



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

February 15, 2018

City Hall/City Council Chambers

250 Hamilton Avenue

8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Board Member Alexander Lew, Robert Gooyer, Osma Thompson

Absent: Vice Chair Baltay

Chair Furth: Good morning and welcome to the meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Find my agenda shortly. Could you call the roll, please?

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Now is the time for anybody who wishes to speak to us on an item not on the agenda. Is there anybody? I don't have a speaker card.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: So, agenda changes, additions and deletions?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: None.

City Official Reports

- 1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2), Administrative Staff-Level Architectural Review Approvals, and 3) Tentative Future Agenda items.**

Chair Furth: Does anybody on the Board have any comments? I mean the only comment if you look at item one which has future agendas you will see that March would seem to be a fairly intense month in terms of agenda items.

Ms. French: There are some changes to those items.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. French: We have one additional item for March 1st, that's the Junior Museum and Zoo and that's proposing to modify the roof materials. On March 15th the Tier Three, Cluster Two for Vinculums Verizon will not be coming to you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Let's see, do I – is this...

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Is this a request to speak during oral communication? Oh, ok. Good enough, I never remember which Lot is which letter.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 375 Hamilton Avenue [17PLN-00360]:**
Consideration of an Architectural Review Application for a Five-Level, Nearly 50-Foot Tall Parking Structure, With One Below Grade Parking Level Providing 338 Public Parking Spaces.
Environmental Assessment: A Draft Environmental Impact Report is Being Prepared for Publication in Late February 2018 for a 45-Day Public Comment Period. Zone District: PF; Public Facilities. For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Furth: Alright, then I think we're onto item two, a public hearing, its quasi-judicial, the site is 375 Hamilton Avenue, it's a consideration of an Architectural Review Application for a five-level, nearly 50-foot tall parking structure, with one below grade parking level providing 338 public parking spaces. It also has retail space, it would eliminate one existing public restroom and is designed to comply not with the current Public Facilities Ordinance zoning standards but with proposed new standards which were considered by the Planning and Transportation Commission recently. The draft environmental report is still in preparation. This agenda says late February but I believe that Staff will tell us that date has been moved back. Could we have the Staff report, please?

Ms. French: Thank you. Amy French, Chief Planning Official overseeing the process on this project. Excuse my voice today, I've had Laryngitis since Sunday. The project is indeed a garage that would provide parking spaces for the public, as well as retail space; a small amount. I will note that on the future notice for this project we will include the words retail space in the notice. Today the purpose is to learn about the project and the statues and the timeline to understand that, to receive the architect's presentation, ask questions of Staff and the applicant and the architect and provide guidance for the next plan set that would come to you. We're targeting April 19th as the next agenda date for this. Board Member Baltay did provide written comments that were distributed to the Architectural Review Board yesterday. Again, we want to continue the public hearing for several reasons. One is that we have not yet published the draft Environmental Impact Report and the target date is now – timeline is now the end of March. So, we want to have some comments – public comments in the public record at the Architectural Review Board hearing in April. This gives an overview that is contained in the Staff report. You saw this project last year, you – a different constitution of the ARB – in September. Those minutes were excerpt minutes were forward by email to the Board and there was a link in the Staff report as well. As noted, the Planning and Transportation Commission on January 19th – January 31st recommended the proposed zone changes that were requested with the Sherman Avenue garage and Public Safety Building project. Those are to modify -- to allow Council to approve case by case each project modified zoning standards for Public Safety or essential Public facilities and public parking garages within downtown and California Avenue in the PF zone. Those included height, lot coverage, setbacks and including the special setback. I'm going to kind of skip through because I'm getting a tired voice here. As you can see I'm handling both projects so I don't want to walk you through this but this is what I'm faced with personally. It is to get both – there really are three projects; the public parking garage on Sherman, the Public Safety Building and this project through the process to the Council for them to approve the final EIRs and the two projects and the zone code change. We have some flexibility for the number of parking spaces actually in the garage through the Council said how many to put into the garage. We do have some flexibility because we are proposing to remove the mailbox that's in the public right of way – City right of way that people drive by to put their mail across the street. That would introduce more parking spaces on the street. In addition, the Council – some Council Members noted their interest in having lift parking in this downtown garage and so that's being explored and that's the reason for the delay in the draft EIR. This drawing on this slide shows a concept that our transportation division Staff has put forward as to improve the pedestrian experience through the garage from Hamilton towards the proposed pedestrian alley. I'm getting tired. Our discussion today is, of course, to provide guidance on this project. Some questions have been raised, particularly about the pedestrian experience at the back to the building near

CVS and that interface and the questions about landscaping and seating. In the Staff report we recommended some additional tension there with taller landscaping along that façade. Another question was raised about when the parking system goes in with those gates preventing cars from going through without paying in the future. Where would the pedestrians go who are parked at the back of that garage when they want to go to CVS? So, that was a question that was raised and it's a good one so exploring that now. The special setback, again this is dating back to the 1950s. We think it was about the cars came – giving more space to the cars and that we would widen the street at some point. Well, our thinking has changed and we prefer narrower streets to calm traffic so in any case it's been recommended. The contextual setback in this area is of interest and certainly the AT&T building next door is a 7-foot setback but this proposed project does have a building separation essentially providing a 20-foot setback for the first 15-feet of the building next to the AT&T building. So, there's – there is a 20-foot setback for some distance but the remainder would be on the lot line. Now to compensate for that, the project has a wider sidewalk proposed and so the other consideration was – has – Chair Furth mentioned the removal of the public restroom. There are nearby retailers including CVS that have restrooms for their customers. I'm going to move forward. I do have a slide for the Downtown (inaudible) Design Guide -- Hamilton Avenue District, if you want to see it later, let me know. I'm going to switch over to the applicant now. Thank you.

Ms. Holly Boyd: Good morning Board Members. My name is Holly Boyd, I'm a Senior Engineer in Public Works, and I'm the project manager for this garage. I just wanted to introduce some members of our design team who are here. We have Michelle Wendler from Watry Design and Genaro Morales from Watry Design and we also have Ken Hayes who is our lead architect on the project and he will be giving the presentation so I'll ask him to come up now.

Chair Furth: Good morning Mr. Hayes, the rules give you ten minutes.

Mr. Ken Hayes: Alright, thank you. Good morning Chair Furth and Members of the Board. Welcome Board Member Thompson. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects and I'll be making the presentation on behalf of the team. We're actually working for Watry Design Group, the experts in parking garage design on this project and thank you for introducing everybody Holly. So, Council's direction for the redevelopment of Lot D, the existing parking lot, was five levels above ground, one level below ground, 338 parking stalls, bikes spaces, a retail space on Waverly – excuse me – as well as future photovoltaic panels on the roof. The project site, I think we're all very familiar with it. It's a 29,00-square foot project site and a little more context here shows the project in the center. It's currently zoned PF, it's surrounded mostly by CDC, GF with a P; pedestrian overlay zoning district. Although the AT&T building is a PF, the post office is a PF and the post office is also a historic Category I. We have a historic Category III at the Palo Alto Toy World on Waverly. As well as a Victorian house next to that and the Decker Oak building on the corner of University and Waverly as well, it's also a historic building. You can see here the 7-foot setback across the front. We will be widening the sidewalk on Hamilton and reconfiguring the drop off for the mail. This sidewalk will be 12-feet, the sidewalk along Waverly at this location will be about 18-feet so we're going to extend those out and create a little bit more generous area. Lane 21 enters here and exits onto Bryant Street. It is one way in that direction from Waverly to Bryant Street. Just some images of the surrounding buildings I showed you back in September. The AT&T building is about 25-feet taller than our building. The All Saints Episcopal Church, 400 Hamilton, is all clad in brick and then we have the historic post office image there with its arcade across the front. When we were here in September we showed you three options and there was some focus essentially on Options One and Three. Option One and Three had a strong arcade at the ground floor level both on Waverly and on Hamilton. They had one or the other perforated metal panels above or metal fins that add interest to the garage but also allowed for the ventilation that's required. This is an unventilated garage at the upper levels. They all had a corner plaza as well as a larger welcoming stair than this option here. So, we focused our – what you see today on kind of a combination of Options One and of Options Three. Some of the changes that were expressly made based on feedback from you, this is a detail of the corner. Originally, we had a 28-foot deep retail space and I think everyone thought that was a little bit shallow. So, we've now made that 35-feet so we've increased the depth. We've also increased the area by about 450-square feet. There was some concern about how you see into the garage from the street frontages

