board Member Gooyer: That is such a gray...

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, well, help me out. I'm trying to think of a way...

Chair Furth: You could drive a truck through that one.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... [crosstalk] say it has to be underground, but it has to have some way of concealing the equipment within something that's already there, or right next to something that's already there. Like the [crosstalk].

Board Member Gooyer: Well, that's actually an easier way to put it, is just to say conceal it in something that's already there, rather than adjacent to...

Vice Chair Baltay: Fair enough.

Chair Furth: I don't think that's going to help the applicant.

Board Member Thompson: The one problem I think there is in that is that it's, it's vague enough that I think if we were to approve it with that condition, it would just be too... We would just not know what we would get.

Vice Chair Baltay: How can we...? I'm trying...

Chair Furth: Well, let's break it down into what is acceptable. Can we have a motion that it's the sense of the ARB that the antenna design itself is acceptable on the light pole?

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure.

Chair Furth: I so move. Is there a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: I second that.

Chair Furth: All those in favor?

Vice Chair Baltay: Aye.

Chair Furth: Aye.

Board Member Lew: Aye.

Board Member Gooyer: Aye.

Board Member Thompson: Nay.

Chair Furth: Nay. Okay, 4 to 1 on...

**MOTION PASSES 4 TO 1, WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON VOTING IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION.**

Board Member Gooyer: But what does that get us?

Chair Furth: It gets a piece of clarity in a sea of confusion. Actually, in a fairly complex bunch of decisions.

Board Member Thompson: Can I explain why I said, "nay?"

Chair Furth: Mm?

Board Member Thompson: Can I explain why I dissented?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure, sure.

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: The only reason I did, because I do generally agree that it is on its own acceptable, but in case we wanted to push for something like an integrated system, that would change the design.

Chair Furth: Right. We're simply saying that the aesthetics of your antenna looks good to us.

Ms. Swanson: Understood. Thank you.

Chair Furth: And it's not out of...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...destroying the aesthetics of the....

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: The other alternative is to say either underground, or if not underground, it has to come back to us.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's a good way to do it, yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: That way, it will be up to them. Is it more convenient for them to...?

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Okay, and that underground equipment installation is fine with us. That's another unanimous point of view up here.

Board Member Thompson: Well, I also have a caveat on that.

Chair Furth: Okay, it's 4 to 1. Go.

Board Member Thompson: If there is existing underground infrastructure and vaults, then I'm okay with it. But if we're...

Vice Chair Baltay: It has to be a new vault.

Chair Furth: You can't stick it in an existing vault.

Board Member Thompson: Well, I guess what I mean is, if there is already existing vaults in the area, we...

Chair Furth: That doesn't make any sense.

Board Member Thompson: That they would put it adjacent to...

Chair Furth: Doesn't make any sense.

Board Member Gooyer: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Chair Furth: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Board Member Thompson: So, I don't know if I support digging up the ground and putting a bunch of holes in it.

Chair Furth: All right, so, there are four of us in support of undergrounding the equipment when feasible. I want to talk... I'm just trying to get off anything we can get consensus on, or at least three votes for. One of the things we were asked about specifically was the location of these particular proposals, and staff recommended denial of three of them. Do we disagree with staff?

Board Member Lew: I'm having a harder time with the, the 28m1.

Chair Furth: This is [crosstalk] up and down Channing, right? Channing [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: In my mind, the 28m1 is good because there is a whole row of existing palm trees that provide screening from the new house that's being built. And the staff mentioned that there's an underground district, underground utility district, and there's issues of ownership and maintenance of the pole. But I don't really know any of the details of that, so that's not... I'm only judging it by the aesthetic. I don't...

Chair Furth: Yeah, this is a proposal for a new not-currently-existing pole, right? And is this...? This is not in front of Scott Park, right?

Ms. French: Correct. It's in front of a new home that the ARB approved.

Chair Furth: That nobody occupies yet, so they can't come and object?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think, Alex, the issue is that what they are proposing on that particular one is to put a new street pole, street light where it suits their needs. And I think there's a process in town for determining when and where we need new street lights, and the City basically has to pay for that. They pay for the power. There's, I'm sure, a process to decide how it should be. And I would think, if perhaps the applicant wanted to work with the City to pay for the street light, that would be reasonable. Because

it is a good location. But, to open up the Pandora's Box of allowing an applicant to just put the pole where they want it is very slippery.

Chair Furth: Counsel, so, they have a license, or whatever, an agreement with the City about installing equipment on existing poles. Do they have any right to have new ones?

Mr. Yang: Their right to create new structures would be based under federal law and, you know, California law. But, so, it's not necessary for them to have a license agreement with the City because they wouldn't be using any of our existing facilities.

Chair Furth: They have no particular right to install a new pole except under the general, by agreement with us; it's simply their general rights under federal and state law to put their equipment in the city.

Mr. Yang: Correct.

Chair Furth: And under what circumstances would they be entitled to put in a new pole like this? I mean, is it the same set of findings we have right now?

Mr. Yang: Yes.

Chair Furth: What about the issue of providing power to this thing?