and so before it was just a single path from Hamilton. You really couldn't see through in this direction so the idea was to reconfigure this corner plaza. Make it a little bit more generous, push the elevator back so that we can actually create a clean pathway here and one coming in from Waverly Street so that no matter where you're coming, you can see into the garage. That helps I think in terms of wayfinding and also safety. Walking down Waverly, this was one of the comments and this really applied to Option Three but is there a way to make sure that the post office is afforded as much view opportunity as possible. So, the option we have today basically has pulled everything back that went into the corner plaza so as you approach the corner on that ground floor, you do see the post office as soon as possible; the main entrance there. Then we wanted to create a walkway to CVS and we really like transportations suggestion at the expense of some parking so now we're at 334 spaces instead of Council's directions for 338 but it does create a great way to come into the garage. You'd be walking along were all the bike racks would be. I think we can expand that bike rack area to include areas for people with strollers or bike trailers so we've increased the potential for parking. It's not on your plan but it's on the slide that you see here. Then having right angle crossing that would send you right to the stairways that then comes from four levels above and feeds into this pedestrian connection that we have here, as well as the alley connection that is behind the building that faces onto Waverley Street. So, we get a little synergy here which I think would be really great and it reinforces people coming down, it's a circulation point. It will probably be used more frequently than the one over here on the corner. Then future underground parking and adjacent lots, there was concern about – Elizabeth Wong and Brad Ehikian parcels. So, the thinking is that from the basement level, we could actually plan into the structural walls of that basement ways for block out panels to take place to allow connections here. At grade level, the proposal with the alley in the back actually is wider than what they have now on those parcels because what they have now is just a drive aisle of the parking lot. That drive isle now is going to become an alley and so we're about 2-feet wider than the free space that they have right now for garbage collection and pumping of the grease interceptor and that sort of thing. Can we reduce the 10-foot pedestrian alley to provide greater setback along Hamilton? We can if we want to get rid of about seventy cars, alright. Our advice is to not do that, to really put some attention into the detail and the amenities of this pedestrian alley. So, the garage is down at the bottom of the screen, this is Elizabeth Wong's building, and this is Brad Ehikian's building. This is what we're proposing as that connection – that linkage. We need it for ventilation for the garage. We need 10-feet, anything less doesn't work and so if it's less than that, we're going to have to go to a mechanically ventilated garage and in my opinion that would be a waste of energy. This actually terminates with a view corridor towards the All Saints sort of open area of their front yard. Then in this direction here it becomes the alley, we have a combined trash enclosure here and we have provisions for them to be able to get to those trash encloses. To get behind their buildings and to do any kind of servicing that they need to do at the grease interceptors and that sort of thing and like I said, more room than they have today if there's cars parked in the parking lot that is. This is the street façade. Here you can see the AT&T building is quite a bit taller than our building. Our building is at about 49-foot 10 to the top of the railing. This is a larger view of the front of the building. You see the arcade or the rhythm of columns and openings that are along Hamilton. Each of those openings is filled with a bench for seating, an integral planter into the building and a ray of vine wires to give some plant material to – excuse me – plant material to fill those openings; as well as some decorative metal and the idea of the decorative metal throughout the garage is to celebrate some of the decorative metal you see in the historic buildings in the vicinity. We have a combination of the metal fins above to provide some interest. They're controlled by a metal frame that wraps around them and then erode the corner at the end to highlight the elevator core. The stair becomes an enclosed stair now with perforated metal around it, before it was an open stair and one of the suggestions was to make that an enclosed stair. However, the stair sort of descends out of that volume so that you see people moving up and down quite easily to the plaza here. The perforated metal denotes the entrance there, it also denotes the entrance here and it denotes the stair at the back when you walk down the alley. This is the façade for Waverley and again we're trying to pick up on the two-story rhythm and heights of the buildings of that block. This is the historic building here – I'm sorry, one more building down is the historic building but we're trying to relate to the cornice line essentially of that building there. Then the retail space below that you see there with the glass and then above that would be again a decorative metal screen that would conceal the cars but bring that color, that texture of the metal into the project. The view from Hamilton looking I guess west and you see the corner façade here. The materials are a sandblasted concrete for the arcade and

we're really trying to bring in the color that you find in the Sienna or Terracotta Tile Roofs, the brick on the corner building so I think one of the strongest ways to relate to context is through color. You can see the perforated metal here and again, we're thinking that all the metal is some kind of a bronze color so it's dark. It's not anodized aluminum in any kind of an aluminum color. This is if we add the solar panels on top and what that could look like. Then a view from above and across. You can see the perforated metal again back here and that's there that you see when you look through. We have the solar panels above and then some detail of the plaza itself and 30-seconds and I'm there.

Chair Furth: Take what time you need, you're the only agenda item.

Mr. Hayes: We want to bring that decorative metal quality into the stair work and so you see it coming down to the plaza and that would wrap up and through this perforated metal screen. This would be a detail of the benches and the back slopes so that you can be comfortable there. The integral planters here and this is where the vines would infill those areas. Then we have the metal – decorative metal screen behind that as well. Just some detail of the fins with the metal work around them and then what that could look like on the right-hand side when the PV (inaudible) is added. Then lastly this is the alley, you see beyond the destination, the stair, the metal screen again because it isn't an entrance identity. Then if you walk down that stair and look back, you can see how we could start to animate that alley with plant material. We have been opportunities and then some kind of interesting lighting. So, I think it could be a really interesting space and if you want to see a space that's similar scale, go to Chop's new building on the corner of Hamilton and High. Look at the alley between the Palantir cafeteria building and his new building, it's almost identical. I think we could really enhance that space and it could be a nice space. That's my presentation, we all look forward to your comments. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have a number of public comment cards and if or members of the public wishing to speak, if you haven't submitted a card, would you please. Brad Ehikian to be followed by Elizabeth Wong.

Mr. Brad Ehikian: Thank you. We have Jaime Rodriguez here who would like to combine Elizabeth's and my card for the full time for the presentation that we have.

Chair Furth: Untangle me a little bit more. What – who – what – I'm fine to have you speak in whatever order you would like. I have four cards here, Elizabeth Wong, Jamie Wong, Jamie Rodriguez and Brad Ehikian and Andrew Wong. What would you like?

Mr. Ehikian: We would like to combine them for one presentation.

Chair Furth: That's fine with me. Sure, feel free, that...

Mr. Ehikian: Thank you.

Chair Furth: ...gives you...

Mr. Jamie Rodriguez: I'm going to go ahead and get started. My name is Jamie Rodriguez, I'm with Traffic Patterns and I'm a traffic engineering firm providing services to a couple of the property owners adjacent to this particular project. Our peer review of the places for the garage really focuses on the operations of the existing buildings, the businesses that operate within those buildings and the long-term impacts both during construction and after. So, here's a quick site plan, again your architect already showed this to you. This is Waverley and Hamilton, the garage – the existing surface lot on Hamilton, Lot D showing down towards the bottom right. We're here working with two of the property owners, Manhattan Associates who's represented by Brad Ehikian behind me and they're basically the building that is owned where Prolific Oven is. Elizabeth Wong with Waverley Post, also behind me, is the building right next to that where the Tai Pan Restaurant is. So, those are the two buildings that are most immediately impacted by the construction of the garage itself. For the people that are home that haven't had a chance to read the letter that was provided to you just yesterday, I'm going to walk through the

presentation so that people later can view this at home on their own to get a high overview of what some of the design issues are that we're requesting additional accommodations on (inaudible) part of this project. Most important and specifically is the issue of grease clean outs. For people at home and for you who don't understand that grease clean outs include two elements. There's basically an underground storage tank that stores grease and other debris that gets generated in kitchens and they also include what is called clean outs. Cleanouts are where vehicles or vacuums are accessing that debris to basically vacuum it out of the ground to take it away for recycling or for cleaning. This is an example of what it takes to clean out these grease traps. Basically, they (inaudible) what they call a vacuum truck and the City Staff uses these around the City to clean out storm drains. They are used all over Palo Alto and other restaurants to pull out that debris and they are cleaned on a weekly basis at the restaurant at Tai Pan. What we're seeing right now is that the only feasible way for both these buildings to access grease pits that exists and others that are being planned right now in construction in Brad's building. You guess have a new application for a restaurant that will be building a second grease trap so you have to have a much higher ground floor. There's no way that these vacuum trucks can connect the additional hoses and vacuums to vacuum out all this debris from these two kitchens from the alleyway. You have to have access from where it takes place today, the equivalent of the lot on the ground floor. That would require a much higher ground floor, I think right now you're at about 11 ½-feet. You probably need closer to a 16-foot ground floor ceiling height to accommodate any of these services vehicles that came in and clean the grease trucks and potentially trash removal vehicles. Regarding parking, 550 and 552 is Prolific Oven and currently has two parking spaces. One is kind of dedicated to the space formally and they operate a second parking space that they use regularly informally. Informal versus formal, that's still parking that's used by these buildings that will get lost both during construction and post-construction. 558 and 560 Waverley where Tai Pan is doesn't have any formal spaces but they use one space regularly every day for different operations. So, we talking about immediately three spaces that are going to get lost and what we're seeing in the plans that were provided by the City is that only one parking space is being provided back to the Prolific Oven building. There's an inequity in the parking distribution back to the Tai Pan Restaurant building with no parking and so that's definitely been a concern for the team. What we're suggesting that the City consider is to dedicate additional spaces within the ground floor of the garage immediately behind the buildings. There are six spaces that are shown on what is the northeast corner of the building. We would request that two spaces get provided per building, as well as a dedicated commercial loading zone with that higher 16-foot ground floor. Service vehicles can get in there, remove trash bins from the garage if you add second double doors sets on the inside of the garage to pull the trash out; as well as the vacuum trucks to clean out the grease pits from the Tai Pan Restaurant and the Restaurant that's going to built at 558 or 552. Preferably, if that's not something that the City is open to doing then we would just request that you provide a 24-foot alleyway around both sides of the building that maintains a two-way access to get vehicles in and out. That's those buildings preserved their existing parking but that would have some significant impacts to the project and so we think that a really good kind of halfway point is dedicate those spaces back to the building owners. Regarding future development of the buildings, the architects mentioned that there were going to be accommodations to be able to punch through at the basement level of the garages future underground parking for the buildings if they were ever to get redeveloped. That's a great idea but what's really missing in the plans we have now is how that's going to happen. If this was a development project, this – you guys at the City would want to see details about how that future construction is going to happen but that lacks today. So, there's just a big concern from our clients that it's great that the note is there but there's no accommodation or design details. It may be found later on that (inaudible) feasible because the design doesn't actually accommodate for it. We really think that this need to really get taken care of at this design phase so there's not an issue later in construction. In addition, in order for that to happen, any developer would have to have agreements that are handed to the City that say that we're going to work with another entity to give access to somebody else to move through our site. That actually hasn't happened for these projects so as great as it is that we're getting kind of notes on the plans that show future access connection points. What's most important is that you have the dedicated access agreements agreed upon between the City and the project property owners, as well as the temporary construction easements or TCEs that allow them later to kind of punch through that wall. In addition, the long-term parking lost impacts from those walls punching through to provide the underground access, needs to be documented and accounted for in the parking stall count for the project because you're

going to start out with a certain project space now. Then you're going to lose that later on when you provide that access so the public really needs to understand what that long-term effect is going to be. Regarding trash operations, it's really good that the garage has a combined trash bin kind of to the north but that provides some significant impacts to the two buildings. It's great for the building behind Prolific Oven because the trash bins (inaudible) their location but for the Tai Pan Restaurant, it introduces almost a 100-foot walk to actually take trash and other debris into the trash enclosure. That's a little bit of a concern for the property owner and the businesses because that introduces an opportunity for there to be injuries taking debris that far. It introduces blockages to the pedestrian alleyway that the City is trying to create while that trash (inaudible) relocated. It introduces the opportunity for a spillage and other kind of impacts to whatever decorative pavers you're trying to create by that trash being hauled away. So, the more you minimize the distance from the buildings to those trash bins, the better in the long term for the community. What we would recommend is that you consider creating two dedicated trash enclosures, one that's dedicated to the Prolific Oven building and a second that's dedicated to the Tai Pan building. Both located immediately adjacent or behind each building to reduce that walking distance. Those though would need to be preferably remove the bins from the inside of the garage so that you're not worrying about then taking debris and spilling other trash and liquids in the alleyway and staining that long-term and creating a long-term impact. What we think would work best is if you dedicate those spaces -- create those dedicated bins and you might have a one parking space impact but in the long run you're going to end up with a much cleaner operating pedestrian alleyway and a much clearer operating garage. Regarding the shade study for the project, our clients are still evaluating that. We're not going to provide too much specifics on the engineering side but we did want to make some specific notes that did bounce out to us. One is that both clients were already in the process of looking at the installation of solar panels to help reduce the operation cost of those buildings. We think that with those buildings coming in with their solar panels, that's going to block the ability of sun to hit the panels that gets installed on these buildings. So, that's a long-term impact that we're still trying to figure out but we wanted to make that note to you. If the buildings were just to get pushed back 24-feet on either side to allow two-way alleyways, that would protect the ability of both of these buildings for our clients to get good sun exposure for their solar panel systems. Regarding the alleyway, we've already expressed concerns to the City that as great of an idea as the alleyway is, you're basically creating an alleyway behind up to three kitchens now and those kitchens do generate noise, they generate trash and order that we don't think are going to be really amenable towards pedestrians wanting to dwell in that space. The other issue is the issue how dark it is and just from this example in the architect's rendering, you can see the alleyways are already dark, kind of (inaudible) at almost all times of the day. What really bounced out to us is that the average foot candle lightening of the alleyway is only one-foot candle. That's the same footcandle design the City uses for its public streets that all the residents complain that are too dark at night. So, you can tell from here if it's dark in the evenings, it's going to be worse in the -- if it's dark in the dust period, it's going to be worse in the evening for residents. The architect's presentation showed a really nice examples of lighting kind of stretching between two buildings but that's actually not what is proposed on the plans. All that's proposed is string lights kind of on the garage side of the building and so with that you're not going to get the type of lighting that both buildings feel is going to require or improve the safety of their employees in the buildings, as well as the public traveling on the back side. The other things is that we would request the removal of anything that would encourage people to dwell and sleep and kind of congregate in that back area for vandalism issues. Regarding the issues of the grease traps, again we showed you how those grease traps need to be accessed. You got to think that vacuum truck and those big vacuum hoses need to push them from the garage on the first floor through openings on the ground floor through the back doors of the buildings and into the kitchens. The trees that are shown, the planters that are shown, those all conflict with those long-term operations. This building as shown will kill the operations of both businesses and any planned businesses at both of these buildings. The only way to do that is to remove the trees that are shown which is highlighted in green and remove the planter wall and provide more access space for service vehicles to be able to get in there and maintain those buildings. A couple other issues regarding construction, you're basically going to be building a pit when you construct the garage and that's just part of construction. The applicant or the developer just don't understand how grease trap operations need to get maintained but there's an impact in cost, they are requesting that the City project take on the burden of removing that grease trap during the construction phase. Also because of the fact that all the loading happens from the back of the

buildings today, they are also requesting that during the construction phase that all of the parking or the majority of the parking along the frontage of Waverley Street be converted to loading zones so that service vehicles can continue to maintain those buildings. If possible, create some type of a parkette or some type of enclosure that let's all the trash bins be stored there. So, that services vehicles can come in and grab that trash before -- then take it out after the project is done and move towards the hopefully preferably two storage bins on the ground floor if the garage. We're also looking to hopefully request weekly cleanings of the buildings. You're going to be generating a lot of dust and debris and any private developer would be required to do that. They do it on their own outside of the City but in this case the City has to take on that responsibility. The other issue that we didn't see addressed in the plans is the issue of drainage from both buildings. Both buildings have rooftop drains that either spill into underground storm drain systems or spill into the alleyway and with the dark and loss of light to dry up that water that generates from the rooftops in the day and in the winter. We're seeing an issue of potential rodents and kind of moss generated in the pedestrian alleyway. So, again, if you push the building back 24-feet, then that allows the sun exposure to come in and dry all that out during the day. In regards to these issues all that we're asking is that you let us sit down with the City Staff more, Seth has met with the developers -- with the clients in the past but they haven't responded to the issues. So, these issues aren't new to the City, it's just issues that haven't been addressed. That's the end of our presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Alright -- Roxy? Mr. Rapp.

Mr. Roxy Rapp: Thank you. Good morning. Two ideas, one is across the street you have the post office and one of the problems with the development of the post office is they want to stay while you develop it and bring it up to seismic, clean out all the asbestos, etc. etc. which is impossible to do a good job. Especially in a historical building and my suggestion is for this Board to encourage the City to work with the US Postal Service and have them move across the street to the retail. It fits beautifully because it's a very narrow retail spot so you can have all of the post office boxes and we really don't need as big of the post office as we have now because that use to be the main post office. It no longer is so I think that would be terrific to move the post office across the street and that would find them a new home for where you can redo the existing post office. That's number one and number two is as most of you know, I developed with Jim Bear 250 University, where we have the alleyway which didn't come out as nice as I pictured it but someday maybe it will get changed. We do have a trash room in the alleyway and it's a tough situation to do. Looking at the plans that Ken just shared with me, my first suggestion would be to move the doors -- that you move out the trash and move those doors to open up early in the morning to the alley itself for the -- they can pull the containers into the alley. Right there the dumpster can pick it up and dump it and then you can move it back in. What I'm worried about is you move them out those existing doors and then you hit into Brad's new building there. Then also you have that electrical box underground and I don't care how careful you are, those dumpsters leak. So, then you would have all the smells of the different garbage etc. going down into the electrical boxes under the ground that has a grade on top of it so that would stop two things there. In regards to dumping the trash for the retailer, I would go ahead and keep a side door so the retailer doesn't have to go down into the alley to dump their existing trash. So, you would actually have a set of doors or one door, a wide door, that they would open up to dump their trash from the retail operation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Would the applicant that is the City like to respond? It's your turn.