Mr. Yang: The applicant would be responsible for paying for the power. There...

Chair Furth: I'm dealing with a negative recommendation from staff, so I'm trying to understand.

Mr. Yang: I think one of the primary objections of staff... I guess, actually, maybe you guys can speak to the problem with the new pole.

Ms. Atkinson: I'd like to say that we, we do have electrical staff here if you have any questions in regard to the master license agreement and paying for power, and so forth. However, in terms of objections to a new location, it would be a typical Tier 3 wireless communication facility permit for a new pole in the right-of-way, just like it would be a new... Any new facility would be a new Tier 3 permit, like I say, on a private building, or anything like that. It's the same process as outlined in our municipal code. Objections include all the things that we mentioned before -- pedestrian flow, clearance issues, in general. As you mentioned also, the benefits of an underground utility district.

Chair Furth: Even underground utility districts have over ground light poles, right? This process that you describe for locating poles in the city right-of-way, we don't ordinarily review, right? It's got nothing to do with us. It's only because these are telecommunication facilities that we're dealing with this. Large communication facilities.

Mr. Yang: That's correct. It's because it's a third-party application to build a new structure.

Chair Furth: But if the City decides to put in new light poles somewhere, that never comes to us.

Mr. Yang: That's correct.

Chair Furth: None of our business.

Mr. Yang: Right. And in this instance, the City is not interested in having a new light pole in this location. And perhaps our utilities staff could speak to why.

Chair Furth: I'm just trying to figure out what our role is here. If we think aesthetically its preferable to any of the other alternatives submitted to us, we can just tell you that and let it go?

Mr. Yang: That's correct.

Chair Furth: Okay. Do we think it's preferable to the other alternatives?

Board Member Lew: I think it's preferable because of the palm trees. I think there are three or four, and they are very dense, and they are large. And then, on the opposite side of the street, my recollection is that that's the side of somebody's house. It's not like somebody's front porch.

Chair Furth: It is the side. You're right.

Board Member Lew: And I think that, to me, those are very important differences compared to the original 28 location, which is in front of somebody's front porch, or close to it.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. All we ever do around here is recommend anyway. We don't have any decision-making powers, so, it is the view of the ARB that this proposal is preferable to any of the others that we've seen, for the reasons discussed. I would add that we spend a lot of looking at this corner because we just worked on a problem of shoe-horning or placing four new residences in that corner, in an old, interesting neighborhood. Speaking purely from the aesthetic and functional aspects of the use of the sidewalk and the looks of the neighborhood, we favor that proposal. We have no comment on other City issues that might make it undesirable. That fair? Okay.

Board Member Lew: There's an existing planting strip. It's not sidewalk there. Right?

Chair Furth: Uh-huh.

Board Member Lew: There's not...

Chair Furth: We could not obstruct [crosstalk]...

Board Member Lew: We're not... My recollection is we're not obstructing anything there.

Chair Furth: We think it would be feasible from the point of view of the things that we look at. What about the recommendation for "no" on Site 25, which is adjacent to 275 Forest Avenue? Staff, why are you saying no?

Board Member Thompson: Board Member Furth?

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Thompson: I actually...

Chair Furth: Sorry, I interrupted.

Board Member Thompson: It's okay. I actually have to... I have to go. It's...

Chair Furth: We all do.

Board Member Thompson: If it seems like we won't be making a motion in the next five minutes or so, then I might have to...

Chair Furth: [inaudible and off-microphone], and then we're going to have to adjourn. Staff, quickly, anything on Site 25? As to why you said no? Remind us.

Ms. French: There are logistical aspects in conflict with the city parking garage.

Chair Furth: Okay, well, that's not an area in which we have expertise. If it's not feasible from an engineering technical point of view, we don't second-guess you on that. Site 26? You recommended no?

Ms. French: That's the Laning Chateau, Stalling Court.

Chair Furth: Okay. How do we feel about sticking the antenna on top of the...? It's only the ground equipment that we objected to on that one. Is that correct?

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: I think we're [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: I think the issue, I guess for me, is what is the historic standard? And then, if there's some historic standard about the corner view, I would think that's the HRB's input and not ours.

Chair Furth: Yeah, talk to the HRB. Like that. The staff is recommending approval of locations subject to not having this above-ground equipment on 29, 30 and 31. I guess we could say that we find the other locations acceptable provided the equipment is underground. Somebody want to move that?

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure. I'll move that we find the antennas and the locations for these nodes acceptable or recommend approval with the condition that all equipment and associated wiring be located underground. Or completely concealed within existing equipment. I think you need to have something (inaudible).

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Thompson: Can I amend?

Board Member Lew: Let me clarify. You're saying all nodes? All of the nodes in this...? Is it seven?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. I think what's been presented to us is a logical package of reasonable places. I don't think the historic stuff is really stuff that we can bite our teeth into. And whether or not the City can work out to get a new light pole with these guys, again, it's not really an architectural board issue.

Chair Furth: We have no idea.