Ms. Boyd: I would just like to say that we received the letter from Brad Ehikian and Elizabeth Wong for the neighboring property owners yesterday and I believe it was sent to you as well. There are some existing issues that we have met with these neighbors in the past, a couple times and we're working out some of the issues. There are some new issues that were brought up in this letter that we have not heard before. I do want to say that I think you also received a letter that was sent from our Attorney's Office...

Chair Furth: From Albert Yang?

Ms. Boyd: ...from Albert Yang on Monday. So, our attorney, the City's Attorney's Office, and the neighbor's attorneys are in communications and ask that City Staff continue meeting with these neighbors to work out these issues but we would still like to hear comments about the building. We're not asking for recommendations of approval today but we'd like to hear comments from the Board regarding this project.

Chair Furth: Thank you so just to go over it, we have the correspondence in the packet, we have the Valentine's Day letter from Ms. Wong and Mr. Ehikian and we have a pretty long memo from our colleague Peter Baltay about his comments on the first round and his subsequent response. I think those are all available to the public. Ok, it's over to us, any questions of Staff before we go on?

Board Member Lew: I just – I have one question so there's an existing bus stop on Hamilton near the mailboxes and is that proposed to stay in the various scenarios where the bulb out gets wider or we retain street parking and what not?

Ms. Boyd: Yes, the bus station or the bus stop will stay in the same location.

Board Member Lew: Ok but if there's – if you widen the sidewalks in that – on Hamilton, is the – does that mean the bus stop is going to block traffic?

Ms. Boyd: It will temporarily block traffic. That was the recommendation by our – the transportation division to leave it there.

Board Member Lew: Great, thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other questions before we start? Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I just have one question. The comment was brought up about an informal parking space. What exactly is that? Is that sort of a hey, we're here first thing in the morning so it's ours? I mean I can understand – from what I understand or what I heard was there was one, I guess, parking space that was sort of dedicated to the adjacent property owner and the second one was an informal dedication.

Chair Furth: It's parallel. I think (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Ms. French: A formal...

Chair Furth: Substandard standard space.

Ms. French: I would try to answer that to say a formal parking space would be one that meets the City's codes and as far as...

Board Member Gooyer: I mean the idea being that it's – I don't want to say owned by them but they can – they park it there and nobody else can park there? The formal one.

Ms. French: I'm not clear on it but I imagine it's on their property, not on the City's property where they are parking...

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, obviously if it's on their property (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Ms. French: ... in a way that doesn't comply with a standard parking space size or access.

Chair Furth: Perhaps we could ask Mr. Rodriguez to elaborate because I was looking at it this morning and I was thinking of it. Just identify which property and which spaces you are talking about maybe looking at the site plan.

Board Member Gooyer: Also, if you could, could you show where your grease inceptor is located?

Mr. Rodriguez: I'll try and do my best here so I'll walk you through what we mean by formal and informal spaces. Let me get this going real quick. Even with glasses, I can barely see that. The way the site works today, this is your typical scenario every morning is we see all the service vehicles that are coming in and parking in the spaces of the lot. Those vehicles also park adjacent to the building so it's very common at both buildings for delivery trucks to park right up to the sides of the buildings here. So, they do temporary blockage of the alleyways or the isles but that's how the informal parking spaces work and they are used mostly as commercial loading zones for pulling food out of them or dropping materials within the buildings. Here another view, here you see the formal parking spaces at 90-degree head in space kind of adjacent to this wall for the Prolific Oven building and here's that informal, second, kind of parallel parking space that's used regularly by the building. So, all in all, there's about a three-parking space loss because there's (inaudible) in those two buildings. There are more service vehicles here out in the back-dropping things off during the day.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: Then also if you could answer where exactly is your grease interceptor located?

Ms. Elizabeth Wong: Good morning. My name is Elizabeth Wong and my family and I own 560 Waverley Street. The grease traps are inside the kitchen, they are two below the floor grease traps and they are in the middle and frontage of the restaurant.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, all I needed to know was just whether they were inside or outside. Ok, thank you.

Ms. Wong: You're welcome.

Board Member Gooyer: That's it right now.

Chair Furth: Thank you all for your informative presentations. We appreciate them. Complicated project. Complicated site. Do you want to just start with an additional round of comments or do you want to sort out the issues first? Start with comments first – general comments first?

Board Member Lew: Can we do two rounds (inaudible)? (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Let's do two rounds. Yeah, let's talk about site issues first. Robert. Site plan issues.

Board Member Gooyer: I like the idea, but I guess this has been floated than lately other than what we've seen, is more of an access or an alley, whatever you want to call it, between the AT&T building and the project. I think having been down there quite a bit, you'll see there's a lot of traffic that moves back and forth from Gilman across to Lane 21 so I think that's a good idea. I can see the point that I think one of the Board Member's mentioned we should set the building back a little bit further but you get to a point where based – I mean parking spaces have a certain set requirement so you can't just say well, we'll shrink the building by 8-feet because that, as was mentioned, could emulate a whole row of parking. I'm ok with it the way it is. In the other direction, like I said if we do a – one away from AT&T that would only lose a couple of parking spaces so I'm ok with that. I think other than that, the fact that we're providing a trash enclosure for them or to assist the adjacent property owners, I think is a great idea. I mean that's a very generous way to do it. I mean I've been in situations where just because a property has had a convenience situation in respect to either a vacant lot next door or whatever the case is for 20-30-years. Doesn't mean that's a god given right. It just means that you happen to have been

lucky for 20 or 30-years so with this building being placed right next to those existing buildings is going to cause some hardships. I'm well aware of that but I don't really see changing the whole design based on that. In fact, the – to give them what they requested basically makes the building almost -- I don't want to say useless but I mean it really doesn't allow it to do the function it needs to do. So, as far as the layout like this, I'm fairly happy with it. There were some questions I noticed on Board Member Baltay's comment about going two floors down and cutting the height of it a little bit. (Inaudible) that's not really layout but I think that would be a great idea but obviously, any layer that you go down, increased the cost tremendously so I can understand why – that's it for me at the moment.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Great so I do want to thank Staff and the architects. I think the set and the Staff report were very – where all very clear and every – it was very thorough and it was very easy to understand what you were trying to do. The – with regard to just with the site issues, the – my main struggle is with the – with encroaching into the 7-foot special setback. I looked at it again this morning to try to see if I – just to help try to make my mind about it. At the moment I'm thinking it's a mistake and we've done it before on their projects like 278 University, Chop's building, your building here and I supported all of those at that time. I think those were – that was the right decision or decisions. I feel very differently about this one because it's a different block. It's a superblock, it's that block of – goes from Waverly to Bryant, it's twice as long, the façade length is fairly long and all the other buildings are complying with the 7-foot special setback. So, this is going to be the only one for three or four blocks that are going to – I think it's going to stick out. I think it's going to look like a mistake and that's my take on it. Earlier this morning I was trying to – I was wondering if the lower floors could stick in if the upper two floors were setback. I was trying to figure out a way to minimizing the parking reduction.

Mr. Hayes: It's all about – right, it's all about the parking (inaudible).

Board Member Lew: I've been going – I've trying to rack my brain about this.

Mr. Hayes: Well, that's what we did at 240, if I may? So, at 240 the building at the upper levels actually encroach into the 7-foot special or the 6-foot special setback there but on the ground floor, we pushed it back so that you do have – it does acknowledge the 7-foot or 6-foot setback at 240. You'd lose this parking along Hamilton.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I know. I guess at the end of the day I'm trying -- I'm wondering is the site too small for what we're trying to put -- what the City is asking you to put on there and maybe it is.

Mr. Hayes: I had – may I just, through the Chair...

Board Member Lew: Please.

Mr. Hayes: ... just ask a question? I did not understand Board Member Gooyer's comment about the walkway along AT&T. Were you proposing a 10-foot walkway along the AT&T building?

Board Member Gooyer: That's what I was thinking is...

Mr. Hayes: Because that has the same effect on the parking then, right?

Board Member Gooyer: Well yeah but it shrinks it this way so you only lose a couple space as compared to a whole row.

Mr. Hayes: No, I think we'd lose the whole row. I mean unless you went closer to the Tai Pan building and got rid...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, what's....

Mr. Hayes: We'd lose that whole row Board Member. You could just lose it on the ground floor if we kept the upper floor but that would be a very dark and I don't think that would be a very good space though.

Chair Furth: What were you thinking (inaudible)?

Mr. Hayes: (crosstalk) So, part of the concern...

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Mr. Hayes: was that when we – looking at Board Member Baltay's comment on the 10-foot alley we have along Tai Pan, he was saying that would be a very unwelcoming and perhaps dangerous space. It's got a two-story building on one side and a five-story building on the other. This would have a 75-foot story building on one side and a five-story – I'm sorry, 75-foot and a 50-foot building on the other side. So, I don't know how that could be a good amenity if the alternative walkway is not a good amenity.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Mr. Hayes: Right so...

Chair Furth: We'll continue our...

Mr. Hayes: Just trying too...

Chair Furth: No, (crosstalk) I think it's useful to do this in a slight study session format because this is a complicated project. We've got a little time, we should be thinking about this. It's a big deal and appreciates that and we'll keep going with the comments. I'm sure we'll have you up here answering questions again. Osma, please.

Board Member Thompson: Regarding site, I find that many parking garages suffer from not advertising bicycle parking adequately. So, the concept of bringing more attention to where the bike station is, pedestrian attention, the diagram that we saw today in the presentation that brings circulation through there I think is a good choice. Mainly because I think it will bring more attention to bike parking because otherwise in parking garages it tends to get very lost. I also – I hope that's also like as the project progresses that that's considered in terms of wayfinding and all that. The loading issue behind Lot 84 and 85 is certainly something needs to be addressed. Mainly in that, it would be – these areas are sort of meant to have these retail spaces thrive and if we're siphoning off something that's essential for their operation then I think that's a mistake. I'm not sure, it seems that the pedestrian access to Lane 21 is being reconsidered and potentially as that is being reconsidered these concerns also ought to be integrated. Perhaps reconfigured a little bit so that these spaces can stay operational and we can still have a pedestrian pathway that works. I mean as it is looking at the plans, having the trash enclosure on one side and the back of house of these restaurants on the other side, that in itself isn't an ideal alley in terms of program. Potentially there's a way to shift things so that the back of house is on one side and the pedestrian amenity access is on the other side. I'm not sure what the solution is but I do think it needs a further look and potential reconfiguration on that side. Not just for what they need but loading and stuff. This is a commercial area and loading is an important part of that and I don't really see any solutions there. Those are my comments for site.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Well, I share Osma's view that I don't know what the solution is but I do see a problem. The problem tends to be about what is gained and what is lost because there are all these unofficial, practical uses of these spaces. I know that this isn't a dedicated alley and that historically these buildings probably didn't have any kind of official access down there. Could you explain to me Staff, what's the situation with Lot 84 with what we call the Prolific Oven? Are there dedicated spaces behind that building that are entitled to some kind of access or not? I'm confused.

Ms. Boyd: There is one dedicated space for their entitlement which is why we included the Lot 84 space (inaudible).

Chair Furth: That dedicated space essentially had an easement and necessity over the City parking lot? I mean how where you suppose to access it? We have no idea, you just could.

Ms. Boyd: I'm not sure.

Chair Furth: Ok, it's like a lot of sewer easements actually. So, let me tell you what I don't consider to be a problem and what I do consider to be a problem. I mean anything that makes it more difficult for a business to thrive is, of course, a real problem but things that are historic hangovers that would not be allowed and haven't been allowed for 20 or 30-years I'm less inclined to try to solve. These buildings should all have, as Mr. Rapp's building does, interior trash places. I mean we don't – these alleys are not intended to be used to store trash bins, though most of them are and it's a long-term project to get that changed and get that storage off the alley and into other places. I think that using some of this space to solve that alley problem is a great idea. I realize that it takes more time and energy to go to a slightly removed – to go to somewhat removed central place. If those buildings come down and get rebuilt, perhaps they're going to have to do interior storage so we need to think about how that would access the alley for collection. I think we need some more thought about the whole – it might be useful to think some more about the whole trash problem in both parts of that alley because it's a mess with the exception of one property. See if we can come up with a more comprehensive solution which would be a benefit to the City but it would also be a considerable benefit to the private property owners. I'd like to see some more thinking about that. I mean maybe more dedicated trash space so that we could really clean up that area. We're not going to get them all in there but make that a much more attractive block because we do have this problem of the superblock that has had this informal access because of the parking lot but isn't going to anymore. I'm not in favor of 24-foot alleys around this project or on either side. I'm not in favor of curb cuts on Waverly so I think we need to be looking for other kinds of solutions as you have been. I think pedestrian access is a big deal. I'm really pleased with your bicycle provisions. As you know I'm really pleased to see benches with handrails so I can stand up when I'm even more frail and elderly or just on the weeks that I'm carrying a heavy child or something around. I don't know what the solution is for good pedestrian access. I'm sure lighting has a lot to do with it. I'm sure design has a lot to do with it. I'm not convinced with that long alley. I ran into Alex this morning as we were both checking out the sight one more time and that is a long way along the Tai Pan frontage. That is a deep building and I would rather this building were closer. I don't like violating the 7-foot setback because I think it's a real built setback. It's not just some historic artifact. You know Stanford got itself a really good campus architect after it put the Business School in the wrong place and realized they'd messed up the line of sight down towards the Quad. Well, this is not at that level but this is a problem. I know when we talked about this before you said with a 5-foot alley would need a different kind of ventilation design but you weren't positive. You would – I did not understand that to mean you needed mechanical ventilation but I don't think that's going to be a very good space and I don't think – I think that intrusion is a problem for the findings we have to make. On low lighting level, I'm sure you can handle that. Drainage, I'm sure you can handle that. The fat, oil and grease FOG service, I don't know what the solution is but I think there are a lot of restaurants that don't have big backstage access for big backstage trucks so I'd like to know more about what's possible. I do know that it's a big issue for the City and we own our sewers and we want it to work as much as the property owners do. I don't think solar access is something I expect this project to not interfere with. We don't have a law in this town that protects ancient lights and there's a proposal to put substantial solar on the top of this building. So, I would consider that a legitimate trade-off. I don't know if my colleagues would agree. Dust management, construction adverse impacts management, I think that's always our obligation and it's going to be difficult. These things always are. Those are my comments at the moment.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me ask you then, what you're saying is push the whole building towards Lot 85? Ok, that's what I thought.

Chair Furth: I do like the better retail. I do like the better earlier chance to look at the post office. I did go on about that entryway a lot last time, I apologize. Shall we talk about design? Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I wasn't here for the last or the first presentation of this and when I started reading over this and the thing is basically or the – what I'm reading is it says that you wanted to relate to the Church across the street. To me, I don't know, I'm not a big fan of sort of 70's, brutalist architecture which I think that comes into. Now whether that's right or wrong or whatever, I don't know if that's the appropriate thing to emulate. I – although there is a -- the Wells Fargo building across the street which is brick, the AT&T building has brick in it. I don't know, to me that would be something a little bit better to emulate than the – not that I'm a big fan of the AT&T building, especially that elevation but I'm talking about just the materials involved. Also, the fact that the Wells Fargo buildings steps back at the corner. I know we talk about you should highlight a corner but in this particular case, I'd rather do the opposite and have it step back at that corner to open up that intersection. It allows better view of – actually of the Church, also of the post office and I just think it works better that way. Because of that, I'm not a big fan of the stair tower right at the corner. I don't think that's doing anything and the reality of it is when I first looked at – which is it? Basically, elevation or your sheet or your page – I guess Hamilton Elevation One. Man, I swear that thing looks like a prison. I mean it – because it is all just to uniform. I mean all the metal framing is going vertical like – I mean is the – there's – I mean I've seen metal mesh used and I – and you have too I'm sure. It looks a little bit more creative. There's some design in it. The mesh is basically intended to create a form and yet still keep an open space and that sort of thing but it doesn't have to be done in this. I mean the only thing I can say in this is you copied the brutalism of the building across the street which I don't think is a good thing on this particular case. It creates a massive volume that I don't think needs to be there. It – so, I like the way you opened up the corner so you did it on a horizontal plane but you didn't do it on a vertical plane. I'd prefer to see that corner opened up like you did and then also step back. Actually, the -- on this, like I said I wasn't (inaudible) there last time but Option Three or even One where that stairway is open, I think works better than enclosing it. I don't think you're doing – I mean it's not like you're doing weather protection. To me it's not really doing anything. Right now, stairways that are glass enclosed are very popular but that's make it work in this particular case. Let's see, what else? Like I said I agree that I think the building ought to be pushed back and it should line up at least with the AT&T building which will – which would make everybody happier here as far as obtaining the full 7-feet. I agree, like I said earlier, I don't – you know the alleyway would be nice or the pedestrian access but it's not critical as long as we come up with something that does it from the Hamilton to Alley 21, whatever it's called – Lane 21. I think there needs to be some access there that needs to be developed and I understand just taking – it doesn't even need to be adjacent to the building. (Inaudible) through the building or something that is highly accented. I mean it – for example, Mountain View has on Castro Street has these sorts of walkways in between the buildings that have been very nicely done. I'm not saying you need to emulate that but they've given it some – where it actually shows some thought was given to get from Point A to Point B. Not we're sneaking through the parking garage to get to the alley. I think that's it for right now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex.