Vice Chair Baltay: I would recommend strongly that the City cooperate with the applicant to the benefit of the citizens. You've made it abundantly clear that, a number of people who live around here all agree that this is the right place. Let's get Public Works to put a light pole there. Tell them to find a way to do it. I'm sure there's enough motivation to make that happen. But I think we need to keep our eye on the ball, that we want the equipment out of sight or underground.

Chair Furth: Okay. And for the benefit of counsel, we're not making the extensive findings we might ordinarily make. Yes, Osma?

## **AMENDMENT TO MOTION**

Board Member Thompson: I was wanting to amend the motion. That whatever the applicant's solution is for the equipment come back to us in a subcommittee.



Vice Chair Baltay: If it's underground, or if it, just in general?

Chair Furth: I'm not going to support...

Board Member Thompson: If it's not underground.

Chair Furth: Okay. Any above-ground alternatives come back to us?

Board Member Thompson: Anything that's visible on the [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Okay. I think they have it, too.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll accept that.

Chair Furth: Okay. Did the seconder accept it? Who seconded?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah. I did.

Chair Furth: All right. All those in favor say aye?

Vice Chair Baltay: Aye.

Chair Furth: Aye.

Board Member Gooyer: Aye.

Chair Furth: Opposed?

Board Member Lew: I'm going to abstain. I've not considered undergrounding for any of these locations. It was not brought up in the packet and I never even thought about it.

**AMENDED MOTION PASSED 4-0-1, with Board Member Lew abstaining from the vote.**

Chair Furth: Okay. Staff, this is a highly-litigated and regulated area. We would ordinarily make extensive findings. We would ordinarily have much better information. We would not be looking at last-minute, on-the-wing proposals. I think we're only doing this because we have a sense that the City is in a hurry. But we would be happy to look at this matter again with better information, if that is useful to the City.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And we are going to break. Now, the question is, shall we break, or adjourn? It's 2:14. I have to leave town in 40 minutes.

Board Member Lew: We have the next item.

Chair Furth: I know we do. We're losing Board Member Thompson. Would the few of you like to continue? We have been meeting now for almost five hours. Almost six.

Ms. French: If you would like assistance from staff on logistics, we could offer that you consider continuing Cluster 3 to December 20th.

Chair Furth: Is that acceptable to the applicant?

Ms. Swanson: It is. I can tell you, though, it's a much shorter presentation than Cluster 2. It's...

Chair Furth: Fine.

Ms. Swanson: ...much, much shorter.

Chair Furth: Well, the problem is you don't have a quorum because I have a conflict of interest, and we're going to...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Swanson: Oh, that's correct. May I ask a clarifying, though, of your motion, if I may?

Chair Furth: I doubt that we can be helpful, but sure.

[Board Member Thompson left the meeting.]

Ms. Swanson: Anything could help, so, thank you. Is that on Node 26, about the furniture being over by the newsstand and the antenna being in front of that, the first motion, it sounded like that was a recommendation of approval, by having the mailbox over by the newsstands.

Vice Chair Baltay: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Ms. Swanson: No? Okay. I just wanted to confirm.

Vice Chair Baltay: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Chair Furth: It should come back with the other one, thank you.

Ms. Swanson: That's helpful. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I know this is difficult for you, as it is for us, and frustrating for you, as it is for the neighbors. Thank you, staff, for the work on it. I know that when we get detailed information, it's often beyond your control. But all we can do is our best, and we have. We're going to adjourn this meeting. Anything else?

## **MOTION**

Ms. French: Did you want to continue to a date certain?

Chair Furth: We'll continue that item to...

Ms. French: Cluster 3 to December 20th. Is that a motion?

Chair Furth: Yes. Would somebody give me a motion to continue Cluster #3 to December 20th?

Board Member Lew: I will move that we continue Cluster 3 to December 20th.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Motion by Lew, second by Baltay, to continue the item. All those in favor say aye? And we'll note that Board Member Thompson has left the meeting.

## **MOTION TO CONTINUE CLUSTER 3 TO DECEMBER 20TH PASSED 4-0.**

Chair Furth: Now can we adjourn?

Ms. French: Yes, you may.

Ms. Swanson: The unofficial question, could Cluster 2 improvements come back at that same time, since it's so recent?

Chair Furth: It's up to staff. They can re-advertise it if they need to.

Ms. French: [inaudible and off-microphone]

Ms. Swanson: Perfect, okay. Thank you again.

Chair Furth: [crosstalk] director. That's Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, Jodie Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager. Before we turn off the microphones and everything, I just wanted to... This is going to be Mr. Gooyer's last meeting with us, so I just wanted to really thank him for his service. I think it's been about five years that you've been on the Board. You've served as a board member, a chair, and a vice-chair, and we just really appreciate all the work that you've done. Thank you.

Ms. French: I will second that.

Chair Furth: Second. Third, fourth and fifth. Shall we adjourn this meeting, then, in rousing tribute to our colleague, Robert Gooyer? Hearing no objection, so adjourned. Thank you.

**Study Session** [not addressed]

**Approval of Minutes** [not addressed]

**Subcommittee Items** [not addressed]

**Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements** [not addressed]

**Adjournment**