Board Member Lew: On the design, I think you've done a very good job. I like – yeah, like a second-floor cornice element to align with the smaller scale buildings. I like the -- I think the fins work well. I like the revisions you've made around the corner stair access. I like the – I think the retail – the deeper retail space makes a lot of sense and I like the – I guess (inaudible) like the setback and awnings that you've done near the AT&T building. You tried to break the mass and changed the materials and I think that's all working. I think the integral planters and benches I think are working really well. So, I can support – I think I can support all of those elements design wise. The – I have a question and I don't think I need an answer today but is the garage going to be painted? So, on some of the other garage that has come to the Board from Stanford, they said that they weren't going to paint them. Mostly based on a sustainable design criterion, it's just less paint, less – you know less off-gassing but then when I went to see them, low and behold they were all painted. I don't know exactly what happens with those but I do know on other projects at Stanford they've had problems with the concrete. So, they are pathing the concrete because of the popcorn texture and I don't know if that's the – exactly what happened but I guess I

would like some sort of thought about that because I think it does make a difference. Yep, great. On the landscape design, I think I am concerned about the Ginkgo's and the pedestrian walkway. I mean I think there's typically require full sun and I don't think you're going to get it in the shade of a – on the north side of a tall building. Same thing with the vines on the north side. I mean most vines require full sun or at least part sun. I think there's like creeping fig that doesn't require – doesn't need – doesn't like full sun but then it doesn't need a green screen, either right? It just needs – it would prefer to grow on a wall so I'm not sure that all of that – the landscaping is working in the pedestrian walkway area. If the walkway area is only 10-feet wide, I think my – my hunch is that the best thing to do is try to keep everything as open as possible and not try to hide the building. Yeah so...

Mr. Hayes: So, the building -- you'll be able to see into the building as you walk along the alley so it's – there's an elevation I think in your packet.

Board Member Lew: I guess I'm concerned about the green – mostly the tall greenscreen panels. Is – if that's really going to work.

Mr. Hayes: Oh, I see.

Board Member Lew: Even if the plants don't do well there, I mean I think the green screen is a nice enough material. I think you had also proposed maybe stainless-steel wires...

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Lew: ...as an alternative as well.

Mr. Hayes: You mean you're saying that as a texture alone without the plant material?

Board Member Lew: Yeah so even – well, so – maybe the best thing to do is plant it but even if it fails, I think it's still ok. I've – so I've had that – I've had that problem...

Mr. Hayes: The garage is painted except where the concrete is on the two street frontages. That's a sandblasted concrete and that will just have a clear sealer, like a Siloxane sealer or something on it.

Board Member Lew: Ok, thank you for that. I think that's all that I have on the building design. I think you've done a really good job.

Mr. Hayes: Great, thank you.

Board Member Lew: I don't necessarily agree with the programming and setbacks and all of that. I would also just disclose that I did watch the Council meeting on January 22nd about the California Avenue garage but they referenced this one as well. So, I'm kind of curious to see where this – where the Council ends up on this particular project.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Ok.

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I would say that my views on this probably more closely align with Board Member Gooyer's views. It is – the idea that it looks like a prison is not inaccurate. It does seem quite overbearing. Unlike my fellow Board Member, I am actually very much a big fan of brutalist architecture but it needs to be done well. Brutalist architecture does well when there is a lot of green like a lot of planting. Also, when there are more interesting forms than just the orthogonal and materialities is also a big part of it. I'm unconvinced, in at least in the renders, how the sandblasted concrete and the metal

fins pertain to the historic – I saw a note that the metal fins pertain to the historic context and it's very unconvincing right now how that is the case. I do appreciate the concept to include a lot of greenery in it. I think greenery definitely softens the brutalist architecture but like Board Member Lew says, it does have to succeed. I disagree or at least I'm unsure if it does fail, what that screen is? Is it just kind of a cage? I feel like there is a green screen product but I'm not sure if that's what you're specking here and I'm also unconvinced if that is what you're spec'ing if that will actually look good. I think some more thought to the overall appearance does need to be considered. I am also not a fan of the stair tower as it stands. It seems under designed in that the relationship between the edges and the floor and the stair are sort of out of sync. I think those datums and planes that you're creating don't mesh well and create a really awkward space as you're exiting from the stair. I am concerned about the façade behind the existing lots. Currently, in render, they look blank, so I'm looking at the aerial view at Waverley on ARB sheet 3.6. On the elevation – like the façade is very much present on Hamilton but given that this building is so tall, its likely that we'll see some it from behind and so it seems like that back of the back-alley area is ignored. The building as it stands as its designed will – if we're trying to make that alley nice, it's definitely being ignored right now. I do like the PV panels. I think they actually add something architecturally that the building doesn't have right now. So, what that says, I don't know, that maybe that sort of break down of mass or texture is something to consider. Those are my comments.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I still like the idea that you have a two-story element along most of it. I agree with Osma that it looks better with a lid on. It looks better with the PV panels in place, at least in this drawing. I don't know what the street experience would be but it becomes a better-looking building I think. It also keeps the stair enclosure from sort of appearing detached in an unpleasant way. I'm really perplexed by the staircase. I know that in September I was complaining that we have other unsuccessful open staircases on parking garages which are wet when it rains and too hot when it's sunny and look like they are crooked as you walk down the sidewalk. I don't know what the answer is but smaller, lighter, less obtrusive I would be supportive of. I think that open is better. I don't know how you design the staircase to get that. I suspect you don't do a spiral the way we did over on what, Alma and...

Board Member Lew: The Joe Bellomo project.

Chair Furth: Yeah, Joe Bellomo's but at least it was compact and the poetry is good. I think this has become too big and that there's a better solution that a skilled architect can figure out. I don't know what it is. I don't know how these vertical fins are going to look. I don't know if it's going to look like a *City of Quartz* jail or if it's going to look differently. It is very vertical and just – you took a comb and you went like this and as we were talking I was thinking well what if it didn't just go like this? Maybe it becomes impossibly complex to design and execute and maintain but as it stands it looks oppressively linear, not at all playful. Garages are a problem, we all know this, we're a little embarrassed by them but they can be beautiful because they are big spaces. How high is the ceiling on the ground floor?

Ms. Michelle Wendler: The ceiling height underneath the beams is 8 ½-feet and then the beam pocket is about 2 ½-feet so in between beams it's taller. So, the story (inaudible)...

Chair Furth: If I'm walking through it, what do I experience?

Ms. Wendler: You'll experience every 18-feet there's a beam so in between it's about 11-feet and then it's 8 ½-feet where the beams occur.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Board Member Lew: Can I ask a question?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Board Member Lew: Can I ask a follow-up question about that? About the ceiling heights? There are – I'm thinking like Santa Row, the first-floor height of the garage, I think my recollection is that it's taller.

Ms. Wendler: The one that's up against Winchester?

Board Member Lew: Yes, or something like – I'm just thinking that that – I'm thinking that there are other garages where they've done a taller first floor to make it more open. Am I...

Ms. Wendler: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: No, no, no.

Ms. Wendler: There's different – 11 ½ is the most normal...

Board Member Lew: Normal.

Ms. Wendler: ...height we do. It's really about the ramp to get...

Board Member Lew: Right, the longer...

Ms. Wendler: When you raise it up you need a longer ramp to get to...

Board Member Lew: Do you have a – if you had a 16-foot ceiling, is it like a 1 to 20 ramp?

Ms. Wendler: The ramp we have now is about – is 18% on the main slope with blends top and bottom to get up the 11 ½-feet that we have now. So, it's (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Board Member Lew: Right so you'd have to increase – right but to go up to a 16-foot ceiling, you're going to have to increase the ramp somewhere like 40%...

Ms. Wendler: We need more length.

Board Member Lew: ... a lot and probably like – probably doesn't work I would think.

Ms. Wendler: We would lose parking space to somehow do that to make a circulation. I'm not sure exactly how we would do it right now. Or the – yeah because it's going to cut into the retail space. There's so little floor plate left.

Board Member Thompson: So, what's the – is that bottomless structure, does that continue to the retail so that the retail height would be – if there was a drop ceiling, it would be about 8-feet?

Ms. Wendler: In the retail space we've been able to remove those beams so it goes all the way to the bottom of the slab which is about 11-feet.

Board Member Thompson: Ok, thanks.

Chair Furth: I guess I was thinking that I hope it's as high as we can make it because it has a big impact on the experience of walking through that space. I'm trying to think of garages I enjoy walking through and there are some. By the way, do you have a materials board that we could see?

Mr. Hayes: I thought – (inaudible) indicated you had it.

Board Member Gooyer: I've just got a couple more questions. Can I jump in or are you...

Chair Furth: Absolutely.

Board Member Gooyer: A couple of things and I – it's funny because I thought the same thing with the panels and I think the reality of it is it's the old adage about a building should have a base, a middle and

top. This building seems to have a base and a middle and there's no top. It just sort of dies at the top and the panels I think create that. The other thing that I was thinking is I still think there needs to be some sort of a link, like I said, across there but I understand what you're talking about with the parking. So, my thought was the alley that is or the walkway, alley, whatever you want to call it, in between the existing neighbors like 48 or 84 and 85 and the AT&T building. That alleyway basically -- what if that just continues straight down towards Hamilton? You know so basically, you're losing four parking spaces.

Mr. Hayes: Right, we were talk – but...

Ms. Boyd: It also (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: I mean whatever but I mean that's still a whole lot less than – and you could do that on one floor, just that one.

Mr. Hayes: It's just the conflict with the ramp.

Ms. Boyd: Yeah, the ramp starts to go up...

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah but the...

Mr. Hayes: Everybody coming up and down the ramp.

Ms. Boyd: Yeah, there would be a conflict in elevation between the pedestrian, alley, and the ramp going up to the floors.

Board Member Gooyer: No – well, ok, I mean maybe it needs to jog – whatever, all I'm saying is if you do it in the middle of the building like that, you can get that and still not lose a whole row of parking.

Mr. Hayes: Correct. If we didn't have the ramp, it would be a lot easier. So, I do have...

Chair Furth: I don't know, those mechanical lifts are sounding better and better.

Mr. Hayes: There is a way through the building, right?

Board Member Gooyer: Let me ask one other question seeing though this is somewhat of a – we have 130,000-square foot building here and we've got 2,000-square feet of retail space. How – I mean I don't know, retail space in parking structures to me have always been sort of used to hide as you're walking past. I mean seeing as though do we really need the extra 2,000-square feet or would we be better having another ten parking spaces?

Ms. French: That's per the Council.

Ms. Boyd: Yeah so Council directed us to include the retail on the Waverley frontage.

Board Member Gooyer: What, supposedly like gosh, we're hiding the parking structure behind this 2,000-square foot of retail space? Come on. You know you've got a four-story building with...

Mr. Hayes: I actually think it's about just the retail continuity for the experience along Waverley, the sidewalk.

Chair Furth: We actually have quite successful retail in a parking garage over on Lytton.

Board Member Gooyer: I don't know for that 2,000 to 130,000 ratio it seems kind of -- ok.

Chair Furth: Well, let's see if we get some coherent direction or at least clues. Yes, go ahead Commissioner...

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, I just had some follow up comments after look at the material board...

Chair Furth: Oh, yes, please, from everybody.

Board Member Thompson: ...and I have one question. For the perforated metal panel, in the material board there's a pressed in image from the De Young Museum and then there's that metal sample. So, they are quite different so which one – is it going to be the metal – the silver with the different circles?

Mr. Hayes: No, actually the drawings indicate that it's a bronze colored perforated metal. However, there's been a discussion with the Art Commission and the artist that's Amy Landsburg, she would like to be able to use this mesh as her backdrop for the public art.

Chair Furth: Which mesh?

Mr. Hayes: So, we wanted to come before you today without the public art, we don't know what it is yet exactly, but if this notion of the perforated metal on that stair tower is not something that you think is supportable because it's too overbearing, then we're going to need to rethink that. I was not proposing the clean anodized finish. We are proposing a finish that is more consistent I think with the historical context in terms of color. I also think the metal fins in terms of color is where I was relating to the historical context. Not in terms of the material or the shape of the metal fin, it's the color.

Board Member Thompson: So, in light of that, the – I mean I did also note here that the N1 channel color as you have it on there appears to me far too dark but perhaps there's a way that it can be reintegrated. That might be more convincing. I find that what the De Young president where they had an image that they water jet cut over a bunch of metal panels. That's very successful and that's not communicated in your drawings. In your drawings, it looks like a big wall but when it has that level of complexity it becomes really exciting. I would almost say like that level of – depending on how you work with your artist, instead of using the metal fins, that would be really exciting to have across the whole garage depending on how you do it.

Mr. Hayes: That was one of the options that we had in September...

Board Member Thompson: Ok.

Mr. Hayes: ... but thank you.

Chair Furth: Our thinking is evolving.

Board Member Thompson: I think it's a matter of representation because I didn't read that off of this but once I looked at your material board, that's instantly already way more exciting in terms of a prospect for down here.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Let's see if we can get some clarity. So, on the site plan, we have three people who would support an increased setback on Hamilton. Everybody but Osma, is that right?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: I can support that as well.

Chair Furth: Ok which is a very difficult design issue but we think it's important. In terms of any direction, we want to give on pedestrian access through the building? Just figure it out. We think it's important.

Board Member Gooyer: I still think there needs to be some link from Hamilton to across, yeah.

Chair Furth: From – essentially from Hamilton back to CVS. That it is a good route, one that looks good, safe, inviting, people want to do it. We would like as high as a ceiling on the ground floor as possible – as feasible to make it a better pedestrian experience.

Board Member Gooyer: The other possibility is instead of the actual slab being different is the framing being different so you don't end up with a 3 ½-inch deep beam but you have either more beams or a space closer together. That way the – the biggest thing is when you're looking down you perceive the 8 ½-foot level, not the ceiling. So, if we could change that 8 ½ to 10-feet and have the framing much more tighter increment it would make it visually look a whole lot taller. Even if it's just for a certain portion or a certain bay...

Chair Furth: Even just to highlight the pedestrian way.

Board Member Gooyer: ...which would be the one where you walk through. You can keep the other framing the way it is.

Chair Furth: I'm sure that made sense to the technically skilled. We want the perception of height.

Mr. Hayes: So, going through the garage is an option in your mind for this pedestrian pathway? It doesn't have to be something that opens to the sky?

Board Member Gooyer: Right. No, no, no, I agree. Right...

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: ... it just has to be something and that's why I was thinking in between that one set of bays that I mentioned. If you change the framing just for that first floor, it's not going to be radically different but then it will – the perception – if you get that up to 10-feet, I don't think anyone would have a problem -- and it's well lite -- walking through that garage area. Obviously, it's not the full length, it's only the (crosstalk) – right.

Chair Furth: I think – we all think it could be on the first floor of the garage, is that correct? A pedestrian through way and I think the point that we're trying to make is that it should be attractive, it should feel safe and it shouldn't feel like an afterthought. It should feel like something you designed in from the beginning so you don't (crosstalk) just think you're...

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible) not dodging...

Chair Furth: ... doing something you shouldn't be doing.

Mr. Hayes: So, straight.

Chair Furth: Ok what else can we agree on? What do we think about the staircase? Opened? Closed? Covered? Somewhere else entirely?

Board Member Gooyer: I don't really care if it's opened or closed. I just think its too dominant right on the corner.

Chair Furth: What would you do with it?

Board Member Gooyer: I don't know I'm not the architect.

Chair Furth: I understand that. You mean it shouldn't be on – you're saying you don't like the corner as a location for the staircase?

Board Member Gooyer: No, no, no the location is fine. All I'm saying is I don't like the massive bulk of it.

Chair Furth: It's too big.

Board Member Gooyer: That's why if you get rid of the screen around it, it automatically reduces the volumetric bulk of it.

Board Member Lew: Can I ask a question for Ken? The volume of the perforated screen is larger than the staircase.

Mr. Hayes: That's correct.

Board Member Lew: So, you have extra space in there.

Mr. Hayes: (inaudible), there's extra space there.

Board Member Lew: You've obviously done that for a reason so I was wondering if you could explain the rationale?

Mr. Hayes: We wanted it to feel like you were actually in a space when you duck under that volume and you sort of – I'm not going to say it's a celebration but you've got this larger space that you're looking up into which could be quite interesting. As opposed to it just enclosing what's required for the stair (inaudible).

Board Member Gooyer: Would it be worth any – even in something like that having the first floor at the same footprint that you have now and then it tapers inward or something? Then it has a perception of reduction of volume?

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, I would have to – we'd have to study it.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm just saying if the (crosstalk) – then still it gives what I'm more interested in as a step back effect.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Gooyer: Even if it's the screen that does the stepping back, it still has that...

Mr. Hayes: Right because right now it's about 20-something feet back from the façade on Waverley but it's not nearly that far back from the other side. Yeah so if we turn it...

Chair Furth: What's the top? Is it open to the sky?

Mr. Hayes: No, no, it's enclosed. We had a skylight up there originally but I think from a cost standpoint that's been illuminated.

Chair Furth: So, what is it?

Mr. Hayes: It's just a solid roof.

Chair Furth: So, it's going to be dark?

Mr. Hayes: Well, no so this perforated – it's going to have this perforated membrane around it so it's going to feel light and at night will glow. Oh, that may not be a good thing.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Mr. Hayes: If there was this wonderful way to create a design in the perforated panel, it could be really exciting.

Chair Furth: If you make it fabulously beautiful we'll probably say yes. We have been talking about the fact that seeing the art – public art as something that comes late in the process is really unfortunate and of course, it's impossible to make everything happen at once. I think that in this case particularly it may be really important. Do we have any consensus on the stairway and its treatment or stairwell and the treatment, Alex?

Board Member Lew: I would just – I think Ken is very talented and I think he hears that we think it may be too big so I would just think – yeah, show us some options and we'll see. If there are any conceptual sketches from the artist by the next meeting, I think that – usually the Board here can make the leap. We did that for the Junior Museum and I think we asked for – at the very end of the project we sort of asked for it to come back to the Board just because they weren't sure where the art was exactly going to be placed. Then they came up with a sketch and I think everybody was happy with it.

Mr. Hayes: Ok.

Board Member Lew: I think I'm fine with the staircase conceptually.

Board Member Thompson: I think if you're going to use the material in the way that we've discussed and make it fabulously beautiful with the perforation and with the artist. I think the next time you show this to us it might be worst considering the representation so that...

Mr. Hayes: Absolutely.

Board Member Thompson: ... we actually see what you're designing instead of a big old block.

Mr. Hayes: Well, this was just massing. We weren't asking for approval today. Thank you for the comment.

Board Member Thompson: Sure.

Chair Furth: Do we have comments on the trash enclosure issue? We have requests from the neighbors, we have proposals from the City so do we have any guidance we want to give?

Board Member Lew: I know this is a tricky one. I've done some historical analysis of the site and so it seemed like the parking was added later. There's never been an official alley behind Prolific Oven or Tai Pan so it's sort of like a defector alley. I would say we would normally require the trash enclosures to be inside on their own property and it's not – why are we giving them a freebie garbage space inside the garage because then everybody is going to want one? So, it seems to me difficult because the – because we don't really have necessarily a trigger until they start to do a project. Once they start doing a project – and I've seen this – I think they've seen the sign out there from the Toy and Sports World but then we can require it inside. It seems to me if the buildings are staying as is then I think it kind of makes sense for the City to have space in the garage. I don't think we need to have two. I think we do have other restaurants that do transport their garbage elsewhere. I think Ken, you had mentioned that the Mills Florist site and that the garage is not on the property so it happens. It's not ideal, it's not desirable but it happens. So, I'm thinking long term and what is the right decision for a long period of time? It seems to me short term I could live with any – I could probably live with any solution so yeah, Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, no, I was going to say the same thing. I think this is the City being a nice guy and providing that. I agree that they could just say you've had a real – you've been real lucky for the last whatever umpteen years and now you're going to have to do what everybody else has to do. So, I agree that anything that fits within the criteria of the project is ok.

Board Member Thompson: I think – I mean I agree that maybe providing the trash enclosure isn't the solution but I do think that loading is important and giving them the access that they need in order to function is important. Maybe that is a closer analysis on how they currently – what their current inner workings are in terms of trash and it's just a matter – I do think that corner needs reconfiguration in general. I do think it works as it stands.

Chair Furth: I would say that essentially, it's good for the City to accommodate this need. I'm sure that they'll listen to the potential future users and thinking about how and where it should be designed. This is valuable space and how the City wants to use it is essentially its choice. I look forward to seeing what can be done and I look forward to hearing about what – how these – when this is construction, how the FOG removal can be handled in a reasonable way. Yes?

Board Member Lew: Can Staff provide a – maybe transportation can provide a – what do you call that? A truck turning diagram for getting – for the Apple Store because I've seen trucks behind there. Oh, maybe it's already in the packet. Ok, I missed it.

Ms. Boyd: Its included in the packet on the last page.

Mr. Hayes: The last page.

Board Member Lew: Awe, that's why I didn't see it.

Ms. Boyd: This is the green waste garbage truck.

Chair Furth: (Inaudible) before you got there.

Board Member Lew: Ok so you're saying it works.

Chair Furth: Where is it?

Board Member Gooyer: Where is it?

Ms. Boyd: Very last page.

Board Member Lew: Last page.

Chair Furth: The last page I have is a bunch of cuts. Oh, there it is.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for that and that's taking into account all the trash enclosures?

Ms. Boyd: That's modeled for green waste – the garbage collector – the hauler the City uses. Their garbage trucks.

Board Member Lew: Awe, ok.

Board Member Gooyer: I think that's fine.

Board Member Lew: I was actually thinking of the – I've seen delivery trucks bringing stuff to the Apple Store and then they double park in the alley so I was just trying to figure out...

Chair Furth: There's a lot of double parking in that alley.

Board Member Lew: Yeah so, I was just trying (crosstalk)(inaudible)

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Ok but a truck can actually get through there. Although it's...

Chair Furth: It's very tight.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, ok, thank you.

Chair Furth: Any comments on landscaping before we go?

Board Member Lew: I don't think it works in the pedestrian walkway area on the north side.

Board Member Gooyer: It's too dark.

Board Member Thompson: It could just be a different landscape that's required there.

Chair Furth: Ok so we're unconvinced but – excuse me – would you like to respond?

Mr. Hayes: No, I missed Alex's comment. You don't favor the trash opening?

Board Member Lew: How do you – on the pedestrian walkway area for all the plants that are in the shade of the building on the north side, have you had discussions about how...

Chair Furth: Are we going to have grow lights?

Board Member Lew: ...viable they are? Then...

Mr. Hayes: The landscape architect with Merrill and Morris, John Potis, who couldn't make it today. I'd like him to address that (crosstalk) (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: We're talking about rethinking that whole thing.

Board Member Gooyer: To accommodate that extra 7-feet?

Chair Furth: Yep, we are.

Board Member Gooyer: So, that means that area – that alley is going to get a lot narrower...

Chair Furth: I think our point is...

Board Member Lew: Well, not necessarily.

Board Member Gooyer: ... (inaudible) a lot.

Board Member Lew: Well, no, I think there are two issues. I mean there's the (inaudible) walkway and the other issue is the setback. You could make a garage smaller and lose spaces. You could make the garage smaller and add motorcycle parking. There are other...

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah but I mean making – shrinking the width of that garage by 7-feet.

Chair Furth: We've given them a project.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Board Member Lew: I'm not – this – there's a 7-foot special setback and they're encroaching 5-feet into it and that's not to say that they couldn't...

Mr. Hayes: We're actually going all the way.

Ms. French: The columns go all the way to the property line.

Board Member Lew: Awe so I think I read the 5-feet somewhere in the...

Mr. Hayes: You did.

Board Member Lew: I would say we have other building downtown, you've done some of them, that have encroached a little bit; like 278 encroaches...

Mr. Hayes: 278 is the only building on that entire block of Bryant that encroaches and we have a display window as you're walking down the sidewalk towards (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: For the benefit for those of us who can't remember all the addresses, which is 278?

Mr. Hayes: That's Keene Shoes.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Board Member Lew: So, Bryant and University and so sometimes it can work. My take on it...

Mr. Hayes: At 240 we actually set the first floor back...

Board Member Lew: Back, yes.

Mr. Hayes: ...so that you have the wide sidewalk but the upper floors did not respect the setback and we got a variance for that.

Chair Furth: If this were not being coupled with a rezoning, this would be a variance full application and instead the City is proposing to change the Public Facilities District Standards. I think you've heard the aesthetic comments. Public art may save us all. We do not like this extent of encroachment into a built setback on a big street and we don't think that the landscaping as proposed on the dark side of the building is likely to flourish. We think that the -- well, the staircase may or may not be terrific but I think you've heard all our thoughts on that. You've got Board Member Baltay's thoughts in his letter which I'm sure will be shaped also by the hearing today. Anything else before we quit? Thank you all for indulging us in a rather freeform discussion. I think we want this project – it's a big project. The City is sitting here in three different – at least three different aspects, it's the client, it's the Staff, and it's the reviewing Board. We have had good participation from the public which we appreciate. We look forward to seeing you again.

Board Member Lew: We need to make a motion.

Chair Furth: So, you want us to continue this to a date certain or to a date uncertain?

Ms. French: It can be to a date uncertain. That's fine because we have – we're going to re-advertise anyways.

Chair Furth: Would somebody make a motion?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we continue this item to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: Second.

Chair Furth: Robert seconds. All in favor? Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSES WITH A VOTE OF 4-0 WITH VICE CHAIR BALTAY ABSENT

Chair Furth: Anything else before we adjourn?

Study Session

Approval of Minutes

Chair Furth: Do we have minutes to approve? No, we don't do we? I didn't read any minutes. Ok, we are adjourned.

Subcommittee Item

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment